CITIZENSHIP AND ETHNICITY IN
TURKEY AND IRAN

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MUSTAFA SUPHİ ERDEN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

AUGUST 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

—————————————————
Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

—————————————————
Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

—————————————————
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut	(METU, HIST)	—————————
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen	(METU, SOC)	—————————
Assist. Prof. Dr. Aykan Erdemir	(METU, SOC)	—————————
Assist. Prof. Dr. Nalan Soyarık-Şentürk	(BAŞKENT U., PSIR)	—————————
Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayça Ergun	(METU, SOC)	—————————

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name   :   Mustafa Suphi Erden

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

CITIZENSHIP AND ETHNICITY
IN TURKEY AND IRAN

Erden, Mustafa Suphi

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen

August 2010, 268 pages

This thesis aims at understanding the citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran by a comparative study of ethnicity, state formation, and nation building in the two lands. The research question is what kind of socio-political and cultural elements caused the two nation states to follow different paths and end up with different citizenship and state formations in the end of the twentieth century. The foci of comparison are the homogenization process of the nation states in ethnic terms, the extent of mass movements, the degree of centrality of the state in shaping the sociopolitical life, and the resistance to the state imposed regulations. In this thesis it is argued that the state tradition inherited from the Ottomans, the ethnic cleansing of the non-Muslim minorities, and the intention to assimilate the Kurdish population were the main determinants of Turkish citizenship. The mass movements emanating from the societal groups, the provincial autonomous movements, and the disruption of the state by external invasions were the main determinants of Iranian citizenship. The national identity in Turkey was more strongly based on the Turkish ethnicity; the Iranian national identity functioned as an umbrella identity over all ethnic identities in Iran. The Turkish citizenship, in comparison to Iranian, was closer to the ethnocentric and exclusionary German model; the Iranian citizenship, in comparison to the Turkish, was closer to the soil based and assimilationist French model.

Keywords: Turkey, Iran, citizenship, ethnicity, state formation.

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE VE İRAN'DA
VATANDAŞLIK VE ETNİSİTE

Erden, Mustafa Suphi

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Mesut Yeğen

Ağustos 2010, 268 sayfa

Bu tez Türkiye ve İran'da vatandaşlık oluşumunu karşılaştırmalı olarak anlamaya çalışmaktadır. Bu amaçla iki ülkedeki etnik yapı, devlet ve ulus kurma süreçleri incelenmektedir. Tezin araştırma konusu ne gibi soyo-politik ve kültürel etmenlerin iki ulus devletin farklı yönlere gitmesine ve iki ülkede yirminci yüzyılın sonunda farklı vatandaşlık ve devlet oluşumlarının ortaya çıkmasına neden olduğudur. Ulus devletlerin etnik homojenleştirme süreci, kitle hareketlerinin gücü ve yaygınlığı, devletin sosyo-politik gelişmeleri belirlemede ne kadar merkezi olduğu ve toplumun devletin düzenlemelerine ne kadar direnç gösterdiği incelenen konular arasındadır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığını belirleyen temel etmenlerin Osmanlı devletinden alınan miras, gayri-Müslimlere uygulanan etnik temizleme ve Kürt nüfusun asimile edilmeye çalışılması olduğu savunulmuştur. İran vatandaşlığını belirleyen temel etmenlerinse toplumdan yükselen muhalif kitle hareketleri, bölgesel otonom hareketler ve İran devlet yönetiminin işgaller sonucu darbe alması olduğu savunulmuştur. Türk ulusal kimliği daha güçlü olarak Türk etnisitesine dayanır; İran ulusal kimliği diğer etnik kimlikler üzerine şemsiye bir kimlik işlevi görmüştür. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığı İran vatandaşlığına göre, etnik temelli ve dışlayıcı Alman modeline daha yakındır; İran vatnadaşlığı, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığına göre, toprak temelli ve asimilasyoncu Fransa modeline daha yakındır.

Keywords: Türkiye, İran, vatandaşlık, etnisite, devlet oluşumu.

Bu çalışma annem Gülseren ERDEN'e, babam İsmail ERDEN'e ve kardeşim Zeynep ERDEN-ÖZKOL'a adanmıştır.

This work is dedicated to my mother Gülseren ERDEN, my father İsmail ERDEN and my sister Zeynep ERDEN-ÖZKOL.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"In the effort to understand the history of a specific country a comparative perspective can lead to asking very useful and sometimes new questions. There are further advantages. Comparisons can serve as a rough negative check on accepted historical explanations. And a comparative approach may lead to new historical generalizations." (Barrington Moore, Jr., Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, 1993: xix)

1.1 Comparing Turkey and Iran

This thesis aims at understanding the citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran by a comparative study of ethnicity and state formation in the two lands. The formation of citizenship in the two contexts is examined in relation to the dynamics underlying the process of foundation of the two nation states in the early twentieth century, the process of nation building throughout the twentieth century, and the relation between the state and society throughout these processes. The periods covered in this thesis correspond to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the first half of the twentieth century, and the third quarter of the twentieth century, up to 1980 in Turkey and 1979 in Iran. It is considered that the consolidation of the Turkish and Iranian national identities corresponds to the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century. The consolidation of the modern Turkish and Iranian nation-states corresponds to the periods of 1908-1945 and 1905-1941, respectively.[1] The third quarter of the twentieth century is considered to be a period in which the consolidated structures were forced to change and adapt according to the emergent socio-political and world-system dynamics.

The near past, namely the period after 1980 in Turkey, which is marked by the Kurdish resistance and European Union membership, and the period after 1979 in Iran, the Islamic Republican years, are not included in the examination within the main body. The first reason is that the objective of this thesis is to analyze the historically deeper causes of the citizenship and state formations of the two lands. The current formations are considered to be shaped more deeply by the developments of the last century rather than by the developments of the last two decades. The transformative impacts of the developments in the near past are considered not to have been intruded into the current citizenship and state formations as deep as those experienced in more than one century. The second reason is that both Turkey and especially Iran passed through enormous

---

[1] The consolidation of the Turkish and Iranian nation states lags their counterparts in Europe with approximately one century. The consolidation of French nation-state and founding of a German nation-state corresponds to the nineteenth century (Brubaker, 1990).

socio-political transformations in the 1980s. Perhaps the amount of literature on the Islamic Republic alone is comparable to the whole amount of literature on the history of modern Iran. For the aims of this thesis, it would be too ambitious to aim at assessing both the century before the 1980/1979 and the decades afterwards. The near past is considered only as a realm of interpretation in view of the presented analysis rather than as a realm of analysis.

The goal of this thesis is to identify the characteristic differences between the citizenship formations of Turkey and Iran that emanate from the historically different social and political experiences. Therefore the focus is on the different sights of the modern histories of the two lands. It is remarkable that although Turkey and Iran started a seemingly similar modernization experience in the 1920s and 1930s, they ended up in totally different regimes in the 1980s. Although the aims of the political elite of the nation states were very close, their degree of success, the paths they followed, and the reactions they got were different. The research question of this thesis is **what kind of socio-political and cultural elements caused the two nation states follow different paths and end up with different citizenship and state formations at the end of the first three quarters of the twentieth century**. The foci of comparison in this thesis are the homogenization process of the nation states in ethnic terms, the extent of mass movements, the degree of centrality of the state in shaping the sociopolitical life, the resistance to the state imposed regulations, and the flexibility of the regimes to changing conditions. All these are considered to have been experienced differently and therefore to have shaped the citizenship formation in different directions.

The contribution of this thesis to the literature about modern histories of Turkey and Iran is its comparative perspective applied to these two lands from the point of view of citizenship and state formation discussions. A comparative historical study brings new insights, which are not revealed, counters some notions, which are readily accepted, highlights some others, which are conceived as only 'natural', 'ordinary', or 'expected' through a non-comparative national history reading. A comparative study can show that what are conceived to be 'ordinary' might turn out to be important historical phenomena underlying the very peculiar state formation of a land.

Turkey and Iran share many commonalities as they inherited Empire traditions, have never been colonized or ruled under mandate[2], are geographically placed in the frontiers of the Muslim dominated area in direct contact with powerful states, especially that of Russia, have been under the political and economic intrusion of the powerful Western states, have experienced industrialization and modern state formation later than the European counterparts, experienced modernization as a project of the state elite in an authoritative way, have dealt with communal and patriarchic relations in the society, and have dominantly Islamic populations. These features make the modern histories of Turkey and Iran look very similar to each other in comparison to the Western lands and to the

---

[2] Since Turkey and Iran were not colonized or ruled under mandate, their "intelligentsia never became bilingual or linguistically bicultural as did their counterparts in India, Pakistan, Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 24).

other Islamic lands in the Middle East and north-Africa. These features help understanding Turkey and Iran together in contrast to the other lands by acknowledging an explanation of a historical phenomenon observed in one of them by means of similar observations in the other.

Despite the commonalities between the two lands, especially that of the authoritarian modernization, the Pahlavi Regime in Iran was overthrown by a mass revolution in 1979; the Kemalist Regime in Turkey is still in power, with the experience of three military coups and two overall-change of its constitution. How did the Kemalist Regime in Turkey managed to survive into the twenty first century? Why did the Pahlavi Regime in Iran collapse despite of its significant economic and military power in the late 1970s?

> Contrary to every scientific and obliviously optimistic forecast of Iran's steady arrival into the calm waters of modernity and secularism – 'everything is going according to the plan…' – reality intervened in the form of a revolution and completely shattered the ill informed and arrogant presumptions/predictions/world views nurtured by authorities in the West until the very eve of the revolution (Mirsepassi, 2000: 9).

The answer lies in the many differences between Turkey and Iran, besides the common experience of authoritarian modernization. The differences highlighted in this thesis are that the Ottoman state was much more centralized and had a more mature bureaucracy than the Qajar state; the ethnic homogenization of population in Turkey included an ethnic cleansing of the land from the non-Muslim populations; Iran experienced mass movements and provincial autonomous governments; Iran had considerably more tribal population in the early twentieth century; the Iranian people dominantly follow the Shi'a Islam while the people in Turkey dominantly follow the Sunni Islam; the societal networks of *bazaaris* – namely the urban propertied classes composed of the merchants, shopkeepers and workshop owners – and that of *ulama* – namely the religious learned – in Iran were much stronger than their counterparts in Turkey in the early twentieth century; the leftist movement in Iran was much stronger than in Turkey; the Iranian state was disrupted in the Second World War by invasion of Soviet and British forces; and the Iranian state has benefited from the oil revenues in the second half of the twentieth century. These features point out the peculiarities of the two lands despite their similar historical background and similar modernization processes. It means that although the intentions of the state elite and impositions by the socio-political world system have been similar, the very local social and historical formations resulted in different paths of development (Mahoney, 2000). All these differences point out that the "historical integrity" of both lands from the Empire era to the nation states result that Turkey and Iran have characteristically different elements in their citizenship and state formations (Skocpol, 1997: 75). The centrality of the state in Turkey and the impact of societal movements in Iran are the main differences. This thesis aims to "increase the visibility" of these differences by contrasting the two lands (Bendix, 1964: 16; Skocpol, 1997: 77).

The most striking features in the history of state formations in Turkey and Iran are existence of a centralized state tradition in Turkey with a widespread bureaucracy vis-à-vis weakly organized societal oppositional groups and existence of strongly organized societal networks in Iran vis-à-vis a less centralized and less bureaucratized state tradition. The demarcation here is about the homogenization and modernization attempts of both states and the resistance emanating from the existing societal forces in the nineteenth and twentieth century. While the state in Turkey managed to realize its modernization project in a greater extent than that of Iran, the oppositional groups in Iran presented a stronger resistance to the projects of the modernizers. Looking at the situation after 1980 in Turkey and 1979 in Iran, it can be stated that in Turkey the project initiated by the Kemalist elite in the 1920s is still in rule, but in Iran there is an Islamic Republic that emerged with a revolution of very native mass movements against the Pahlavi regime.

Throughout the thesis the term 'modernization' refers to the attempts to reorganize the state by establishing Western institutions, to change the society by importing the Western ideologies and adapting Western life styles, all associated with the modern nation states, and consequently to the abolishment of existing/traditional state institutions and ideologies inherited from the pre-modern times. Such modernization is realized as a project of the state elite by making use of their "despotic power". Mann (1984) defines the despotic power of the state as "the range of actions which the elite is empowered to undertake without routine, institutionalized negotiation with the civil society groups". The actions taken by the state elite in order to realize the modernization project also aim at transforming the identities and life styles of the people. Therefore, in conceptualization of this thesis modernization inevitably comes with the resistance of the existing/traditional societal forces. The striking difference between state formations of Turkey and Iran emanates from the difference in the relative strength of these two moments of the process, in other words from the difference in the despotic power of the states in the two lands.

A more centralized state with a strong and durable bureaucratic organization manages to consolidate its power and implement its programs more successfully. The late Ottoman Empire and the modern Turkish state present such a scene in comparison to the late Qajar Empire and the modern Iranian state. The state in Turkey was more centralized with a relatively well-established bureaucracy; the state in Iran was comparatively less centralized with a less-established bureaucracy. On the other hand, a society with strong societal networks, a tradition of mass protest/resistance and ability to organize oppositional groups present a stronger resistance to the programs of the state attacking at the existing social structures. The mass protests, organized groups, and struggle against the Shah in the late Qajar period point out such features of the Iranian society; the society in Turkey did not possess those to the same extent. The association of the features of a centralized state and strong societal networks with Turkey and Iran, respectively, are not meant in absolute terms, but in a comparative sense. The thesis aims to make a comparative understanding of the two cases, not to reach to absolute demarcations with these notions.

The repression of the potential oppositions in the early nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, strong reforms without significant mass oppositions under the rule of Mustafa Kemal, continuity of the regime after the Second World War and the consequent stable passage to the multi-party system with the initiative of the state, and the arrangements of the state to determine the limits of the oppositions in the multi-party system are the highlights of the state centered politics in Turkey in the twentieth century. What is remarkable in this period is the lacking of any significant mass initiative. Political expression of masses opposing to the state, though weak in comparison to those in Iran, were repressed in the beginning, canalized into 'loyal' parties in the middle, and subject to the state-defined limits in the third quarter of the twentieth century. The significant features of this political process in Turkey, in comparison to Iran, are the top-down formation of the political system, lacking of strong mass protests[3], and ability of the state to preserve its fundamentals by tuning itself and manipulating the political system according to the emerging socio-political conditions.

The persistence of societal forces and the considerable mass movements against the state initiatives in the late Qajar Empire, weak reforms of Reza Shah confronted with considerable opposition from the societal groups, emergence of mass movements when the administrative structure was demolished during and after the Second World War, inability of Mohammed Reza Shah to channel the opposition into the limits of his regime, collapse of the repressive regime of the Shah with the protests of politically active masses, all signify a mass protest tradition in the politics of Iran in the twentieth century. This tradition points out the existence of politically active groups in Iranian society. The repressive regimes brought these forces together to act against the common enemy, mostly the Shah; but the comparatively liberal periods resulted in the disarray of Iranian politics. The mass protest tradition in Iran resulted in moments that reflected the initiatives of the masses in the twentieth century Iranian politics. The Constitutional Revolution, the National Front Movement, and the Islamic Revolution were results of the mass movements coming from below. These movements, though all shared a bottom-up formation in themselves, did not always succeed to form a durable bottom-up formation of the political system, perhaps except for the Islamic Revolution.

The centrality of the state in Turkey and the existence of a mass protest tradition in Iran both point out the differences in the relations between the state and society. The citizenships in the two lands have different formations due to the differences between the state and society in the two contexts. This thesis aims to arrive at some comparative determinants about the citizenship formations of Turkey and Iran by examining the nation and state building processes in both lands.

---

[3] This statement should be considered for the period before the 1990s. As Yeğen comments, the Kurdish movement led by the PKK should be regarded to gain a genuine mass support after 1989 (Yeğen, 2006: 34).

1.2 Citizenship, Ethnicity, and State Formation

The citizenship discussions draw considerable attention of the social science scholars in the last decades. The underlying socio-political reasons and theoretical motivations of such an attention are the rise of supra national companies and economic organizations, the regression of the confidence on the nation state, the immigrations taking place from non-Western countries towards the industrialized Western lands, therefore the threat on the homogeneity and integrity of nation states, the corrosion of the notions of nation state and the accompanying socio-political life, the claims for a united European socio-political structure, and the utopias for a world-communitarian existence on the planet.[4] Namely, the discussion is motivated mostly by the very empirical socio-political and socio-economic problems in the Western world and competing policies to overcome those.

Among all these discussions a significant work is performed on understanding the formation of citizenship. This attempt scrutinizes the origins and actors of the formations of citizenship as well as the dynamics underlying its evolution. The related work searches for both universal answers that will encompass all types of citizenship emerged in different contexts and also for structural differences that avoid such an encompassing theory. The main stream of discussions on citizenship formations can be followed through the line of works by Marshall, Mann, Turner, and Brubaker, who respectively emphasized 'class conflicts', 'ruling strategies', 'establishments from above/below and realization in public/private realms', and lastly 'soil based and blood based citizenship formations as a model of membership to the nation state'.[5] The ideas of the last three scholars in fact evolved one after the other, as a progress of the discussion by criticism of the ideas of the former scholars, especially those in the seminal work by Marshall. This main stream discussion is revealed by relating it to the Turkish and Iranian contexts in Chapter 5.

A decisive process in nation state building is the homogenization of the population into a national identity. The national identity is usually defined on the basis of the majority ethnic group. This process of homogenization relates to the assimilation, exclusion, deportation, and even massacre of the minority ethnic groups. The citizenship formation is closely related to the homogenization in nation building process. Therefore the change in ethnic demography of the land and the relation of the state with the ethnic minorities are central to the citizenship discussions. For

---

[4] Some literatures that dwell upon the citizenship discussion from different perspectives are as follows: European Union perspective [Habermas. J. (1995), Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe, in *Theorizing Citizenship*, ed. by R. Beiner, (New York: Sunny Press), pp.255-281]; cosmopolitan and world citizenship perspective [Hutchings, K. (1999), Political Theory and Cosmopolitan Citizenship, in *Cosmopolitan* Citizenship, ed. by R. Dannreuther, (London:McMillan)] and [Roblat, J. (1997), *World Citizenship: Allegiance to Humanity*, (London: McMillan)]; immigration perspective [Joppke, C. (1999), How Immigration is Changing Citizenship: A Comparative View, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22 (4): 629-652].

[5] Marshall, T.H. (1992), *Citizenship and Social Class*, (London: Plute Press), pp. 1-51, first published in 1950; Mann, M. (1987), Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship, *Sociology*, 21 (3): 339-354; Turner, B.S. (1990), Outline of the Theory of Citizenship, *Sociology* 24 (2):189-217; Brubaker, W.R. (1990), "Immigration, Citizensip, and the Nation-state in France and Germany: a Comparative Historical Analysis". *International Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 379-407.

the lands of Turkey and Iran, which are transformed from multi-ethnic Empires into nation states, the ethnicity question is especially central to citizenship discussions.

An ethnic group is constituted on the basis of a belief of its members in the "myth of a common descent" (Yıldız, 2001: 41). The determinant of an ethnic group is that the members 'perceive' themselves as having a distinct identity based on descent or cultural elements like language and religion. The cultural elements function to distinguish ethnic groups to the extent they are loaded with social meanings (Yıldız, 2001: 44; Beck, 1990: 196). Ethnicity also refers to the set of behaviors and habits of daily life. How one "tidies own room, eats in the most comfortable manner, washes the self" are mostly determined by the ethnic group (Shaffer, 2008: 13). Ethnicity is not a term referring necessarily to minority groups; an ethnic group can be the hegemonic group with which the national identity is most closely related (Yıldız, 2001: 40). The Turkish and Persian are the hegemonic ethnicities in Turkey and Iran respectively. Their main determinants are language, and the myths of common descent and history. The non-Muslim communities in Turkey and Iran constitute ethnic minority groups on the basis of religion. The Kurds in Turkey, Azerbaijanis and Kurds in Iran constitute the major minority ethnic groups on the basis of language and myth of common descent. This thesis focuses on the relation of the Turkish and Iranian states with their minority ethnic groups in order to understand the citizenship formations in the respective lands.

Tribes can be considered as socio-politically organized subgroups within ethnically defined larger groups. The common feature of tribe and ethnicity is that they are "imagined identit[ies] based on continually revised conceptions of history and tradition in the context of contemporary circumstances" (Beck, 1990: 189). "Ethnicity is a wider, more inclusive construct than is tribe…The term *tribe* emerges in reference to some form of sociopolitical organization, whereas the phrase *ethnic group* emphasizes a culturally defined self-consciousness" (Beck, 1990: 196). The nomadic tribes in Iran were subject to severe repressions and harsh treatment by the state to be settled and assimilated into the Persian ethnicity. The assimilation policies towards the Azerbaijanis, Kurds and other ethnic groups and the settlement and assimilation policies towards the tribes constituted the homogenization process in Pahlavi Iran. Therefore, the tribes in Iran are considered in this thesis as a part of the ethnicity discussion.

The citizenship formation is directly related to the state formation of a land. In fact, the term 'state formation' should be read as 'nation state formation'. The main problematic pointed out with this term is the transformation of the medieval states into the nation states of the twentieth century. In many European lands this transformation took place following a line of estates, absolutist kingdoms, and nation states. The transformation of the state structure was accompanied by the transformation of the legitimacy of the government as well as the transformation of the idea of the 'people' of the state. The process of 'nation building' corresponds to these two accompanying changes in the state apparatus. The answers given to the questions of how the state gains its

legitimacy and how the people are associated with the state constitute the ideological elements of the nation building process. The answers given to these questions are inevitably related to the citizenship discussion as they directly point out the relation between the individual and the state. Therefore the state formation, including the transformation of the state apparatus and the nation building process, are in the center of the discussions of citizenship formation. That is the reason that all citizenship literature is based on the state formation literature.

In Turkey and Iran the state formations were about transformation of an Empire into a nation-state through a modernization process. The problematic in Turkey and Iran were about how to transform the state institutions into the Western models, how to gain the consent of masses for these transformations, how to transform the social life of people accordingly, how to define the nation for the emergent state, and how to repress the oppositions to these transformations. The practices developed as answers to these questions, under the banner of 'modernization', constituted the main determinants of the relation between the individual and the state, namely the citizenship formations, in Turkey and Iran. The state formations of Turkey and Iran are compared in Chapter 4. This chapter provides the comparative historical background to understand the citizenship formations of Turkey and Iran, comparatively examined in Chapter 5.

In the last decades there appeared a considerable amount of literature by Turkish scholars dedicated to citizenship formation in Turkey. This interest of scholars in the citizenship discussions is perhaps mainly due to the two factors: the Kurdish movement raised by both the PKK (Kurdistan's Workers Party, *Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan*) and the political parties representing the Kurdish population, on the one hand, and the rise of discussions about the inclusion/exclusion of Turkey in/from the European Union, on the other hand. The Kurdish resistance basically forced the scholars to question the validity of the citizenship in Turkey being based on the Turkish ethnicity. Seemingly there is a consensus today, not only among the Turkish scholars, but also among many power groups in the Turkish state, that the definition of citizenship in Turkey should be extended to include the Kurdish population by recognizing their Kurdish identity. However, there is still an ongoing dispute whether this extension should be made to eliminate the stress on the Turkish ethnic values on the political realm and to open the path for political representation of the Kurdish identity, or to put regulations that will allow for the representation of the Kurdish culture in civil social life but restrict the political representation of the Kurdish identity by still defining the Kurdish people with the term 'Turkish'. The discussions about the membership of Turkey to the European Union force the scholars to question the range of democracy within the Turkish politics. This leads to the questions about the characteristic of the relation between the Turkish state and society: how much influence the individuals and the civil societal groups in Turkey have on the daily politics, whether the citizenship in Turkey is formed through an authoritarian top-down process or a participatory bottom-up process, whether the rights of citizens in Turkey are

recognized to the level of those in the Western world, whether the welfare of the state or the individual has the precedence in Turkey.

Considering the literature studied for this thesis, the discussion of citizenship is less central in Iran, in comparison to that in Turkey.[6] It is hardly possible to come across literature with a title like "citizenship in Iran" or "Iranian citizenship". Therefore the knowledge on Iran is acquired from the texts about the modern history of Iran and the national identity of Iranian people. It is a curious question why the notion of citizenship did not perceive a similar attention in the social science literature on Iran, compared to that on Turkey. The answer perhaps lies in two domains. First, the two fundamental factors that appeared in Turkey, a significant Kurdish movement and the question of membership to the European Union, are absent in Iran. Although there is a Kurdish movement in Iran, its power is much less compared to the one in Turkey (Beck, 1980; Bruinessan, 1986). Moreover, Kurds are not the largest ethnic minority group in Iran. The largest ethnic minority group in Iran is the Azerbaijanis. [7,8] The Azerbaijanis population is quite integrated to the Iranian culture and Iranian identity, especially after the Islamic Revolution. Therefore, there is no strong ethnic based resistance to the regime in Iran as in Turkey. There is also no question of integration with the West in the current Iranian politics; both the Islamic Republic and the European Union consider the other as align to their own political values.

The second reason for the relatively less attention on the notion of citizenship in the literature on Iran is perhaps a deeper one related to the modern history of Iran. The notion of citizenship is inevitably bound to the official definition of the term by the state. Therefore, the legal framework related to citizenship constitutes the backbone of the discussions around the term. The political groups that struggle for recognition of their rights or identities make reference to the judicial definition of citizenship; they either criticize the definition or they demand for their rights recognized on paper but not realized in practice. Therefore, it is important how durable and how reliable the official definition of citizenship is in the daily politics. This is related to how powerful the state is to enforce its regulations and how sustainable the regime is. When the state is disrupted as in Iran, especially as in the Second World War, the regime is not conceived by the people as powerful enough to enforce its regulations and as durable to last for long. The belief in the sustainability of the Pahlavi regime happened to be weaker compared to that of the Kemalist regime. The state apparatus in Turkey was not disrupted; therefore the Kemalist regime could

---

[6] It should be noted here that the author of this thesis does not speak or read Persian. Therefore, the knowledge about the modern Iranian history and Iranian national identity is acquired from the texts written in English on Iran. It should also be noted that there is a considerable amount of literature on modern Iranian history written in English by Persian scholars. This is perhaps due to the fact that a lot of intellectual people flew away from Iran after the first years of the Islamic Republic and a lot of the scholars among those found positions in the Western universities.

[7] Gunter estimates the size of Kurdish population in Turkey to be around 12 to 15 million, around 18-23% of the total population: Gunter, M.M. (2008), *The Kurds Ascending – The Evolving Solutionto the Kurdish Problem in Iraq and Turkey*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p.2. Mutlu estimates the size of Kurdish population in Turkey in 1990 to be around 7 million, corresponding to 12% of the total population.

[8] The Azerbaijanis in Iran constitute around the 20-30%, the Kurds 9%, Baluchis 3%, Arabs 2.5%, and Turkmes 1.5% of the total population in Iran (Shaffer, 2008: 264).

maintain its rule since its foundation. It was more usual in Iran than in Turkey that the official sanctions were ignored in practice. During the rule of Reza Shah, the constitution and assembly were ignored almost totally by the government. Mohammed Reza Shah did not intend to change the statement in the constitution about the Shi'a Islam character of the Iranian state, although his regime was very secular. Due to the gap between the official sanctions and practice, the official definition of citizenship did not preoccupy the Iranian political surroundings as a framework for struggle for rights and recognition of identities. The official citizenship was not conceived by the opposition as a domain to give a struggle to change or to expand or to redefine. The oppositional groups were mostly directed to the regime itself, rather than its sanctions within the official domain. The discussions about Iranian identity, individual rights, and rights of ethnic minorities were performed less with reference to the details of the official framework than by attacking the regime itself. The derivations about Iranian citizenship formation in this thesis are therefore based on the literature on modern history and national identity of Iran, not on a literature explicitly dealing with Iranian citizenship.

In this thesis the ethnic cleansing of non-Muslim minorities and the resistance of the Kurdish population to assimilate into the Turkish ethnicity are considered to be the most important determinants of Turkish citizenship. The "ethnic-cleansing" of the Christian minorities was performed by two major catastrophic events, the Armenian Massacre[9] in 1915 and the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations in 1923 (Aktar, 2006: 18). These events underlie the exclusionary character of Turkish citizenship towards the non-Muslim populations. The ethnic cleansing of the land was accompanied by the nationalization of economy, namely the transfer of entrepreneurs and assets owned by the non-Muslims to the Muslim population. This was a process initiated by the government of CUP during the First World War and continued by the Republican elite after the foundation of the Republic. The treatment of the Turkish Republic towards the Kurdish population signifies the assimilationist character of Turkish citizenship. The Kurdish population was considered to be potentially assimilated to the Turkish ethnicity. However, the resistance of the Kurds to assimilation created an undecided policy of the Turkish state between ethnic exclusion and ethnic assimilation towards the Kurds. Besides discussing these main determinants, it is argued in this thesis that the formation of Turkish citizenship was passive and from above without a significant contribution of the masses. Furthermore the citizenship formation did not evolve as an expansion of rights. Rather, it was used by the Kemalist regime as an instrument for its ruling strategy. Therefore, the Turkish citizenship was loaded with more duties than rights. In comparison

---

[9] It should be noted at the very beginning that the author of this thesis is convinced to name the catastrophic events of 1915 as "Armenian Genocide". The recent studies convince the author about existence of a centralized decision by the CUP leaders of the time and organization of the massacres by the Special Organization (*Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa*) functioning as the secret service of the CUP. Especially the studies by Taner Akçam are convincing for the author [Akçam, Taner (2002), *Insan Haklari ve Ermeni Sorunu – Ittihat ve Terakki'den Kurtulus Savasi'na*, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari]. Since the issue is still being discussed within the Turkish intellectual surroundings and yet not a consensus is achieved, the term "Armenian Massacre" is used instead of "Armenian Genocide" throughout the text. The term "Armenian Genocide" is used once in the conclusion.

to Iranian citizenship, Turkish citizenship was more close to the ethnocentric and exclusionary German model.

The most important determinants for the Iranian citizenship are considered to be the Constitutional Revolution, the mass movement tradition in Iran, and the ethnic provincial movements in the early 1920s and in 1945. The Constitutional Revolution of Iran in 1906 was a result of a mass movement of various societal groups. The participation of masses and the emergence of the notion of Iranian as an umbrella identity over the ethnic groups were reflected in the Constitution of 1906. The Constitutional Revolution strongly relates to a mass movement tradition in Iran. This tradition continued in the twentieth century with the provincial movements in 1945, the National Front Movement of Mossadeq in the early 1950s, and the mass protests in the early 1960s and late 1970s that led to the Islamic Revolution in 1979. The provincial movements in the Gilan and Azerbaijan provinces in 1920-1921, the Autonomous Government of Azerbaijan and Kurdish Autonomous Government in 1945 are considered to be a result of the largeness and variety of ethnic minorities in Iran, which is not observed in Turkey except for the Kurdish population. The Pahlavi regime aimed at an ethnic homogenization based on assimilation into the Persian culture by suppression of other ethnicities in the political arena and education. However, unlike that in Turkey, there was no systematic policy of rejection of the existence of ethnic identities. The policies of Reza shah resulted in the reaction of the ethnic minorities in the form of the Kurdish and Azerbaijan autonomous governments in 1945. It is argued in this thesis that the Iranian citizenship was more active than Turkish considering the mass protest tradition in Iran. The umbrella characteristic of the Iranian identity signifies the assimilationist character of Iranian citizenship. In comparison to the Turkish, Iranian citizenship was more close to the soil based assimilationist French model. Due to the impact of the Constitutional Revolution the Iranian Constitution emphasized the rights over duties. However, similar to the Kemalist regime in Turkey, the Pahlavi regime in Iran aimed at using the notion of citizenship as an instrument of ruling. Therefore, the citizenship promoted by the Pahlavi state emphasized duties over rights.

1.3 Comparative History

The benefits of a comparative perspective in history and social sciences have long been acknowledged by scholars. Barrington Moore has given one of the pioneering texts, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, in this regard. As he states in his preface, comparative studies might lead to new questions about a land that do not arise by reading merely its own history. Moreover, a comparative study might also check and disprove the accepted explanations that are reproduced by reading of the own history of a land (Moore, 1993: xix). How one looks to history might change what one sees in the documents and written stories. Comparative studies have the potential to equip the scholar with new perspectives. It is possible only by gaining new perspectives that existing explanations can be criticized, new explanations can be developed, and new problems can be defined.

Skocpol distinguished three "logics-in-use of comparative history". Among those the first type of logic in comparative history is "*parallel demonstration of theory*" (Skocpol, 1997: 73). A representative of this kind of analysis is *The Political Systems of Empires* by Eisenstadt.[10] This first type of comparative history aims at validating a general theory by proving the hypotheses derived from the theory in different contexts. In this type "the reason for juxtaposing case histories is to persuade the reader that a given, explicitly delineated hypothesis or theory can repeatedly demonstrate its fruitfulness – its ability convincingly to order the evidence – when applied to a series of relevant historical trajectories" (Skocpol, 1997: 73). "The point of the comparison is to assert a similarity among the cases – similarity, that is, in terms of the common applicability of the overall theoretical arguments" (Skocpol, 1997: 74).

The second type of comparative historical analysis is "*macro-causal analysis*". This type performs "hypothesis-testing through multivariate analysis" (Skocpol, 1997: 73). The main representatives of this kind of comparative historical analysis are the *Social Origins of Democracy and Dictatorship* by Moore (1993) and *Social Revolutions* by Skocpol (1997). The scholars applying this second logic use "comparative history primarily for the purpose of making causal inferences about macro-level structures and processes" (Skocpol, 1997: 78). In this second type there is no strong devotion to theory as in the first; therefore, the aim is not to demonstrate the validity of a theoretical explanation. Rather, historical comparisons are used "to test the validity of existing theoretical hypotheses and to develop new causal generalizations to replace invalidated ones" (Skocpol, 1997: 78).

Lastly, the third type of logic in comparative history is "*contrast of contexts*" (Skocpol, 1997: 73). The pioneering example of this type of comparative study is the *Nation Building and Citizenship* by Bendix (1964). In this type of logic the scholars

> make use of comparative history to bring out the unique features of each particular case
> included in their discussions, and to show how these unique features affect the working-out of
> putatively general social processes...[W]hat matters more in the Contrast-oriented type is that
> the historical integrity of each case as a whole is carefully respected. For much of the thrust of
> this variant of comparative history is to suggest that particular nations, empires, civilizations,
> or religions constitute relatively irreducible wholes, each a complex and unique sociohistorical
> configuration in its own right (Skocpol, 1997: 75).

Accordingly Bendix states "Comparative sociological studies...increase the visibility of one structure by contrasting it with another" (Bendix, 1964: 16; Skocpol, 1997: 77). Skocpol suggests that "the task of the Contrast-oriented comparative historian is facilitated when maximally different cases within given bounds are chosen for comparison" (Skocpol, 1997: 76).

---

[10] Eisenstadt, S.N. (1963), *The Political Systems of Empires: The Rise and Fall of Historical Bureaucratic Societies*, New York: Free Press.

The approach of this thesis follows the third logic in Skocpol's description, the *contrast of contexts*. This thesis aims at analyzing the citizenship and state formations of Turkey and Iran by contrasting those to each other. In parallel with Skocpol's description, Turkey and Iran constitute two socio-historical domains "within given bounds". Both of the lands experienced modernization as a project of the state elite, both of them experienced transformation from an empire tradition into a nation state, both of them were non-colonized, and both of them have Muslim populations. On the other hand, again in parallel with Skocpol's description, Turkey and Iran constitute "different cases" as the empire traditions they inherited were different, as the societal networks and mass movements in the two contexts were different, as the ethnic demography and ethnic movements were different, and as the sects of Islam followed by the majority of the populations are different. Both of the nation states aimed at westernization, but they followed different paths due to the difference in social structures and historical experiences (Mahoney, 2000). Skocpol also state that "[p]ractitioners of Contrast-oriented comparative history stand squarely in the middle between the characteristic disciplinary concepts of social scientists and historians...Contrast-oriented comparativists take chronology very seriously, emphasizing how sociocultural experiences exhibit continuity over time" (Skocpol, 1997: 87). In this thesis too the discussion of citizenship and state formation in Turkey and Iran necessitated a review of the modern histories of the two lands. This review is made by emphasizing the moments of the modern histories concerning ethnic minorities, provincial movements, and societal oppositional groups.

It is usually acknowledged that the social sciences in Turkey are "over politicized" in support of the official ideologies of the Turkish Republic, especially in comparison to their counterparts in the Western lands (Ergut, 2004: 375). In the last decades there have been significant attempts to rewrite the modern history of Turkey, a promising engagement to bring the social sciences in Turkey to the level of the *state of art* of the contemporary world. These attempts generally criticize the official historical reading. The discussions related to the Kurdish problem question the ethnic homogeneity of the land as promoted by the official ideology and point out the cooperation of the Turkish and Kurdish populations in the Independence War (Yıldız, 2001), something not visible in official historical readings. A comparison of the size of the Independence War of Turkey, with the size of the First World War for the Ottoman Empire, questions the central importance of the Independence War in nation building and state formation in Turkey (Başkaya, 1997: 69). The discussions about the Armenian Massacre in 1915 (Akçam, 2002) and Wealth Tax in 1942 (Aktar, 2008), reveal the ethnic cleansing prior to and after the foundation of the Turkish state, which are absent in official readings. Such attempts of rewriting the modern history signify that there is a quest among the Turkish scholars for gaining new perspectives to interpret the known stories in another way and to perceive the unforeseen sides of the stories by new means. Comparing the history of Turkey with other lands provides new perspectives for understanding its history.

A comparative perspective on Turkey and Iran provides insight into the modern histories of these two neighboring lands; because they have similar features in comparison to European lands and are quite different considering their own social formations and state traditions. Most of the studies on state formation and national identity in Turkey and Iran compare those with the Western lands. Although, these studies provide an understanding of the differences of the two from the West, they might skip the peculiarities that do not appear as a comparative element with respect to the Western history. Therefore, a reading of the history of these two lands side by side brings about the characteristics of their modern histories, which are not observed in the West. This thesis is therefore mainly based on a simultaneous reading of the modern histories of Turkey and Iran. The most prominent texts that underlie this reading are the seminal works by Zürcher and Abrahamian, *Turkey – A Modern History*[11] and *Iran Between Two Revolutions*[12], respectively. These two texts provide an almost overall picture of the modern histories of the two lands starting from the late Ottoman and Qajar times, respectively, till the last decades, namely covering the overall period subject to this thesis. Both of them are written in the English language. Besides these two, various literatures on Turkish and Iranian modern history, Turkish and Iranian national identity, and ethnic problems in Turkey and Iran are used. The ones on Turkey are mostly written in Turkish. The ones on Iran are all in English. The literature on Turkey and Iran are read with a comparative perspective to find out similarities, differences, and peculiarities of the two lands.

A comparative reading of the history of two lands necessitates acquiring 'handles', namely notions of comparison, in order to guide the literature survey and reading. These 'handles' are derived from some comparative historical literature on the Western as well as north-African and Middle Eastern lands. The first step of the study was to examine these notions in the contexts of Turkey and Iran and to determine the ones that are most informative for understanding Turkey and Iran from a comparative perspective. 'Ethnic homogenization' (Münch, 2001), 'network of societal groups' (Janoski, 1998), 'citizenship rights' (Marshall, 1992), 'ruling strategy' (Mann, 1987), 'duties and rights' (Janoski, 1998), 'active-passive citizenship' (Turner, 1990), 'soil based-blood based citizenship' (Brunaker, 1990) are the prominent notions existent in the literature on the Western states; 'disruption of the state apparatus' (Anderson, 1986; Cleveland, 2008), 'tribes' (Anderson, 1986; Longva, 2000), 'modernization as a project' (Zubaida, 1989), 'centrality of the military in modernization' (Butenschon, 2000), 'rejection of the past' (Hatem, 2000), 'ulama' (Zubaida, 1989), 'coercion' (Hermassi, 1987), and 'gradual citizenship' (Butenschon, 2000; Davis, 2000) are the prominent notions existent in the literature on north-African and Middle Eastern states; all used in this thesis to compare the state formations and citizenship in Turkey and Iran. The second step was to identify the notions peculiar to Turkey and Iran and not stressed in the literature on the Western, north-African, and Middle Eastern lands. 'Provincial movements',

---

[11] Zürcher, Erik J. (1994), *Turkey- A Modern History*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd. Publishers.
[12] Abrahamian, Ervand (1982), *Iran Between Two Revolutions*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

'saving the state', 'inherited state structure', 'xenophobia and nativism', 'early repression or persistence of potential oppositions', and 'canalization of the opposition into legal political framework' are the prominent notions that are important for comparison of Turkey and Iran, and that are not stressed in the literature on other lands.

1.4 State Formation Literature

The consideration of state formations of other lands provides exemplary perspectives to pinpoint to the historical moments that might be important for citizenship and state formations in Turkey and Iran. Some of the criteria used for comparison of citizenship and state formations of Turkey and Iran are derived from the comparative literature on some Western, Middle Eastern and north-African lands. The examination of some Middle Eastern and north-African lands was considered to be important to bring a non-Western perspective to the discussion. In the following first a very brief treatment of some prominent moments of Western histories is performed in order to reveal the context from which the Western notions of citizenship that are used in this thesis emerged. The Western contexts are also briefly compared with the history of Turkey and Iran by mentioning the differences in between. Afterwards a discussion of the state formations of some Middle Eastern and north-African states is given. In this discussion the aim is to show the non-Westen side of Turkey and Iran by relating the two to those lands. The criterion of comparison derived from the Middle Eastern and north-African contexts are mentioned.

The history of Western lands, with very bold lines, followed the chronological line of estates, absolutist kingdoms, and nation states. The era of estates was marked by the struggle of feudal rule of landlords and the patrimonial rule of the kings. Among those the patrimonial rule is considered to have affinity with the idea of nationalism in the era of nation states. The eighteenth century was marked by the absolutist kingdoms where the kings consolidated their patrimonial rule and autonomous jurisdiction over the landed nobles. Absolutist kingdoms can be considered to be an intermediary step from the medieval patrimonial-feudal estate structures to the nation-states of the twentieth century. This step was strongly experienced in the European continent, but not in Britain and not so strongly in the Scandinavian lands. It is possible to follow the affinity between patrimonialism and nationalism, and the intermediary role of the absolutist regimes from Bendix's words.

> For with the rise of absolute monarchies paternalism is transformed from a justification of domestic relations to an ideology of national government… Where all people have rights, where all are the subjects of one king, where the king in turn exercises supreme authority over everyone – we get a first intimation of 'national citizenship' and one supreme authority over all public affairs which eventually emerge as the distinguishing characteristics of modern Western societies (Bendix, 1964: 47).

Barrington Moore distinguishes "three routes to the modern world". The route of "capitalist and parliamentary democracy" was experienced in England, France, and the United States (US).

Moore names this route also as "bourgeois revolution". The second route was fascism experienced in Germany and Japan. This route was also capitalist but lacked a revolutionary struggle and was marked with reactionary politics. The third route was communism experienced in Russia and China, having its "origins among the peasants" (Moore, 1993: 413). According to Moore, these three types "constituted alternative routes and choices" for modernization. Moore also states that the feudalism in Western Europe, where the capitalist and bourgeois democracy emerged, "did contain certain institutions that distinguish it from other societies in such a way as to favor democratic possibilities" (Moore, 1993: 415). The development of Western modernity can be traced through the stages of the growth of cities within the feudal system in the fifteenth and sixteenth century; "massive growth of dispersed, small-scale manufacturing in towns and countryside around poles of capital" in the seventeenth and eighteenth century; "capital, workers and manufacturing concentrating increasingly in cities as countryside became more exclusively agricultural" in the nineteenth and twentieth century; and "service industries…continu[ing] to grow at the expense of agriculture, forestry and fishing" in the twentieth century (Tilly, 1993: 27).

The nation state formations in Turkey and Iran did not follow the line of estates-absolutism-nation states. The nation state formation in Turkey and Iran occurred because the Empires of both lands disintegrated due to external impacts of wars, invasion, and economic intrusion. The Western lands were transformed through the line of estates-absolutism-nation states mainly due to their own social dynamics. The transformation from Empires to nation states in Turkey and Iran was due to the disintegration of the Empires by external impacts. The local social dynamics were not the prominent determinants in the political transformation. Therefore, the demarcation of the outside powers as 'Westerns' – perhaps with conflicting attitudes as sometimes with admiration and imitation and sometimes with hatred and xenophobic feelings – and preserving the local values with the sentiments of 'saving the state' and 'nativism' constituted the fundamental elements in nation building of Turkey and Iran. However, the state formations in Turkey and Iran borrowed considerably from the two of the routes to modernity delineated by Moore: the capitalist and parliamentary democracy and the conservative revolutions from above leading to fascism (Moore, 1993: 414). It can be argued that Turkey and Iran aimed at the capitalist economic system of the Western Europe by creating their own national bourgeoisie. For doing that, the states functioned in a very authoritarian way performing reforms from above, very comparably to the regimes that led to fascism. The system aimed at was that of capitalist parliamentary democracy, the methods used mostly resembled those of the authoritarian regimes.

In the Western world, the development of rights started "with barons gaining access to legal rights (e.g. the Magna Carta in Britain)" (Janoski, 1998: 3). Afterwards "the creation of mass national armies" during the era of absolutist kingdoms forced the regimes to expand the rights to the grass and root people (Tilly, 1998: 69). Via the principle of plebiscitarianism of the absolutist regimes the avenue was opened for "the entry of the lower classes into the arena of national

politics" (Bendix, 1964: 79). The following moment of expansion of rights was due to the "bourgeois-led drive for civil and political rights" (Tilly, 1998: 69). The rights "developed further with the bourgeoisies obtaining legal and political rights in various legal codes and constitutions during the Industrial Revolution" (Janoski, 1998: 3). Barrington Moore distinguishes the following rights as the characteristics of the capitalist and bourgeois regimes in Western Europe:

> Key elements in the liberal and bourgeois order of society are the right to vote, representation
> in a legislature that makes the laws and hence is more than a rubber stamp for the executive,
> an objective system of law that at least in theory confers no special privileges on account of
> birth or inherited status, security for the rights of property and the elimination of barriers
> inherited from the past on its use, religious toleration, freedom of speech, and the right to
> peaceful assembly (Moore, 1993: 429).

The political struggle in the medieval ages was between the king and landed nobles to extend the territory under their control. Control and discipline were the main functions that the rulers experienced over the subjects within their own territory. In the era of nation states the political struggle turned out to be between the lower and ruling classes to dominate the sovereignty represented by the nation state. The situation of being subject to the discipline of a ruler was transformed to living in the territory of a state and being subject to the laws of the state. Therefore, with the nation state the understanding of civil rights and expansion of civil rights was also opened (Ergut, 2004: 368). Enlarging the sphere of rights was one of the aims of the lower classes in nation states. Bendix mentions this transformation as follows:

> Politics ceases to be a struggle over the distribution of sovereign powers whenever the orderly
> dominion over a territory and its inhabitants is conceived to be the function of one and the
> same community – the nation-state. Instead, politics becomes a struggle over the distribution
> of the national product and over the policies and the administrative implementation which
> affect that distribution (Bendix, 1964: 106).

The development of rights for the nobles, the bourgeoisie, and the lower classes should not be considered as developments in the same direction, or to be consistent with each other only because they are new entitlements. Although "the same civil rights that advanced the bourgeois position supported the organization of workers and petty bourgeois", this was, only "within limits" (Tilly, 1998: 68). While the nobles were entitled new rights vis-à-vis the king, they also advanced their domination over the bourgeoisies and lower classes; while the bourgeoisies were entitled new rights vis-à-vis the king and the nobles, they advanced their domination over the working classes. Therefore, Janoski states, "[t]he market, supported by basic liberal rights, dominated the political and citizenship rights of the masses previously embedded in medieval constitutionalism" (Janoski, 1998: 106). As a result of this situation, the struggle of the lower classes did not happen to be against the king controlling the state, but against the ruling classes, the bourgeoisie and partly landowners, controlling the market forces. "The subsequent rise of citizenship and its concomitant rights and duties in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries need to be seen against this

background of market forces nearly overwhelming prior feudal and agrarian rights and obligations, which were largely communitarian" (Janoski, 1998: 106).

The process of claim-making by the working classes did not follow the same path all through the nineteenth and twentieth century. While the rights demanded in the early phases were based on individuality, in effect of the demand of bourgeoisie for legal rights, in the latter phases workers demanded for institutional rights. This "shift from the guarantee of basic citizenship rights of labor towards the institutionalization of organized labor's collective rights" was in relation with the change in "the rules of the game of political and economic interest intermediation" (Ebbinghaus, 1996: 64). Furthermore, while in the early phases of the nineteenth century the labor movement emerged with more internationalist sounds, with the "national electoral and bargaining channels" that emerged in the early twentieth century, the labor movement was "drawn into the national polity and society" (Ebbinghaus, 1996: 88). The expansion of citizenship rights as civil, political, and social, as mentioned by Marshal (1992), should be considered in this context of changing political and economic conditions in the West.

The socio-political formations of the Ottoman and Qajar Empires did not pass through the estates-absolutist kingdoms transformation as in the Western world. The expansion of rights in the West by transformation of functional representation to plebiscitarianism and further towards a nation is not readily observed in the Ottoman and Qajar Empires. This is because the local powers in the Ottoman and Qajar Empires were not as strong as the magnates in the European lands. There were no comparable formal rules or customs that could bind the Sultan and the Shah against the nobles. Therefore the historical tradition of reciprocal rights between the big powers was not existent in the Ottomans and Qajars.

Barrington Moore states, "a vigorous and independent class of town dwellers has been an indispensable element in the growth of parliamentary democracy" (Moore, 1993: 418). After the end of the fifteenth century, Europe experienced "an unprecedented burst of industrialization, urbanization, proletarianization and population growth" (Tilly, 1993: 26). Beginning with the sixteenth century the largest cities in the world were located in the northern Europe (Tilly, 1993: 22). The economic independence of these cities from the countryside brought with their governmental autonomy vis-à-vis the landlords and kings. Ikegami mentions the existence of "municipal autonomy in the pre-modern cities in Europe" (Ikegami, 1996: 218-219). The political autonomy in the frame of city was important to prepare the primordial understandings of citizenship. Existing of such a municipal autonomy was a characteristic of Europe in contrast to Asian lands. Ikegami argues that also the German lands shared the feature of having autonomous cities as in Western Europe. The autonomous cities of German lands as well experienced "the common European tradition of natural and positive law" within the frame of Holy Roman Empire in a degree as in Western Europe. The Emperor there was determined by election among the equal kings under the empire. Therefore the empire was both dependent on the kings and bound by the

rules (Ikegami, 1996: 219-220). In the case of Ottoman and Qajar Empires, the Sultan and the Shah were not dependent on any other power center, considering the legitimacy and formal politics. There were also no independent cities on the land of Ottoman and Qajar Empires. Therefore, the idea of consensus and the idea of being restricted by the rules were not such developed in the two lands as in Europe.

The impact of expansion of armies in the nineteenth century did not result in a comparable expansion of rights in the Ottomans and Qajars as in the Western world. The wars of these two Empires in this period were almost all defensive. The people were called to defend their land, a condition which did not necessitate expansion of rights but necessitated struggling to preserve what they already had. Moreover, most of the wars were lost that there was no condition for promotion of the attendants in the war. However, the expansion of the armies had an impact on the centralization of the government in the Ottoman Empire. While the Ottoman armies were more centralized and came close to the modern armies of the West, the Qajar armies remained dependent on the autonomous cavalries of the tribes. On the other hand, in none of these contexts the military recruitments resulted in a significant shift of state ideology from religious to national. The wars of these Empires were mostly against the non-Muslim countries, and therefore, serving for the religion, rather than the nation, was the prime legitimization.

The European lands in the early twentieth century had already experienced industrialization; their political agenda was determined by conscious class struggle. The industrial bourgeoisie was the hegemonic class and there was a considerable working class power in the European lands. In Turkey and Iran the economic formations were still dominated by agriculture. The politics in Turkey and Iran were still dominated by the court patronage, state elite, landowners, state bureaucracy, and to some extent the commercial bourgeoisie. The majority of the population in Turkey and Iran, namely the peasants, were more or less indifferent to state level politics, although they constituted the main productive class.

The rights of citizens in Turkey and Iran did not evolve due to a struggle given by the bourgeoisie or working class. The civil rights in Turkey were initiated by the state elite of the Ottoman period; the political rights were partially initiated in the late Ottoman period and consolidated by the Kemalist regime. The main civil and political rights in Iran were initiated with the Constitutional Revolution, which cannot be associated with a sole class, but with a unity of merchants, religious, intellectual groups, ethnic and tribal powers against the monarchy. In both contexts saving the land from disintegration and avoiding the intrusion of the external powers were the main tenets in introduction of these very initial rights.

The French Revolution of 1789 reinforced the central structure of the state by transforming the sovereignty from the absolutist king to the "community of independent citizens with equal rights" (Münch, 2001: 29). Bendix notes that the absolutist regime and the French Revolution

destroyed the medieval political life by "creating among all citizens a condition of abstract equality" (Bendix, 1946: 48-49). "The French intellectual of the Enlightenment and the revolution framed a radical idea of the nation: a united republic of citizens transcending any group division" (Münch, 2001: 30). This radical idea was, in fact, advancement of the "plebiscitarian principle", which stated, "all powers intervening between the individual and the state must be destroyed" (Bendix, 1964: 75). Accordingly, with the 1792 Constitution of France, all the distinctions within the citizens were abolished, following the argument that "men who were liable for military service should also have the right to elect members of the government for which they risked their lives" (Tilly, 1996: 223).

In Turkey both the civil and political rights were introduced by the state elite in order to comply with the European standards and to avoid disintegration. Similarly the idea of the nation composed of equal citizens was not a result of a mass movement. Rather, it was a result of the transformation of the idea of 'subject of the sultan' to the idea of 'member of a nation associated by the state'. The transformation was about the transformation of the notion of 'sultan' to the notion of 'nation state'. In Iran, on the other hand, the situation was closer to the case in the French Revolution. The sovereignty of the Qajar Shah was restricted by a mass movement that led to the Constitutional Revolution in 1906, in which a broad spectrum of political powers took place. Therefore the seeds of the idea of an equal membership to the Iranian nation were planted in this revolution, not as an initiative of the ruling elite.

Turkey and Iran both have dominantly Islamic populations. The peculiarity of their Islamic characters lies in the fact that the Ottoman and Qajar empires were both the leading states for their sects. The Sultan of the Ottoman Empire was the religious leader of all Sunni Muslims on the world. The Qajar Empire was the only land where Shi'a Islam was declared as the state religion. The official ideologies of the two empires were religious. Islam constituted an important side of the cultural motive of the masses. The religious learned, ulama, constituted a culturally and politically important group in both lands. The Islamic character of these two lands relates their state formations closely to that of the lands in north-Africa and the Middle East. Many of the lands in these regions are also Islamic. The ones that are not Islamic, like Israel and Lebanon, are strongly marked by how they treat their Islamic populations. Despite the common denominator of Islam in these regions, with Turkey and Iran, it is difficult to come up with a general picture of historical transformation of state structures, as the estates-absolutism-nation state model in the West. However, it is possible to point out some similarities and differences between Turkey and Iran in the light of observations of state formations of some lands in these two regions.

Some characteristics that are observed in some north-African and Middle Eastern lands are of comparative value to mark some differences between Turkey and Iran. These are generally related to the existence of a historically centralized state apparatus, existence of tribal populations, the impact of the world wars, and the attitude of the state against the oppositions. These characteristics

reveal that despite both being Islamic lands, Turkey and Iran have their peculiar historical and socio-cultural features. It should be noted that the characteristics derived by reading the state formations in north-Africa and the Middle East and that point out a difference between Turkey and Iran, would not be revealed by mere consideration of the European lands in understanding Turkey and Iran. These are the features that can be derived by examining the state formations that are somewhat close to Turkey and Iran vis-à-vis the West but also somewhat different from Turkey and Iran because of many other reasons.

Turkey and Iran have striking differences considering the state traditions they inherited, existence or lack of strong bureaucratic mechanisms, existence or lack of tribal segments in the society, existence or lack of an invasion of the land in the Second World War, and preservation or disruption of the state administration due to this invasion. The comparative study of Anderson presents similar differences in the contexts of Tunisia and Libya (Anderson, 1986). The relatively strong state tradition of the Ottoman Empire provided the Turkish Republic with an organized and unified military, secularized state administration, and well spread bureaucratic apparatuses. The relatively less centralized Qajar Empire provided these to the modern state of Iran in relatively less structured and less functional forms. These were observed in the histories of Tunisia and Libya in a similar way to that of the situation in Turkey and Iran, respectively. In Turkey there were no comparably significant tribal populations as in Iran. The existence of tribal populations in Iran was observed also in Tunisia and Libya. The settlement of the tribal groups, the conflict between the countryside and the tribes, and the situation of the landlords against these tribal populations were existent in Iran, but not in Turkey. The invasion of Iran in the Second World War resulted in the disruption of the state apparatus. In Turkey, on the other hand, the state preserved its structure. The preservation of the administration in Tunisia under the French rule and the disruption of the bureaucratic structures in Libya under the Italian present a comparable situation to the cases in Turkey and Iran. Like it was the case for Tunisia and Libya, respectively, the state structure in Turkey happened to be more reliable than the one in Iran. While the state and its ideology were accepted by almost all segments of the population in Turkey, the state in Iran and its ideology remained subject to severe criticism by many societal groups.

Algeria presents an example of repression of any kind of opposition leading to the marginalization of political movements (Hermassi, 1987). The policy of total repression in Algeria is closer to the policy of Mohammed Reza Shah, than that in Turkey, as the former strongly repressed the oppositions and marginalized them from the legal political framework. A similar situation in which the opposition is marginalized and the oppositional groups aim at collapsing the system rather than reforming is observed in Algeria.

Egypt is important to observe the emergence of militarist-bureaucratic state formation on the remnants of the Ottoman administration (Hatem, 2000; Butenschon, 2000: 14). This characteristic is stronger in Turkey compared to that in Iran. The transformations in the state formation of Egypt

in the 1950s resemble that of the Turkish Republic, rather than that of Iran, in the 1920s: the abolishment of monarchy, rejection of the former state ideology, and foundation of a republic are the prominent items in this regard. After total transformation of the rejime it was possible to promote a new ideology, to promote a new national identity, to stress the Arabic ethnic character of the people, and to cover the ethnic and class divisions with the new discourse. Similar ideological elements were promoted and accepted more easily in Turkey than in Iran.

Israel presents an example for a formal gradual citizenship which rejects the idea of egalitarianism among the citizens (Davis, 1997, 2000). The state of Israel clearly discriminates between its Jewish and Palestinian citizens by restricting the access of the latter to some of the resources of the state and land. The gradual citizenship is implicitly observed in Turkish citizenship as it discriminates between the ethnic Turks, Kurds, and non-Muslims. In Kuwait, two different conceptions of the notion of citizenship are observed in the tribal and settled populations, respectively (Longva, 2000: 192). The two different understandings of citizenship by these groups in Kuwait mark the farther distance of the tribal populations from the state in comparison to that of the settled, being an example to an implicit gradual citizenship like in Turkey.

In Lebanon citizenship was used as a political instrument by the Maronite regime in order to preserve the Christian character of the state (Maktabi, 2000). The share of the religious groups in the governmental body was determined by the rate of the groups in the population. By not giving the citizenship status to many Muslim individuals settled in Lebanon the regime limited the share of the Muslim population in the government. This is an example that the state used the notion of citizenship as an instrument to establish legitimacy for its political structure. In Turkey and Iran also citizenship was perceived by the states as an instrument. They did not use it to control the government structure as in Lebanon, but they used it as a discourse to disseminate the official ideologies and the values of the nation-state.

The characteristics of Turkey and Iran that are also observed in north-African and Middle Eastern lands mostly relate to the common history, religion, and their common economic situation vis-à-vis the West. State centered Westernization, late industrialization, Islamic populations, communal and patriarchic relations, nationalization as a mobilizing ideology against the West, emergence of political and oppositional Islamic discourses, and importation of Western ideologies and values are such characteristics. These mainly delineate the common history and societal structure of Turkey, Iran, and many of the Islamic lands in those two regions in comparison to the European lands. These characteristics are generally related to the interaction with the Western world and development of defensive reactions.

The main differences of Turkey and Iran with the lands in north-Africa and the Middle East emanate from the facts that unlike the others Turkey and Iran inherited empire state traditions, were never colonized, and founded their modern nation states earlier, around twenty years before the

Second World War. The state formation problematic in Turkey and Iran was more a matter of transformation of an existent state structure, rather than founding a new one. Because of the inherited empire traditions the state apparatuses were not based on power sharing among the communal groups. There was a state bureaucracy and idea of state situated outside and above the societal powers. The empires had already developed secular measures, despite the Islamic characters of the states. While in some of the Middle Eastern lands the states were founded on the basis of the Islamic thought of unity of state, religion and society, this was absent in Turkey and Iran. Religion and religious groups were only one of the centers of societal power, among the others. These characteristics situate Turkey and Iran somewhere close to each other but apart from the lands in north-Africa and Middle East.

The foundations of nation states in Turkey and Iran correspond to a time of around twenty-five years earlier than that in many Muslim lands in north-Africa and Middle East. The formations of nation states in Turkey and Iran corresponded to transformation of their state structures in the 1920s; the formations of nation states in many lands in north-Africa and Middle East, on the other hand, were a result of gaining their independence either by giving a war against the Western colonialists or achieving their independence from a Western power in the aftermath of the Second World War (Keddie, 1998: 9): Tunisia in 1955 against the French, Libya in 1951 against the Italians (in 1943 from the British), Morocco in 1956 against the French, Algeria in 1962 against the French, Egypt in 1922 against the English, Lebanon in 1941 from French, Saudi Arabia in 1926, Kuwait in 1961 from the English.

The fact that the Ottoman Turkey and Qajar Iran were never colonized is considerable in comparison of the modern state formations of these two with the lands in north-Africa and Middle East (Keyder, 1998: 192)[13]. The non-colonization of these lands resulted in their being "inheritors of rich political traditions" and persistence of a bureaucratic class dedicated to rule the state. The nationalism that emerged in these two lands therefore evolved basically from their own state traditions. The aim of the national powers happened to be to capture an existing state mechanism and to transform it into a nation state. However, in the colonized lands in north-Africa and Middle East, in general, a centralized administration system was introduced more or less by the colonial powers (Harik, 1987: 39). The nationalist currents that evolved in these latter aimed at capturing a state mechanism, which was not inherited from their own past but was founded by their very opposition, the colonial power. It was perhaps due to this difference that Turkey and Iran happened to be "stronger" states, in comparison to the other Muslim lands in north-Africa and Middle East, in the sense of maintaining a centralized and rationalized state bureaucracy, which works efficiently

---

[13] Keyder mentions the importance of not having been colonized and cites the Ottoman Empire, China and Japan in this regard (Keyder, 1998: 192). The reason that Keyder does not cite the land of Iran in this list is probably that the south and north parts of Iran were in fact occupied and remained under British and Russian hegemony in the First and Second World Wars. However, these occupations were basically for militaristic, rather than economic purposes; they were temporary and did not aim at a direct colonization of the land. Therefore Iran can also be added to this list of uncolonized lands.

and without major social oppositions.[14] "[T]he weight of the state *vis-à-vis* the society it pretends to control, i.e. its autonomy in dealing with other socio-economic actors and its capacity for influencing their behaviour" is considered in this demarcation (Salamé, 1987: 206). Turkey and Iran share the peculiar characteristic of inheriting an Empire tradition, which is not observed in any other land in north-Africa and Middle East.

A factor that limits the development of civil society in Muslim lands is noted to be the understanding in the classical Islamic thought that religion, state, and society are united (Arkoun, 2002: 43). This understanding legitimizes the monopoly of the state over the society in the extent that it rules according to the Islamic laws. Although the independent character of the clergy in Iran might be an exception, this observation fits to the situation in the Ottoman Empire in the ideological level. However, both in the Ottoman and Qajar Empires, the practice had led to the laws by the state that did not originate from the religion. These laws can be considered as partial separation of the actual state administration from the religion. Moreover, in the late nineteenth century, especially in the Ottoman Empire, many of the state institutions were secularized and the religious law was restricted to the realms of family and civil law (Atabaki and Zürcher, 2004: 10). According to the Shi'a Islam in Qajar Empire, the ulama was traditionally separated from the state, therefore there was no strong unification of the state with the religion. While the religion was under the control of the state in Ottoman Empire, namely the state was dominant over the religion; it was more within the realm of civil society in Iran that the religion was independent from the state. Therefore, in both cases the states and religions meant different realms; they did not constitute a unity; they were dissociated enough to reject the idea of a united state, religion, and society. Turkey and Iran did not have the idea of united religion-state-society as in some other north-African and Middle Eastern lands.

1.5 Content

This thesis is composed of six chapters, including the introduction and conclusion. Chapter 2 gives a chronological review of the modern history of Turkey starting from the late Ottoman Empire ending with the coup in 1980. This review aims at highlighting the centrality of the state elite as modernizing actors and the centrality of state initiatives in transforming the socio-political and socio-cultural life throughout the modernization and nation building process. Unlike the many texts on modern Turkish history, special attention is devoted to the early suppression of potential opposition in the Ottoman period, namely the abolishment of the Janissaries and weakening of the ulama. The situation of non-Muslim minorities in the late Ottoman period is reviewed in connection to the Balkan Wars and the rise of the Community of Unity and Progress (CUP). The single party regime in between the two World Wars, the nationalization of the economy in ethnic

---

[14] Salamé mentions this concept of "strong and weak" states in a critical sense; however, he also adds that "the issue [of strong/weak state] has remained central in the political discourse, and more deeply in the political culture" (Salamé, 1987: 205).

terms, and the Kurdish resistance to the Kemalist regime are discussed in relation to each other. The passage to the multi-party regime and canalization of the discontent of the peasant masses into the political framework via the Democrat Party (DP) and the tuning of the borders of political freedom by the military coups are mentioned. Lastly, the situation of Turkish political left vis-à-vis the Kemalist regime is discussed.

Chapter 3 gives a chronological review of the modern Iranian history starting from the late Qajar Empire up to the Islamic Revolution in 1979. This chapter starts with a consideration of the traditional Iranian social structure with the mass movements in the late nineteenth century. The succeeding sections of Chapter 3 include the following discussions. The Constitutional Revolution and the following civil war were important as they involved many segments of the population and opened the way for provincial representation in the central politics. The networks of anjomans (societies, councils) were influential in this war and the rights of anjomans were recognized in the Constitution of 1906. The Constitutional regime in Iran was disrupted by the Russian-British invasion prior to and during the First World War. This disruption prepared the condition for the rise of Reza Khan as an authoritarian leader. The nationalization program of Reza Shah harshly suppressed the tribes and pressed the ethnic minorities to assimilate into Persian ethnicity. These policies resulted in the uprising of many tribes during the rule of Reza Shah and the foundation of autonomous Azerbaijan and Kurdish governments after his abdication. The abdication of Reza Shah created a political freedom in the 1940s. As a culmination of this political freedom there emerged the National Front under the leadership of Mossadeq in the early 1950s. This movement was suppressed by Mohammed Reza Shah by a coup in 1953. Mohammed Reza Shah ruled the land in an authoritarian and repressive way. The 1960s witnessed the modernization projects of the Shah under the banner of White Revolution. The regulations were based on westernization and secularization of politics and social life, which initiated religiously oriented mass protests starting from 1963. In 1963 the leader of the Islamic Revolution, Ayatollah Khomeini, first time appeared by denouncing the Shah. The regulations of the Pahlavi regime in the third quarter of the twentieth century and the mass oppositions in this period prepared the conditions for the Islamic Revolution. The political left in Iran was exceptionally strong in comparison to its counterparts in the other Middle Eastern lands.

Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 present the main ideas developed in this thesis by the comparative reading of modern histories of Turkey and Iran. Chapter 4 compares Turkey and Iran from state formation point of view. The concern here is how the modern states in Turkey and Iran were constituted in the institutional level by transforming the preceding Empire traditions, how the national identity was built in the ideological level in accompany to the nation states, and what the role of the state elite and masses were in determining the modernization processes. The inherited state structure is the topic of the first section. The Turkish Republic inherited a central state structure with a relatively mature experience of state bureaucracy and some experience of

participatory government. The Pahlavi regime in Iran, on the other hand, inherited the Qajar Empire state tradition, which was less centralized, compared to that of the Ottoman Empire, and had a less structured bureaucracy with almost no experience of participatory government. The early repression of the oppositional groups in the Ottoman period and the persistence of the ulama and bazaaris as main bodies of mass protests in Iran are comparatively highlighted in the second section. The third section is devoted to the network of societal groups. Here it is examined that the ulama, bazaaris, tribes, and political left constituted significant societal opposition to the Pahlavi regime. In Turkey the oppositions from the societal centers were more easily repressed; there appeared no comparable societal opposition in Turkey to the modernization project of the Kemalist elite. Therefore the reforms of modernization were easier and stronger in Turkey compared to those in Iran; this is the subject of the fourth section. A major difference of modern Iranian state compared to Turkey is its disruption during the Second World War, constituting the topic of section five. The disruption of the state apparatus in Iran damaged the trust of the masses in the reliability of the state, culminating in the lack of consent of the masses for the state centered regulations. As a result the state resorted to more coercion in Iran than in Turkey. In Turkey, the state was more able to gain the consent of the masses. These are discussed in section six. The seventh section reconsiders the ethnic homogenization in the two lands; ethnic cleansing and repression in Turkey and ethnic repression in Iran. The major ideas derived from the comparative discussion in the sections of Chapter 4 are highlighted in the concluding section.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the comparison of citizenship formation in Turkey and Iran. The first five sections in this chapter compare the two citizenship formations from point of view of citizenship rights, ruling class strategies, duties and rights assigned to the citizens, active-passive formation of citizenship, and soil based French and blood based German citizenship models, respectively. These notions of citizenship formation are major in citizenship literature. The sixth section adds the notion of gradual citizenship to these classical notions for comparison of citizenship in Turkey and Iran. It is argued in Chapter 5 that the citizenship formation in Turkey and Iran cannot be understood from the perspective of expansion of rights due to class struggles. The point of view of ruling class strategy is more suitable to understand Turkey and Iran, as in both lands the political elite aimed at modernization as a project initiated and realized by the state and used the notion of citizenship in service of this project. The citizenship formations promoted by the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes were passive and from above; they were initiated and defined by the states. However, unlike in Turkey, the citizenship formation in Iran had active and from below elements due to the mass movements, especially that of the Constitutional Revolution, prior to the Pahlavi regime. This side points out some elements in Iranian citizenship that were actively initiated from below. The Constitutional Revolution was a result of totally active participation of masses from below. This revolution was effective in Iran to bring about the understanding of an Iranian identity over the ethnic groups. The repressive policies of the Pahlavi regime decreased the

impact of this active revolution on the formation of the citizenship as defined by the state. The Pahlavi regime promoted the hegemony of the Persian ethnic identity. In Turkey the exclusionary character of citizenship towards the Christians resembles the blood based exclusionary German citizenship model. On the other hand, the assimilationist character of the same citizenship towards the Kurdish population, and again the exclusionary character against the Kurdish population whenever they were considered not to assimilate, all point out an undecidedness between exclusion and assimilation. In Iran, on the other hand, the assimilationist French model is more strongly observed that the Iranian nationalism appears to be an umbrella identity over the ethnic groups. The undecidedness in the definition of Turkish citizenship points out a gradual citizenship formation in which the ethnic Turks are in the center, the Kurds are in the close ring to the center, and the Christians are farthest to the center marked as being potentially non-loyal to the Turkish state. The major ideas presented are highlighted in the concluding section of Chapter 5.

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis by highlighting the major ideas about the citizenship and state formation of Turkey and Iran and by giving an interpretation of the current Turkey and Iran in view of these major ideas. In this interpretation the period from 1980 in Turkey and 1979 in Iran to 2010 is considered.

CHAPTER 2

TURKEY: ETHNIC CLEANSING, KURDISH RESISTANCE, AND MILITARY COUPS

In this chapter the modern history of Turkey is considered from the viewpoints of ethnic cleansing in Turkey, the Kurdish resistance against the nationalization attempts of the Turkish Republic, and the military coups as regulative actions of the modern state. The ethnic cleansing in Turkey refers to the Armenian Massacre and the exchange of Greek and Turkish populations. The pressures on the non-Muslim communities, including the Jews, continued with the nationalization of the Turkish economy in the sense of getting rid of the non-Muslim owned entrepreneurships and companies. These measures were the main constitutive of ethnic homogenization in Turkey in religious terms. They signify the exclusionary character of Turkish citizenship against the non-Muslim populations.

The Kurdish resistance in Turkey has been the main ethnic based opposition to the nationalization attempts of the Turkish Republic. As a Muslim population the Kurds in Turkey were not subject to direct exclusionary measures as the non-Muslims. The Turkish state considered the Kurds potentially to be assimilated into the Turkish ethnicity. Therefore, the measures of the Turkish state towards the Kurds point out the assimilatory characteristics of Turkish citizenship. The Kurds were in some occasions subject to exclusionary policies especially from state-security related positions. In that sense the measures towards the Kurds are also related to the exclusionary characteristics of Turkish citizenship.

The regime in Turkey switched to multi-party system in the mid of the twentieth century. This passage happened to be by emergence of an oppositional party from the ranks of the Kemalist elite. This oppositional party organized the discontent of the rural masses at the same time remaining in the legal political framework. Three military coups took place in Turkey after transition to the multi-party regime. All the coups aimed at replacing the governments elected by votes of the people. These military coups were measures of the military and bureaucratic elite to tune the regime and to redefine the borders of political activity for the elected parties. The canalization of the discontented masses to the legal political framework and tuning of the borders of that framework by the state elite signify both the central role of the military-bureaucratic elite and the flexibility of the regime to adapt to the emerging situations.

In the following sections the modern history of Turkey is reviewed by highlighting the three aforementioned moments. The review considers also the historical, social, and political developments that prepared the conditions for these three moments. The repression of the potential oppositional groups and modernization movements in the late Ottoman period were significant to result in the centrality of the state elite both in the late Ottoman period and afterwards in the

Turkish Republic. The Armenian Massacre and Greek-Turkish population exchange were the main moments of cleansing the land from the non-Muslim groups. The cleansing continued with nationalization of the economy and maltreatment of the Jewish and remaining Greek and Armenian community during the Republican period. The single party regime and its nationalization attempts antagonized the Kurdish population against the regime. The passage to the multi-party regime provided channels of accommodating the discontented masses within the legal political framework of the regime. The three military coups in the second half of the twentieth century tuned the limits of this framework adapting it to the emergent conditions, but always aiming at the protection of the fundamentals of the regime. The tuning of the borders of the system was affective not only to accommodate the conservatively/rightist oriented masses but also to keep the many political leftist currents and their supporters loyal to the regime. All these items are discusses in order to highlight the three moments of ethnic cleansing, Kurdish resistance, and centrality of the military-bureaucratic elite in modern Turkey in shaping the citizenship and state formation. The overall aim of this chapter is to provide the historical material on which the discussion of state formation and citizenship will evolve in the following chapters in comparison to Iran.

2.1 Late Ottoman Empire: Abolishment of the Janissaries (1826), Tanzimat Era (1839-1876), and the CUP

In the traditional Ottoman Empire the society was officially considered to be composed of four strata: *askeriye/kilic ehli* (military), *ilmiye/kalem ehli* (ulama), *beraya (tuccar ve sanatkar)* (city dwellers, merchants and artisans) and *reaya* (peasants). The former two were considered to be the *devletlu* (statesmen). The strata *devletlu* was composed of the royal family, military, state bureaucracy, and religious clergy. The *devletlu* strata did not pay taxes; their income was basically from the state revenues. The *beraya* and *reaya*, on the other hand, were the ruled population, composed of the urban and rural tax payers. The landowners, landowning and landless peasants, and tribal populations were considered to be members of the *reaya*. These were the main producers and tax payers in the empire (Timur, 1998: 33; Mardin, 1969).

In the traditional understanding of division of the society there was no place for the notion of 'classes' in the economic sense (Timur, 1998: 171). The division was, with very bold lines, based on being a member or a subject of the state apparatus (Karpat, 2006: 99-102). The politics was therefore not shaped by conscious class interests but mostly by opportunism and factionalism based on personal interests (Timur, 1998: 171; Berkes, 1972: 55). The central power was hold by one of the factions, constituted by the personal coalition of some palace elite, strong pashas, influential ulama, Janissary and cavalry leaders, influential and wealthy merchants and jewelers. Not only the faction in power but also the composition of all factions frequently changed (Timur, 1998: 285).

The ulama in the Ottoman Empire did not have a leadership role as the ulama in the Shi'ite Iran. The power of the ulama in the Ottoman Empire, as in most Sunni world, was based on their "religious position and not much on their social relationship with other segments of civil society"

(Kamali, 1998: 250). They were bound to and dependent on the state. This difference between the Shi'te ulama in Iran and Sunni ulama in the Ottoman Empire underlay the political activism of the former as the leader of the mass movements in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In the Ottoman Empire, however, there were no comparable mass movements in this period. The ulama in the Ottoman Empire did not play a role of leadership of the masses. They usually supported the rebels of the Janissaries against the modernization attempts of the Sultans.

The traditional oppositional force to the Ototman palace was the coalition of Janissaries, guilds, and Bekhtashi orders (Timur, 1998: 140-141). This coalition was based on the strong connection between the Janissary military organization and the religious Bekhtashi orders. The Bekhtashi orders provided the spiritual leadership to the Janissaries (Timur, 1998: 140-141). The Bekhtashi orders had also links with the lower strata of the Ottoman population (Başkaya, 2004: 194, 196). The link between the Janissaries and the trade guilds was also considerable. The guilds were traditionally one of the most important centers of opposition to the Ottoman court. They traditionally had links with the military in the frontiers of the Ottoman land, the raider notables who followed the Bekhtashi orders (Heper, 2006: 53).

Oppositions to the state regulations were traditionally in the name of the "dervish" values, represented by the Bekhtashi orders. Usually the Janissaries constituted the armed side of the rebels. Timur (1998: 136) states, the main reason the Ottoman Sultans were opposed to the Janissaries was that this institute was under the influence of the lower strata of the population. The Patrona Rebel that ended the Tulip Period in 1730 and the Kabakçı Rebel in 1807 against the reforms of Selim III reflect the link between dervish values, Janissary participation, and opposition to the state (Mardin, 2007: 54, 112-113; Timur, 1998: 111, 124). "In revolts of Janizaries four Sultans lost their lives and four were dethroned" (Horniker, 1944). The Janissaries were representatives of the opposition to the state regulations and protector of the "traditional social formation of the Ottoman Empire" (Başkaya, 2004: 190). Therefore Başkaya (2004: 190) regards Janissaries as "a kind of party" and Horniker (1944) considers them as "the greatest internal obstacle to transformation" in the Ottoman Empire.

> Throughout the-entire period, the Janizaries were supported in their opposition to reorganization and reform by the clergy, especially the derwishes of the order of Bektaşié, who derived great prestige and power from their ancient affiliation with the corps, and the powerful caste of the learned, the ulema, the staunchest defenders of old Turkish laws, customs and traditions, who openly expressed their sympathy for the corps and always supported the Janizaries in their demands on the Sultans. Among the lower classes, the Janizaries, who were spread throughout the whole Empire, were considered a sanctified institution, and with their name were connected the dearest recollections of Muslims of former glory and victories. On their part, the Janizaries throughout the whole of their existence sympathized with the masses and at all times constituted a counterbalance against the arbitrariness of the Sultan in favor of the people (Horniker, 1944).

Starting from the seventeenth century the Janissaries engaged in "various civil occupations". "In Constantinople, the Janizaries controlled completely the fruit and vegetable and coffee roasting business, and other important articles of consumption, with accompanying evils of monopolistic practices" (Horniker, 1944). Therefore, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Janissaries were not only a military organization. They constituted an important portion of the population in the capital (Başkaya, 2004: 187); they had economic relations with other parts of the society (Timur, 2004: 152, 156; Berkes, 1972: 114); they engaged in trade and manufacturing industry, especially that of military (Berkes, 1972: 107). Many of the merchants in the capital became Janissaries and engaged in the profitable trade with the state (Berkes, 1972: 107, 114). Timur states that Janissaries had the potential to constitute the Muslim side of the mercantile bourgeoisie in the Ottoman population besides the Christians. He argues, such an emergent bourgeoisie could overcome the conservatism of the ruling elite and manage a social synthesis to transform the Ottoman population into a nation, which could have been the basis for a secular modern nation state (Timur, 1998: 152).

In 1809, Sultan Mahmut II ordered the Janissaries to murder the *ayan* (notable) Alemdar Mustafa Pasha, who had led the other ayans to force the Sultan to accept their power by accepting the *sened-i ittifak* (document of agreement) in 1808. After the successful murder, the Janissaries intended to change the Sultan with his brother Mustafa IV, whom they had previously brought up to the throne after they ascended Selim III. In response to this intention Mahmut II murdered his brother and remained as the sole heritor for the sultanate, hence managed to continue as the sultan. At this moment, however, the first time, the Janissaries claimed that the sultan could be anybody, not necessarily a heritor of the existing dynasty (Ortaylı, 2005: 37). This was an early sign for Sultan Mahmut that the Janissaries would be a severe threat for his reign. It is important to note that an attempt to devalue the dynastic continuity in choosing the man on the top of the Ottoman Empire first emerged from the Janissaries.

In his early years, the policies of Mahmut II were basically aimed at sustaining the central power of the state. For this purpose he initiated various reforms. Lapidus that argues the reforms of Mahmut II, in comparison to those of Selim III, were not only more comprehensive, but also more intended to consolidate the central state authority[15]. The most important among those reforms was the abolishment of the Janissaries in 1826, which is known in history as *Vaka-i Hayriye* (the beneficial event) (Zürcher, 1994: 42). Despite the name given to the event by the Ottoman historians, the terrific murder of the Janissary soldiers and their supporters were at a degree to shade the "beneficiality" of the event.

---

[15] "While Mahmud's program of military, administrative, and educational projects began on the base pioneered by Selim III, the new effort to improve military capabilities, rationalize administration, subordinate the provinces, raise revenues, and establish schools was guided by a strong Western orientation and a more radical concept of a centralized state, governed by an absolute monarch. The reforms were intended to revive the absolute authority of the Ottoman rulers supported by new elites who were technically proficient and entirely devoted to the authority of the regime" (Lapidus, 2002: 494).

The Janissaries in the early nineteenth century had lost their effectiveness as an army order (Başkaya, 2004: 189). They were not disciplined and acted as gangs in their relations with the merchants (Çadırcı, 2007: 102). Their ineffectiveness was proven during the Greek insurrection of 1821. Their incompetence in suppressing the rebel cost them considerable prestige in the eyes of the population of the capital and prominent members of the ulama (Ahmad, 1999: 36; Ortaylı, 2005: 37-38). In 1826, Mahmut II established a new army order, named *Eşkinci Ocağı* (its soldiers were named as *Muallem Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammadiye*). The Janissaries reacted by a revolt on June 25. The confrontation between the powers of the Sultan – the *Mansure* troops supported by some ulama, theology students, and a considerable part of the Istanbul population – and the Janissaries happened to be bloody.

Thousands of Janissaries were murdered. The number is sometimes noted to be more than eight thousand, but Timur (1998: 140) states, this is too less considering the fact that the number of the registered Janissaries was more than one hundred thousand. The Janissaries who hided and the people who had relations or were likely to have relations with the Janissaries were found and slaughtered in the streets after a brief questioning (Ortaylı, 2005: 37-38). It is noted by the English ambassador of the time that there appeared specks of dead bodies in the Marmara Sea. The part of the sea besides the palace in front of the window of the Sultan was full of dead bodies. The dwellers of the city are said not to have dared to go out of their houses because of the "heart-rending situation" (Başkaya, 2004: 192). Some foreign travelers noted in their itineraries that they were shocked by the dead bodies in the Marmara Sea. The *Vaka-i Hayriye* is noted to be one of the bloodiest events in the nineteenth century Ottoman history (Timur, 1998: 143-144).

With the abolishment of the Janissaries the mass rebels were deprived of their military support. The following reforms in military created a new order of troops that did not allow interaction with the civil groups (Mardin, 2007: 113-114). Namik Kemal wrote the following in the newspaper Hurriyet:

> It was the view of thousands of moldering Janissary bodies in the Golden Horn that stopped
> people to declare their ideas since *Vaka-i Hayriye*; that was because the Janissaries constituted
> a power against the repression of the statesmen (quoted by Mardin, 2007: 115).[16]

Bektashi orders had been providing the ideological-social link among the Janissary organization. According to the legend it was Haci Bekhtash (*Hacı Bektaş*), the historical leader of the Bekhtashi orders, who gave their name to the Janissaries.

> The corp was formally affiliated with the Bektaşié. The members of the order served as
> godfathers and chaplains for the Janizaries. Haci Bektaş became the patron saint of the latter
> and was always remembered by them in their evening prayers (Horniker, 1944).

---

[16] Mardin quotes from Namik Kemal, "Usul-i Meşveret Hakkında Mektuplar", Hürriyet, September 14, 1868.

As stated earlier, the Bekhtashi orders had also contact with the lowest strata of the population. The slaughter of the Janissaries was followed by the attacks on the Bektashi religious orders. The official religion of the Ottoman Sultanate and the ulama was Sunni Islam, which objected the teachings of the Bektashis. The Ottoman elite and the leading ulama considered the orders dangerous for the official Sunni Islam and were inclined to denounce them as heretical (Başkaya, 2004: 196, 2001). After the abolishment of the Janissaries, the Bektashi orders were banned and their *tekkes* (dervish lodges) that were not older than sixty years were demolished. Some of the prominent Bekhtashi leaders were murdered and the others were expelled from the capital (Başkaya, 2004: 193-194; Timur, 1998: 140-141; Berkes, 1972: 119).

After the abolition of Janissaries, Mahmut II acted to end the "traditional autonomy of the different corps" and appointed the head of the new troops as the *Serasker* (commander-in-chief) of the Ottoman armies (Zürcher, 1994: 42). The institution of *Yeniçeri Ağası* (head of Janissaries), which had a somewhat autonomous character, was replaced with a new one that would act according to the commands (Ahmad, 1999: 37). The institution of *Serasker* would later develop into the Ministry of War (Zürcher, 1994: 42).

Karpat states that with the abolition of the Janissaries, as well as the elimination of the influence of the ayans and the ulama, the sources of opposition disappeared and the Sultan became the absolute ruler. The upper classes being close to the court rather than the countryside remained the sole representative of the rural masses in the political realm (Karpat, 2006: 26). Mardin states similarly that the reforms in the Ottoman Empire meant strengthening the central power of the state in the expense of the Janissaries, ayans, and the ulama (Mardin, 2007: 127-128).

In the early nineteenth century, the ulama constituted another source of opposition to the state regulations (Zürcher, 1994: 42). After abolishing the Janissaries, Muhmut II attacked at this center of potential opposition. The *evkaf* leagues (pious foundations) were taken from the autonomous control of the ulama and given to the control of the newly established Directorate of Religious Foundations (Zürcher, 1994: 42). In this way the ulama became salaried state officials. The head of the ulama, *Şeyhülislam*, was associated with a new post named *Bab-ı Meşihat*, to function only for giving advice and consultancy from that time on (Ahmad, 1999: 37).

Lapidus regards the abolishment of Janissaries, "absorption of many waqf endowments, courts, and schools into new state-controlled ministries", and dissolution of the "Bektashi religious order, associated with the janissaries" as moments of the suppression of the "conservative resistance" to state regulations. He states that these reforms were "intended to revive the absolute authority of the Ottoman rulers supported by new elite who were technically proficient and entirely devoted to the authority of the regime". After these, "[t]here would…be little opposition to reform – and even considerable support from the higher-ranking 'ulema'" (Lapidus, 2002: 494). The comments of Lapidus support the idea that the regulations of Mahmut II were intended not only to

replace some inefficient state institutions, but more than that to destroy the social formations that could be an obstacle for the upcoming reforms.

The classical Ottoman government system was based on the idea of sustaining the "order" (*nizam-ı alem*) on the lands under control. This understanding did not only mean to maintain the order/rule, but also to preserve the statuesque corresponding to the traditional rule of the Empire (Kaynar, 2001: 36). The preservation or reestablishment of this 'order' was the duty of the statesmen of the court, named as *kapıkulu* in the Ottoman Empire (Kaynar, 2001: 49).The modernization of the Empire under the impact of the West corresponds to the transformation of these state-elite into the bureaucrats that defined and realized the reforms. In this way the task of the state elite to sustain the traditional order of the Ottoman Empire was transformed into adopting the modern system of the West under the name of "westernization" (Kaynar, 2001: 49). Regarding to this discussion, Kaynar points out two things. First, the modernization in the Ottoman Empire was not "from within" as it was the case in the West. While modernization in the European lands was a result of internal social dynamics, it was a result of the policies of the statesmen in the Ottomans (Kaynar, 2001: 42). Second, the position of the statesmen vis-à-vis the people remained the same before and after the modernization. Both the *kapıkulu* of the Ottomans and the bureaucrats of the modernization era were outside and above the people of the land. The people, on the other hand, remained as objects of the policies of these statesmen in both periods (Kaynar, 2001: 49).

The Tanzimat reforms, in between 1839 and the start of the Abdulhamid era in 1876, followed the line of regulations initiated by Mahmut II, aiming at increasing and centralizing the state power. As in the case of Mahmut II, the army, central bureaucracy, provincial administration, taxation, education, and communication were reformed, but with more emphasis on judicial reforms and consultative procedures (Zürcher, 1994: 59). The reforms "did not deeply penetrate Ottoman society, or affect the masses of people whose lives, beliefs, and loyalties were still bound up with Islam" (Karpat, 2006: 40). The reforms did not result in an improvement of the life standards of the peasant masses; consequently, they did not gain the support of the masses. On the other hand, "[the reforms] created a 'new class'". "With the destruction of the janissaries, the weakening of the 'ulema', and the adoption of the reform programs, political power in Ottoman society shifted to *memur*s, or bureaucrats, and within that elite to the Westernized and Westernizing element – the servants of the translation bureaus and the war office who had been educated in secular schools and had traveled in Europe" (Lapidus, 2002: 496). The main beneficiary of the Tanzimat reforms was this emergent "class", composed of the state bureaucrats (Karpat, 2006: 48; İslamoğlu, 2007).

The abolishment of the powers of organized social groups, namely the Janissaries and the ulama, resulted in a political arena in which the Ottoman modernization could take place without confronting a significant opposition. The Young Ottomans, during the Tanzimat era, did not have the necessary links with the lower strata of the population; therefore, they usually fluctuated in between supporting and opposing to the Ottoman palace (Timur, 1998: 263-265). Therefore, in the

nineteenth century, although there was a potential of opposition due to the widespread discontent among the population, there was no leadership that could organize and lead an opposition against the state regulations. The Tanzimat reforms and afterwards the rise of the CUP took place in such a political environment.

The Young Turk movement in opposition to the Abdulhamid regime culminated in the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) that came to power with a coup in 1908.[17] Those years were marked by the idea of constitutionalism, inspired especially from the constitutional revolutions in the Russian Tsarist Empire (1905) and in the Iranian Qajar Empire (1906) (Sohrabi, 1995). The Young Turks' constitutionalist movement merged the global idea of constitutionalism, inspired from the French Revolution, with the local problems of the Ottoman state. They adapted a peculiar understanding of constitutionalism in order to provide solutions to the problems of disintegration and underdevelopment. In order to create such an understanding from the constitutionalism of the French Revolution, "its liberal dimensions emphasizing individual rights and local autonomy were weakened at the expense of newly added developmental (economical and military) and integrative (of various ethnicities) dimensions" (Sohrabi, 2002). They also created arguments to prove that constitutionalism was compatible with Islam.

At the end of the Balkan Wars in 1912-1913, the Ottoman Empire lost tremendous amount of its lands in Europe. CUP organized voluntary officers for retaking the city Edirne. The Temporary Government of Western Thrace (*Garbi Trakya Hükümet-i Muvakkatası*), founded by those officers, was effective in retaking the city. Zürcher notes, the CUP voluntary officers that took part in retaking Edirne later organized formally under the name of *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* (Special Organization) in 1914. This organization was the main "behind-the-scenes" power in "suppression of separatist movements, especially in the Arab provinces,…in the terror campaigns against Greek businesses in the western Asia Minor" and especially in the murders of Armenian population in 1915. He further states that the Edirne experience happened to be a "laboratory" for the national resistance movement (Zürcher, 1994: 114, 121).

On June 15, 1913, Mahmut Şevket Pasha was assassinated by a supporter of the liberal opposition party (*Hürriyet ve İtilaf*) to the CUP. This was used by the CUP to purge a repression against the oppositional groups. A lot of people were arrested and some were sentenced to death.[18] After that, during the First World War, the CUP could rule without any opposition (Zürcher, 1994: 115). The lack of an oppositional power center with mass support in the society enabled the CUP to suppress the liberal and palace centered oppositions among the Istanbul elite. Furthermore, the war itself and the mass immigrations to Anatolia from the lost territories created a catastrophic situation that any alternative societal control mechanism to the state was severely weakened. Under these

---

[17] Some scholars name this action of the CUP cadres as a "constitutional revolution" or "revolution". Sohrabi (1995, 2002) and Ergut (2004: 153-162) can be cited as examples.
[18] Baskaya argues that this assassination was in fact a conspiracy of the CUP to legitimize its planned arrests of the opposition (Fikret Başkaya, *Yediyüz*).

circumstances it was easier for the state to impose own control mechanisms to render new rules and regulations (Ergut, 2004: 371). In this period the CUP performed a number of radical and fast modernization reforms. In May 1917 all Sheri'a Courts (religious courts) were brought under the Ministry of Law. This was a considerable move towards secularization of judiciary. In the same year the thirteen days difference between the Islamic and solar calendars was eliminated. In April 1917, a law was declared to turn the *madrasahs* (religious schools) into secular schools in which positive and natural sciences were taught (Dündar, 2001: 28).

According to the CUP cadres, the ethnic heterogeneity of the Empire, but especially the existence of Christian minorities, was the source of obstacles for saving the Empire and transforming it into a nation-state (Keyder, 1998: 197). The Christian minorities were seen as the agents of the world capitalist system that would destroy the local economy and that of imperialism that would weaken the power of the elite in the rule of the land. As a result, the economic and political conflict between the bureaucracy and the Christian minorities was "displaced ideologically onto a level of ethnic and religious conflict" (Keyder, 1998: 197-198). Zürcher states the CUP established many nationalist organizations, which had the word *milli* (national) in their names. He cites *Müdafaa-i Milliye Cemiyeti* (Committee of National Defense), which was founded during the Balkan Wars, as the most important of those. He further states, it was due to these organizations that participation in politics became more popular, rather than being limited to some elite, but also more brutal especially against the non-Muslims (Zürcher, 1994: 127).

The CUP aimed to create and develop a national bourgeoisie. "Many of the Young Turk leaders were themselves of provincial or of lower-class origin. Their revolt was motivated in part by the feeling that the Tanzimat elite had become a hereditary aristocracy and neglected 'the people'" (Mardin, 1969). Creating a national bourgeoisie meant to the Young Turks getting rid of the non-Muslim bourgeoisie and handing over the trade and manufacturing facilities to Turkish entrepreneurs. Another policy to create a national bourgeoisie was to support the interests of the national capitalists and landowners against the workers and peasants (Zürcher, 1994: 127).

The ultimate aim of the CUP was from the beginning to avoid the disintegration of the Empire. The Balkan Wars caused the Empire to lose 83% of its lands and 69% of its population in the Balkans. The only reliable piece of land remaining in their hands was Anatolia. The solution of the CUP to save this remaining land from disintegration was to create an ethnically homogeneous population. Islam and Turkishness were the two characteristics to be pursued in this homogenization. The First World War provided the opportunity for such a process. The immigration of Muslim populations during the war years were used effectively for this purpose. The war conditions created a camouflage for the cleansing of the Armenian and to some extent Greek populations. The resettlement of the non-Turkish Muslim populations helped for assimilation of these into the Turkish ethnic culture. After the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the population exchange resulted in getting rid of the rest of the Greek population and increasing

the number of Muslims with the new comers. As a result, the Turkish nationalism in the early twentieth century did not happen to be the ideology of a rising national bourgeoisie but an ideology resulting from the demographic changes that led to the homogenization of the Anatolian population in Islamic and Turkish terms. This was due to the gathering of ethnically close groups in Anatolia and cleansing of the land from the non-Muslim populations (Dündar, 2001: 245-246).

The repression of the Janissaries, Bekhtashi orders, and the ulama in the early nineteenth century resulted that there was no oppositional group that had strong links with the lower strata of the society. Therefore, in the nineteenth century there happened no comparably significant mass protests and movements in the Ottoman Empire as in the Qajar Empire in Iran. The Tanzimat reformers, therefore, could easily realize their modernization plans. These reforms reinforced the power of the bureaucratic elite within the Ottoman society. Although many of the reforms did not bring any bettering of the conditions of the peasant masses, the elite could still promote those by means of the power they hold. The CUP cadres gave a struggle to gain the power mainly against the ruling statesmen under the Abdulhamid regime. The struggle was between the modern and traditional factions of the state elite. The masses did not take a significant part in this struggle. Therefore, once the CUP gained the power it could rule without a significant opposition. All these point out that the early repression of the potential oppositional groups in the early nineteenth century was followed by a more central and more powerful state rule without significant opposition in the late Ottoman Empire.

2.2 Armenian Massacre (1915) and Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations (1923)

After the conquest of Istanbul in 1453, the Ottoman Empire applied the *Millet* System (Community System) according to which the non-Muslim communities were provided with the right to independently administer themselves in their internal matters (Oran, 2004: 48). As a consequence of years of application of such a system, when it came to the eve of the nineteenth century, the population of the Ottoman Empire was divided into groups designated by religious, linguistic, and ethnic identities (Karpat, 2006: 148). Different groups in the countryside usually lived in distinguished villages according to their religions. Even in the urban cities, as Baban transfers from Şerif Mardin, the *mahalle* system (district system) divided the population into "islands of communities" (Baban, 2005: 54).

The Muslim and Christian populations of the empire were separated from each other also on military-administrative and economic bases. The Muslims had been traditionally holding the military and bureaucratic power that underlay the rule of the land. Merchantry was considered by the traditional Ottomans as the lowest level of economic engagement, therefore this sector was lagely left to the non-Muslim populations (Timur, 1998: 65-66). The Muslim population did also not engage in the entrepreneurial sector nor took part in significant amounts as workers in manufacturing. According to a report dated to October 5, 1872, 95% of the workers in the silk

factories in Bursa were Greeks and Armenians (Kaplanoğlu, 1999: 35). To draw a very rough picture, Jewish people were mostly engaged with jewelry, tailoring, and banking; the Greeks were engaged with wine production, bar keeping, and silk production; the Turks were engaged with official administration and farming (Kaplanoğlu, 1999: 35). These fields of work were dependent on each other, since they were sustaining the necessary products and services for each other. As a result, the different religious groups in the classical Ottoman period needed each other, which resulted that there occurred a social balance of relations, rather than a persistent antagonism or conflict.[19]

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were marked by the economic intervention of the West into the Ottoman land. The groups that benefited most from the expansion of trade with the West were the local contacts of the European merchants, almost all from among the Christian populations (Keyder, 1998: 199). Throughout the eighteenth century the capitulations were renewed and further advantages were introduced for the European states. One of these was the right of giving protection papers to the non-Muslims of the Ottoman land. These papers, named as *berat*, gave to its holder the same protection rights as applied to the European citizens. The Europeans acted very generously in distributing such papers that the Christian minorities of the Empire gained a significant advantage over the Muslim merchants and controlled a significant portion of the external trade (Cleveland, 2008: 69). The trade agreements with Britain in 1838 and 1862, and the Islahat Reform in 1856, reinforced the trend of European intervention in the economy and engagement of the local Christians in the external trade. All these resulted in the weakening of the Muslim middle classes and rise of Christian middle classes (Karpat, 2006: 489-490; Zürcher, 1994: 13). The aim of the Islahat Reforms in 1856 was to make the Muslim and non-Muslim populations equal as citizens by ending the privileged position of the Muslims in front of the law. However, the trade concessions to the Western powers and their cooperation with the Christian population resulted in reversal of the statuses in the economic realm. The Christian traders benefited to a degree that they became the privileged rather than the equals (Mardin, 2007: 14). The Christians gained economic power and became the mercantile bourgeoisie of the population. This was a development that challenged the tradition social balance and initiated the anti-Christian feelings among the Muslim population in the Ottoman Empire.

In the age of nationalism in the nineteenth century the *Millet* System and the segregated social structure proved to be not satisfactory for maintaining the unity of the Empire. The Tanzimat (1839) and Islahat (1856) reforms were partially aimed at regaining the loyalty of the non-Muslims by limiting the religious and cultural autonomy of the millets (communities), and creating an idea of common Ottoman citizenship or common Ottomanism. The Islahat Reforms reinforced the rise

---

[19] With "social balance", it is not intended to mean that there existed a peaceful egalitarian balance between the Muslim majority and the non-Muslim minorities in the classical Ottoman period. What is meant is that there existed a traditional statuesque in which the non-Muslims did not have the power to challenge their being the second-class subjects (Zürcher, 1994: 12).

of the Christian Merchants vis-à-vis the religious leaders of the Christian groups. The control of the Christian groups was transferred from the religious leaders to the rising merchants, artisans, and intellectuals. The result was that, the term millet, which used to mean a large religious community, gained the new meaning of a small ethnic-religious group that could be delineated as a national community (Karpat, 2006: 364-365).

The search for a secular identity for the Ottoman population continued with the 1869 Citizenship Law. This law reinforced the idea that all the individuals on the Ottoman lands should share a common citizenship regardless of their religion (Cleveland, 2008: 96). The practical aim of the law was to avoid the Christian minorities to pass to the citizenship of Western powers via the acknowledgment of foreign consulates. The first item of the law stated "anyone who had Ottoman parents or only Ottoman father is an Ottoman citizen" (Karpat, 2006: 181, 269-270, 430). It was made clear that in the past, the people had no more status than being a mere subject of the Sultan. With this law it was announced that the people gained the equal status of being a citizen of the Ottoman State regardless of their religion. Some of the unequal treatments due to being a Muslim or Christian were eliminated. With this law the institution of millet lost its previous legal status. The millets were reduced to the category of religious communities; from that point on it was the Ottoman State responsible for the legal, cultural, and educational problems of the people, not the leadership of the communities.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the Ottoman Empire lost enormous lands in the Balkans and some in Circassia. Most of the Muslim population of those lands immigrated to Anatolia. The anti-Christian feelings among the Muslim population were reinforced with the immigration of Muslim masses from the lost territories. Due to these immigrations there happened enormous demographic changes. As Karpat argues, this demographic change was followed by significant social changes; the economic, cultural, and political structures in Anatolia were altered (Karpat, 2006: 447). Between 1859 and 1879 around 1.5 million Muslim Circassians immigrated to Anatolia. The number of immigrants immediately after the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian War alone ranged up to another 1.5 million (Dündar, 2001: 56; Kaplanoğlu, 1999: 36).[20] The immigrants from the Caucasus and Balkans in this period were named as *93 Göçmenleri* ('93 immigrants'), after the year of the war according to the Ottoman calendar. Most of these people were settled in Anatolia, Balkans, Crete and Syria, "contributing to the anti-Christian feeling" (Zürcher, 1994: 85).

In the late nineteenth century, the two most problematic regions of the Ottoman Empire, considering communal conflicts, were Macedonia and Eastern Anatolia. In Macedonia the Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbians organized their national movements against the Ottoman Empire. In the east there emerged the *Henchak* (The Bell, 1887) and *Dashnakzoutiun* (Armenian Revolutionary Federation, 1890) organizations aiming at Armenian independence (Zürcher, 1994: 86-87). As a

---

[20] Zurcher notes the number of immigrants to be over 800.000 (Zürcher, 1994: 85).

response, the Ottoman government, under the rule of Abdulhamid, "reacted by enrolling a number of Kurdish tribes in new irregular regiments modeled on the Russian Cossack troops, the so-called *Hamidiye* (Hamidian) units". The slaughter of the Armenians by the Hamidiye troops was the first mass murdering of Armenians in Anatolia.

> In the autumn of 1894 a series of incidents led to large-scale slaughter of Armenians by *Hamidiye* troops in the district of Sasun… In 1895 and 1896 there were again widespread massacres in the east and now also in Istanbul... After 1896, the Ottoman government gradually re-established control and the fighting died down (Zürcher, 1994: 88).

The last large group of immigrants was those coming from the Balkans after the Balkan Wars in 1912-13. The number of Muslim people that immigrated to Anatolia after the Balkan War was around 640 thousand (Dündar, 2001: 56). This was in a degree to again disturb the order and security in the land (Dündar, 2001: 34). The people that immigrated to Anatolia witnessed the brutality of the war, lost their relatives and acquaintances, lost their lands and homes, and left almost all their belongings at the back. Moreover, for a long time they filled the shantytowns of Istanbul in the worst conditions. Due to their dreadful experiences, they were full of negative feelings against Christians. They had almost nothing, and the Christians in Anatolia were benefiting from the agreements of the Ottoman state with the Western powers. After their settlement in Anatolia, the immigrants were confronted with the comparatively wealthy Christian minorities. They wanted to take part in the economic activities that Christian minorities engaged (Kaplanoğlu, 1999: 36, 131). All these culminated in a rising stress between the Muslims and the Christian Minorities in Anatolia (Dundar: 249, endnote 9, 12).

After ending the rule of Abdulhamid II, the CUP government demolished the *millet* system. In this way the Party stressed the loyalty to Ottomanism and promoted the ideal of protecting the unity of the Ottoman lands (Cleveland, 2008: 154). However, all the attempts of CUP failed to constitute a common understanding of Ottoman citizenship accepted by all different communities. The persistent superiority feeling of the Muslims and the emergent nationalist ideas among the non-Muslim groups were the main obstacles for this ideal (Cleveland, 2008: 96). The Christian middle classes were reactionary to the fact that the Ottoman State could not create new links with its non-Muslim populations. The Muslim middle classes, on the other hand, were reactionary to the economic, political, and cultural dominance of the European powers and to the local Christians that have economic and political relations with those (Karpat, 2006: 192).

Added to the popular anti-Christian feeling was also the political threat that the Christian minorities could demand for independence and cause further losses of land. The leaders of the CUP were inclined towards nationalization of Anatolia, which in fact meant at that time Islamization of the land. The image of the "other" of Turkish identity in those years was related with the non-Muslim groups living in the Empire (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 36). Therefore they put forward the anti-Christian policies. Bora delineates the national economic policy during the second constitutional

period of the Ottoman Empire (after 1908) as an ethnicist program that perceived the minorities as a threat (Bora, 2006: 82-83).

The vehement murder of the Anatolian Armenians took place during the First World War in 1915 when the Ottoman Empire was ruled by the CUP. The massacre was once named by Mustafa Kemal as a "shameful act" in his speech in the Turkish parliament in April 24, 1920 (Akçam, 2006: 346).[21] These murders culminated in the ethnic cleansing of Eastern Anatolia from the Armenian population. The number of Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire by the time was around 1,500,000, which corresponded to 10% of the total population in Anatolia. Before the war, "the *Dashnakzutioun* had demanded the establishment of a foreign gendarmerie to protect the Armenians in eastern Anatolia" (Zürcher, 1994: 121). "The CUP government had approached the British about this matter and the latter had discussed it with the French and Russian governments. In February 1914 agreement was reached about the establishment of two inspectorates with far-reaching powers in eastern Anatolia and a Belgian and a Dutch inspector were appointed in May" (Zürcher, 1994: 121). However, the start of the war precluded the establishment of these inspectorates in the region.

As the war started, the Armenian nationalists were encouraged by a Russian victory to establish an independent Armenian state in eastern Anatolia. "A few thousand Armenians joined the Russian army; there were Armenian desertions from the Ottoman army and guerilla activity behind the Ottoman lines" (Zürcher, 1994: 120). The Ottoman cabinet led by Talat Pasha took the decision to relocate the entire Armenian population in the war zone to the outside-war region of Zor in the middle of the Syrian Desert. However, as Zürcher states, "the deportations were not limited to the war zone but took place all over the empire. In western Anatolia and Istanbul deportation of whole communities was exceptional, but members of the Armenian elite were persecuted". Zürcher estimates the number of Armenian deaths during the murders and relocation to be between 600,000 and 800,000 (Zürcher, 1994: 121).

About existence of intent of cleansing, rather than merely taking precautions for the war, Zürcher shares the "opinion that there was a centrally controlled policy of extermination, instigated by the CUP".

> There are indications that, while the Ottoman government as such was not involved in genocide, an inner circle within the Committee of Union and Progress under the direction of Talat wanted to 'solve' the Eastern Question by the extermination of the Armenians and that it used the relocation as a cloak for this policy. A number of provincial party chiefs assisted in the extermination, which was organized through the *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* under the direction of

---

[21] Despite this statement and condemning the CUP leadership, Mustafa Kemal shared the official Turkish view. "Kemal also held the foreign powers and the Armenians themselves responsible and tried to focus attention on Armenian massacres of Muslims…According to Kemal, 'foreign intrigues caused the calminities that occurred in Turkey'. '[W]hatever happened to the non-Muslim communities living in our country, it is the result of partition politics that they themselves, swept away by foreign intriguis and abusing their privilidges, pursued in a most brutal manner'. His words are eerily reminiscent of Talat Pasha's…[T]his view was adopted as 'official' Turkish version, and would be often repeated " (Akçam, 2006: 346).

its political director (and CUP central committee member) Bahaeddin Şakir (Zürcher, 1994: 121).

The Armenian Massacre, which refers to the overall events culminating in the murdering and departure of the Armenian population, was organized by the CUP cadres and performed by the paramilitary secret organization of the party, named Special Organization (*Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa*) (Akçam, 2002: 273, 276, 291). Some parts of the Ottoman army (the Third Army) also took part in the murdering and departure of the Armenian people (Akçam, 2002: 291). Many of the assets left by the Armenian people were used to settle the Muslim immigrants during the war. The lands and production facilities were distributed to the newly settled Muslims (Dündar, 2001: 65, 169, 189, 248). Even some immigrants from the time of the 1879 Ottoman-Russian War were settled in the villages left by the Armenians (Dündar, 2001: 215, foot note 134). The rest of the assets were sold in public auctions; the money was transferred to an account in the name of their owners (Dündar, 2001: 179). The local rich also benefited from the leftovers, lands, and houses of the Armenian people. It is very possible that the take-over of the assets by the local rich played a crucial role in accumulation of wealth in their hands in the following years (Mardin, 2007: 225, cites from Çağlar Keyder).

It is worth noting the role played by *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* in the end of the First World War and in establishing the Defense of Rights Organizations (*Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyetleri*). During the Dardanelle War in 1915 it was expected that the Ottoman Empire would lose and İstanbul would be occupied by the Allied Powers. In those years *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* ordered its units to store arms in secret depots. In 1918 *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* was reconstituted as *Umum Alem-i İslam İhtilal Teşkilatı* (General Revolutionary Organization of the Islamic World) and acted to organize guerilla bands. "This was not a particularly hard thing to do since many such bands were already in existence and had played a gruesome part in the maltreatment of Armenians and Greeks. They lived in fear of retribution should they give up their arms and disband" (Zürcher, 1994: 140).

After the Moudros Armistice, signed on October 31, 1918, it was expected that the Allied Powers would occupy parts of Anatolia. The most important of the regions were western Anatolia and eastern Thrace, under the threat of occupation by Greeks, and eastern Anatolia under the threat of the return of the expelled Armenians in accompany of a French invasion. In reaction to such threat the CUP acted to found societies for defense of national rights of the Turkish Muslim population (Zürcher, 1994: 141). The Sevres Treaty signed in 1920 promised for an Armenian state in the Eastern Anatolia. This meant the return of the Armenians and retaking their belongings, which were now owned by the local rich and Muslim people settled in the region. These people immediately reacted against such a possibility. Therefore the first organizations of the Independence War took place in the Eastern Anatolia. The "Defense of Rights Organizations" emerged on the infrastructure prepared by the CUP cadres towards the end of the First World War (Zürcher, 1994: 140). They were strongly supported by the Muslim landowners and traders of the

region, "[m]any of [whom] had become wealthy through government contracts and by taking over the land, property and business of the deported or emigrant Greeks and Armenians for next to nothing; they thus had a very strong incentive to resist the Greek and Armenian claims" (Zürcher, 1994: 154). The Greek Army invaded Western Anatolia in 1919. The Sevres Treaty gave the region of İzmir to Greek control for five years. Based on the Sevres Treaty some parts of the Greek population cooperated with the invading army. The invasion resulted in the reaction of the Muslim people living in the region and they also formed local resistance organizations. The anti-Christian feelings raised in the late nineteenth century and during the First World War were also underlying the support of the Muslim population to the Defense of Rights Organizations.

The first ideas about a Greek-Turkish population exchange had appeared in 1914 at the end of the Balkan Wars, but were not put into practice (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 38). After the Independence War, the Turkish and Greek states agreed on a population exchange. On January 30, 1923, they signed an agreement of compulsory population exchange, which was later ratified in the Lausanne Treaty on July 24, 1923. According to this agreement the Greeks in Turkey and Turks in Greece were to be exchanged, except for the ones living in Istanbul and Western Thrace, respectively. Around 1,200,000 Greeks living in Anatolia were exchanged with around 400,000 Turkish people living in Greece (Aktar, 2006: 150; Aktar, 2008: 17; Erden, 2004).[22] Such an amount of a population exchange was unexampled in the history (Dündar, 2001: 67). Aktar refers to the agreement in Lausanne as the first decision for a large "ethnic cleansing" in the twentieth century (Aktar, 2006: 18). İpek states that there were two main reasons for the Turkish State to champion the exchange of people in the Lausanne negotiations. One of them was that the Turkish people living in Greece were suffering from the pressures of the Greek State. The second reason was to increase the population in Anatolia in a homogeneous way by bringing ethnically Turkish people to the land (İpek, 2000: 28).

Both states in Turkey and Greece were willing to homogenize their populations on ethnic terms. In the population exchange the criterion of distinguishing a group as Turkish or Greek was not based on language, ethnicity, or race, but on religion (Karpat, 2006: 76). The practice of the Turkish Republic in these years reveals that Turkishness was conceived in religious terms (Esendemir, 2008: 78). Many of the non-Turkish Muslim groups, except for the Arabs, were perceived as Turks but the Turkophonic non-Muslims were rejected from the Turkish identity. This shows that being Muslim was more important than being a non-Muslim Turkish citizen in order to be accepted to the Turkish identity. Being non-Muslim happened to be a natural obstacle for becoming Turkish (Yeğen, 2006: 110; Çağaptay, 2007: 93)[23].

---

[22] Zürcher notes these numbers to be 900,000 Greeks exchanged with 400,000 Turkish people (Zürcher, 1994: 171).
[23] The relation of the Kurds and Jews with the Turkish identity blurs the understanding that being a Muslim was a key to acceptance to the Turkish identity. On the one hand, the Kurds were rejected despite being Muslims; on the other hand, the Jews did not experience a rejection comparable to that of the other non-Muslim groups like the Greeks and Armenians.

The most important impact of the population exchange was nationalization of Anatolia (Arı, 1995: 182). The population was homogenized; the trade and industry in Anatolia were passed to the hands of Turkish people (İpek, 2000: 169; Arı, 1995: 163). In those years the number of Turkish population in Anatolia was approximately 12 million. With the population exchange around half a million of Turkish people were added to this amount. Moreover, with the First World War and the population exchange the land was cleaned from a population of more than 1,500,000 Greeks. With the population exchange of the 1920s the balance of the economic forces in the society was demolished. The economy in Anatolia made a considerable backward step. In the first years of the young Republic, all economic activities had to be learned and improved by the native and immigrant Turkish people. What is gained was nationalization of the economy, but what was lost was the infrastructure for many economic productions (Erden, 2004).

After the population exchange, the Republic of Turkey was faced with the problem of settling the new comers, preferably onto the lands and in houses left by the emigrant Greeks. The problem was so severe that it caused a split between the two factions within the People's Party in the parliament. The oppositional group raised harsh criticisms about "the way the government had handled the resettlement of Muslims from Greece on the possessions of the Greeks who had had to leave, something which had given rise to widespread corruption" (Zürcher, 1994: 175). The Prime Minister, İsmet İnönü, needed to ask for confidence, which he had. Following this, 32 deputies around Hüseyin Rauf left the People's Party and founded the Progressive Republican Party (*Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*, PRP) on November 7, 1923. Not to leave the adjective "Republican" to the opposition, the People's Party immediately adopted the name Republican People's Party (RPP).

During the First World War and after the population exchange the demography in Anatolia was significantly changed. During the war 2.5 million Anatolian Muslims, between 600,000 and 800,000 Armenians, and around 300,000 Greeks lost their lives. The land was cleaned from around 1,500,000 Armenians during the war and more than 1,500,000 Greeks both during the war and with the population exchange.[24] Anatolia was left dominantly with the Muslim Turkish and Kurdish populations (Zürcher, 1994: 170-171).

The murder of Armenian population during the war, the murder of the Greek people during the same period, and the exchange of the Greek and Turkish populations after the Independence War were results of a historical context in which the anti-Christian feelings were raised among the Muslim populations. Underlying all these tragic events was the fear among the late Ottoman leaders and intellectuals that they could lose the last piece of land they had, Anatolia, if they did not

---

These show that the Turkish identity was not only categorically open to Muslim populations, but also not categorically closed to non-Muslim groups (Yeğen, 2006: 112).

[24] Zürcher notes that "the population of Anatolia declined by 20 per cent through mortality, a percentage 20 times as high as that of France, which had been the hardest-hit country among the European belligerents in the World War" (Zürcher, 1994: 170-171).

clear it from the Christian populations. The immigrations, murder of Armenians, and population exchange with Greece resulted in the homogenization of the land of Anatolia in Islamic terms. In the 1870s there were around 2.3 million Armenians, 2.1 million Greeks, and 4 million Arabs in the Ottoman lands. According to the numbers in 1927 there were left only 65 thousand Armenians, 120 thousand Greeks, and 135 thousand Arabs in Anatolia. In 1970s, the 30% of the total population of Turkey composed of people whose ancestors up to four generation had immigrated to Anatolia from the former Ottoman lands (Dündar, 2001: 252). The ethnic cleansing in Turkey resulted in the homogenization of the population in religious terms. This process culminated in the wide gap between the Turkish citizenship and the non-Muslim identities. The ethnic cleansing underlay the exclusionary character of Turkish citizenship towards the non-Muslim communities.

2.3 Turkish Republic and One-Party System

The nation building in the late Ottoman Empire was conditioned with the question of how to save the state. Therefore the safety and continuity of the state was always given priority over the liberal rights of the people. This understanding was inherited by the Turkish Republic in the form of the predominance of the reforms in order to establish a modern nation-state. Kadıoğlu (1999: 14-15) mentions that the regime in Turkey resembles the revolutionary ones, in which sustaining the state government precedes the "liberal ethic". Accordingly, neither "democracy" nor "liberalism" existed in the six principles of the Republic as accepted in 1931 (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 47). Zubaida (2000) also states that "Turkish Republic is not a liberal democracy".

The bureaucratic elite in the early Republic did not have an understanding of a common will determined by negotiations. They were even against an idea of a common will associated with the interests of the majority. The economic interests of social groups were immediately marked with selfishness. Heper (2006: 118) states, according to Mustafa Kemal the general interests of the nation could not be determined by popular vote; it could be determined only by the national will, which emerges only when the nation reaches a civilized standard of life. The bureaucratic elite associated the common will of the nation with some norms and values determined by the fundamental principles of the state (Heper, 2006: 148).

The "separateness" of the statesmen from the society in the Ottoman Empire was preserved in the Turkish Republic in a new form. The relation between the statesmen and society was reestablished within the nation-state with the understandings of "positivism" and "solidarism" (Kaynar, 2001: 51). In theory, the state was for the people (nation); in practice, the people were for the state (Kaynar, 2001: 65). Keyman describes the strong-state tradition in Turkey as follows:

> Turkish modernity, since the beginning of the Republic, has been characterized by and has given rise to the 'strong-state tradition'. This tradition means, first, that the state has assumed the capacity of acting almost completely independently of civil society; second, that the state, rather than the government, has constituted 'the primary context of politics'; and third, that as

a moral/ethical actor, the state has intervened in the cultural domain with the aim of transforming societal affairs into a secular, civilized and rational national identity (Keyman, 2005: 281).

The sacrifice of liberties for the welfare of the state can be traced in the suppression of the oppositional groups in the early years of the Republic. The Turkish Republic was proclaimed on October 29, 1923, when many of the "celebrities from the independence war, Hüseyin Rauf, Ali Fuat (Cebesoy), Adnan (Adıvar), Refet (Bele) and Kazım (Karabekir) were not in the capital". "They reacted angrily to the proclamation in interviews in the Istanbul press, calling the decision premature, and stressing that calling the state a republic did not in itself bring freedom and that the real difference was between despotism and democracy, whether under a republican or a monarchic system" (Zürcher, 1994: 174). There was considerable discontent in Istanbul about the proclamation of the Republic. Among the reasons of this discontent was the expectation that the caliphate would also be abolished. There happened to be some tendencies in support of continuation of the caliphate, which resulted in severe reaction of the Ankara government. On March 3, 1924, the institution of caliphate was indeed abolished (Zürcher, 1994: 174-175). On April 20, 1924 the new constitution (*Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu*) was promulgated. The 1924 Constitution was not based on a pluralist understanding where the sovereignty would be shared in between or would be based on the consensus of multiple policy representatives. Rather, it was based on the understanding of predominance of majority representing the national will (Tanör, 2006: 328). The rights and demands of the minorities were repressed in the name of the common will (Tanör, 2006: 352).

On February 8, 1925 the Kurdish Sheikh Said rebellion broke out. Immediately martial law was declared and the High Treason Law was modified to include religious offences against the state. The hard liners in the ruling RPP were critical about the Prime Minister Fethi's policies. After Mustafa Kemal sided with the hard liners, the Fethi government lost a confidence vote and İsmet became the prime minister, his government being packed with the hard liner deputies. This government passed the *Takrir-i Sükun Kanunu* (Law on the Maintenance of Order), with which the government could ban, for two years, anything that was considered to be disturbing the order (Zürcher, 1994: 179). The Sheikh Said rebellion was suppressed and the Kurds were harshly treated by the Independence Tribunals. The Law on the Maintenance of Order was used not only to suppress the Kurdish movement. Many of the leading newspapers and periodicals were suppressed. "With the press out of the way, the Progressive Republican Party was closed down by the government on the advice of the Independence Tribunal on 3 June. According to the tribunal, members of the party had supported the rebellion and tried to exploit religion for political purposes" (Zürcher, 1994: 180).

On June 15, 1926, a conspiracy was uncovered in Izmir aiming to assassin Mustafa Kemal by a group led by the former deputy Ziya Hurşit. The Independence Tribunals handled the situation:

"[a]lmost all the surviving prominent Unionists" and "the former PRP members" were arrested. "Sixteen of the accused were condemned to death, in spite of the fact that most of them had not been proved to be involved" (Zürcher, 1994: 182, 184). Kazım Karabekir, Ali Fuat (Cebesoy), Refet (Bele), and Cafer Tayyar (Eğilmez), all being heroes of the Independence War, were released only because of military discontent about their arrests. After the Izmir conspiracy and following arrests the opposition was dissolved. From that time on the RPP was the only and non-opposed political force.

The liberal opposition movement of the 1930s can be considered to be an extension of the liberalist movement represented by Prens Sabahattin in the late Ottoman era. The Free Republican Party (*Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*) was founded by the initiative of Mustafa Kemal in August 1930. In the early years of the Republic a central issue between the government and opposition was the civil rights. The government was inclined to constantly increase the power of the police to enforce the regulations of the reforms. The liberal opposition, on the other hand, aimed at limiting the power of the police for sake of civil rights (Ergut, 2004: 373). The Free Republican Party tended to become a real opposition which could appeal considerable attention of the masses (Zürcher, 1994: 187). With the request of Mustafa Kemal, Ali Fethi closed down the party in November 1930. The Menemen incident was used as an occasion to accuse the Free Party members with offending the fundamentals of the Republic. This was the start of the one-party system officially declared at the party congress in 1931.

During the one-party system not only external but also internal opposition within the RPP was suppressed. "[F]ree discussion was only allowed in the (closed) meetings of the party. After a decision on any topic had been reached in these meetings, delegates were bound by the majority decision and were required to vote for it in the assembly" (Zürcher, 1994: 185). Zürcher argues that the voting and decisions of the assembly were not sincere, since they were already determined outside the parliament. The RPP was the supreme power in the state governance, in the assembly, and in the provincial administrations. The party cadre itself was "dominated by the members of the national assembly". "State and party were closely identified". The provincial governor was nobody else than the head of the provincial party organization (Zürcher, 1994: 185). In the early Republican period the party bureaucracy was more effective than the civil bureaucracy of the state. In the 1927 congress of the RPP, it was decided that the administrators of the socially, politically, economically, and culturally related state institutions and village headmen could be appointed only with the approval of the RPP inspectors. The RPP became actually a part of the government (Heper, 2006: 108).

In 1924 the institution of Şeyhülislam and the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Pious Foundations were abolished. Instead, *Diyanet İşleri Müdürlüğü* (Directorate of Religious Affairs) and *Efkaf Umum Müdürlüğü* (Directorate-General for Pious Affairs) were founded. In this way religious institutions were brought under direct state control. Zürcher states these two institutions

were the clear signs that the understanding of secularism of the Turkish state did not imply the separation of state and religious affairs; but the state control over the religious affairs (Zürcher, 1994: 195). Tanör states that the principle of secularism (laicism) gained a militant character in the Turkish Republic. Rather than the separation of religion and state by preserving their mutual autonomy, the state controlled and regulated the religious affairs (Tanör, 2006: 390). As a part of the policy of rejecting the past, in September 1925, the shrines (*türbe*ler) and dervish convents (*tekkeler*) were banned. The fez was forbidden and replaced by the Western style hat. In 1934 family names were introduced (Zürcher, 1994: 181, 191).

Turkish Women's Union was founded in 1924 "by women who had been active in the national resistance movement" (Zürcher, 1994: 188). Despite that, Kadıoğlu states, the women activists were hindered in the period 1926-34. The reason for this hindrance was the preoccupation of not losing the votes of the conservative masses for the ruling party (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 107-108). The repression of women's movement in the first years of the Republic should be considered as a result of the lack of "liberal ethic" in the program of the state elite. The women were given the right to vote for the municipality elections in 1934 and for the parliamentary elections (which was then a two staged, indirect election) in 1935. These rights were given to the women not because of a political movement within the civil society. They were the result of mere regulations of the "revolutionary male elites" (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 108-109, 117).

In 1925, following the Sheikh Said rebellion and after the *Takrir-i Sükun Kanunu* was put in force, all conservative, liberal and socialist newspapers and publications were banned (Zürcher, 1994: 179, 188). In 1935, *Türk Kadınlar Birliği* (Turkish Women's Union) was forced to dissolve itself, with the claim that "its aims…had been achieved with the granting of the vote to Turkey's women" (Zürcher, 1994: 188). *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Hearts), which had been "reactivated…to spread nationalist, positivist and secularist ideas" were closed down in 1931. In 1932 they were replaced by *Halk Evleri* (People's Houses) in towns and *Halk Odaları* (People's Rooms) in large villages. These latter "served essentially the same function but were tightly controlled by the provincial branches of the party". In 1933 the old *Darülfünun* ('House of Sciences', the university) was turned into the University of Istanbul. However, this was not a mere change of the name and administration. "In the process two-thirds of its teaching staff, over 100 people, lost their tenure and only the most dependable followers of the Kemalist line were kept on" (Zürcher, 1994: 179, 188).

In October 15-20, 1927, Mustafa Kemal gave his famous 36-hour *Nutuk* (Speech) before the congress of the RPP. According to Zürcher, Mustafa Kemal intended to perform four things with his speech:

1. The former leaders of the PRP were not only Mustafa Kemal's former colleagues, but also leading heroes of the independence war. He aimed to vindicate the

suppression of these people. He did this by presenting them as "doubters, incompetents and traitors".

2. "He depict[ed] himself as the only one who led the independence movement."

3. He disregarded the early phase of the resistance movement by starting it with his landing on Samsun. Namely, he ignores that the *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* had started to organize armed guerilla movements, stored arms in Anatolia, and established the basis of the Defense of Right organizations.

4. He "present[ed] the independence struggle not as one to preserve the parts of Ottoman Empire, but as a movement for the establishment of a new Turkish state". (Zürcher, 1994: 183)

All four of these intentions are important, since they constitute the basis of the official ideology of the Turkish Republic. The speech was given before the RPP congress, called to be "The Second Congress of the RPP". Zürcher writes, in fact, this was not true, since the so-called first congress, namely the Sivas Congress held in 1919, was not a congress of the RPP. This misnaming was due to "the (false) identification of the RPP with the national liberation movement and monopolizing its heritage" (Zürcher, 1994: 183).

The official ideology of the Turkish Reepublic, referred to dominantly as Kemalism till the 1950s and as *Atatürkçülük* (Atatürkism) afterwards, "never became a coherent, all-embracing ideology, but can best be described as a set of attitudes and opinions, which were never defined in any detail" (Zürcher, 1994: 189). In 1937, the six principles, named *Altı Ok* (Six Arrows), were incorporated to the constitution (Zürcher, 1994: 190). Despite being an all-embracing ideology, Kemalism signified the centrality of the state in the politics of the country. Namely, it would be the state initiatives and regulations, rather than the social groups, which shaped the social and political realm. As Göle points out, democracy was not among the items of the Six Arrows announced as the founding principles of the Republic (Göle, 1994: 19-20). The item of "populism" within these six arrows, referred to the understanding of "non-class character of Turkish society" (Keyman, 2005: 276). As Keyman quotes from Toprak, "Kemalist populism defined 'people' as an organic unit composed of professional groups rather than classes. As opposed to class solidarity, populism emphasized the solidarity of the whole nation. There were no classes, hence no privileges based on class differences, and hence no class conflict" (Keyman, 2005: 276). Mustafa Kemal clearly stated that in the Turkish society there were no classes pursuing different interests or in rivalry with each other. The different occupational groups needed and supported each other. Therefore the ruling party, RPP, could provide wealth and a just rule for all groups in the society (Yeğen, 1999: 104). The understanding of populism by the Kemalist elite signifies the intention of the domination of the state over the civil societal groups from the beginning of the foundation of the Republic.

The ideology of the young Turkish Republic was based on the reactionary attitude of its elite to the personal rule of the Sultan and the Islamic basis of the Ottoman Empire. The Republican elite aimed "to create a nation-state distinct from the person of the sultan and secular enough to reduce Islam to the realm of individual faith" (Keyman, 2005: 275). The attempt to construct a national consciousness was handled by Mustafa Kemal's own initiative. The attempts in the realms of language and history are noteworthy in this regard. The language reform initially aimed at getting rid of the Persian and Arabic influences in the language. *Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti* (Society for the Study of Turkish Language, later *Türk Dil Kurumu*) was founded in 1932. However, the attempt to replace the Persian and Arabic words with the newly established ones did not succeed. "The language reform movement was temporarily saved from deadlock by the launching in 1935 of the *Güneş-Dil Teorisi* (Sun-Language Theory)", which claimed that all languages on the world originated from the same source to which Turkish was the closest (Zürcher, 1994: 198). "The theory, concocted by a Viennese 'orientalist' by the name of Kvergic, was greeted by skepticism among Turkish linguists, but it gained the support of Mustafa Kemal, who ordered the Society for the Study of Turkish Language to study it in detail" (Zürcher, 1994: 198). This theory meant that, in fact, all the languages had originated from Turkish; therefore there was no need of replacing the foreign words with their Turkish counterparts. This unscientific theory lost much of its support after the death of Mustafa Kemal in 1938; after the Second World War it was no more promoted by the state.

Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti (Society for the Study of Turkish History, later *Türk Tarih Kurumu*) was founded in 1931. In its first congress in 1932 the society announced another unscientific thesis, named *Türk Tarih Tezi* (Turkish History Thesis). According to this thesis the Turks who emigrated from the Central Asia to all parts of the world created the great civilizations of the world. In these terms, "the Sumerians and the Hittites were really proto-Turks"; moreover, "Atilla and Cengiz Khan were described as executing civilizing missions" (Zürcher, 1994: 199). Zürcher states, with this theory the state aimed to create a past, other than that of the Ottomans, and with which the nation could be proud.

The ideology of the Turkish Republic was constructed to reject everything associated with the immediate past, namely everything belonging to the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Palace, Ottoman Sultan caliphate, Islam as the state ideology, the ethnic variety within the population, the CUP, Enver, Cemal, and Talat Pashas were all rejected. The rejection of the immediate past created a thousand years of gap prior to the foundation of the Republic. Therefore, the elite resorted to ideas like the Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory in order to construct an image of history that would fill the gap (Yeğen, 1999: 194-195). Such theories served for practical purposes, though their creators also sincerely believed in them.

> The theory aimed to give Turks a sense of pride in their past and in their national identity,
> separate from the immediate past, that is to say the Ottoman era... That is not to say that it was

a purely cynical form of indoctrination. As with the linguistic theories, there is every indication that Mustafa Kemal himself, and many in the national political leadership and educational establishment, believed in it (Zürcher, 1994: 199).

Zürcher states, the extreme nationalism promoted with such theories should not be considered as a contradiction with, or an obstacle to, the westernization attempt of the founders of the Republic. The pride created with such ideological manipulations "made it easier to exchange elements from traditional Middle Eastern civilization for those of the West" by "counterbalanc[ing] the need to follow the Europe" (Zürcher, 1994: 199-200). Yeğen (1999: 192) also states, the *Turkish History Thesis* was a product of a rational construction that addressed some objective needs. The intelligentsia, who had its roots among the "bureaucrats, officers, teachers, doctors, lawyers and entrepreneurs of larger commercial enterprises", were representing the "backbone" of the Kemalist regime. "The regime thus continued the Ottoman system in which a highly educated, urban, bureaucratic, and military elite dominated the rest of the country" (Lapidus, 2002: 502). More or less all the emergent intelligentsia of the Turkish Republic supported the Kemalist ideology. An important publication of intelligentsia through which Kemalism was supported and reproduced was the journal *Kadro* (Cadre), published between 1932-4. "They advocated state planning in all areas of social, economic and cultural life and they saw statism as a viable alternative to communism and capitalism, a sort of 'third way'" (Zürcher, 1994: 206).

During the one-party regime the elite of the young Republic could easily repress the oppositions for their modernization and nationalization programs. The institutional modernizations and the accompanying ideology reinforced the centrality of the state in politics and social life. The secular character of the state was based on rejecting the Ottoman past and repressing the religious tendencies of the traditionally oriented masses. The nationalization program aimed at basing the national identity on the Turkish ethnicity by rejecting the other ethnic identities. The modernization and nationalization policies during the single-party regime reinforced the centrality of the state prepared the bases for the secular and ethnically Turkish characteristics of Turkish citizenship.

2.4 Nationalization of the Economy

In the late Ottoman Empire the industry was not yet developed, therefore there was no industrial bourgeoisie and no significant working class. The peasants were dominated with the classical understanding of being the subjects of the Sultan; therefore, they did not raise political initiative to shape the ruling of land. The rural rebels that occurred were basically against the local governors and generally demanded no more than their replacement. The main political actors among the late Ottoman population were the traditional statesmen (the palace surrounding), emergent state bureaucracy and modern military, the landowners in the rural, the non-Muslim intellectuals and activists, and the emergent non-Muslim bourgeoisie. From economic point of view, the main groups were the emergent state bureaucracy and military that advocated a nationalization of economy (better to say, handing over the trade and enterprises to Muslims from

the non-Muslims), the landowners that more or less ruled the rural population, and the emergent non-Muslim mercantile bourgeoisie.

In the nineteenth century the trade between the Ottoman Empire and Western lands reached to an enormous amount[25], out of which the Greek traders and Armenian bankers benefited most and strengthened their position, especially under the *berat* system (Zürcher, 1994: 29, 50). In this period there was no Muslim middle class that could compete with the Christian middle classes for the economic benefits of the external trade (Karpat, 2006: 18). On the other hand, the reaction of the Ottoman Empire to counter the Western powers happened to be modernization of the military and state by further centralization and establishment of a powerful bureaucratic system. The majority of the statesmen in the bureaucracy were Muslims. Consequently, "military and political power and economic strength were polarized between two distinct sectors of Ottoman society: the predominantly Muslim military/bureaucratic elite and the emerging Christian bourgeoisie" (Zürcher, 1994: 41).

The CUP from the beginning sided with the capitalists and landowners, rather than the workers and peasants, as its general policy. Till 1913 the CUP supported a free trade instead of a protectionist economy, hence did not intervene in the economic matters. However, after the *Bab-ı Ali* coup in 1913, when the CUP had complete control of the state, it started to take active part in the economy. "In the following years this new direction evolved into the policies of *Milli İktisat* (National Economy), in which nineteenth century German industrialization served as an example" (Zürcher, 1994: 129). Accordingly the CUP leaders (then the government) aimed at building a national bourgeoisie. Before the war, they promulgated a law, which stated that the Ottoman products should be preferred even though they were more expensive than the imported ones. They founded a national consumer society to spread this attitude. They formed "entrepreneurial cadres" from Muslim traders in the towns. They encouraged this "embryonic bourgeoisie to accumulate capital by making use of the exceptional market conditions during the war" (Zürcher, 1994: 130).

In the eve of the First World War, the trade and investments ongoing in the Ottoman Empire were mostly in the hands of the Entente states that the Empire was in war with. Therefore, it was necessary to have a different economic policy for the war years. In 1914, the CUP cancelled all the capitulations, declared protective customs duties and started regulations that brought the foreign companies under the control of Ottoman legislative system and made them tax payers to the Ottoman state. The CUP followed the policy of giving the state tenders to the Muslim owned companies. These measures were effective to limit the advantages of the local Christian entrepreneurs (Cleveland, 2008: 168).

---

[25] "One result of the free-trade arrangement of 1838-41, which coincided with the start of the rapid economic expansion in Europe known as the 'mid-century boom', was that the empire's external trade, which had already increased by roughly 80 per cent between 1780 and 1830, increased approximately fivefold in 1830-70." (Zürcher, 1994: 50)

The actions performed for building a national economy was not limited to promotion of local products and encouragement of Muslim entrepreneurs. During the First World War, the CUP government attacked the Greek and Armenian Entrepreneurs by forcing them to use Turkish in their administration and to employ Turks in their boards. They initiated "threats and intimidation"; "130,000 Greeks from the Western coastal regions alone left for Greece. Their companies were given to the new Muslim entrepreneurs" (Zürcher, 1994: 130). However, these Muslim entrepreneurs who took over the business of the exiled non-Muslims were unsuccessful in running the companies. This was because they lacked "overseas contacts, markets and management skill". Due to the nationalist policies, "[o]ver 80 new joint stock companies were founded between 1916 and 1918 with active support from the CUP". "By the end of the war, the empire's economy was in ruins" (Zürcher, 1994: 130-131). However, these nationalistic policies gave their fruits to create the "intended capital accumulation by the Muslim traders, the large landowners and the guilds" (Zürcher, 1994: 130-131). The share of Muslim-Turkish capital in the overall Ottoman enterprises rose from 3% in 1908 to 38% in 1918 (Ergut, 2004: 158-159).

The Turkish government continued the policy of the CUP about Turkification of the national economy by compelling the companies to exchange their non-Muslim employees with Muslims. "It is estimated that by the year 1926 approximately 5,000 employees from Greek minority had already been replaced with Muslim-Turks". Moreover, "[t]he Law of Public Employment, dated to 1926, conditioned public employment on 'being Turk' and not on 'being a Turkish citizen'". "Hence, since non-Muslim minorities were considered Turkish only in terms of citizenship, the law, in practice, excluded non-Muslim peoples from the state sector while reserving it exclusively for the benefit of Turkish-Muslim citizens" (Soner, 2005: 298).

The fear of the CUP cadres about the disintegration of the land did not totally disappear after the foundation of the Republic. Saving the state from disintegration was among the primary concerns of the republicans (Mardin, 2007: 100). Throughout the single party regime and up to the 1950s this fear at least implicitly preoccupied the Republican elite (Heper, 2006: 93). Especially the pressures on the non-Muslim communities to use the Turkish language (Yıldız, 2001: 266), the Thrace Incidents that ended up with desertion of many of the Jewish population, and the Wealth Tax regulation in the 1940s against the remaining non-Muslim populations should be related with this persisting fear.[26]

The 37th and 45th items of the Lausanne Agreement gave the Armenian, Greek and Jewish communities the status of minority as it was the case in the Ottoman Empire. These items gave to the three groups the rights such as religious practice, travel, using their own language, and education. The 42nd item gave them the rights of practicing their daily customs and applying their

---

[26] The idea of existence of a threat of disintegration was used by the ruling parties also to accuse the opposition in many occasions. When the DP came to the rule in the 1950s it accused the CUP of disintegrating the nation by the oppositional activities it pursued. Similar accusation is observed towards all oppositional movements throughout the second half of the twentieth century up to today (2010) (Mardin, 2007: 179).

own principles in the family and private life. These rights were to be regulated by the special commissions composed of representatives of the religious minorities (Aktar, 2008: 112, footnote 21). The Civil Law adapted from the Swedish was accepted by the Turkish parliament in February 1926. Aktar states that the acceptance of the Civil Law was a significant step to dissolve the social system of the Ottoman Empire raised on the communal divisions based on religion. This law was not only a step of modernization to catch up with the civilized world, but also a triumph of the national state to acquire the judicial sovereignty over its citizens (Aktar, 2008: 110).

The preparations for the Civil Law were fulfilled in the summer of 1925, before the acceptance of the law. These preparations included pressuring the religious minorities to abandon their right due to the 42nd item of the Lausanne Agreement. The commissions mentioned in the 42nd item were constituted in May 1925 for the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish communities. The Greek, Armenian, and Jewish members of these commissions were appointed by the government. After long discussions and due to the pressures from the government the commission of the Jewish members declared their decision on September 10, 1925 that the Jewish community abandoned their rights emanating from the 42nd item of the Lausanne Agreement. This was followed by the decision of the Armenian commission to abandon from the same rights. The Greek community showed more resistance. The police arrested three members of the commission who were openly against abandoning the rights. Finally, the Greek commission as well signed the document declaring that they abandoned their rights due to 42nd item of the Lausanne Agreement. With these declarations the non-Muslim minorities, who were subject to a different family law in the Ottoman Empire, were "Turkified" in the judicial terms (Aktar, 2008: 112-113; Esendemir, 2008: 77).

In the congress of the Turkish Heart organization in January 1927 one of the main items of discussion was to force the "minorities" to talk in Turkish. "Threatening" was also considered as a measure in this direction (Bali, 2010: 134). The students' organization of the faculty of law in *Dar-ül-fünun* (later İstanbul University) took the decision in its congress on January 13, 1928 to start a campaign to force the minorities to use the Turkish language. The organization took permit from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to start the campaign which is known with its slogan *"Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş!"* ("Citizen, Talk in Turkish!") (Bali, 2010: 134-135). This campaign targeted not only the non-Muslim minorities but also the Muslim and non-Turkish groups. There appeared posters stating this phrase in public transportations, trams, and ferries (Yıldız, 2001: 286-287). The phrase of the campaign sounded more like a threatening of attack than a suggestion to use the Turkish language. The campaign resulted in some reaction of the minorities that in some places the posters were torn out and there were quarrels and fights between the ethnic Turkish and minority groups (Bali, 2010: 134-136-137).

The campaign was effective not only in Istanbul, but also in other cities like Izmir and Edirne where there lived considerable amount of non-Muslim populations (Bali, 2010: 139-148). In Edirne, there appeared posters all around the city. A local newspaper stated that the non-Muslims

were free to go wherever they wanted if they were not willing to use the Turkish language, and continued: "[a]s the last word we state that you are obliged to talk in Turkish, the ones that do not talk in Turkish are not one of us and they cannot live in this land".[27] The most passionate participants of the campaign in Edirne were the students. In comparison to the other cities the campaign in Edirne was held more intensely in an anti-semitic atmosphere (Bali, 2010: 145). The campaign all around Turkey did not last long and lost its effect in April 1928; but it became a symbol of the sensitivity of the state about using the Turkish language (Yıldız, 2001: 287).

The rise of Nazis in Germany in 1933 initiated anti-Semitic currents also in Turkey. The racist writers Nihal Atsız and Cevat Rıfat Atilhan adapted the notions of the Nazis to their Turkish centered politics and pioneered the anti-Semitic agitations against the Jewish community (Bali, 2010: 243-244). The anti-Christian feelings happened to be an ideological instrument to construct the national identity of the Republican Turkey. The attitude of the Republican elite towards the minorities is reflected in the journal of *Kadro*. In this journal Burhan Asaf Belge wrote in 1933 that none of the Jews in Germany spoke any other language than German; they all declared themselves to be Germans; and they even made significant contributions to science in Germany.[28] He continued, despite of these the German nation felt the necessity to punish the minorities. He argued, in the Turkish case, the Turks did not even seek to force the minorities to adapt the Turkish language; the minorities in Turkey should take lessons from the anti-Semitism in Germany. He stated, what they should do is either to adapt the language and Turkishness, namely to assimilate, or to leave the land. Belge further threatened the minorities that if they did not discover the ways to adapt to Turkishness in a sincere way, the result would be "not good" for them (Bora, 2006: 88-89).

The Law of Compulsory Settlement (*Mecburi İskan Kanunu*) was the initiator of the attacks on the Jewsih community living in the Thrace region of Turkey in 1934. The attacks are known as the Thrace Incidents (*Trakya Olayları*). The Law was actually prepared to resettle and assimilate the Kurdsih population, but it was used also to force the non-Muslim communities move from the regions where they intensely lived and resettled (Bali, 2010: 246). There were two reasons for the attack on the Jewish community in Thrace. The first one was military: Thrace was considered to be a delicate region from military point of view, and the Jewish community was not considered to be loyal to the state. The second reason was economic: the state elite aimed at eliminating the dominance of the Jewish merchants on the trade in Thrace (Bali, 2010: 249). Around two weeks after the promulgation of the Law, there were attacks on the Jewish quarters in Thrace, such as in Edirne, Çanakkale, Uzunköprü, Kırklareli, Babaeski. The houses and shops of the Jewish community were looted, some Jewish women were raped, and the shops of the Jews were boycotted. The Jewish community had to run away from the region to Istanbul leaving behind their houses and shops or selling them for very low prices (Bali, 2010: 247). After these events, the

---

[27] Halid, M, "Türkçe Mecburiyeti", *Edirne Postası*, March, 22, 1928 (quated by Bali, 2010: 144-145).
[28] Belge, B.A. (1933), "Bizdeki Azlıklar". *Kadro*, vol. 16, April, pp. 52-53.

government took action and arrested some of the participants in the attacks. Bali comments that the Thrace incidents were a part of the process of Turkification of Thrace from both population and economic point of views (Bali, 2010: 254). After these events the pressure was increased on the Jewish community to use the Turkish language (Bali, 2010: 255).

During the Second World War, although Turkey did not take part, the standard of living of the majority of Turkish population declined. However, there happened to be a minor group who benefited from the government interventions, inflation, and black market of the war years. Among those were "big farmers, importers and traders and those officials who handled government contracts and permits". There occurred resentment in the population against these beneficiaries. Therefore, a "Wealth Tax" (*Varlık Vergisi*) was introduced in November 1942, to tax such unfavorable incomes (Zürcher, 1994: 208). This was in rhetoric aimed to tax the superficial earnings of the merchants. However, in practice it was applied mostly to attack the non-Muslim minorities.

> [T]he way in which this law was applied was scandalous… There was no fixed rate. The result was that the tax was almost wholly paid by traders in the big cities, notably Istanbul, and that 55 per cent of the total tax revenue was paid by the tiny non-Muslim communities, who were subjected to rates ten times higher than those of Muslims (Zürcher, 1994: 208).

Aktar states that the Wealth Tax cannot be considered as an ordinary tax regulation; this was a part of the Turkification process that started with the CUP government in 1912-1918 (Aktar, 2008: 215). Wealth Tax regulation was a significant step considering the nationalization of the economy in Turkey. In between June 1942 and May 1943, the 34.3% of the total spending of the state was financed by the revenues from the Wealth Tax. The ratio of non-Muslims among the people obliged to pay the Wealth Tax was 87%; the non-Muslims were supposed to pay more than the 83% of the total collected money. The 70% of the total tax was collected only from Istanbul. It was true only for the Muslim-Turk payers that the tax was collected from the rich. Among the non-Muslims obliged for the tax were 26,000 people being drivers, greengrocers, secretaries, laborers, janitors, and alike (Aktar, 2008: 221-225). The 67.7% of the immovable assets sold for paying the Wealth Tax were bought by Muslim Turks or by companies owned by Muslim Turks; the 30% were bought by state owned companies and the Istanbul municipality (Aktar, 2008: 230-231). Oran states, the Wealth Tax regulations resulted in the largest transfer of wealth from the non-Muslims to the Muslims in the history of Turkish Republic (Oran, 2004: 144).

Another occasion of attack on the remnants of the non-Muslim businesses happened to be in 1955 under the government of the Democrat Party. The rising inflation and the repressive policies of the Democrat Party in the 1950s antagonized the salaried bureaucracy, armed forces, and the intellectuals (Zürcher, 1994: 234, 236-237, 241). The demonstration organized by the government to show the public opinion about the Cyprus problem in September 1955, ironically happened to be an occasion to reflect the discontent of the masses. The demonstrations turned into an attack at the

Greeks in Istanbul culminating in the September 6-7 events. "[T]he demonstrations got completely out of hand and developed first into a pogrom against Greek businesses and then into a general attack on visible wealth by the inhabitants of the gecekondu [shantytowns]" (Zürcher, 1994: 242). Martial law was declared in the three big cities and the interior minister had to resign. This was an attack on the last group of Christians left in Istanbul. Aktar considers the September 6-7 events also as a part of the Turkification process as it was the case with the Wealth Tax. He states that due to all these Turkification processes the rate of the non-Muslim minorities dropped from 2.78% of the total population in 1927 to 0.50% in 2000 (Aktar, 2008: 217).

The nationalization of the economy in Turkey meant the transfer of the commercial wealth of the non-Muslims to the Muslim population. This process was in line with and a continuation of the ethnic cleansing of the land from the Armenian and Greek populations. Therefore the nationalization of the economy was related to the exclusionary characteristics of the national identity towards the non-Muslims. Moreover, the process was also accompanied by an emphasis on the Turkish language. This dimension of the process was pointing to the Turkish ethnic character of the national identity and citizenship. The attacks on the non-Muslims throughout the process were clear indications that the rights of people were secondary to the welfare and security of the state in the Turkish Republic. The rights could be violated especially for the groups whose loyalty was suspicious for the nationalist elite. Therefore, looking to the process of the nationalization of the economy it can be expected that rights were not the defining elements of Turkish citizenship.

2.5 Kurdish Resistance in Turkey

Prior to the late nineteenth century, there did not appear a strong idea of Kurdish nationalism in the Ottoman lands. The reason behind, Natali argues, was the fact that the official ideology of the Ottoman Empire was not marked by nationalism or ethnic identification. In the late nineteenth century, however, "nationalist tendencies started to emerge in the Ottoman Empire" (Natali, 2002). Although the ideology of the Ottoman state was not based on ethnic nationalism, it would be misleading to think that the late Ottomans had no understanding of ethnic differentiation in between their Muslim populations. It is well known that the Young Turks distinguished the Anatolian Muslims on ethnic basis. Even prior to the Young Turks, the Ottoman statesmen placed the Turkish ethnicity in a superior position in comparison to the other Muslim groups. For example, in his report dating to 1885, Osman Nuri Pasha clearly stated that the Turks constituted the basis of the Muslim Ottoman people. The Arabs, Kurds, and Albanians were the supporting entities in this population (Deringil, 2007: 98-99).

Perhaps the most dominant ideology among the CUP cadres prior to the war years was Pan-Turkism. Yusuf Akçura, a Tatar Turkist from Russia settled in Istanbul, was the pioneering figure

to advocate this ideology. He published the famous article *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*[29] (Three Types of Policy), considered to be the first coherent statement of Pan-Turkism and known as the "Communist Manifesto of Turkism" (Zürcher, 1994: 133-134). In this article he compared the three principles of Ottomanism, Islamism*,* and Turkism on behalf of the latter. Pan-Turkism was spread by the CUP organization *Türk Ocağı* (The Turkish Heart), founded in 1911, and its journal *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland). However, Pan-Turkism as advocated by Yusuf Akçura was not the only version of Turkish nationalist ideology. Another version concentrated on Anatolia, rather than the Turkic lands out of the Empire. According to this populist version, Anatolia was the heartland of the Turks; the culture of the Anatolian Turkish peasants represented the genuine culture of Turkishness. "[I]ts doctrine of populism (*halkçılık*) aimed to create national solidarity at a time when the economic developments of the war years were creating social tensions which had to be subdued" (Zürcher, 1994: 134-135). This populist Turkism was spread by another CUP organization, named *Halka Doğru* (Towards the People), founded in 1917. It was this populist version of Turkish nationalism that emerged as the constitutive ideology of the Turkish Republic in after-war years. Mehmet Ziya (Gökalp) provided the most systematic approach to conciliate the European modernization with this populist version of Turkish nationalism (Zürcher, 1994: 136).

During the rule of the CUP, ethnic Turkishness was central to its nationalism. It is remarkable that after the 1908 coup, Mahmud Sevket Pasha was considering to change the name of the Hamidian Troops of Kurdish cavalry to Oguz Troops; "Oguz" being the name of the tribal branch of Turks that the early Ottomans are believed to originate from (Deringil, 2007: 107). Another indicator of the predominance of ethnic Turkishness among the CUP cadres was the importance given to the ethnographic distribution of population in Anatolia. In the time of Abdulhamid II it was only the religion recorded in the census records; the ethnic origins were ignored. In the time of the CUP there was no official census, but the secret ones separated the Muslims according to their ethnic origins. In July 1915, Talat Pasha sent a secret telegraph to all provincial and district centers commanding the preparation of documents showing the ethnicity and number of the populations in the detail of ranging to the villages. After the fall of the CUP, in November 1918, an ethnographic map of the land was prepared based on these documents (Dündar, 2001: 84-86). The difference in treatment of the Kurdish and Turkish populations that immigrated from the eastern to the western parts of Anatolia during the Russian invasion is also remarkable. These people were settled in the western Anatolia during the war years. After the withdrawal of the Russian army in 1917 the Kurdish populations were not allowed to return, but the Turkish populations were tolerated and sometimes even allowed to resettle in their former lands (Dündar, 2001: 153-154).

As stated before, during the First World War and after the population exchange between the Greek and Turkish states, the demography of Anatolia was significantly changed. Anatolia was left

---

[29] The article was published "in the Young Turk *émigré* paper *Türk* (The Turk), which appeared in Cairo in 1904" (Zürcher, 1994: 133).

dominantly with the Turkish and Kurdish populations. In fact there were also other Muslim ethnicities, the Arabs and the populations who had immigrated to Anatolia during and after the nineteenth century, such as Circassians, Georgians, Albanians, Bosnians, Pomacs, and Tatars. But these latter were in less significant numbers compared to the Kurds. According to the 1927 census of the Turkish state the total population size of Turkey was 13,648,270. Among this population the mother tongue of the 86.3% was Turkish, 8.7% was Kurdish, 1% was Arabic, 0.9% was Greek, 0.7% was Circassian, and the rest were divided among various languages none of them constituting more than 0.7% (Brice, 1954). Economically the land was almost in ruins, religiously Islamized, but ethnically not yet Turkified. The opposition to the Turkification program of the state emerged from the side of the Kurdish population. The Kurds had sided with the Islamization process by ethnic-cleansing during the First World War, but were not willing to accept the Turkification policies of the young Republic.

Under the leadership of the nationalist deputies, the Ottoman assembly in 1920 acknowledged the famous *Misak-i Milli* (National Pact). This pact was going to be the guiding official paper of the resistance movement in Anatolia throughout the Independence War. Moreover, it was an important element to ensure the Muslim coalition of Turks and Kurds throughout the Independence War. According to this pact, the regions that formed an indivisible whole were the ones inhabited by the Ottoman Muslims, which meant the Turks and the Kurds. Therefore, the pact was a statement that "advocated not Turkish national sovereignty but that of all Muslim Ottomans" (Zürcher, 1994: 144). During the Independence War, the policy of the state was in the direction to appeal to the Turkish-Kurdish cooperation. Yeğen argues that the period between the end of the First World War in 1918 and the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923 marks a short-term, though weak, anti-national and decentralized rule of the state. This was due to the failure of the CUP advocating for a centralized Turkist policy (Yeğen, 1999: 74).

The appeal to Turkish-Kurdish cooperation during the Independence War can be related to this political atmosphere of the years. The cooperation was based on being Muslim, on the historical reality of having acted together for cleansing of the non-Muslim Armenians from eastern Anatolia, and also on the economic reality of having benefited from their left possessions. Therefore, the leaders of the Independence War, including Mustafa Kemal himself, promised representational rights and even autonomy to the Kurdish nationalists. During the Independence War, the Kurdish nationalists were convinced that their ethnic rights would be recognized by the Ankara government. Kurdish nationalists took part in the Sivas and Erzurum congresses (Zürcher, 1994: 177; Başkaya, 1997: 95). Yeğen demonstrates that the Republican elite clearly recognized in this period the ethnic and political existence of the Kurdish population both on the legislative and political frameworks (Yeğen, 1999: 112-118). Even as late as 1923, Mustafa Kemal stated in Eskişehir-İzmit speeches that the state perceived the Kurds as a group that can have a local autonomy within the political unity (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 41). It should be noted also that despite the

rhetorical appeals for cooperation, the actual nationalist policies of the state caused a Kurdish rebel in Dersim during the Independence War. This rebel was harshly repressed by the military, which caused severe discussions in the National Assembly.

The main Kurdish reaction rose following the Lausanne agreement (July 24, 1923), abolition of the institute of the caliphate (March 3, 1924) and the following policies of the government to promote Turkish nationalism as the founding ideology of the state (Zürcher, 1994: 178). The Lausanne agreement made the real intentions of the Ankara government clear to the Kurdish nationalists. Despite the promises of the war years, there was nothing mentioned in the text about the Kurds. This caused the resentment of the Kurdish nationalists that had previously sided with the National Assembly. The former military officers among those Kurdish nationalists founded the *Azadi* (Freedom) society, which later led the organization of the Sheikh Said rebellion in 1925.

With the abolition of caliphate an important symbol binding the two Muslim populations of Kurds and Turks disappeared (Zürcher, 1994: 178). Yeğen considers the abolition of the caliphate as a determining moment in the rise of the Kurdish resistance (Yeğen, 1999: 118). The abolition of the caliphate put an end to the judicial recognition of the multi ethnic character of the land (Yeğen, 1999: 241). It turned out that the Turkish government was not willing to recognize a political Kurdish identity (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 41). The promotion of Turkish nationalism meant a "repressive policy towards the Kurdish identity: the public use of Kurdish and the teaching of Kurdish were prohibited [in 1924]" (Zürcher, 1994: 178). Moreover, the government acted to break the connection between the Kurdish population and their leaders. "Influential Kurdish landowners and tribal chiefs were forcibly resettled in the west of the country" (Zürcher, 1994: 178). This change of perception was reflected in the 1924 Constitution, which accepted the existence of different ethnic groups but rejected their legislative representation as a group (Yeğen, 2006: 51-52). These measures were signs of an emerging assimilation policy towards the Kurdish population and initiators of the Kurdish rebels against the Ankara government.

The first rebellion in "Beytüşşebap in the extreme south-east in August 1924" remained to be weak and was easily suppressed (Zürcher, 1994: 178). Afterwards, the real big rebellion was planned to be in May 1925 by the *Azadi* and Sheikh Said. This rebellion "prematurely" started on February 8. "Nearly all Zaza tribes and large Kormanci tribes took part in the insurrection, but the divisions between the Kurds showed themselves again: the Alevi Kurds fiercely attacked the Sunni insurgents" (Zürcher, 1994: 178). Zürcher comments that the division between the Kurds was caused by the ideological discrepancy between the leaders and the rank and file of the movement. While the leaders were motivated by Kurdish nationalism and aimed at an independent Kurdistan, the Sunni rank and file was motivated by religious sentiments and aimed at restoration of the caliphate. The Alevi Kurdish tribes were antagonized by the Sunni reaction of the rank and file on a very religious sectarian base (Zürcher, 1994: 178).

The Sheikh Said rebellion took a religious form and the Ankara government tended to associate it with religiousness, social backwardness, and the intrusion of external powers. The rebellion was harshly repressed by the İsmet İnönü government and afterwards the Kurds were harshly treated by the Independence Tribunals (*İstiklal Mahkemeleri*). "Many of their leaders were executed... From now on, the existence of a separate Kurdish identity was officially denied" (Zürcher, 1994: 179). After the repression of the Sheikh Said rebellion the government decided to "solve the Eastern problem". A commission was constituted including the Prime Ministry, the Minister of Internal Affairs Camil Uybadin, the Minister of Law Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, the Chair of the parliament Abdülhalik Renda, and the Second Chief of Staff Kazim Orbay under the name *Şark Islahat Encümeni* (Commisison of Reform in the East). This commission prepared the report of *Şark Islahat Plani* (Plan of Reform in the East) which suggested continuation of the martial law, the Turkification of the law courts (no local judges in the civil and military courts), resettlement of non-Kurdish populations in the regions left from the Armenians, resettlement of the Kurdish populations that settled in the regions left by the Armenians to their former regions, banning of the Kurdish language, and assimilation into Turkishness by education (Yıldız, 2001: 245-248). In the following years, there were continuous Kurdish uprisings in the south-east Anatolia. The most important of them happened to be in Dersim in 1937-8. This rebel too was harshly suppressed and "tens of thousands of Kurds were forcibly resettled in the west of the country" (Zürcher, 1994: 184).

In the 1930s the state started the policy of rejecting even the physical existence of the Kurdish population (Yeğen, 2006: 53). The state promoted the idea that there was no Kurdish ethnicity at all and that the Kurdish people were in fact originally Turkish. The language of Kurdish was banned, not only in education and press, but also in daily life. The names of Kurdish towns and villages were replaced with Turkish names. The restrictions on the Kurdish language were in fact against the item 39/4 of the Lausanne agreement, which clearly stated there would be no restriction on the usage of any language of the Turkish citizens, considering all sorts of trade, religious rituals, media, publication and meetings; Turkish citizens could use any language outside the official matters (Oran, 2004: 78-79). Despite the statement in the foundation agreement of the Republic, the state banned the Kurdish language to assimilate the Kurdish population into Turkish ethnicity. This is a clear sign that rejection of the Kurdish identity had become an important constitutive element of Turkish nationalism (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 39).

The Law of Compulsory Settlement (*Mecburi İskan Kanunu*) declared in June 14, 1934 aimed at assimilation of the notable Kurdish families by settling them in the ethnically Turkish regions. The law forbade the construction of a new village by settlement of any population whose mother tongue was not Turkish (Dündar, 2001: 209). The number of resettled Kurds was 25,381 from 5074 families (Çağaptay, 2007: 102). The Minister of Internal Affairs Şükrü Kaya stated "[t]his law will create a nation that talks the same language, thinks in the same way, and has the same sentiment".

The Kütahya deputy Naşit Hakkı said "[t]his law will help to assimilate the people who do not feel Turkish and who have lost their Turkish identity" (Esendemir, 2008: 82). Yıldız comments that the document of the Law of Compulsory Settlement demonstrates the racist/ethnicist side of the Kemalist nationalism. It openly aimed at homogenization in lingual, cultural, and racial terms (Yıldız, 2001: 248). The Law of Surnames (Tukish surnames were made compulsory), the spread of the Turkish Hearths (*Türk Ocakları*) organizations, the establishment of Peoples' Houses and Peoples' Rooms (*Halk Odaları, Halk Evleri*), The Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory were all signs that a systematic Turkification was in progress (Esendemir, 2008: 83-84).

The Kurdish population presented a strong resistance to assimilation to Turkishness. This was not the case for the other ethnic groups that immigrated to Anatolia in the late nineteenth century. The difference is probably because the populations settled in a region for ages are more reluctant to give up their local identities, in comparison to the newly immigrated groups (Yeğen, 2006: 13; Oran, 2004: 32). Similar to the French nationalism, the Turkish nationalism towards the Kurds did not pursue racist discrimination as in the German case or ethnic differentiation as in the British. However, the Turkish assimilation did not achieve the success of the French. Perhaps recognizing this reality, the Turkish state resorted from time to time to racist discrimination against the Kurds, in contrary to its general policy of cultural assimilation. Therefore Yeğen observes the "undecidability" in the Turkish Constitutions about pursuing a land based assimilation policy or race based discrimination policy towards the Kurds (Yeğen, 2004).

The Sheikh Said and other Kurdish rebellions in the early decades of the Republican Turkey were the result of the strong feeling of communal consciousness among the Kurds. One of the important elements of Turkish nationalism turned out to be the rejection of the Kurdish identity and promotion of Turkish ethnicity (Yıldız, 2001: 158-164, 245-248). After the foundation of the Republic the question of how to save the state was transformed into how to unify the population with Turkification (Yıldız, 2001: 242). The answer to 'how to save the state' was given by eliminating the non-Muslim populations. The answer to 'how to unify the population' was to be given by the assimilation and partial discrimination policies urged in the following years.

The approaches to comprehend the Kurdish problem by the statesmen and nationalist intellectuals in Turkey usually fail to acknowledge its historical and ethnic character. Keyman states, "political modernization reduces Kurdish question to a reactionary politics of the tribal type, economic modernization to economic backwardness, and an identity paradigm to the problem of exclusion and otherness". "While focusing on only one dimension or aspect of the Kurdish question and making use of it as the explanatory basis for their analyses, each paradigm ignores the historical context in which the question is embedded" (Keyman, 2005: 273). Similarly, Yeğen states that the Kurdish question can only be understood in relation to the social history of Turkey in the last two hundred years; namely, understanding the modernization history of Turkey with its continuities and breaking points is of paramount importance for understanding the Kurdish

question (Yeğen, 1999: 9-10). The centralization, nationalization, and secularization processes throughout Turkish modernization are mentioned in this regard as the crucial moments (Yeğen, 1999: 15). Yeğen further argues that the Turkish state did not acknowledge the ethnic character of the Kurdish problem (Yeğen, 2006: 143). In the 1920s the state perceived it as a religious reaction demanding for return to the sultanate and caliphate and as an incitement of imperialist powers; in the 1930s and 1940s as a tribal reactionary movement; in the 1950s as an incitement of the Communists; in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s as an economic backwardness problem (Yeğen, 1999: 20, 132, 139, 152, 155, 159).

Yeğen states that the rejection of the ethnic character of the Kurdish problem by the Turkish state was not due to a simple "lying" or "hiding" attitude. The perception of the Kurdish problem in different forms, but not in ethnic terms, was due to the state discourse emerging and changing in time (Yeğen, 1999: 223). Throughout the single party regime the fundamental problem of the state was founding of a nation state, in contrast to the Islamic and multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. Therefore the state discourse was shaped by rejecting Islamic and multi-ethnic values and raising Turkish ethnicity. Within this discourse the Kurdish problem was perceived as an obstacle for the national homogeneity and a threat to the nation building. In the 1950s, the main problem of the state was economic development; therefore, the Kurdish problem was perceived as a problem of economic backwardness of the eastern regions (Yeğen, 1999: 217-218). The changing state discourse resulted in changes in the perception of the Kurdish problem, but at the same time always avoided its perception as a genuine ethnic problem demanding for judicial and political representation of the Kurdish identity.

Yeğen further states that till the 1980s, the "other" of Turkish nationalism has never been the Kurds or the Kurdish problem. It has changed in time, but never been Kurdishness. In the early phases of Turkish nationalism the "other" was the traditional, Islamic and cosmopolitan past related with the Ottoman Empire. The two side elements besides the past were the non-Muslim groups and the external enemies. During the cold-war years the main "other" of the fundamentalist nationalism happened to be communism. The result is that Turkish nationalism perceived the Kurdish problem only through the entities of the image of the "other", namely in relation to the past, in relation to external enemies, and in relation to communism. It did not perceive the Kurdish identity as the "other" per se (Yeğen, 2006: 143).

In the political realm any attempt of declaration of the Kurdish identity was considered to be a threat to the unity of the state. The attempters were harshly punished. Even the Turkish left, for a long time shared the stand of the state. They associated the discontent in the Kurdish regions with the feudal relations, the economic and social backwardness of the region, without paying attention to the ethnic dimension. During the Cold War years, in the 1960s and 1970s, the political left came close to the eastern part of Turkey and started to state the problem with ethnic terms. The first moment that the political left in Turkey recognized the Kurdish problem was with the Eastern

Meetings (*Doğu Mitingleri*) of the Workers' Party of Turkey (*Turkiye Isci Partisi*, WPT) in the 1960s. This happened to be the restart of the Kurdish resistance that was repressed in the 1930s (Yeğen, 2006: 165). At this stage, the state associated the Kurdish problem with communism, one of the biggest dangers as perceived.

The national identity of the Turkish Republic was based on Turkish ethnicity. The state aimed at assimilating the Kurds by denying their ethnic identity. Denying the Kurdish identity constituted the second decisive step in homogenization of the population after the ethnic cleansing of the non-Muslims. The attitude of the state towards the Kurds signifies the assimilationist character of Turkish citizenship. The Kurds were subject to discriminatory policies from security related positions, which indicates that the exclusionary characteristics of Turkish citizenship was also active towards the Kurds in some occasions. The latter also signifies the centrality of state security in Turkish citizenship. The policy of assimilation could be changed towards exclusion if the matter was about security and welfare of the state.

2.6 Multi-Party System and Military Coups

On November 1, 1945, İsmet İnönü declared the forthcoming elections to be free and direct. This meant, first, there was allowance for oppositional parties, second, the two-staged elections performed till that time, were ended. Only from that time on the Turkish people could directly vote for the candidates of the assembly (Zürcher, 1994: 221). These four prominent figures – businessman Celal Bayar, bureaucrat Refik Koraltan, history professor Fuat Köprülü, and landowner Adnan Menderes – representing the landowners and the private sector founded the *Demokrat Parti* (Democrat Party, DP) on January 7, 1946 (Ahmad, 1999: 126). The DP won 62 of the 465 seats in the parliament in the elections in July 1946 (Zürcher, 1994: 222).

The political situation in the Western World after the Second World War was influential in the passage to the multi-party system in Turkey. Savran states that although the international politics had an undisputable affect, the struggle between the ruling classes was crucial in the change of the political regime. He further states, the working and peasant classes of the land did not have any significant impact on this transformation (Savran, 1987: 165). The rising discontent both in the factions of the ruling party and among the masses culminated in the initiation and rise of the oppositional DP. It was basically the "absolutist authority of the bureaucracy" that was opposed by the majority of the population (Keyder, 1998: 210). The DP movement unified all social classes against the RPP regime. "Even the illegal communist party supported the Democrat Party in the 1950 elections" (Keyder, 1998: 210).

The foundation of an opposition party did not cause much anxiety among the RPP circles about the fundamentals of the state. This was because the leaders of the opposition were Kemalists that had played important role in shaping the young Republic throughout the single-party period (Ahmad, 1999: 127). The RPP circles expected that the DP would act in parallel to the ruling party,

as it was the case with the Republican Free Party in 1930. The people, as well, considered in the beginning that the DP would function in order to settle down the enmity of the people towards the state. The program of the DP actually confirmed these expectations. The DP leaders approved the six-principles of Kemalism. Their opposition was aiming at development of democracy and enlargement of the rights and freedom of the individuals. They advocated that the political initiative would emanate not from the party in a top-down manner, but from the people in a bottom-up direction (Ahmad, 1999: 128). The party leader Celal Bayar declared that there was no ideological difference between his party and the RPP; their aims were the same; but the way they chose to reach those aims were different (Ahmad, 1999: 133; Heper, 2006: 206). As a result the DP leaders managed to attract not only the entrepreneurs and businessmen from the private sector, but also the liberal intellectuals (Ahmad, 1999: 128).

The opposition won a victory in the next elections in May 1950. The number of seats in the parliament was turned almost to opposite, 408 seats for the DP and 69 seats for the RPP. The triumph was even reinforced by the elections on May 2, 1954; this time with 503 seats for the DP and only 31 for the RPP (Zürcher, 1994: 231, 234). The DP ruled the country, starting from 1951 till the coup in 1960, basically in a populist way. The policies were aimed the first time in the history of the young Turkish Republic to improve the conditions of the farmers. The industrialists and traders also benefited from the policies (Zürcher, 1994: 234, 236-237, 241). The DP appealed to the discontent of the masses, especially the rural-religious-traditional parts of the population, as a reaction to the secularist-repressive policies of the single-party regime. It appealed also to the discontent of the masses due to the restrictive policies of the state during the Second World War. The DP attempted to change some of the secularist regulations of the previous single party regime.

Although the DP program advocated democracy, its leaders' understanding of democracy was immature. They could not manage to eliminate the antidemocratic mentality of the single-party regime. This was perhaps because the founders of the DP were already coming from the RPP cadres. Similar to the RPP attitude, the leaders of DP could not stand any opposition even within their own party (Ahmad, 1999: 134). The ruling elite in the period 1945-1960 were reluctant to follow a policy according to the demands and preferences of the masses (Heper, 2006: 138). It should be noted that although the leaders of DP were loyal members of the Republican elite, the rank and file of the party was not necessarily composed of ex-Kemalists. Contrarily, the provincial organizations of DP were recruited from people who had "suffered great pains" under the rule of Republicans and were full of enmity towards the RPP. The independent provincial groups criticized the leaders of DP about their compromise with the opposition. Some of those Democrats resigned from the DP and founded the *Millet Partisi* (Nation Party) in 1948. In order to calm down such internal oppositions, the DP leaders resorted to hard precautions against the RPP, repressive policies against the universities and press. In January 1954, the DP government also closed down the Nation Party with the accusation that it acted against laicism (Ahmad, 1999: 135-136).

Göle (1994: 32, 42) considers the DP movement in the 1950s as the emergence of the "liberal conservative political tradition of Turkey". This liberal conservative tradition in Turkey symbolized "a synthesis between traditional Muslim values and aspiration for western modernity" (Göle, 1994: 42). It was this liberal conservative policy that brought the modernist-Kemalist elite and the traditionalist-religious masses close to each other against the leftist and Kurdish movements in the following decades. The Republican elite and the military, however, regarded the policies of DP as a backward step from the fundamentals of the regime in the late 1950s. The 1960 coup and the following regulations aimed at avoiding any other selected government from threatening the 'fundamentals' of the Republic by means of appealing to religious-traditional values.

The economic deprivation and rising inflation in the years of 1957-58 and the traditionalist policies of the DP favoring the rural life rather than the urban caused the discontent of the salaried bureaucracy, armed forces, and the intellectuals (Zürcher, 1994: 234, 236-237, 241). In the end of the 1950s a coalition of the industrial bourgeoisie, urban population, and intellectuals gathered around the RPP (Savran, 1987: 138). It was this coalition that encouraged a coup within the cadres of military. The coup on May 27, 1960 "was greeted with explosions of public joy in Ankara and Istanbul, notably among the large student population in both cities and in general among the intelligentsia". It should be noted, however, that "[t]he rest of the country showed no such reaction" (Zürcher, 1994: 253). Following the coup, the power was in the hands of the military led by General Cemal Gürsel. Milli Birlik Komitesi (National Unity Committee, NUC) was established to rule the state (Zürcher, 1994: 254).[30] On June 12, the NUC, joined by some university professors, declared a provisional constitution, which legitimized the coup and the rule under the NUC. The provisional constitution stated that the Turkish Military acted in the name of the Turkish nation to reestablish the state of law and abolished the parliament with the claim that it did not anymore represent the nation (Tanör, 2006: 367).

A group of professors from the Ankara University prepared a draft of constitution in the leadership of Professor Yavuz Abadan. In order to finalize the constitution a constituent assembly was convened on January 6, 1961, consisting of a lower and an upper house, the latter filled by the NUC members. The 272 members of the lower house were composed of the representatives of the two remaining parties (the RPP and Republican Peasant National Party), some professionals, and people representing the provinces. However, finalizing the constitution was effectively performed by a committee of 20 members headed by Professor Enver Ziya Karal and Professor Turhan Feyzioğlu. The outcome was "a full bill of civil liberties", which permitted for new parties and new publications, both on the right and left (Zürcher, 1994: 257). The DP members were excluded from the constituent assembly. This meant that the political view of almost half of the population (DP

---

[30] Savran argues that despite the support of the bureaucrats and intellectuals, the ultimate dynamic underlying the coup was the conflict between the industrial bourgeoisie and the ruling groups of the time (Savran, 1987: 139). The military act solved the conflict on behalf of the industrial bourgeoisie, which became the leading faction of the overall bourgeoisie in the following years. The policy of imports substitution followed in the 1960s and 1970s can be considered as a sign of this change in the ruling power.

got 47.7% of the votes in 1957) was ignored in the preparation of the constitution. Tanör considers this as a defect with respect to the democratic principles (Tanör, 2006: 373). The constitution was brought to public referendum and accepted with 61.7% 'yes' against 38.3% 'no' votes. Despite its acceptance, this ratio was not favorable for the supporters of the coup. The 'no' votes were mostly from the regions where the DP was strong. Zürcher (1994: 259) comments that looking at these results the constitution was not accepted by the populations of those regions.

The universities played an important role both in the protests against the DP government prior to the coup and in the establishment of the constitution afterwards. The leading role of the universities in the society was enforced with this fact. This development was in accordance with the Kemalist tradition of "revolution from above", performed by the "enlightened elite" of the society (Zürcher, 1994: 268). After the coup, the foundation of the NSC and the Constitutional Court (*Anayasa Mahkemesi*), intrusion of the military to the economy, and introduction of the phrase of "the inseparable unity of the state with its land and nation" (*devletin ülkesi ve milletiyle bölünmez bütünlüğü*) into the constitution were remarkable considering the top-down state tradition in modern Turkey. With the 1961 Constitution the military bureaucracy was introduced into the governing body as a third force besides the presidency and the cabinet. This was in contrast with the general understanding that the military should be bound to and under the cabinet. With this constitution the military gained a sort of autonomy vis-à-vis the civil bodies of government. Through the NSC the military could impose decisions on the government of elected (Tanör, 2006: 400). Accordingly, the three presidents of Turkey in the period of the 1961 Constitution were all ex military officers (Tanör, 2006: 407). It is also remarkable that the military officers who performed the coup in 1980, signed the memoir as a "member of the NSC" (Tanör, 2006: 411). In a way the coup in 1980 was legitimized by the 1961 Constitution.

The NSC was a top-level state-organization to advise the government on internal and external security (Zürcher, 1994: 258). The council included high echelon military officers. It was chaired by the president or, in his absence, the prime minister. The other members of the council were the chief of the general staff, the chiefs of the land, air, and naval forces, and the ministers concerned with the issues of the day (Ahmad, 1999: 21). In March 1962 the power of the NSC was increased to take part in decision-making in the organs of the cabinet (Ahmad, 1999: 157). With these measures the military became an almost autonomous organ which guarded and took active part in the new political order (Ahmad, 1999: 157). Zürcher writes, "[i]n the two decades which followed its establishment, the NSC gradually extended its influence over government policy and became a powerful watchdog, sometimes replacing the cabinet as the centre of real power and decision-making" (Zürcher, 1994: 258).

These political arrangements aimed at making the military take part in high-level decision-making in the state affairs. Economic arrangements were also put into effect in order to render the military a part of the market. The Military Solidarity Organization (*Ordu Yardımlaşma Kurumu*,

OYAK) was founded in 1961, initially as a solidarity fund for the military officers. It was immune from all kinds of taxes and levies (Süvari, 2000: 27-28). The capital of OYAK was sourced from the fund made up of the contributions of around 80 thousand military officers. With the initiatives of this organization the military directly entered to the business and industry (Ahmad, 1999: 157). Automotive, cement, conserve, food, petrochemical, tire productions, insurance, finance, business, hotels, and tourism were among the sectors that OYAK had a share (Süvari, 2000: 30-31). Ahmad states that it would not be wrong to consider OYAK as the "third sector" in the market besides the state and the private sector (Ahmad, 1999: 158). Through the mid-1970s it was one of the five biggest holdings (Süvari, 2000: 29). Military Bazaars (*Ordu Pazarları*) were established to provide the military staff with cheap products and to eliminate the undesirable effect of inflation on them (Ahmad, 1999: 157). With their intrusion into the economy, the military became a privileged group, which had its interest in preserving the statuesque. The generals became so powerful that they did not have to rely on a party leader for their future. From that time on the party leaders had to seek the support of the generals (Ahmad, 1999: 158-159).

Another military initiative in the economy was the military industry projects. These were to be carried by the military foundations established in the 1960s. The Foundation for Reinforcing the Air Forces (*Türk Hava Kuvvetlerini Güçlendirme Vakfı*) aimed to establish a native aircraft industry. The company *Türk Uçak Sanayi A.Ş.* (Turkish Aircraft Industry Inc.) was an outcome of this initiative. The Foundations for Reinforcing the Land and Naval Forces acted in a similar manner. These foundations and the associated military industries further grew especially with the wave of armament following the Cyprus Action of Turkish military in 1974 (Süvari, 2000: 32-33).

The passage to the multi-party system resulted in the necessity of considering the political tendencies of the masses (Kaynar, 2001: 72). Therefore, the primary process of the early state elite, namely defining and establishing the Turkish nation, needed to be transformed into preservation of what was established during the single-party regime. This was realized by defining upper level limitations for the political activities of people (Kaynar, 2001: 71-71, 75). Kaynar stresses this transformation with pointing out the emergence of a new phrase in the 1961 Constitution: "the inseparable unity of the state with its land and nation". He states, this phrase, which did not exist in the former constitutions, passes in four items in the 1961 Constitution, sixteen items after the amendments in 1971 (after the 1971 military memorandum), and appears eighteen times in the 1982 Constitution (Kaynar, 2001: 10-11). A close reading of the phrase reveals that the hegemonic understanding in Turkey considers the land and the nation to belong to the state; not vice versa. According to the 1962 Constitution there is a Turkish State which has a nation and a land; moreover, these land and nation are bound to the state in an "inseparable" way. According to Kaynar's comment, "inseparability" here is the word that signifies the limits of the political activity of the people. There is a danger zone signified with "inseparability" that the constitution forbids the people to engage in through any means of thinking, deliberation, or action (Kaynar, 2001: 16-17).

Kadıoğlu mentions that the evolution of democracy in Turkey is a history of the struggle between the "appointed" and "elected" (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 49). While the RPP, military, and the state bureaucracy correspond to the "appointed", the conservative-liberal parties in the parliament in opposition to the RPP correspond to the "elected". The insertion of the phrase of "the inseparable unity of the state with its land and nation" into the constitution, the military coups/memorandums of 1960, 1971, and 1980 should be considered as the acts of the appointed against the elected, in order to preserve and protect the established understanding of the "nation". Establishment of the Constitutional Court after the 1960 coup should also be added to these. The task of the court was to check the legislation of the elected in the parliament to fit to the constitution. The laws considered to be unconstitutional were to be thrown out (Zürcher, 1994: 257). A striking example of the consequence of the determination of the borderline for the elected was the following: the parliament in Turkey could forgive any guilt of crime but not the ones offending the inseparable unity of the state with its land and nation (Kaynar, 2001: 13).

The constitution prepared in the aftermath of the 1960 coup brought considerable freedom to the secular-intellectual engagement in Turkey. There was an increase in the number of intellectual activities, media organs, publications, associations, meetings, activities of trade unions and political parties (Tanör, 2006: 405). Göle (1994: 36) mentions "syndicalism, leftist political movements, and the diffusion of printed material" as important civil societal developments of the 1960s and 1970s. Toprak (1994: 94) considers the 1960 coup as an attempt "to protect civil society from a repressive state under the control of elected governments which used its mechanisms to thwart the very logic of competitive politics". "The 1960s and 1970s, therefore, witnessed an unprecedented growth in the number of political parties, interest groups, and civil associations" (Toprak, 1994: 91). She cites the organizations of occupational groups, a strong trade union movement, student organizations, women's groups, peace groups, and revolutionary cells in this regard (Toprak, 1994: 104).

Tanör mentions, despite the fact that the 1961 Constitution enlarged the space of rights and freedoms in civil society, it was not immune from "antidemocratic" principles. He cites various "antidemocratic" decisions of the Constitutional Court based on the 1961 Constitution. Among them were the sanctions for crimes of thought, the death penalty, the confinement on bread and water, the allowance for control of the associations in any time by government organs, the prohibition on the claim that there were ethnic minorities in Turkey, the sanctions on the strikes of the labor unions, in case of martial rule the allowance for establishing the martial courts, the allowance to judge the suspects in the martial court for crimes that were committed before the martial law (Tanör, 2006: 410-411). All these decisions of the Constitutional Court reveal that the regime performed a strict check on the civil society by the hand of the judiciary in order not to let it go beyond the allowed borders. Such decisions of the Constitutional Court perhaps exemplify the "judicialization of politics", namely "the expansion of the judiciary's political role", as conceptualized by Shambayati (2004). This means, the judiciary was independent but intervened a

wide range of political sphere in alliance with the "guardians" (military-bureaucratic elite), in order to suppress the anti-regime demands of the "elected" and oppositional groups.

The political freedom brought by the 1961 Constitution did not immediately result in creation of rightist, namely fascist and Islamic, parties like it was the case for the currents of political left. The rightist parties, like the National Action Party (*Milliyetci Hareket Partisi*, NAP) of Türkeş, appeared afterwards in the second half of the 1960s. Towards the end of the 1960s the strife between the political left and right groups made a peak. The Demirel government, in 1971, was unable to stop the fights in the universities and streets. On March 12, 1971, the military gave a memorandum to the government. "It demanded that a strong and credible government be formed which would be able to end the 'anarchy' and carry out reforms 'in a Kemalist spirit'. If the demand were not met, the army would 'exercise its constitutional duty' and take over power itself". Demirel resigned from premiership; İnönü, the leader of the RPP, denounced the memorandum. "But both party leaders soon took up more conciliatory positions" (Zürcher, 1994: 271).

At first, most of the political left considered the military action to be a liberating one like in 1960. However, a severe attack of persecutions started against the leftist groups. "About 5000 people were arrested, among them many leading intellectuals (writers, journalists, professors), all the leading members of the WPT and many prominent trade unionists. There were widespread reports of torture, both in the prisons and in so-called 'laboratories', torture chambers of the MİT [National Secret Service]" (Zürcher, 1994: 271-272). Zürcher stresses the role of the contra guerilla organizations in suppression of the leftist movements after the 1971 memorandum.

The cabinet of Nihat Erim, constituted after the memorandum, put in order the regulations that took back the liberating rights introduced by the 1961 Constitution. The tightening of liberties was accepted by the assembly dominated by the rightist parties. With the new regulations the autonomy of universities and the autonomy of the state radio and television were ended. There came severe limitations to the freedom of press (Zürcher, 1994: 274). Before the 1971 memorandum the responsibility of the NSC was limited to informing the cabinet. After 1971 its responsibility was raised to advising (Heper, 2006: 217-218).

After the 1971 memorandum the Constitution was amended by the initiative of the Justice Party and the support of the RPP, in the direction to enlarge the power of military vis-à-vis the civil government, to enlarge the authority of the state in the civil society, and to limit the rights and freedoms (Tanör, 2006: 412-417). The civil bureaucratic elite were an influential political group from the beginning of the Republic that the "owner" of the state till the 1960s was considered to be the army, bureaucratic cadres, and the RPP. Towards the end of 1960s, this schema changed and the army started to consider itself as the sole "owner" of the state (Heper, 2006: 165, 171). Savran states that the regulations following the 1971 memorandum could not manage any significant change to overcome the economic problems of the existing system. The only things managed under

the military rule were decreasing the real wages, changing some parts of the constitution, and putting repressive policies against the political left by executing some of the young movement leaders and torturing a lot of the others. These policies could neither solve the problem of foreign currency deficiency nor slow down the workers' movements. The problems that the March 12 regime could not solve underlay the collapse of the parliamentary regime in the late 1970s and paved the way for the 1980 military coup (Savran, 1987: 150-151).

In December 1978 the youth organization of the "fascist"icly inclined NAP of Türkeş organized "a series of pogroms of Alevites", who generally supported the political left (Zürcher, 1994: 277). The casualties of these events were more than 100 deaths. In 1978, the PKK was founded by the Ankara university student Abdullah Öcalan. "Its aim was the establishment of a socialist Kurdish state in the south-east of the country" (Zürcher, 1994: 277). Towards the end of the decade the fight between the political right and left groups again made a peak. The government was again unable to maintain the control (Zürcher, 1994: 277). "The number of victims of political violence rose quickly: from around 230 in 1977…to between 1200 and 1500 two years later" (Zürcher, 1994: 276). The Islamic Revolution in Iran, in January 1979, had impact on the politics in Turkey. The National Salvation Party (*Milli Selamet Partisi*) of Necmettin Erbakan and other Islamic groups were encouraged by this revolution. "They were increasingly visible and on 6 September 1980 they held a mass demonstration in Konya, during which they called for a return to the *şeriat*, the Islamic holy law, and refused to sing the Turkish national anthem" (Zürcher, 1994: 282).

"[I]ncreasing law and order problems, Kurdish separatism, a political system which seemed completely deadlocked,…an economy in tatters" and the growing Islamic movements brought about the third military coup on September 12, 1980 (Zürcher, 1994: 282). The military coup in1980 harshly repressed the political left by banning the parties and workers' unions, arresting and torturing many of the members of the political leftist organizations, abolishing the autonomy of the universities, and by many more suppressive policies. The military government in the following three years of the coup created the political realm needed for the economic regulations announced with the January 24 declaration in 1980. Afterwards the Motherland Party led by Turgut Özal easily performed these regulations.

After transition to the multi-party regime in 1945, Turkey experienced three take-over of the government by the military in the years 1960, 1971 and 1980. These three military actions are generally considered to be regulative attempts of the central state powers in order to tune the parliamentary regime in accordance with the fundamental ideas of the Republic.[31] These fundamental ideas can be argued to have historical character in the sense of evolving and changing

---

[31] Savran criticizes this perspective naming it as the view of the "liberal left", and argues that the military actions can only be understood if perceived as outcomes of the class struggle in the very society in the respective years (Savran, 1987: 133). He regards these coups not as the actions of a state isolated from the society but also as a result of the class struggle taking place in the society over the emerging problems of capitalism (Savran, 1987: 161).

throughout the years of the Republic, depending on the conflicts in the society, policies of the oppositional movements, the most threatening factions of the oppositional groups, religious movements, ethnic movements, and perhaps international relations. Roughly said, traditionalism and religious intentions in the 1950s[32], the political left in the 1960s and 1970s, the workers' movement in the 1970s, and the Kurdish movement in the late 1970s and 1980s can be regarded as the fundamental threats conceived by the Republican elite, namely the military, RPP cadres and the Kemalist intellectuals. Accordingly, laicism and modernism, anti-communism and political centralism, avoidance of a strong workers' movement, unity of the land and Turkish nationalism can be cited as the respective fundamentals of the state in the years of military actions. Göle names "Islamism", "Kurdish identity", "leftist ideology", and "liberalism" as the "four phobias" of the state ruled by the Kemalist ideology (Göle, 1994: 20).

Transition to the multi-party system is a major moment that signifies the flexibility of the Kemalist regime in Turkey. This passage resulted in controlling the discontent of the masses by letting them organize under an oppositional party loyal to the fundamentals of the regime. After this oppositional party came to the rule, the regime was tuned by a military coup in order not to let the impetus of the masses behind the elected government to disturb the fundamentals. The succeeding military coups aimed at limiting the liberties introduced by the former in order to suppress the political left movements. The flexibility was observed in first enlarging the liberties in order to counter the conservativeness of the DP, then limiting the same liberties to counter the demands of the political left in the 1970s. The military coups did not only tune the limits of the multi party activity, but also reinforced the centrality of the Kemalist state in the socio-political realm by rendering the military a political and even economic power. The flexibility provided the regime the ability to adapt itself to changing conditions by preserving the centrality of the state and protecting the secular, ethnic Turkish, and anti-communist fundamentals, all of which can be expected to be observable in the Turkish citizenship.

2.7 Political Left in Turkey

The political left in Turkey did not pose a significant political threat to the Republic in its early decades. This was, first, because the left did not have a significant mass support, second, there was a close ideological affinity between the Turkish left and the Republican elite (Yeğen, 2006: 146-147). The leaders of the Turkish Communist Party (TCP) welcomed the Republican Government with agreeing that the basic problem for the country was to raise the nationalist struggle against the imperialist powers and feudalist social forces (Yeğen, 2006: 150, 154). It was

---

[32] Savran states that the DP was criticized to be a "counter-revolutionary movement" in the 1960s and 70s, with the argument that it acted against the "Kemalist revolutions" in the fields of religion/laicism, education, and national independence. Savran further states that this view was wrong for two reasons: First, the basic regulations performed by the DP government had already been started by the RPP government in between 1946-1950. Second, what the DP government did was in fact to respond to the needs for solving the problems of capitalist development of the time. Savran considers the traditionalist and religious regulations of the DP government not as a "counter-revolution" to the regime but as a "restoration" and "normalization" of the regime (Savran, 1987: 135).

not a coincidence that the pioneers of the *Kadro* movement, the journal in which the Kemalist ideology was refined in the 1930s, were ex-members of the TCP (Yeğen, 2006: 150, 158). The Turkish left became a political force with a mass support only in the 1960s, in accompany of the industrialization under the import substitution policies (Yeğen, 2006: 160). Even after attaining its mass support, the traces of the Kemalist ideology could be observed in the many factions of the political left. Especially, the ideas of struggle against the conservative-traditional forces, elimination of feudalism, and struggle against imperialism brought the political left and Kemalist ideology close to each other. The *Yön* (Direction) movement of the 1960s and the *Milli Demokratik Devrim* (National Democratic Revolution) movement of Mihri Belli were striking in this regard.[33]

One of the outcomes of the intellectual freedom provided by the 1961 Constitution was the emergence of new periodicals. The most important of these journals was *Yön*, which happened to be a "broad-based forum" for the Turkish left (Zürcher, 1994: 267). Ahmad comments that the anti-imperialist current, especially anti-Americanism, was significant to bring the radical left with the Kemalists in the 1960s (Ahmad, 1999: 169). Yeğen's discussion of how the Kurdish problem was debated in the journal reveals the affinity of the *Yön* movement with the nationalist attitude of the regime. The comprehension of the Kurdish problem by the authors of the journal was not far from that of the republican statesmen: "Underdevelopment of the region" and "persisting feudal relations" were considered to be the ultimate causes of the Kurdish problem. Even a "courageous" text that admitted the ethnic dimension of the problem was ended with the nationalist proclamation of existence of a "single nation" in Turkey, and the warning against any separatist inclinations. Similar to the *Kadro* movement of the 1930s, but being more close to the left, the *Yön* movement was an attempt of the intellectuals to reformulate the Kemalist state ideology (Yeğen, 2006: 160-163). This publication was effective to give the RPP a slight inclination towards the left, leading to the "left-of-center" discussions in the mid-1960s, and to regenerate the Kemalist ideology with the "welfare state" arguments borrowed from Europe (Zürcher, 1994: 265-266). Such a shift resulted that the RPP and its Kemalist ideology turned out to be the "popular left" in Turkey against the religious and conservative parties following the DP tradition. This situation made it difficult for the political left to disassociate itself from the official ideology.

Many other more leftist journals were published in the 1960s by student groups organized around the debating clubs. These groups, gathered around the journals, evolved into factions of political parties in the following years (Zürcher, 1994: 267). "Political debating societies (*Fikir*

---

[33] Yeğen examines how the Kurdish problem was comprehended by the Turkish left throughout the Republican history (Yeğen, 2006: 145-196). His discussion reveals the influence of Kemalism on the Turkish left. Related to the Kurdish problem, the average attitude of the Turkish left in the 1970s was to approve the ethnic dimension of the problem, but to distance itself from the separatist ideas with acknowledging the national unity. There were movements that deviated from this average trend. The *Cephe* tradition, for example, had separated from the National Democratic Revolution group by refusing the nationalist attitudes of the latter (Yeğen, 2006: 145-196). The *Kurtuluş* branch of the *Cephe* movement, for example, defined the policies of the Kemalist rule as "reactionary" and "anti-democratic"; the Kurdish problem was conceived in the most radical way: The Kurds were designated as a separate nation and the Kurdish regions as "Kurdistan", being bound to Turkey under a colony status (Yeğen, 2006: 178-179). The Maoist *Türkiye İşçi Köylü Partisi* was the movement that advocated the idea of National Democratic Revolution most strongly in the 1970s (Yeğen, 2006: 184).

Klüpleri or 'Idea Clubs') sprang up at all the major universities, the most prominent being the one at the political science faculty of Ankara University" (Zürcher, 1994: 268). Through the mid-1960s many of these clubs were captured by the student activists of the Workers' Party. They eventually brought the clubs under the "national network" of the Federation of Debating Societies (*Fikir Klüpleri Federasyonu*) (Zürcher, 1994: 268). Ahmad considers these debating clubs as the "first significant civil society initiative" in a country under bureaucratic control and suppression (Ahmad, 1999: 169).

In the 1960s, there were two centers of ideological dispute within the political left in Turkey. One of these centers was the Workers' Party of Turkey (*Turkiye İşçi Partisi*, WPT), led by Mehmet Ali Aybar. The WPT advocated that Turkey had reached to a historical stage within which a democratic socialist revolution could be performed (Zürcher, 1994: 268). As stated before, the WPT was the party that first time established a link between the political left and the Kurdish population. After the military memorandum, on July 20, 1971, the WPT was banned. It was claimed that the ideas advocated by the party related to Kurdish problem were in opposition to the constitution (Yeğen, 2006: 165-167).

The other center of the political left in the 1960s was the group around Mihri Belli. This second side argued, "Turkey was an Asiatic society with feudal characteristics, that the proletariat was too weak and that revolutionary change could only be brought about by a coalition of intellectuals and officers" (Zürcher, 1994: 268). The idea of a revolution performed by the intellectuals and military was referred to as National Democratic Revolution (*Milli Demokratik Devrim*, NDR). It was marked by its closeness to Maoism (Ahmad, 1999: 174). The close affinity between the idea of NDR and the 1960 coup can easily be observed. While the WPT was aiming at closing the gap between the left and the Kurds, the NDR movement preferred to preserve the existing distance (Yeğen, 2006: 168). In 1968, the NDR current took over the Federation Clubs, in Ankara University; and dominated the Revolutionary Youth (*Dev Genç*) organization, and in fact many of the student organizations and armed left groups that emerged from *Dev Genç* in the late 1960s and 1970s (Zürcher, 1994: 268).

Not all the factions that emerged from the NDD movement continued its nationalist attitude. Especially, after the 1971 memorandum and following the harsh persecutions against their members, much of the leftist groups were alienated from the state bureaucracy and its Kemalist ideology (Yeğen, 2006: 174). "From 1970 onwards some radicals from the [NDD] circle decided that agitation was not enough and that only 'armed propaganda' (i.e. terrorist attacks) and an armed guerilla struggle could bring about a revolution…These groups began a campaign of terrorism, or urban guerilla warfare, aimed at destabilizing the country" (Zürcher, 1994: 268-269).

The federation of labor unions *Türk-İş*, was founded in 1952, with the initiative of the statesmen, and their proclamation that "it would be the state itself who brings what is needed, even

if it is the communism" (Kaynar, 2001: 18). The discontent of some of the unionists about the close cooperation of *Türk-İş* with the Demirel government resulted in its split in 1967. The second union confederation, DISK (*Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu*, Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions), was founded (Zürcher, 1994: 286-287). This was a leftist confederation, which started its history with the aim of a revolution. However, Ahmad comments, in the 1970s, lack of a more leftist political leadership than the RPP resulted that the confederation ignored its aim of "revolution" and supported the reformism of the RPP (Ahmad, 1999: 200).

The political left in Turkey appeared in the political arena as an actor mainly in the 1960s and 1970s. This was far later than the emergence of strong political left parties and organizations in Iran, such as the Azerbaijan Autonomous Movement in 1945 and the Tudeh Party in 1940s, to be discussed in the following chapter. Moreover, the political left in Turkey as it emerged in the 1960s did not pose a radical challenge to the Kemalist regime. It was only in the late 1970s that some factions dissociated themselves from the official ideology and recognized the Kurdish ethnic problem. Much of the political leftist currents remained loyal to many of the fundamentals of the Kemalist regime. The difficulty of the political left in Turkey to disassociate from the official ideology signifies the centrality of the state and its ideology in the national identity in Turkey. The lack of a radical disassociation of the political left from the Kemalist regime and the persistent opposition of the political left currents to the Pahlavi regime constitutes a contrast between Turkey and Iran. The earlier emergence and wider mass support of organized political left in Iran, and the more active role of political left in Iranian politics should also be noted as a difference. This comparison reinforces the observation of the centrality of the state in Turkey and the tradition of mass opposition to the state in Iran in their respective citizenship formations.

2.8 Conclusion for the Modern History of Turkey

The modern state formation of Turkey follows a path of 1) early repression of potential oppositions, initial modernizations prior to the founding of the nation state, 2) ethnic cleansing of the land, 3) intensive modernization under the one-party system, 4) promotion of nationalism based on Turkish ethnicity, denial of Kurdish ethnic identity, nationalization of the economy by seizing the assets of the non-Muslim groups, 5) passage to the multi-party regime and adapting the system by means of military coups. All these five items do not only refer to the most important moments of citizenship and state formation, but also signify contrasting differences of the modern history of Turkey from that of Iran. The following comments should be read considering a comparison to the case in Iran.

The early repression of the Janissaries opened the path for the initial Tanzimat modernizations in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. Due to these modernizations a bureaucratic-military elite emerged and took over the power of rule in the late Ottoman Empire. Turkish Republic inherited a strong state tradition with a knowledged and experienced bureaucracy. This heritage

from the Ottoman Empire paved the way for the centrality of the state in pursuing modernization in Turkey. The Kemalist elite happened to be the almost sole actor of modernization without confronting a significant opposition. The outcome for the citizenship should therefore be expected to be a state centered formation with more duties than rights and shaped from above rather than by mass movements.

The foundation of the Republic was based on the ethnic cleansing of the land from the non-Muslim populations. Armenian Massacre and population exchange left the land with almost totally Muslim population. The nationalists considered this as the only material condition to build a nation state. The cleansing from the non-Muslims continued with nationalization of the economy by seizing the wealth of the remaining non-Muslim groups and indirectly forcing them to leave the land. All these developments can be expected to be reflected to the citizenship formation of Turkey as an exclusionary characteristic towards the non-Muslims.

Throughout the one-party regime, the state in Turkey could realize intensive Westernization of institutions and social life. The institutional modernizations did not confront a significant mass protest. The modernization program of the Turkish Republic was accompanied by a process of nationalization in the sense of Turkification. The nationalization program of the single-party regime resulted in the reaction of the Kurdish population. The Republican elite considered the Kurds as potentially to be assimilated to the Turkish ethnicity. The policies towards the Kurds were geared for assimilation. The elite ignored and rejected the existence of the Kurdish identity and expected the Kurds to forget their identity. The Turkification program towards the Kurds during the single-party regime and continuation of the rejection of the Kurdish identity can be expected to result in an assimilative character for Turkish citizenship. On the other hand, the exclusion of the Kurds from security related high level state positions can be expected to reflect exclusionary and sometimes racist characters of Turkish citizenship.

The change in Turkey from one-party to multi-party system resulted in the canalization of the discontent of the masses about the regime into legal political frameworks. The fundamentals of the regime were used as a basis to redefine the borders of multi-party activities by military coups. First the freedoms were enlarged to counter the conservative oppositions; second the freedoms were tightened to counter the leftist political currents; and third the political left and Kurdish movements were repressed; all with the claim of preserving the fundamentals. Such maneuvers enabled the regime to bring the many of the adherents of conservative-right and political-left currents within the borders of legal frameworks. The reflection on the Turkish citizenship can be expected to be that the citizens more easily associate themselves with the state and regime and accept its fundamentals.

CHAPTER 3

IRAN: CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION, ETHNIC MOVEMENTS, AND MASS PROTESTS

This chapter reviews the modern history of Iran by focusing on the mass movements in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, especially that of the Constitutional Revolution, the ethnic movements in the form of tribal resistance to the Pahlavi regime and provincial movements of especially Azerbaijani and Kurdish populations, and lastly the mass protests in the second half of the twentieth century including the National Front movement of Mossadeq and the protests culminating in the Islamic Revolution. These three moments of the modern Iranian history are striking considering the absence of their counterparts in Turkish history to the degree and power as in Iran. These three moments signify the active participation of masses in initiating the nation state building, in resisting the repressive policies of the Pahlavi regime, in organizing and raising oppositions to the state with a considerable mass support, and finally in collapsing the regime by a mass movement. They point out a strong mass movement tradition in Iran. These moments also signify that the modern Iranian state was not as strong as the modern Turkish state to realize its projects, to manipulate the oppositions, and to gain the consent of the masses.

The Constitutional Revolution in Iran marked the rise of nationalist forces in order to limit the many power of the Qajar Shahs on behalf of a nationally elected assembly. The revolution was a result of mass protests participated by various political, ethnic, and religious groups. The societies established prior the revolution were in the core of organization of the mass movements. The coup by the forces of the Qajar Shah against the assembly was countered by resistance of the same wide range of groups. The coup led to a one year long civil war and finally ended with the triumph of the constitutionalists. The initiation of constitutionalism by mass movements and the determinedness of the societal forces behind the revolution signify existence of strong societal forces vis-à-vis the state and emergence of a tradition of mass movements in the late Qajar period. This situation constitutes a contrast with the early repression of potential oppositional groups in the Ottoman Empire.

The regime of Reza Pahlavi followed a project of modernization and nationalization of the Iranian society. The modernization program aimed at elimination of the tribal lifestyle and tribal identities by disarming and settling the tribal populations. This policy was realized by a harsh attack on the tribal people and caused resistance and uprising of tribal groups. The existence of a significant amount of tribal population in Iran and the power of their resistance to the regime was in contrast to the situation in Turkey. The nationalization program in Iran aimed at assimilation of the ethnic minority groups, including the tribal people, into the Persian ethnicity. The main target groups were the Azerbaijanis and the Kurds. The usage of minority languages in schools, official buildings, and press was banned. In contrast to the spirit of the Constitutional Revolution, the

Iranian national identity was associated with the Persian ethnic identity. The history of ancient Persian Empires was praised in the expense of the Islamic past of Iran. Despite all these nationalization policies, the Pahlavi Regime in Iran did not develop a systematic and persistent rejection of the identities of ethnic minorities as happened in Turkey. The names of the provinces were preserved and the identities of the minorities remained to be recognized in the constitution. The repressive policies of Reza Shah towards the ethnic minorities resulted in the rise of ethnic consciousness especially among the Azerbaijani and Kurdish populations. The abdication of Reza Shah was followed by declaration of two autonomous governments in the respective provinces. This is of comparative values to the case in Turkey: although there was ethnic based Kurdish resistance to the Turkish Republic, the Kurdish movement in Turkey did not get to the point of declaring an autonomous government.

After the abdication of Reza Shah, Iran underwent a period of political freedom in the 1940s. There emerged various political groups including the communist Tudeh Party and National Front of Mossadeq. The government of Mossadeq managed to gain a significant mass support against Mohammed Reza Shah. The protests supporting the Mossadeq government marked the opposition against the Pahlavi regime. In the same period the opposition against the Kemalist regime in Turkey was organized by the DP emerging from the ranks of the Kemalist elite. The mass protests in Iran were in contrast to the absence of such political activity from below in Turkey. The same political activity of the masses was observed in the last decades of the Pahlavi regime, this time mostly organized by the ulama in Iran and participated by the Marxist and nationalist groups. These mass movements directly attacked the regime itself, rather than demanding reforms within the regime. In the same period there were a workers' movement and a yet thin Islamic current in Turkey. However, these were already accommodated in the legal political system as trade unions and political parties. These oppositional movements in Turkey did not have the power for and did not aim at collapsing the Kemalist regime.

The mass movements and Constitutional Revolution in the late Qajar Empire, the tribal resistance and ethnic provincial movements during the Pahlavi regime, and the mass protests culminating in the collapse of the Pahlavi regime mark the differences of the modern history of Iran from that of Turkey. In the following sections the modern history of Iran will be reviewed by highlighting these three moments. The political developments, cultural and religious features of the Iranian society will be mentioned in order to reveal the context of the three moments of focus. The lack of a strong central state and bureaucracy in the late Qajar Empire, the contributions of various political and ethnic groups to the nineteenth century mass movements and Constitutional Revolution, the nationalization program and repressive policies of Reza Pahlavi, the demands and programs of the provincial autonomous governments, the nationalization program and xenophobic character of the National Front movement, the White Revolution of Mohammed Reza Shah, and the mass protests organized by religious and Marxist groups prior to the Islamic Revolution will be

dealt in these sections. These items constitute the historical material of Iran on which the comparison of state formation and citizenship will be performed with Turkey. They reveal the from-below characteristics, active dimension, and assimilative characteristics of the Iranian citizenship. They also reveal the umbrella characteristics of the Iranian identity over the ethnic groups.

3.1 Late Qajar Empire: Tobacco Movement (1891) and Semi-Secret Organizations

A feature of the nineteenth century Iranian society was its fragmentation on ethnic, religious, regional, and socio-economic bases. Abrahamian provides a tabular data for the demographic structure of the Iranian society for the years 1850 and 1956. He gathers various ethnic groups under the four major subtitles of Iranians, Turkic Speakers, Arabs, and Non-Muslims. According to the data, between the years 1850 and 1956 the number of Iranians (speakers of a close language to Persian) increased from 6,375,000 (63.9%) to 12,770,000 (67.4%); Turkic Speakers from 2,900,000 (29.1%) to 5,130,00 (27.1%); Arabs from 400,000 (4.0%) to 667,000 (3.5%); and non-Muslims from 300,000 (3.0%) to 378,000 (2.0%).[34,35] The increase in the size of the populations is approximately 100% for Iranians, 77% for Turkic speakers, 67% for Arabs, and 26% for non-Muslims (Abrahamian, 1982: 12). The increase of the Persian speakers leads the increase of all others. It is remarkable that there has been no ethnic cleansing in the Iranian society in this period. Non-of the groups disappeared from the ethnic mosaic.

The Qajar Dynasty ruled the land of Iran between 1779 and 1925. Lacking a centralized strong army, inability to maintain administrative stability, and lacking a strong ideological legitimacy were the characteristics of the Qajar Empire in the nineteenth century. The two pillars of the forces the state had to confront were the tribes in the provinces and the ulama organized within the religious establishments (Lapidus, 2002: 469).The state could manage to stay in power either by manipulating the conflicts between the rival communal groups, by retreating whenever it could not overcome the opposition, or by means of marriage ties (Abrahamian, 1982: 41; Ghods, 1989: 14).

In Iran the majority of the people follow the Twelver sect of Shi'a Islam. It is estimated that around 89% of the population in Iran is Shi'a, 9% is Sunni, and 2% is non-Muslim.[36] Shi'a Islam

---

[34] It is worthwhile to give the names of the sub-groups existing in the table under these four main titles. The listing will go from the largest to the smallest population in each group. *Iranians*: Persians, Kurds, Baluchis, Mazandaranis, Gilakis, Bakhtiyaris, Lurs, Talleshis, Hazars, Afghans; *Turkic Speakers*: Azeris, Qashkayis, Turkomans, Afshars, Shahsavens, Timurs, Jamshids, Qajars, Bayats; *Non-Muslims*: Baha'is, Armenians, Jews, Assyrians, Zoroastrians.

[35] Based on the table provided by Ghods, the Ethnic/Linguistic Composition of Iran today has remained more or less the same as it was in 1956: Total Persian speakers: 60%; Total Turkic speakers: 25%; Kurds: 7%; Baluchis: 2%; Arabs: 3%; Armenians and Assyrians: 2%; Others: %1 (Ghods, 1989: 4, Table 1.1). Shaffer also gives close numbers to those: The Azerbaijanis in Iran constitute around the 20-30%, the Kurds 9%, Baluchis 3%, Arabs 2.5%, and Turkmes 1.5% of the total population in Iran (Shaffer, 2008: 264).

[36] Kamrava, M. and Dorraj, M. (2008), *Iran Today – An Encyclopedia of Life in the Islamic Republic, Volume 1 and 2*, Westport, the USA: Greenwood Press, p.441; Crane, K., Lala, R., and Martini, J. (2008), *Iran's Political Demographis, and Economic Vulnerabilities*, Santa Monica, CA: RADN Corporation, RAND Project Air Force, p.41. Another estimate is around 85% for Shi'a, 13% for Sunni, and 2% for other religion groups: Asgharzadeh, A. (2007), *Iran and the Challenge of Diversity*, New York: Palgrave MacMillon, p.15. Abrahamian states that in 1900 the Shi'a population constituted more than 85%, the Sunna and non-Muslim populations constituted less than 10% and 5%, respectively, of the total people in Iran: Abrahamian, E. (2008), *A History of Modern Iran*, New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 17.

has been the official religion of Iran since the foundation of the Safavid dynasty in 1501. During their rule till 1722, the Safavids strengthened the religious institutions. The ulama had independent sources of income, they maintained "direct control of certain religious taxes…not having them pass through the hands of the government" (Keddie, 1981: 17). Therefore, the Shi'a ulama in Iran were less dependent on the state power in comparison to the Sunni ulama in the Ottoman Empire. During the political turmoil after the collapse of the Safavids, the ulama remained organized and active in social regulations. In this period they became the leading social force for the population especially to raise protests against the state regulations. The independence of the ulama vis-à-vis the state and their role of leadership continued also throughout the rule of the Qajar Empire (Chehabi, 1990: 14). This independence underlay their political activism in mass demonstrations throughout the end of the nineteenth and twentieth century. Lapidus argues, "[i]n Iran the weakness of the state, the organizational strength of the religious establishment, and the latent cultural permission for 'ulema' resistance have all allowed for, though they have not mandated, revolutionary struggle in the name of Islam" (Lapidus, 2002: 484-485).

The relative independence of the Shi'a ulama from the state, in comparison to the Sunni ulama, resonates with the difference in the belief systems of Shi'a and Sunni Islam. The source of this difference dates back to the years after the death of the Prophet Mohammad in A.D. 632. Most of the Muslims of that time followed the three caliphs after Mohammad, but "[a] minority felt that succession belonged to Mohammad's cousin and son-in-law Ali…and this originally political claim within a few generations took on religious content" (Keddie, 1981: 5). The majority group that recognized the three successor caliphs was called the Sunnis and the minority group was called the Shi'as. "The party or 'Shi'a' of Ali insisted on the charismatic leadership of the male descendents of Ali" (Keddie, 1981: 5). These mail descendents of Ali turned out to be called the Imams.

According to the Twelver sect of Shi'a Islam "the infant son of the eleventh Imam went into 'occultation' in the ninth century leaving behind four successive interpreters…After the death of the fourth…there is no infallible interpreter of the Twelfth Imam's will until he appears as the Mahdi to institute the realm of perfection and justice" (Keddie, 1981: 8). The sect of Twelver Shi'ism turned into a "militant movement" with the ascent of the Safavid dynasty to power in 1501 (Keddie, 1981: 9). The founder of the Sfavid Empire, Shah Ismail, "demanded that all preachers and mollas publicly curse the first three (Sunni) caliphs, usurpers of the place of Ali" (Keddie, 1981: 12). With such policy the rulers of the Safavid Empire aimed at unification of their people against the Sunni enemies, the Ottomans in the west and the Uzbeks in the east. The religious institutions in this period were intentionally strengthened by the Safavids.

The relative freedom of the Shi'a ulama from the state is related to two important differences considering the Sunni ulama, one material and one ideological. The material difference was the aforementioned economic independence of the Shi'a ulama. The religious taxes and donations especially from the bazaaris and other urban rich provided the Shi'a ulama with economic

independence from the state (Keddie, 1981: 17). The ideological difference between the Shi'a and Sunni ulama was due to the power of the former to interpret the religious texts for the problems of the day. "The most learned of the ulama, who had reached the highest level in their studies, became *mujtahids*, who were capable…of giving authoritative interpretations on questions of religious law…The most important function of Shi'i mujtahid was to exert ijtihad to give new interpretations of law and doctrine in response to new questions" (Keddie, 1981: 18). "The need to follow the rulings of a living mujtahid, who was les fallable than any temporal ruler, gave basis for power in the hands of the mujtahids that was far greater than that of the Sunni ulama" (Keddie, 1981: 22).

The Shi'a faith constituted an important element for the integration and homogeneity claims of Iranian nationalists. Wilber states "[t]here is also a basis for national unity and national self-consciousness in the overwhelming adherence of the community to the Shi'a sect of Islam" (Wilber, 1981: 162). Many of the Iranian intellectuals agreed with the idea that "Iran must be one indivisible country, one nation, with one unified religion", stated by Abdulrahim Talebof-i Tabrizi in the very early twentieth century. It is remarkable that these were the words of a secularized intellectual who "saw the ulema as a reactionary social force" (Ghods, 1989: 29-30).

The non-Muslim minorities in Iran basically consisted of the Armenians, Assyrians, Zoroastrians, and Bahais. While the Christian minorities, namely Armenians and Assyrians, were ethnically non-Persian, the Zoroastrians and Bahais were Persian. Among those the most severely repressed were the Bahais, the largest non-Muslim group. Bahaism emerged from the Shi'a Islam in the mid-nineteenth century and recruited considerable amount of followers. The hegemonic understanding of Shi'a Islam in Iran condemned Bahaism as being heretical; a lot of its followers were executed. Bahaism was considered as the most important danger to the religious homogeneity of the Iranian population (Cottam, 1964: 88). Zoroastrianism, the ancient Persian religion, was not subject to repressions comparable to that of Bahais. Unlike Bahais, Zoroastrians were considered to be 'people of the book', besides Muslims, Christians, and Jews.

The dependence of the state on tribal forces was another inheritance of the Qajars from the preceding monarchies of Iran. The tribal cavalry "constituted the backbone of the Iranian army" (Amjad, 1989: 13). Moreover, the tribes comprised strong kinship links, which could lead to an organized armed power in reaction to the state regulations. "By the 1860s tribal groups in Iran, taken as a unit (although they were never united), were still more powerful than the Qajar state" (Beck, 1990: 205). The state was almost helpless against the attacks of the tribes to the cities and villages for plunder. On the land of Iran, "[t]his situation continued until the 1920s, when Reza Shah (1925-1941) subdued the tribes, ending their crucial role in the development of the Iranian state" (Amjad, 1989: 13). One-third to one-half of the population in the early nineteenth century Iran was composed of the members of the tribes (Keddie, 1999: 10).[37] Although tribes constituted

---

[37] Keddi writes: "While tribespoeple probably made up from one-third to one-half of the Iranian population in the early nineteenth century, and urban classes probably made less than 20% of that population, while non-tribal agricuturalists being

the backbone of the military force of the Qajar Empire, they did not form a unified power center against the state. The members of the tribes were mostly directed by their leaders, whose attitudes changed based on their connections with the Qajar Shahs, nationalist leaders, or external powers. For example, Cottam argues, the support of the Bakhtiari tribe and the opposition of the Turkoman and Shahsavan tribes to the Constitutional Revolution can only be explained by the personal political ideology of the leaders of the respective tribes (Cottam, 1964: 54).

The communal rivalries in the Iranian society were effective not only among the lower classes of the population but also among the landed aristocrats. Due to the communal rivalry they were unable to unite against the central government (Abrahamian, 1982: 36). Amjad argues that the ownership of the land and arbitrary use of power by the state was an obstacle for emergence of a unified strong landowning class (Amjad, 1989: 9). Katouzian describes the regime of the Qajar Empire as an "arbitrary rule". "Arbitrary rule meant that there were no independent rules and procedures for the protection of life and property, even of the highest people in the land" (Katouzian, 2004: 173). "[A]nything was possible. Just as a chief minister's life and property could be taken at the will of the ruler, the humblest person could become chief minister upon his pleasure" (Katouzian, 1997).

In the traditional Iranian society the ulama played the role of leadership of the masses in their opposition to state regulations. Therefore, unlike in the Ottoman case, the ulama in Iran were an important group effective on the socio-political development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The economic, ideological, and marriage based alliance of the ulama with the bazaaris underlay their leadership in the society. The sons of the bazaaris were educated by the ulama. The judiciary was in the hands of the ulama giving a lot of control over the society. The social rituals, almost all being religious, were organized and managed by them (Upton, 1970: 25). The ulama were in cooperation with the bazaaris, and they together constituted "the core group of alliance" in many of the political movements (Kamali, 1998: 239-240). "The *bazaaris* relied on the *ulema* for political support and protection, and the *ulema* depended on the *bazaaris* for economic support" (Ghods, 1989: 16). The income of the madrasas, shrines, and other religious endowments were due to the religiously obliged contributions of the riches of the land. The leadership of the ulama in the late nineteenth century was apparent with their active role in the Tobacco Movement in 1892. "The power of religion as a force to mobilize antiforeign sentiment among the masses was clearly evident in this episode" (Ghods, 1989: 27). Halliday (2004: 28) writes, "the particular social formation of Iran contained within it [a] social base, and associated leadership and ideological structure, that served to mobilize against the state and against external influence, in the form of the Islamist institutions and the bazaar".

---

the rest, the political, economic, and intellectual importance of the urban classes was much greater" (Keddie, 1999: 10).
Cottom writes in 1964 "[o]ne-sixth to one-fourth of the Iranian population are members of tribes" (Cottam, 1964: 51).

In the early nineteenth century the Iranian land was constantly under the Anglo-Russian military pressure. However following 1870, the pressure changed its character from militaristic to economic and commercial (Upton, 1970: 7). The intervention of the West and the state imposed economic regulations served for the "political, economic, and strategic needs" of European powers (Amjad, 1989: 19). The local economic groups reacted to the impositions by protests and mass movements. Under the domination of "foreign capital and the state", the bazaaris "could not play a significant role in the reorganization of political economy" (Amjad, 1989: 19). The influx of cheap mass-manufactured products from the European countries resulted in the downfall of local urban production forces and the rise of the number of import/export traders. At the end of the nineteenth century this situation created two contrasting groups of middle class in the Iranian society. On the one hand were the ones who lost their beneficial positions in the bazaar. Among this group emerged a common idea, which would bring them together in the forthcoming political events: the foreigner is the enemy.[38] The benefiting group, on the other hand, was the comprador bourgeoisie who engaged in importing from and exporting to the Western lands (Abrahamian, 1982: 60).[39] This group would support the state regulations responding to the demands of external powers.

The Iranian intelligentsia lagged their Ottoman counterparts to get acquainted with the Western ideologies and philosophy. In fact, the Ottoman intellectuals themselves were one of the main sources that Iranians learned about the West (Boroujerdi, 1996: 24). Abrahamian argues, in the nineteenth century Iranian society the intelligentsia was not enough in number nor had a coherent ideology to form a real social class. They were composed of people coming from very diverse economic backgrounds. Among them were the aristocrats, royal princes, civil servants, army officers, clerics, and merchants. Despite their diverse economic and ideological background, what they argued and discussed were important to provide the key concepts for the socio-political changes of the twentieth century. They advocated for political, ideological, and economic changes in order to replace "royal despotism, clerical dogmatism, and foreign imperialism" with "constitutionalism, secularism, and nationalism" (Abrahamian, 1982: 61-62). The late nineteenth century, namely the decades prior to the Constitutional Revolution (1906-1911), is designated as the Period of Awakening in Iran (*Asre Bidari*) (Mirsepassi, 2000: 56-57).

Afgani and Makhum Khan were two influential figures among the nineteenth century Iranian intellectuals. Afgani argued that imperialism was threatening the Middle East. The East could protect itself by adopting the modern technology of the West. Islam would be effective in binding and mobilizing the people of the East against the West (Abrahamian, 1982: 62-65). Malkum Khan was the intellectual who drafted the *Daftar-i Tanzimat* (Notebook of Transformation) in 1858 and

---

[38] "The influx of mass-manufactured products, especially textiles, undermined the traditional handicrafts, and consequently presented for the many bazaars a mutual enemy – the foreigner" (Abrahamian, 1982: 59).
[39] "[T]he introduction of European capital and the capitulations granted to European businessmen created outside the bazaars a comprador bourgeoisie. Although this new group was reputed to be drawn from the non-Muslims, a British "Who is Who" indicated that it was not: of the fifty three wealthiest businessmen active et the end of the century, one was a Zoroastrian, five were Armenians, but forty-seven were Muslims" (Abrahamian, 1982: 60).

submitted to the court under the reign of Naser al-Din Shah (1848-1896). This paper, inspired from the Ottoman Tanzimat reforms, was the first systematic proposal for a reform in Iran. Malkhum Khan also founded the influential newspaper *Qanun*, which was among the first to raise the demand for a parliamentary government (Abrahamian, 1982: 67-68).

Banani (1961: 10-11) states that there was no nationalism among the Iranian public during the military defeats in the early nineteenth century. At this time the reaction had mostly a religious character. The rise of nationalism in Iran was a result of the ideological, economic, and military intrusions of the West. By the impact of modern European ideas the urban population was antagonized against the Qajar dynasty. By the impact of the economic intrusion of the West a strong xenophobia and religious fanaticism was created among the population. These two moments, namely the thrust of westernization in the scientific-technological-administrative sense and the thrust to preserve the local identity against the cultural imperialism of the West structured the forthcoming political discussions in the twentieth century (Abrahamian, 1982: 71-73). Cottam (1964: 160) states, "[m]ore than any other factor, including the intellectual impact of the West, the anger and humiliation aroused by these foreign economic inroads led to the rise and triumph of the Iranian nationalism – and Iranian nationalism was a consequence of their economic rivalry that neither power anticipated".

The bazaaris gave a considerable struggle against the unfavorable state regulations and intrusion of foreign capital into the Iranian economy in the late nineteenth century. Against these intrusions, the bazaaris developed and demonstrated a class consciousness to protect their interests. Amjad mentions the establishment of the Council of the Representatives of the Merchants (*Majlis-e-Vokalaye-e Tojjar*) in 1884, and the active participation of the bazaaris in the Tobacco Movement in 1891 and the Constitutional Revolution in 1905-1911 as signs of their class consciousness (Amjad, 1989: 19-20). The very basic demand of the bazaaris was "to create a socioeconomic system in which the private property and life and limb of the people were protected by the rule of law" against the arbitrary rule of the state (Amjad, 1989: 19). The political struggle in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Iran was between the middle classes raising economic-political liberalism on the one hand, and the upper classes trying to preserve the existing political and economic formations imposed by the Qajar state.

Naser al-Din Shah intended for comprehensive reforms in the nineteenth century in order to maintain a centralized state. His reforms, in practice, served for the western powers to intrude into the Iranian society and economy (Abrahamian, 1982: 54-55). The economic and social state regulations "gave rise to growing hostility to the government and to the foreigners who increasingly influenced or controlled it" (Keddie, 1999: 44). An example to these regulations was the Reuter concession of 1872, favored by the Shah and his Prime Minister Mirza Hosein Khan. This concession granted to the British citizen Reuter the right of building a railway from Caspian ports to the south, besides exclusive rights to factories, irrigation, minerals, agricultural

improvements, and new transport. George Curzon described this concession "as the most complete grant ever made by a country over its resources to a foreigner" (Keddie, 1999: 37). The Reuter concession created the first significant mass movement in Iran against the state regulations. The movement included notables, ulama, and other parts of the population. Although the size of this first movements was much smaller than the Tobacco and Constitutional Movements, "it did have some similarities as a successful movement uniting a variety of forces against foreign concessions and governments considering complaisant to foreign powers" (Keddie, 1999: 39).

The continuing attempts of the state for reforms resulted in "[t]he increasing public discontent" which "erupted on a mass scale during the tobacco crisis of 1891-1892" (Abrahamian, 1982: 73). The cause of the protest was the sale of the tobacco concession to a British citizen. According to the concession, the holder would have the monopoly over the distribution and exportation of tobacco in Iran for fifty-years. The protest started with the shutdown of the bazaar in Shiraz after the arrival of the company agents and it immediately spread to the bazaars of Tehran, Isfahan, Tabriz, Mashad, Qazvin, Yazd, and Kermanshah. With the help of a fatwa (religious decree) from the religious leaders, the protest extended to a consumers' boycott. As a result of this wide spread protest Naser al-Din Shah had to step back and cancel the concession. Abrahamian considers the Tobacco protest as the "rehearsal for the forthcoming Constitutional Revolution". With this Tobacco Movement, the first time it was "demonstrated that local revolts could…spread into general rebellions; that the intelligentsia and the traditional middle class could work together; and that the Shah, despite his claims, was a Titan with feet of clay" (Abrahamian, 1982: 73).

Muzaffer al-Din Shah, the successor of Naser al-Din, pursued unpopular economic policies accompanied with relatively liberal police control (Abrahamian, 1982: 74-76). Since the Western penetration and unfavorable economic policies persisted, the liberal policies did not descend the public opposition; rather created possibilities for foundation of semisecret organizations (Abrahamian, 1982: 76). The Secret Society, Secret Center, Social Democratic Party, Society of Humanity, and Revolutionary Committee were the five prominent secret societies founded in this period. The members of these organizations were from different political and ideological factions among the intelligentsia, traditional middle class, and ulama. Secret Society, the most important of all, was formed by members of the ulama and bazaaris. Secret Center and Social Democrat Party were formed by members of the intelligentsia affected by Russian Marxism. Society of Humanity was also formed by members of the intelligentsia, the ones affected by the humanism of the French scholar Auguste Comte. Revolutionary Committee was formed by more radical intellectuals who advocated the "overthrow of despotism" and developed radical tactics and strategies for this purpose (Abrahamian, 1982: 76-80; 1979: 402-404). These societies played an important role in the forthcoming events that led to the proclamation of the constitution.

The late nineteenth century Iranian society differed from that of the Ottoman for existence of an independent ulama in leadership of the lower and middle classes, for the political consciousness

and activity of the bazaaris, for the far less size of the Christian populations, and for the lack of a strong and centralized state structure. All these differences underlay the political activism of the middle and lower classes and the emergence of mass movements in this period. They can be expected to have prepared the conditions for the active and from-below characteristics of the Iranian citizenship. In comparison to the Turkish, the state can be expected to be less central to the Iranian citizenship.

3.2   Constitutional Revolution (1905-1906) and the Civil War (1906-1909)

The economic crisis in the year 1905 was the initiator for the mass protests that led to the Constitutional Revolution in Iran. The first protest took place in the religious mourning of Muharrem in June 1905. The protestors, composed of some shopkeepers and moneylenders, peacefully demanded the dismissal of the Belgian customs administrator (Monsieur Naus) and reimbursement of their money taken as loans. Muzaffer al-Din Shah (1896-1907) managed to settle this first wave of protests by promising to fulfill the requests. However, not holding his promise led to the successive waves (Abrahamian, 1982: 81).

The second protest took place in December. This time it was the state that excited the protest by bastinadoing two of the respected sugar importers of the bazaar, with the aim of lowering the sugar prices. "Stores and workshops closed; crowds congregated in the main mosque; and two thousand merchants and theology students…took sanctuary at 'Abdul 'Azim. From there they sent the government four main demands: replacement of the governor; dismissal of Naus; enforcement of the *shari'a*; and establishment of a House of Justice" (Abrahamian, 1982: 82). The government tried to break the strike in Tehran for one month, without success. At the end, the protestors were victorious and "on their return to the city, [they] were greeted by the huge crowds shouting 'Long Live the Nation of Iran.' …[T]he phrase 'Nation of Iran'…had never been heard before in the streets of Tehran" (Abrahamian, 1982: 82). This second wave ended with again the promises of the Shah to convene a House of Justice and dismissal of Monsieur Naus.

The third and final wave of the protests took place in the month of next Muharrem, in the summer of 1906. The Shah had again not held his promises. When the government arrested a preacher for his denunciation of the government, the semisecret societies started to circulate oppositional broadsheets. While a crowd of protesting theology students was approaching the city police station, the police killed one of them, who happened to be a sayyid (coming from the lineage of the Prophet). "On the subsequent morning, thousands of students, shopkeepers, and guild members – many of them wearing white sheets as a sign of their willingness to die in a religious crusade – proceeded with the sayyid's body from the main bazaar to a public funeral in the central mosque. Outside the mosque however, they were intercepted by Cossacks. The collision was brief but bloody: twenty-two lost their lives and over one hundred suffered injuries" (Abrahamian, 1982: 83).

These events led to two demonstrations one in Qum and the other in the village of Gulak to the north of Tehran. The one in Qum was a demonstration of religious notables and their followers. "From Qum, the religious leaders proclaimed that the capital would be left without spiritual guidance – and consequently without judicial actions and legal transactions – until the Shah fulfilled his earlier promises. The 'ulema had gone on strike" (Abrahamian, 1982: 83). The demonstration in Gulak took place in the garden of British Legation. It was organized by a comity of guild leaders and joined by members of the bazaar. Wilber (1981: 69-70) states, the number of the attendants mounted to 10,000. The place was frequented by visitors of intellectual students who explained the Western thoughts, constitutionalism, and even republicanism to the groups in the garden. The government could not surmount such a strong protest. Three weeks later, on August 5, Muzaffar al-Din Shah appointed a more liberal prime minister, and "signed a proclamation convening a Constituent National Assembly" (Abrahamian, 1982: 84-85).

The main uniting tenet for Constitutional Revolution was being against the Qajar Shahs and the influence of foreign powers. The oppositional groups perceived the Shah and the foreign powers as allied for their own common interests. Opposing to the Shah and foreign powers brought together the traditionally oriented religious groups and the Western oriented secular modernists. While nationalism was supported by both of the factions, constitutionalism and many of the secular policies were supported by the latter but not opposed by the former. The establishment of a Majlis was considered by the ulama as a means to "limit the state power and exert control over it"; "[t]hey wanted to extend and widen the realm of civil society, i.e. ulema's sphere of influence" (Kamali, 1998: 230). The secular modernists were "intensely patriotic; they shared an abhorrence of arbitrary rule and wanted constitutional rights; and they generally stood for secularization, and a vociferous group among them were extremely anti-clerical" (Banani, 1961: 21). The religious minorities, Jews, Armenians, Zoroastrians, and Baha'is were important elements supporting the constitutional movement on the secular side (Mirsepassi, 2000: 59).

The elections for the National Assembly and the convening of the Majlis (parliament) in October 1906 initiated a very active political engagement among the population of both the capital and provinces. The existing infrastructure due to the societies (anjomans) was critical. In the provinces regional assemblies were founded in leadership of the bazaar people. According to Abrahamian, these assemblies were considerably independent and they were in opposition to the provincial rulers. In the capital lots of professional, ethnic, religious, and regional societies appeared and all supported the constitution. Among these were the Society of Guilds (*Asnaf*), Society of Scribes (*Mustawfian*), Society of Theology Students (*Taleb*), Society of Azerbaijanis, Society of Armenians, Society of Jews, and Society of Southern Iranians (Abrahamian, 1982: 86-87). They functioned to deliver the modern thoughts, such as liberal democracy and nationalism, to the Iranian public. They served as debate and education centers. Accordingly, "most of the liberal deputies in the Majlis were members of one or more of the groups" (Cottam, 1964: 247). Among

these societies, the strongest and the most important was the Society of Azerbaijan, established in Tabriz. The importance was due to "its influence on the development of the Constitutional Revolution" (Ghods, 1989: 34).

The first process in the assembly was to draft a constitution with which the deputies could guarantee and protect the parliament against the Shah. For this purpose they prepared the document known as the Fundamental Laws, which gave extensive power to the assembly, proclaimed the parliament as being "the representative of all people" and having "the right in all questions to propose any measure that it regards as conductive to the well-being of the Government and the People". These meant the assembly had the power of "final determination over all laws, decrees, budgets, treaties, loans, monopolies, and concessions" (Abrahamian, 1982: 89). The power of the Shah was considerably limited. The document was ratified by the Shah in his deathbed, on December 30, 1906.

The succeeding ruler Mohammed Ali Shah resorted to an autocratic policy. He ignored the National Assembly and the provincial councils. The negative attitude of the Shah against the assembly resulted in a severe struggle between the two. The assembly prepared the second famous document, known as the Supplementary Fundamental Laws, adapted from the Belgian Constitution (Abrahamian, 1982: 89-90). This was a longer and more fully constitutional document (Keddie, 1999: 56). The Supplementary Fundamental Laws recognized the equality of citizens before the law, guaranteed some basic citizenship rights, and concentrated the power on the assembly in the expense of the executive. Furthermore, it described the sovereignty of the Shah as derived from the people, rather than as solely from the God (Abrahamian, 1982: 89-90). The Shah refused to sign the Supplementary Fundamental Laws, resulting in public protests in all big cities.

> At Tabriz, a crowd of 20,000 vowed to remain on strike and even threatened 'to separate Azerbaijan from the rest of the country unless the constitution was immediately ratified'…At Tehran, the various associations and clubs formed a Central Society…, organized a general strike in the bazaar and in the government bureaucracy, held a mass meeting of over 50,000 and mobilized 3,000 armed volunteers…for the defense of the National Assembly. Meanwhile, a moneylender from Tabriz…assassinated premier Amir-al Sultan and promptly committed suicide outside the parliament building (Abrahamian, 1982: 91-92).

These protests and especially the assassination of the premier forced the Shah to step back and sign the Supplementary Fundamental Laws on October 7, 1907.

The two documents, the Fundamental Laws and Supplementary Fundamental Laws, "formed the core of the Iranian constitution until 1979" (Keddie, 1999: 56-57). The main principles in the constitution reflected the two aims that brought together the traditional and secular factions. These were, on the one hand, "to establish a firm check on the Shah's previous right[s]", and on the other hand, to ensure that "granting foreign concessions, contracting foreign loans, selling the public domain, or transferring public revenue require Assembly, or Majlis, approval or authorization"

(Upton, 1970: 16). Due to the protests of some ulama, a committee of mojtaheds was also recognized by the Constitution in order to judge the compatibility of the legislation with Islam. However, such a committee "was never set up, nor did those who framed it intend to set it up" (Keddie, 1999: 57).

The Constitutional Revolution was a result of the united protests of a wide range of groups in the society. Different ethnic, religious, economic, and communal groups, all in opposition to the court, united to establish the constitutional government and to safeguard the assembly. More importantly, the two traditional and secular factions in the assembly, namely the Moderates and the Liberals respectively, acted together and supported each other in the period of safeguarding the parliament and pressing the Shah to sign the Supplementary Fundamental Laws (Abrahamian, 1982: 92).

Although the tenet of being against the Shah united the secular and religious groups, the centrality of religion in the society remained as a source of conflict between the two in the Majlis (Ghods, 1989: 229). With the thrust of their success against the court, the Liberals intended to further the reforms in a more egalitarian and secular direction. This was severely opposed by the Moderates. The disruptions around the secularization matters were accompanied by a bad harvest and increase of food prices. The very lower classes were discontented by the policies of the constitutional regime. The royalists made good use of these conditions to mobilize lower classes and some factions of the mujtahids. The reactionary movement was opposed by a counter mass support for the assembly. "When the Society of Guilds organized a general strike in the bazaar in support of the constitution, over 100,000 citizens, including some 7,000 armed volunteers from the Society of Azerbaijanis and the Society of College Graduates, rushed to defend the National Assembly" (Abrahamian, 1982: 93-95). The Shah managed to break the resistance by using the Cossack Brigade commanded by a Russian colonel. He ordered the Cossack Brigade to bomb the Majlis leaving behind over 250 deaths in the fights in June 1908. After the coup the Shah declared martial law, banned all societies and public meetings, and dissolved the National Assembly.

In the provinces armed volunteers appeared to fight for the assembly and constitution. They eventually spread to all cities including Tehran. The Provincial Council in Tabriz declared itself as the Provincial Government of Azerbaijan (Abrahamian, 1982: 97-98). The confrontation between the constitutionalist and royalist forces lasted around one year from June 1908 to July 1909. At the end, the royalist power in Tehran was weakened, the armed volunteers took the city, the Shah took sanctuary in the Russian legation and the civil war ended in July 13 (Abrahamian, 1982: 100). It should be noted that the coming together of the Tabriz forces with the forces of the Bakhtiyari tribe was crucial for the triumph of the constitutionalists (Sohrabi, 1995).

The nationalism that united the masses for the Constitutional Revolution had very much xenophobic content. The unfavorable Anglo-Russian Agreement signed in September 1907

contributed to the rise of this feeling. According to the agreement the land of Iran was to be divided into three zones of political influence by preserving its political integrity. The north part of Iran was to be dominated by the Russians while the south was by the British. The region in the middle was to be left neutral, however, eventually that part also became "a field of British activity" (Wilber, 1981: 70-71). Especially anti-Russian feelings were exacerbated due to the Russian support to the Shah against the constitutional movement, the role of Russian commanded Cossack Brigade in bombing the parliament building and closing down the Majlis, and the ruthless treatment of Russians towards the Azerbaijani constitutionalists (Banani, 1961: 11).

A wide range of societal forces took part in the civil war for the constitutional regime. The Bakhtiyari tribe in the south and the armed forces in Tabriz (north) constituted the main powers. Among the Tabriz forces were a significant number of Armenians and Georgians besides the Muslims (Afary, 2004: 69; Cottom, 1994: 16). Especially the armed Armenian groups within the Tabriz forces were effective. After the triumph, Iranian Armenians took part in the establishment and development of Iran's first modern political party, the Democrat Party, led by Hasan Taqizadah. Vram Pilossian and Tigran Ter Hocabian were the prominent Armenian figures in close contact with Taqizadah (Afary, 2004: 67). Hocabiab's letters to Taqizadah reveal that they advocated "a new concept of nationality transcending ethnic and religious affiliations" (Afary, 2004: 75). This idea was shared also by many of the social democrats and took its place in the program of the Democrat Party. "After the restoration of the constitutional order…Ter Hocabian, Resulzade, and Taqizadeh further developed this new concept of nationality in their writings, as well as in their activities" (Afary, 2004: 76). This was a rare occasion that the idea of 'Persian citizenship' appeared as a component of Iranain nationalism in the Iranian politics. Afary quotes the following from Hocabian:

> We must create a new [concept of] nationalism which will be Iranian. It would be the same to us if people speak different languages or worship different gods. In our view, there should be no differentiation among ethnic groups (*les nations*). We should recognize only one nation – the Iranian nation, the Persian citizen (Afary, 2004: 76).

Added to these was Resulzade's critique of the nationalism adopted by the Moderate Party, the conservative branch of the constitutionalists. His criticism stressed that the nationalism of the Moderates counted only the "Muslims and followers of one religion and one ideology" and "did not recognize a single person other than Muslims as citizens of Iran". Resulzade criticized the isolation of the non-Muslims from this understanding by stating "the history of the Iranian revolution…shows that [many] *Fidais* [who helped restore the constitutional order] came from among the ranks of these same non-Muslims" (Resulzade's words quoted by Afary, 2004: 77; the additions are Afary's). The active role of the non-Muslims in the Constitutional Revolution had resulted in the acceptance of a secular and non-ethnic understanding of Iranian nationality among the secular branch of the constitutionalist powers. However, "[t]he subject of political rights for

non-Muslims (Jews, Armenians, Zoroastrians), as well as Muslims who did not belong to the Shi'ite Ithna 'Ashari banch of Islam, was a highly controversial one during both the First and Second Constitutional Periods" (Afary, 2004: 75).

In the second assembly opened in November 1909, the two factions, this time named respectively as the Democrats and Moderates, had characteristically different policies. The Democrats advocated for "political centralization, communal integration, and national unification" (Abrahamian, 1982: 105). They supported the idea of equal and free Iranian citizenship, which appealed to the religious and ethnic minorities. The Moderates, on the other hand, were inclined towards a less centralized government because they did not want to give up their advantageous positions in their provinces (Abrahamian, 1982: 10-106; Cottam, 1964: 98; Matin-Asgari, 2004: 40).

After the end of the civil war, the government in Tehran was under the hegemony of the forces that played the main role in the triumph, especially that of the Bakhtiyaris, one of the strongest tribes in Iran. The remaining tribes in the provinces, on the other hand, were not in support of the constitution and national assembly. They regarded the Tehran government as a tool for Bakhtiyari domination (Abrahamian, 1982: 107). The groups that had fought together for the constitutionalism during the civil war, "soon fell in disagreement" (Wilber, 1981: 71). The consequence was the disarray of the Tehran government and lack of any viable policy to cope with the disintegration problem. "Turkomans in the north Khurasan, Shahsavens in Azerbaijan, and Kurds in Luristan took advantage…to withhold their taxes, loot local villages, disrupt communication lines, and support the ex-shah when he reappeared in Iran in July 1911 for a last [unsuccessful] bid to regain the throne" (Abrahamian, 1982: 107). Wilber argues that a considerable "progress" took place only after W. Morgan Shuster, an American, was appointed as the Treasurer-General of Iran. "With several American assistants, Shuster arrived in Tehran in 1911 and in a very short time had made considerable headway with reorganization of the financial system" (Wilber, 1981: 71).

The internal conflicts and tribal rivalries made it easy for the British to enter the southern regions in October 1911, and Russians to occupy Enzeli and Rasht (on the coast of Caspian Sea) in November 1911. The progress due to the efforts of Shuster was not welcomed by the Russians. With the invasion they presented the Iranian government an ultimatum, which included the demand for dismissal of Shuster and threatened the government with occupying the capital (Wilber, 1981: 71). There emerged a strong public protest, led by the Democratic Party and the Tehran Women's Anjoman, against the ultimatum (Ghods, 1989: 44).

> [T]hree hundred women marched into the public galleries with pistols hidden under their long
> veils, and threatened to shoot any deputy willing to submit to the Russian ultimatum. Angry
> demonstrators attacked the city trams that were partly owned by the Russians. And a huge

crowd, described by one eyewitness as the 'largest up to that point in Iranian history', gathered outside the parliament shouting, 'Independence or Death' (Abrahamian, 1982: 108-109).[40]

The strong protest resulted in rejection of the ultimatum by the Parliament; however, the ministers of the cabinet accepted the ultimatum with the excuse to avoid the occupation of the capital (Wilber, 1981: 71; Abrahamian, 1982: 108-109). The Shah and the prime minister reacted to the attitude of the parliament by closing down the Majlis, arresting many Democrats, and closing the party's newspaper (Ghods, 1989: 44). "This marked the end of the revolution, brought down mainly by foreign intervention and secondly by internal divisions and problems" (Keddie, 1999: 62).

When the Russian troops threatened to occupy Tehran again in 1914, "[t]he thirty Democrat deputies, accompanied by some journalists and influential politicians, set out on their 'long march', first stopping in Qom where they formed the "*Komiteh-e Defa'-e Melli*" (the National Defense Committee), then falling back to Kashan, and finally establishing themselves in Kermanshah, where they called themselves the "*Hokumat-e Melli*" (the National Government)" (Atabaki, 2000: 41). The *Hokumat-e Melli* had the official recognition as the central power and at that time was the only legitimate power of Iran. The Gendarmerie forces, one of the main pillars of the Iranian state army besides the unfavorable Cossacks, played an important role in organizing the National Defense Committee and seizing the power in the provincial towns. "Throughout 1916 and into 1917, the gendarmes fought a series of battles with the Russian armies, in defense of the National Government" (Cronin, 2004: 126).

At the end of the First World War, Iran lacked any strong viable government. It was more or less a land without any control (Upton, 1970: 48). Upton states that after the war "a Germanophile group was added to those of the Russophilies and Anglophiles" and "latent antagonisms between minority groups, such as the Kurds, Armenians, and Assyrians, had been aroused" (Upton, 1970: 40). The withdrawal of the Russians after the Soviet Revolution in 1917 resulted in the total hegemony of the British power. The Iranian government aimed at preventing the British to replace the Russian domination. However, the British maintained a political dominance over Iran, resulting in the Anglo-Persian Agreement in 1919, which "made Iran a virtual protectorate of Britain" (Lapidus, 2002: 476). The British domination and especially the Anglo-Iranian Agreement after the War contributed to the xenophobic sentiments of Iranian nationalism (Banani, 1961: 35).

After the First World War, the Christian minorities, who had supported the Constitutional Revolution, were considered to be alien elements for Iranian nationalism. The invasion of Iran during the War, especially of the Caucasian regions by the Russian and afterwards Ottoman armies, disturbed the relations between the Christians and Muslims. The Christians of the Urmia region, dominantly Armenians, including the ones who escaped the massacres in Anatolia, "sided with the

---

[40] Keddie considers this protest as "one sign of the organization and political consciousness of many women that had grown up during the revolution" (Keddie, 1999: 62).

Russians and their allies after being mistreated by the Ottoman invaders". "This exposed them to even harsher repression when the Ottomans retook their area. When the Russians quit the war after the October 1917 revolution, these Christians turned toward the British and French, which made Persian nationalists see them as enemies" (Keddie, 1999: 67). The Christian populations in Iran were subject to massacres and mass departure after the First World War.[41]

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century marked the Iranian history with protests and mass movements culminating in a Constitutional Revolution. This period and the Constitution of 1906-1907 underlie the from-below characteristics of the Iranian citizenship. The participation of variety of societal forces in the revolution is remarkable. The xenophobic feeling was one of the elements that united all these forces. This feeling can be expected to shape the Iranian citizenship with distancing itself from the West and emphasizing the native values. Another observation about the Constitutional Revolution is that different ethnic and religious groups enthusiastically took part in the struggle. The idea of Iranian national identity as an umbrella over the ethnic identities was apparent. The Pahlavi regime challenged the xenophobic and umbrella-identity characteristics of Iranian nationality. However, these two features of the early Iranian identity survived and appeared again after the Reza Shah era. The idea of Iranian as an umbrella identity over the ethnic groups can be expected to have marked the Iranian citizenship more with land based features rather than ethnic.

3.3 Reza Pahlavi (1921-1941)

Following the withdrawal of the Russian army from the north provinces, towards the end of the First World War, Iran experienced a rise of provincial political movements. These provincial movements were mainly a result of the lack of a powerful centralized government. The movement of Jangalis led by Kuchik Khan in the Gilan region, the Azerbaijanis Democrat Party established by Khihabani, unification of the Iran Communist Party with the Jangali movement and the establishment of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Iran (Gilan Republic) were the prominent events of this period. Prior to the rise of Reza Khan with a coup in 1921, the political scene in Iran can best be described as disintegration and external domination. This situation raised the centralist sentiments among the Tehran politicians. Therefore, Reza Khan's consolidation of power and rise to the throne was supported by an alliance of wide range of political groups existing in and outside the Fourth and Fifth national assemblies.

After the First World War, when the central government was ineffective and under almost total British control, "Khiabani and his fellow Democrats returned to their province and established the Azerbaijan Democratic Party" (Ghods, 1989: 57). In April 1920, Azerbaijan Democrat Party

---

[41] The Persian nationalists in Tabriz "incited Isma'il Aqa, called Simko, a Kurdish chief, to raise his men against the Christians, to assassinate the Christian patriarch, and to unleash a veritable civil war…The Christian populations, abandoned to themselves despite British promises, owed their salvation to an improvised and murderous population exodus toward Hamadan and Baghdad where, however, fewer than half of the 75,000 refugees arrived alive. For those who remained, massacres only stopped in June, 1919" (Keddie, 1999: 69).

captured the control in the Azerbaijan province. However, the divisions within the party leaders, the lack of support from the masses, and the ethnic animosity between the Kurds and Azerbaijanis resulted in the weakness of the movement. The Cossack forces of the central government, reinforced with the Simko-led Kurds and the Shahsavan tribes, could easily suppress the movement and shot Khiabani in September 1920 (Ghods, 1989: 58).

The Russian armies in the northern regions of Iran were withdrawn, leaving the Jangalis – who fought against the Russian armies – as the main force in the Gilan region. In June 1920 the Justice Party adopted the title of Communist Party of Iran in a congress held in Enzeli (in the western coast of the Caspian Sea). At the end of the congress, the Communist Party united with the Jangalis of Gilan and they announced the formation of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Iran (Gilan Republic) in Rasht (Abrahamian, 1982: 115-116). In the last days of July 1920 the Communist Party members and the leftists in the Jangali movement, "staged a coup d'état…to overthrow Kuchik's [the Jangali leader] government and capture state power" (Ghods, 1989: 79). However, the radicalism and Azeri-Kurdish domination in the new government alienated the Gilani population (Ghods, 1989: 80). In October 1920, the Communist Party elected Haydar Khan as the secretary. The party changed to its former name of Justice, "thus adopting the name it had had before the open rift with Kuchik" (Ghods, 1989: 84). The Red Army encouraged the Gilani forces to capture the power in Iran. In the end of 1920 the soviet government in Gilan "was preparing to march into Tehran with its guerilla force of some 1,500 Jangalis, Kurds, Armenians, and Azerbaijanis" (Abrahamian, 1982: 115-116).

During the years of Gilan Republic the ethnic tensions, especially between the non-Gilani leaders and the Gilani population, remained as an obstacle to gain a social base. The Azeris, Kurds, and the Caucasians were not welcomed by the Gilani population (Ghods, 1989: 90-91). The rifts between the leaders resulted in expulsion of a group led by Ehsanollah in August 1921, who marched Tehran with 3,000 troops without the permission of the Gilan government. The troops were easily destroyed by the forces of Tehran Government under the control of Reza Khan. It was a severe disaster for the Gilan movement. Added to this was the dispute between Haydar and Kuchik Khans. On September 1921 Kuchik's rightist forces among the Jangalis killed Haydar Khan and performed a "*coup d'état*, destroyed the Communist headquarters in Rasht, and, after heavy fighting, occupied the Gilani capital. Meanwhile, conservative Shahsavan tribesmen implemented the *fatwa* that had been declared against the Gilan Soviet. They fought all of the factions in the Gilan Republic" (Ghods, 1989: 89). In this way, the Gilani Republic ended.

Prior to the rise of Reza Khan there were four political groups: "the conservatives of the misnamed Reformers' party…; the reformers of the Revival party…; the radicals of the Socialist party…; and the revolutionaries of the Communist party" (Abrahamian, 1982: 120). The majority Revival Party and the Socialist Party were mainly composed of the former Democrats. These Democrats in the Majlis were divided into two factions after the 1919 Anglo-Iranian Agreement

and the repression of the provincial revolts of 1919-1921. The faction of "organizationalists" sided with the state and supported the idea of a strong central administration to overcome the danger of disintegration. The faction of "anti-organizationalists", on the other hand, opposed to the Anglo-Iranian agreement and was in support of the provincial rebels. Seemingly, it was the dominance of the organizationalists that resulted in the centralist policies of the Revival party and its early support for Reza Khan. (Abrahamian, 1982: 123)

The support for a centralized state, repression of ethnic identities, and secularization were reflected in many publications close to the organizationalist Democrats. *Iranshahr*, was writing about the "harmful consequences of ethnicity" and arguing to "eliminate local sects, local dialects, local clothes, local customs, and local sentiments"; relating the origin of Iran's backwardness to the "Arab Muslim invasion of the seventeenth century" and arguing to free the country "from the shackles of the superstitious and reactionary clergy"; and praising the "creative abilities of Iran's talented Aryan population" and "the 'civilized' Zoroastrian population of ancient Iran". *Farangistan* was arguing that Iran "needed a 'revolutionary dictator' who would forcibly liberate the ignorant masses from the clutches of the superstitious clergy". It was written: "our only hope is a Mussolini who can break the influence of the traditional authorities…and thus create…a modern nation." *Ayandeh* was in support of "a centralized state and unified national identity", "removing the traditional differences", and "teach[ing] Persian and Iranian history to the masses". Among the academic circles, the Azerbaijani historian Kasravi contributed to this trend with his article *Azeri: Ya Zaban-i Bastan-i Azerbaijan* (Azeri: Or the Ancient Language of Azerbaijan), and argued that Azeri, being "the original Aryan tongue of his native province, had been destroyed by the Turkic invasions" (Abrahamian, 1982: 124-126). Kasravi advocated for national solidarity against the separatist sentiments among the Kurdish and Azerbaijani minorities (Ghods, 1989: 124-125).

Reza Khan was the head of the Cossack Brigade in Qazvin, when he marched on Tehran for a coup with his three thousand men on February 21, 1921.[42,43] After the coup, the Shah appointed Reza Khan as the Sardar Sepah (Army Commander). Sayyid Ziya, the initiator of the coup, was appointed as the prime minister. The same year, "fearing unpopularity", Reza Khan "arrested and exiled" the pro-British Sayyid Ziya (Banani, 1961: 40).

After he was in the cabinet as the Army Commander in 1921, Reza Khan consolidated his power over the military. His accomplishments to reorganize the army and success of suppressing the Jangali armed guerillas of Kuchik Khan in Gilan reinforced his position. In the late 1921

---

[42] "Before setting out, he probably consulted to British officers in Qazvin and obtained from them ammunition, supplies, and pay for his troops. Reaching the outskirts of Tehran, he secretly met junior officers from the gendarmerie and a young journalist named Sayyid Ziya Tabatabai [who would prove to be a prominent British supporter in future politics]… Having won the support of the gendarmerie officers and the British military advisers, Reza Khan marched into Tehran on the night of February 21, arrested some sixty prominent politicians, assured the Shah that the coup d'état was designed to save the monarchy from revolution, and requested the appointment of Sayyid Ziya as prime minister" (Abrahamian, 1982: 117-118).
[43] Keddie notes that, despite the visible support of British elements to the coup, "the British Foreign Office was not involved, and local Britons who were involved did not plan the coup scenario that in fact occurred. Despite the indirect help…and possible additional relations with Sayyed Zia, the new government's policies were not controlled by the British" (Keddie, 1999: 80).

another revolt broke out among the Khorasan gendarmerie forces under the leadership of the democrat nationalist Mohammad Taqi Khan Pesyan. This revolt was also suppressed by Reza Khan's forces. In Tabriz, again a gendarmerie leader, the leftist Kurdish Major Lahuti, revolted with some followers of Khiabani. This Tabriz revolt was suppressed in February 1922. A few months later the Kurdish leader Simko revolted, again suppressed by Reza Khan's forces. Reza Khan also performed military campaigns against the tribes, Bakhtiyari and Lurs in the south and Shahsevan and Turkomans in the north. All these military actions added to the fame of Reza Khan as a strong centralizing leader. "Reza's work to create a strong modern national army and his successful campaigns against political and tribal autonomy brought a unification to Iran unknown under the Qajars or previously" (Keddie, 1999: 84).

As the Minister of War, Reza Khan dissolved the independent units in the army in 1921. He therefore, was the first to create a standing centralized national army in Iranian history. Banani (1961: 54) notes that "[i]t was the newly generated power of this army that elevated Reza Shah to the throne". He became prime minister in October, 1923. With the support behind and "manipulation of the elections", Reza Khan maintained a Fifth Majlis of Iran, which "passed his extensive reform program" (Keddie, 1999: 85). "It passed the compulsory military service bill, abolished aristocratic titles, obliged all citizens to have birth certificates and family names, approved a tax bill devoting new taxes from tea and sugar and an income tax to a proposed trans Iranian railroad, and instituted a uniform metric system and a solar calendar dating from Mohammad's hijra" (Keddie, 1999: 85). He also consolidated the national police during his premiership (Cottam, 1964: 20). In 1925, Reza Khan was powerful enough to end the Qajar Dynasty. After four months in 1926 he crowned himself as the Shah-in-Shah of Iran (Abrahamian, 1982: 119-120).

In the time of his reign, Reza Shah had absolute power over the politics. Abrahamian states that in the preceding twenty years "independent politicians had campaigned in the cities and rural magnates had herded their retainers into the voting poles", but during the next sixteen years Reza Pahlavi determined the outcome of all elections. Consequently, during the rule of Reza Shah, the national assembly lost its meaning just to perform a "ceremonial function" (Abrahamian, 1982: 138). Reza Shah also avoided any kind of political opposition by resorting to police repression, closing down independent newspapers, and banning or destroying political parties (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 41; Wilber, 1981: 127). The conservative Reformer's party was banned; the Socialist Party's leader was forced into retirement and its clubs were burned, resulting in the dissolution of the party; the Communist Party was subjected to severe police repression; the Revival Party was replaced first by the New Iran Party, then by the Progressive Party, and even this "subservient" party was banned in 1932 with the claim that "it promoted dangerous republican sentiments". Prominent political figures such as Mudarres, Mossadeq, and Pirniya were "deprived of the Majlis seats and denied any part in public life" (Ghods, 1989: 100). The independence of the Majlis was already

destroyed as early as 1928, and in 1933 almost all sources of opposition from the cabinet were eliminated (Upton, 1970: 58). With all these Reza Shah was preparing the political arena for his extensive reforms "to rebuild Iran…in his own image of the West. His means for attaining this…aim were secularism, antitribalism, nationalism, educational development, and state capitalism" (Abrahamian, 1982: 140).

The policies of Reza Shah were based on "a complete dedication to the cult of nationalism-statism; a desire to assert this nationalism by rapid adoption of the material advances of the West; and a breakdown of the traditional power of religion and a growing tendency toward secularism" (Banani, 1961: 45). While advocating a modernization in Western lines, Reza Shah sought for ideological elements from the own pre-Islamic history of Iran to legitimize and enforce his policies. He idolized the glories of the pre-Islamic Persian Empires (Banani, 1961: 46). In 1934 the name of the country was changed from Persia to Iran, "signifying the primordial Aryan origin of the nation" (Ashraf, 2006). "[W]hile the latter name was associated with recent Qajar decadence and referred to the province of Fars only, the former invoked ancient glory and signified the birthplace of the Aryan race" (Abrahamian, 1982: 143). "The name Persia was itself an invention of the Greeks"; it originally referred to the region of Pars (in Arabic Fars) where the Achaemenid dynasty seated; and in the modern ages it was used only in foreign languages (Asgharzadeh, 2007: 123). The term Iran was historically used by the kingdoms to refer to the land by recognizing the "differences and diversity" of its people (Asgharzadeh, 2007: 122; Ashraf, 2006). In Reza Shah's conception, on the other hand, the term Iran meant "the birthplace of the Aryan race" and reinforced the idea of one state and one nation (Asgharzadeh, 2007: 123). The change in the name of the country by Reza Shah was a part of the attempt to associate the Iranian identity with the Persian ethnicity.

Banani mentions a difference between the early nationalism in Iran and the one promoted by the regime of Reza Shah. The former nationalism was intervened with religious sentiments. The Constitution of 1906, for example, maintained many Islamic restrictions on the enacted laws. The employees to most of the state positions were required to be Muslims (Banani, 1961: 21). These resulted in the popularity of the nationalism that paved way to the Constitutional Revolution. The nationalism of Reza Shah, on the other hand, was very much secular and based on "the concept of an omnipotent state", rather than a popular support of the masses (Banani, 1961: 146). Secular and European origins were not appealing to the Iranian masses. Therefore, the Shah used the pre-Islamic history of Iran to "hide the European origin of many of measures undertaken. There were frequent appeals to the imperial grandeur and achievements of ancient Iran" (Keddie, 1999: 87). Apart from this ideological maneuver, the Pahlavi regime enforced a "brutal iron cage of modernity to Iran" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 61).

Under the autocratic regime, the intellectuals were "[f]orced to choose between liberalism and nationalism" (Cottam, 1964: 256). Nationalism corresponded to the authoritative rule of the Shah and accepting the state regulations without any opposition. Many of the intellectuals chose

liberalism, and sided with traditional groups (feudal, royalist, tribal, and clerical) – against which they had previously fought for modern, secular, and liberal reforms – in order to oppose Reza Shah's policies. "Reza Shah's modernization programs did not contribute to the political legitimacy of his regime" (Ghods, 1989: 7). His suppressive-secular policies resulted in hatred among the traditional middle-classes. The support he gained from the modern middle classes was challenged by the unfavorable Anglo-Iranian Oil agreement signed in 1930s, by his willing to increase the dynastic wealth, by his autocratic regime, and by the inflation caused by his military expenditures (Abrahamian, 1982: 153). The younger generation regarded him as "not a patriot but a Cossack trained by the Tsarists and brought to power by the British; not a nation builder but a self-seeking founder of a new dynasty; and not a genuine reformer challenging the traditional forces but an autocrat strengthening the conservative landed classes" (Abrahamian, 1982: 154). As a result the early support for Reza Shah from almost all political circles deteriorated and he was quite unpopular towards the last years of his rule.

As Parsi observes, the peasantry did not play a role in shaping the Iranian nationalism promoted by the Shah. While the peasantry in Turkey had a paradoxical but significant role, as both the carrier of the elements of genuine Turkish identity and as the 'other' of the modernist regulations, the nationalism in Iran was "exclusively urban" (Parsi, 2000: 123). Peasantry in Iran was neither a source of inspiration nor the 'other' to be manipulated. It was not the peasantry per se but the tribal life that was coded as the 'other' by the national discourse. Especially their socio-political independence and being out of the control of the central state were the concerns to contribute to this 'otherness'. After 1930 the state aimed at disarming the tribes and settling them on the sites where housing were provided (Wilber, 1981: 166). A number of the tribal revolts against the centralization attempts of the state were severely suppressed. The settlement of the tribes and the increase in the security in the rural areas freed the peasants "from the pillaging, raping, and destruction of brigands and tribesmen" (Upton, 1970: 70). The measures of Reza Shah put the tribes-people under much worse social and economic conditions than what they had before (Keddie, 1999: 88). The peasants of Iran, as Upton (1970: 70) states, admired Reza Shah almost to the end of his rule.[44]

A strong opposition to Reza Shah came from the traditional middle classes mainly composed of the ulama and the bazaaris. The economic deteriorations and the suppressive secular reforms were the underlying policies that mobilized these against the regime. Reza Shah's secularization regulations decreased the traditional power of the clergy in the Iranian society. Especially after the law of 1932, with which the task of registration of legal documents was transformed from the Shari'a courts to the secular, many of the clergy lost their jobs and sought for secular employment (Ghods, 1989: 105). "The bureaucratic capitalism of Reza Shah weakened the position of Bazaaris

---

[44] A similar situation of political closeness between peasants and urban population aginst the tribal population is observed by Anderson in Tunisia and Libya (Anderson, 1986: 44-42).

and prevented them from emerging as a strong class… The bazaaris…were kept out of the industrialization efforts". Besides, the "power of the tribal khans and the landlords was broken" with the rising state capitalism in the expense of the traditional socio-economic formations (Amjad, 1989: 21). Abrahamian notes two upheavals. The first one was in 1926-1927, when Reza Khan intended to establish a republic. The protestors were successful, since Reza Khan responded with the proclamation of the Pahlavi dynasty instead of establishing a republic. The second mass protest came in 1935-1936. This upheaval was against the prohibition of veiling of women and introduction of the "international hat". The state harshly repressed this protest, causing the death of "over one hundred, including many women and children" (Abrahamian, 1982: 152).

Reza Shah's policies of educational reforms, industrialization, and expansion of state bureaucracy enlarged the wage earners in general, and intelligentsia in particular (Abrahamian, 1982: 146). For the bourgeoisie "[o]btaining or administering government monopolies or large contracts became a means of economic and social advancement". For the middle class, on the other hand, "[t]he junior officer ranks of the army, the university and colleges, and the various branches of the government bureaucracy were…channels for upward social and economic mobility" (Ghods, 1989: 112). In this way, the state of Reza Shah created its own bourgeoisie and middle class in the economic terms. However, the policies of Reza Shah did not create a similar dependence of the same classes on the state in the ideological and political terms.

Regarding the rule of Reza Shah, Abrahamian states that "[f]or the first time since the Safavids, the state was able to control society through extensive instruments of administration, regulation, and domination… He successfully implemented many of the innovations that had been unsuccessfully proposed during the previous century" (Abrahamian, 1982: 136).[45] It is true that Reza Shah managed to establish a "modern state bureaucracy" that would underlie the modern Iranian state in the twentieth century (Abrahamian, 1982: 137). However, this process was accompanied, reshaped and most of the time weakened by the opposition of intellectuals, severe mass protests, and tribal uprisings.

According to Abrahamian what was missing behind all the modernization attempts, and in fact what underlay the failure of Reza Shah's rule, was that "he had no viable class bases" (Abrahamian, 1982: 149). The development proposed by the regime excluded the "key societal groups" of the traditional Iranian society, namely the clergy and bazaaris (Kamali, 1998: 232). Besides being unable to gain the favor of the existing classes or creating a new social basis, the policies of Reza Shah further antagonized his early supporters of centralists and reformers

---

[45] "In 1925 an extensive commercial code was enacted by Parliament, followed in 1926 by a criminal code, and in 1928 by a civil code of some nine hundred articles. These three basic codes established the new legal system, while certain other laws were aimed at the 'modernization' of Iran. A law of 1928 abolished the so-called 'capitulations', which up to that time have given foreigners resident in Iran some immunity from arrest as well as the right of trial by their own consular representatives. Laws passed in 1932 and 1935 established the legal ages for marriage and enhanced the divorce and property rights of women. Laws of 1928 and 1935 did away with the ancient Persian costume and made western clothing and headgear compulsory, and the use of honorary titles, another holdover from the autocratic past, was abolished in 1935." (Wilber, 1981: 260)

(Abrahamian, 1982: 149). Ghods mentions the "atmosphere of insecurity" created by his policies as the reason of this loss of support (Ghods, 1989: 110). Abrahamian states, the Pahlavi state "failed to cement its institutions of coercion into the class structure" (Abrahamian, 1982: 149).

> Whereas Mustafa Kemal conscientiously channeled the enthusiastic backing of the intelligentsia into the Republican party, Reza Shah gradually lost his initial civilian support, and, failing to secure social foundations for his institutions, ruled without the assistance of an organized political party. Thus whereas Mustafa Kemal's authority rested firmly on Turkey's intelligentsia, Reza Shah's state however somewhat precariously, without class foundations, over Iran's society (Abrahamian, 1982: 148-149).

Reza Shah could not create a class base support for his regime, but managed to create the middle class of Iran, which would be the backbone of the Iranian nationalism in the coming decades. Not his regime, but Iranian nationalism had gained a popular base of support due to his policies (Cottam, 1964: 99-100; Kamali, 1998: 224).

The beginning of the era of Reza Shah was marked by a call of the nationalists for a strong central state as a reaction to the disintegrative powers. Reza Shah ruled the land and performed modernizations in an authoritative way. His state harshly treated the tribal populations. His policies contributed to the coercive characteristics of the Iranian state. The ulama and traditional forces successfully opposed his attempt to found a secular republic. Therefore his modernization in the Western style did not lead to a success in comparison to that in Turkey. His repressive and authoritative policies antagonized the intellectuals. Therefore, his policies did not maintain an ideology that would gain the consent of the masses. The consequence was that the centralization and modernization attempts of Reza Shah did not make the state a strong element of Iranian citizenship as it was the case in Turkey with the modernizations by the Kemalist regime.

3.4 Ethnic Suppression under the Rule of Reza Shah

The Pahlavi regime perceived the tribal populations and the ethnic minorities as the main obstacles for its project of nationalization.[46] The "tribal groups and affiliation were a major focus" to be eliminated "to create his image of a modern nation-state" (Beck, 1990: 206). The homogenization process for the Pahlavi regime aimed at, first, disarmament and settlement of the tribal population and, second, imposition of the Persian ethnicity over the ethnic minorities. The settlement of the tribal populations was considered to be a step towards civilization. Elimination of the tribal identities and tribal life style was a major part of the modernization under Reza Shah. The attempt of Persianization affected especially the Azerbaijani and Kurdish populations. The policies of Reza Shah resulted in emergence of nationalist ideas and autonomous movements among these ethnic groups.

---

[46] Cottam mentions the tribes, the regional (ethnic) groups and religious minorities were the "nonnational elements" in Iran for the Pahlavie regime (Cottam, 1964: 8). Upton, as well, considers these as sources of social customs "contributing to national disunity" from the point of view of the regime (Upton, 1970: 29).

Tribes played an important role in Iranian political history. Many of the dynasties established on the land of Iran sprang from the tribes which managed to capture the power from the preceding dynasty (Wilber, 1981: 118).[47] Throughout these dynasties the Iranian army relied heavily on the tribal cavalry (Amjad, 1989: 13). Despite their political-military influence, however, the tribes in Iran were in conflict with the sedentary population. Wilber states that "[a] persistent division within the Persian community was between the tribal nomads and the settled people". This was because "the tribes won a part of their livelihood from raiding the trade routes and villages, even attacking and capturing towns" (Wilber, 1981: 118), and therefore they "disrupted normal life and production" (Amjad, 1989: 13). This situation of the tribes persisted throughout the Qajar Empire and came to an end only with Reza Shah's repressive policies of forced settlement and establishment of a standing army which did not rely on tribal cavalry (Amjad, 1989: 13). Among the many tribal groups in the late nineteenth century the Qajars, Qashqayis, and Bakhtiyaris were the most important since they had their "own central authority in the form of an ilkhan", recognized by the state (Abrahamian, 1982: 20).

In the turn of the century about one-third to one-half of the Iranian population is estimated to be tribal (Keddie, 1999: 10; Bayat, 2003: 213). The tribes in Iran were important for the Qajar Shahs as a source of cavalry for the army. Reza Shah also relied on the tribal cavalry in the early phases of his rule. Since he needed the tribal cavalry for the army, in the beginning, he made use of the disputes between the different tribes in order to break their power (Beck, 1990: 206). He supported one against another in their conflicts.

Reza Shah regarded the tribes as an obstacle for his intentions of a centralized government and modern state. Cottam mentions that eliminating the tribal forces was not only an ambition of Reza Shah himself but also of all nationalists of the time. He writes "probably no single aspect of the program of Reza Shah had more appeal for nationalists than his policy of disciplining the tribes" (Cottam, 1964: 59). "For the new regime and for the nationalist elite which supported it, the suppression of the tribes was an indispensable element of their larger project: the construction of a modern, centralized state with a culturally homogeneous population" (Cronin, 2003b: 241). Even the ones who opposed to Reza Shah's dictatorship, such as Mudearres and Mossadeq, "applauded this policy as a major contribution to the nation's internal security" (Ghods, 1989: 98). The measures of Reza Shah against the tribes resulted in "a number of tribal revolts which were severely repressed" (Wilber, 1981: 166).

Reza Shah aimed to eliminate the tribes by disarmament, forced settlement, and killing, imprisoning, and removal of their leaders (Beck, 1990: 206). Conscription was also effective to diminish the power of tribal forces (Upton, 1970: 79). The disarmament started when Reza Khan

---

[47] "Such dynasties as the Seljuq, Afshar, Zand, and Qajar sprang directly from leaders of tribal groups, while others, such as the Safavid, came to power through tribal support. Then, as late as 1906 tribal forces influenced the course of political development of Tehran." (Wilber, 1981: 118)

was the Minister of War. This was the first stage of his tribal policy (Tapper, 2003: 223). This first stage was supported by the urban segments of the society. Disarming the tribes meant bringing the order of the centre to the countryside. At the end of this first stage "[h]e had removed the political danger he felt to be inherent in tribal leadership and autonomy, by imprisoning, executing, exiling or otherwise incapacitating many of the more-powerful chiefs, abolishing their titles and offices and confiscating their landed properties or exchanging them for others in remote parts of the country" (Tapper, 2003: 225).

The attempt of disarmament, however, resulted in uprisings of the nomadic people. These rebels were on a scale to threaten the overall state apparatus. The 1929 marked the beginning of the tribal revolts. "One by one, the tribal areas of western, southern, central and south-eastern Iran erupted into rebellion, the south almost slipping out of government control altogether" (Cronin, 2003b: 262).[48] "The tribal revolts began in January with a serious outbreak in Kurdistan, in the early summer the province of Fars descended into turmoil as first the Qashqa'i and then the Khamsah rose up, and by early July there were signs of impending trouble in Bakhtiyari" (Cronin, 2003b: 262). The state resorted to coercion against the resistance. A lot of tribal people were killed during their confrontation with the state powers. Many of the tribal leaders were executed, arrested or forced to leave the land (Cronin, 2004: 155).

After disarming the tribes and eliminating their leaders from the political scene, Reza Shah started his second stage of tribal policy in the 1930s, the enforced settlement of the nomadic people in villages (Tapper, 2003: 225). However, settlement was not performed with a well planned program. The statesmen viewed the tribal people as being backward and they aimed at eliminating anything related to their tribal life. They were motivated to act with hatred, rather than to provide them with better life conditions.

> By the late 1920s hardly any trace had been left of nomadic rebellion and brigandry, and, moreover, the nomads had been largely disarmed. It was precisely after such pacification that extreme force was used to break up tribes and 'settle' them in strange environments, which often led to large-scale deaths in the process. Those in charge of such operations looked upon the nomads almost in the same way that many American whites viewed native Americans in the nineteenth century (Katouzian, 2004: 31).

Reza Shah used his modern army in suppressing the tribal forces. The usage of "the armored car and the airplane" was crucial in crushing the tribal resistance (Banani, 1961: 41, 56). The military acts were brutal, "with considerable losses on both sides" (Upton, 1970: 80). "Examples of the sadistic methods of terrorizing whole tribes are only too common" (Cottam, 1964: 61-62).

---

[48] Cronin cites the causes of these rebels as "the attempts made by the government to disarm them,…the ever-increasing taxes they were forced to pay,…the new dress law,…the growing reach of the conscription commissions, and the imposition of the census registration which was their preliminary,…the frequent replacement of their own leaders by military officers,… the establishment of new government monopolies on commodities such as opium and tobacco and…the activities of the Department for the Registration of Title Deeds" and adds the "rumors of forced sedentarization" as a factor that motivated the tribal people to rebel.

"Martial law was established in the areas and the tribesmen were subject to more or less systematic pillaging and oppression" (Upton, 1970: 80). The ones forced for settlement were also harshly hit, because there was no program to prepare for the new settled life; the villages they were forced to settle were not guaranteed to be self-sustaining. "His policy resulted in terrible suffering and the pauperization of the tribes" (Cottam, 1964: 61-62).

> This program of forced sedentarization, which was carried out in Luristan, Fars, Azerbaijan and Khurasan during the years 1933 to 1937, took a very brutal and, in some cases, a genocidal form. In a short period of time the tribal life of Iran was transformed, but this transformation did not come about through the adoption of an idyllic agricultural way of life, as it was initially conceived, but through coercive and violent methods that virtually wiped out a large segment of the tribal population of Iran (Bayat, 2003: 217).

The settlement policy of Reza Shah did not find support, as in the first stage of his tribal policy. Reza Shah "has received considerable notoriety – largely justified – as a brutal failure" (Tapper, 2003: 225). Reza Shah also pursued a harsh assimilation towards the tribes as he "embarked on wide-reaching policies of Persianization through education, bureaucratization, conscription, and changes in language and dress" (Beck, 1990: 196).

The Qajar Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was marked by mass protests (Tabacco Movement) and civil war (Constitutional Revolution), which can be considered as the "rebellions of the society (*mellat*) against the state (*dowlat*)" (Katouzian, 2004: 13). In this period there appeared no movement that can be named as ethnic. In the time of the Qajars the ethnic identity was not a political issue. Till the mid-nineteenth century, there was even no Azerbaijanis identity in Qajar Iran. The people of Azerbaijan till this period identified themselves as Turks or Muslims (Shaffer, 2008: 52). "The border lines between the identities of Turkic-Azerbaijanis, Iranian or Muslim were not clear and the Azerbaijanis rarely identified themselves as 'Azerbaijani'" (Shaffer, 2008: 17). The idea of an Azerbaijani identity emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century with a more cultural content than political (Shaffer, 2008: 53). Therefore, the people of Azerbaijan could associate themselves with the state and land of Iran in an upper level than their locally ethnic identity (Shaffer, 2008: 26-27). There was no conflict in associating oneself with the Iranian state and the Turkic-Azerbaijanis culture at the same time. Shi'a Islam reinforced the relations between the Azerbaijanis and Persians and bound them together under the Shi'a state (Shaffer, 2008: 53; Zirinsky, 2003: 94).

Atabaki states that "[i]n late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century political discourse in Iran, there is no trace of such ethnic identification. With no reference to their ethnic background, the Qajar rulers were often blamed for advancing a tyrannical rule in Iran and for hindering the necessary political change in the country" (Atabaki, 2004: 55-56). Furthermore, in this period there was no demand for regional autonomy in any part of Iran. "During the events of the Constitutional Revolution of 1905-9, there was no trace of aspirations for regional autonomy among the

Constitutionalists" (Atabaki, 2000: 27). All centers of power struggling against the state, whether Persian, Azerbaijanis, Armenian or tribal, were aiming at a central state in which the rule of law, instead of the arbitrary rule of the Qajar Shahs, was in order (Atabaki, 2000: 27).

The Constitution of 1906 declared after the Constitutional Revolution of Iran recognized the provincial identities and accepted the establishment of local governing bodies, named as Anjomans (Councils). This was mainly due to the contribution of such councils to the Constitutional Revolution against the powers of the Shah. The electoral law passed in the First Majlis, allowed for a greater number of representatives from the provinces in the Second Majlis (Atabaki, 2000: 35). In this Second Majlis, "[t]he parliamentary group of Democrats consisted of some twenty-seven members, twelve of whom were Azerbaijanis" (Atabaki, 2000: 36). The Democrats in the Second Majlis did not conceive Iran as composed of different ethnic groups. Khiabani, the leader of the Azerbaijanis Autonomous Movement in the 1920s, was a member of the Democrats. In June 1920, when Khiabani declared the Autonomous Government of Azerbaijan, he used the name of *Milli Hukumet* (National Government). As Atabaki stresses, the term *Milli* (National) here, did not mean the Azerbaijani nation: "*Melli Hukumat*, as employed to describe the newly set up local government of Azerbaijan, was never intended to convey the meaning of an independent Azerbaijani nation-state" (Atabaki, 2000: 49). In many occasions Khiabani used the term *Milli* to refer to the people of Iran, rather than a specific ethnicity.

After the repression of the provincial movements in the 1920s, Reza Shah started a strong centralization and Persianization policy. The ethnic minorities were subject to cultural repression and discrimination. The Persian language was associated with the "cultural heritage, rich in content and experience, expressed particularly in poetry" (Upton, 1970: 29). Persian Language Academy (*Farhangestan*) was founded in 1935 with the aim of purification of the Persian language, especially from the Arabic words (Perry, 1985). The language of Persian was used to impose Persian chauvinism. Reza Shah associated the Iranian state and identity with the Persian people and Persian language. "Not only was Persian now the national language of Iran, but all the other ethnic languages in the country were banned. It was not permitted to publish books and newspapers in any language other than Persian" (Atabaki, 2000: 58). In this way the identity of the state was equated to the identity of the largest ethnic group in Iran. The regime aimed to "assimilate ethnic minorities" into Persian (Moghaddam and Crystal, 1997). Ghods states, in the Reza Shah era, "education, publication, or even public speech in their native languages – Assyrian and Armenian as well as Azeri and Kurdish – was forbidden" (Ghods, 1989: 107). The schools giving education in the provincial languages were closed down. Many places in Azerbaijan and other regions were renamed with Persian words (Asgharzadeh, 2007: 124). The statesmen avoided the children to be given non-Persian names. These policies of the Pahlavi regime paved the way for the development of the Azerbaijani ethnic identity (Shaffer, 2008: 56).

The attempt of unification around the Persian language was considered by the minorities as an attack on their ethnic identity. The Kurds were denied of their ethnic difference by being "referred to, not as Kurds, but as 'mountain Iranians'"(Ghods, 1989: 108). These measures underlay the autonomous movements in the Azerbaijani and Kurdish regions after the abdication of Reza Shah. Ghods states, "[t]he more Reza Shah tried to implement his traditional brand of nationalism by Persianizing Iranian culture, the more he made the Azeris and Kurds conscious of their own ethnic distinctness". Reza Shah's stress on the political continuity with the glorious ancient Persian Empire, "not only failed to achieve the political assimilation of ethnic minorities, it actually alienated them and promoted their ethnic consciousness" (Ghods, 1989: 7). It should be remembered that, neither the Azerbaijan Democrat Party nor the Gilan Movement in the 1920s had been established with autonomous or separatist inclinations. Therefore, it can be argued that the Persianization policies of Reza Shah created the inclination of ethnic minorities towards autonomous movements that arose in the political turmoil following the Second World War.

The policies of Reza Shah towards the Azerbaijani province were not limited to restriction of the language and ethnic symbols. The economic policies as well were aimed to punish the region for the rebel of its people against the central power in the 1920s. Reza Shah transferred the right to collect taxes from the provincial powers to the state agents appointed by the Tehran government. His economic policies aimed to diminish the local economic power of the provinces (Cottam, 1964: 98-99). From the time of Qajars till 1937, the land of Azerbaijan was ruled as a separate administrative province. In 1937 it was divided into two provinces and one of them was united with parts from the former Kurdistan province. In the time of Reza Shah the Azerbaijani region received a limited portion from the national revenue, because much of the resources were spared for the centre. The trade with the Soviet Azerbaijan was restricted by the government (Shaffer, 2008: 56-57). All these measures resulted in the decline of economy in the Azerbaijani regions and caused an increased resentment of the Azerbaijanis towards the Pahlavi regime.

The disarmament and settlement of tribal populations caused severe uprising that the state could hardly repress. The inhumanly attitude of the state towards the tribal people caused Reza Shah to lose prestige in the eyes of the liberal intellectuals. The assimilation policies into the Persian ethnic culture caused the resentment of ethnic minorities. The policies of the state in the era of Reza Shah repressed the umbrella characteristic of Iranian citizenship as was initiated in the period of the Constitutional Revolution. However, the years following the abdication of Reza Shah proved that these were only repressed in his era but not eliminated from the Iranian society.

3.5 Azerbaijan and Kurdish Autonomous Movements (1945-1946)

It was mentioned before that there was no idea of nationalism in the Iranian society in the early nineteenth century. It was also mentioned that in this period the people of Azerbaijan identified themselves as Turks or Muslims, rather than Azerbaijanis (Shaffer, 2008: 17, 52). There

was an understanding of differentiation of Turkish and Persian identities; however, as the ethnic affiliations did not play a significant role in this period, the people of Azerbaijan could easily identify themselves with the Iranian state. This did not mean that they identified with the Persian culture, but with an understanding of Iranian state which included both the Turkish and Persian culture and languages, as in the model of Safavid Empire (Shaffer, 2008: 52-53). The idea of an Azerbaijani identity emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century. The proponents of this idea perceived themselves as Azerbaijani Turks, rather than only Turks or Muslims, and considered the Turkish culture as an important element of the Azerbaijani culture (Shaffer, 2008: 27). Namely, the identity of Azerbaijani was emerging as something different than the identity of Turkish in the region of Azerbaijan. Especially after the nationalization policies of Reza Shah the people of Azerbaijan gained a consciousness of Azerbaijani identity. It is remarkable that the program of the Democrat Party of Azerbaijan, to be mentioned below, identified the people of Azerbaijan as the Nation of Azerbaijan and referred to their language as Azerbaijani Language, rather than Turkish or Turkic (Shaffer, 2008: 65). It is also interesting to observe that in the 1960s the short story writer and intellectual Samad Bahrengi, from Tabriz, insisted that his mother tongue should not be referred as 'Turkic' as the regime did, but as 'Azeri' (Shaffer, 2008: 69).

In the first year of the Second World War, in 1941, the Russian and British armies invaded Iran from the north and south, respectively. After the invasion, the prime minister was encouraging the Allies to dismiss Reza Shah. Three weeks later the Shah abdicated himself and crowned his son as the new Shah (Abrahamian, 1982: 164-165). The land entered into a political atmosphere of multi-party system. The five effective political centers in this period were "the court, the Majles, the cabinet, the foreign embassies, and the general public" (Abrahamian, 1982: 169). According to Abrahamian in this period the emergence of various parties was as a result of the "class antagonism" and "ethnic rivalries" exacerbated by the policies of Reza Shah. Reza Shah suppressed such class based and ethnic political affiliations, but could not eliminate them totally (Abrahamian, 1982: 171-172). Chehabi classifies the emergent political groups under the three main lines of the communist left, the conservatives, and the followers of the Nationalist Movement of Mossadeq. He regards the flourishing of political parties in this period as "the general revival of civil society" (Chehabi, 1990: 112).

In this period there appeared various newspapers and journals in the Azerbaijani language. The political groups from the provinces demanded for their right to provincial councils.

> "From the beginning of 1944, it was the common demand of almost every political gathering in the region that Constitutional Code be applied, especially Articles 90-93, which were concerned with the right of the provinces to have local assemblies. For the period between 1944 and 1945, there are reports describing fifteen political meetings or demonstrations which took place in the cities of Tabriz, Ardabil, Meshginshahr, Marand, Sarab and Urumiyeh, and at each of these meetings the demand was made for provincial councils" (Atabaki, 2000: 95).

The ethnic movements emerged in the Azeri, Kurdish, and Arabian regions. The strongest of them was the one in Azerbaijan. The movement in Azerbaijan demanded for usage of the Azeri language at schools and government offices. Opposing to the regulations of the Reza Shah era they raised that Azerbaijanis had never been Persian speakers and their official language and mother tongue were Azerbaijani (Abrahamian, 1982: 175-176). The Kurds held various meetings in which they voiced "their national aspirations", and discussed the failure to establish a unified Kurdish state promised by the Sevres Treaty in1920 (Ghods, 1989: 123). In the Kurdish areas "numerous small independent republics" emerged, which were the clear signs of inclination towards autonomy. The Arabs were also approaching the American government requesting their help for "liberation from the Iranian aggression" (Abrahamian, 1982: 175-176).

The invasion of Russian and British forces from the north and south, respectively, and the following pro-British, pro-American and pro-Soviet alliances created a difference in the political inclinations of the northern and southern regions of Iran. With the support of the Soviet Union the politicians of the north were inclined towards autonomy from the central government. The repressive policies of the Prime Minister Hakimi reinforced their inclination and paved the way for the provincial revolts. In September 1945 Pishevari founded the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan with people from the former Communist Party and Khiabani revolt of 1919-1920.

> Intentionally adopting the same name as Khiabani's organization, the party leaders expressed
> the desire to remain within Iran, but demanded three major reforms for Azerbaijan: the use of
> the Azerbaijani language in state schools and government offices; the retention of tax revenues
> for the development of the region; and the establishment of the provincial assemblies
> promised in the constitutional laws (Abrahamian, 1982: 217).

The People's Congress of Azerbaijan was held in Tabriz on November 20, 1945. The outcome was declaration of autonomy sent directly to the Tehran Government. In the declaration it was stated that "[t]he nation of Azerbaijan has no desire to separate itself from Iran or to harm the territorial integrity of Iran", however, "[t]he people of Azerbaijan [have] distinct national, linguistic, cultural, and traditional characteristics, [that] entitle Azerbaijan to freedom and autonomy, as promised to all nations by the Atlantic Charter" (Ghods, 1989: 141). In December 1945, the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan (Azerbaijan Democratic Party) announced the formation of the Autonomous Government of Azerbaijan (or Autonomous Republic of Azerbaijan) (Abrahamian, 1982: 221).

For about one year the Autonomous Government ruled in the region. In this period the emphasis on the Azerbaijani language and using the revenue of the province for its own expenses were among the most emphasized items. In the declarations of the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan "it was stated that the Azerbaijani language should be the sole language used for teaching during the first three years of primary school, after which time Persian was to be introduced as the 'state language'. Both languages were to be employed throughout higher education" (Atabaki, 2000:

103). The Party declared its constitution in October 1945. In this constitution "the Azerbaijanis are described as a particular *millet* (nation) like other nations living in Iran" (Atabaki, 2000: 109). The Azerbaijanis who had trade relations with Tehran and other regions were worried about the separatist tendencies of the Autonomous Government. Due to the isolation of the province from the other parts of Iran, the economy declined and the Autonomous government started to lose its popular support (Shaffer, 2008: 66).

After the establishment of the Autonomous Republic of Azerbaijan, the government of Pishevari immediately started social and economic reforms in the region. These reforms were successful to the extent that "more improvements were made in the city of Tabriz in one year of Democratic rule than in the twenty years under Reza Shah". Therefore, the regime "attracted significant support from the populace" (Cottam, 1964: 126). The Pishevari Government's promise for a land reform played a crucial role to attain the support of peasantry. However, towards the end of the first year this land reform was shelved, because the regime decided to attract the support of landowners, at least temporarily. This policy resulted in the alienation of the masses of lower classes from the regime (Cottam, 1964: 127).

Parallel to the movement in Azerbaijan, the Kurdish leader Qazi Mohammad and the nationalist party of Kumeleh had come to the idea that the support of a superpower was necessary to establish Kurdish independence. They decided for an alliance with the Soviet Union against the Tehran Government (Ghods, 1989: 142). Following the declaration of the Autonomous Republic of Azerbaijan, these Kurdish nationalists founded the Democrat Party of Kurdistan in Mahabad, with similar claims for their own region. In January 1946, under the leadership of Qazi, the Democrat Party of Kurdistan founded the Autonomous Kurdish Government. Ghods notes that, the cabinet of the Kurdish Government reflected the fragmented nature of the Kurdish population "with its family loyalties and rivalries, and illustrated the limited abilities of urban nationalists…to attain positions of power in this milieu" (Ghods, 1989: 163-164). Moreover, the chiefs of the Kurdish tribes that signed the proclamation "had little or no enthusiasm for the new Mahabad Republic", but they conformed "only at the insistence of the Soviet occupation forces" (Cottam, 1964: 72). Atabaki states "[i]n view of the deeply rooted tribal nature of the society in the region, the campaign for autonomy in Kurdistan was based more on ethno-tribal loyalties than a purely ethnic identity as in Azerbaijan" (Atabaki, 2000: 152).[49] Therefore, the Azerbaijani movement can be argued to have more significant impacts on the Iranian citizenship in comparison to the Autonomous Kurdish Movement.

Considering the Tehran political surroundings, the autonomous movements turned the existing "fears against the social danger" (communism) into "fears against the separation of the land". A strong nationalist and centralist sentiment peaked in the Tehran politics. The politicians,

---

[49] Zürcher notes that "[t]he denial of a Kurdish identity after 1928 in Iran echoes that in Turkey after 1926" (Zürcher, 2004: 110).

intelligentsia, and newspapers in Tehran reacted harshly to the separatist movements and called for the unity of the land. Kasravi, for example, stated, "[i]f similar claims are advanced by the other linguistic minorities – especially Armenians, Assyrians, Arabs, Gilanis, and Mazandaranis – nothing will be left of Iran". The newspaper *Ittila'at*, argued, "Turkish was not the native language of Azerbaijan but a foreign tongue imposed on the region by the Mongol and Tartar invaders… Common history, common religion, common racial origin, and common culture had made Azerbaijan an integral part of Iran" (Abrahamian, 1982: 218-219). It was only among the Tudeh members who had a positive attitude towards the autonomous movements. Ghassemi, a leading Tudeh intellectual, for example, was ready to recognize the right of the minorities to use their own languages. His preoccupation was that the repression of such rights by the government would reinforce the separatist sentiments and eventually lead to "the destruction of the state, as had happened in the Ottoman Empire" (Ghods, 1989: 126).

The Prime Minister Hakimi applied suppressive policies. These were not only against the autonomous movements in the north but also against the Tudeh Party and the street demonstrators in Tehran. The provincial movements that faced repressive policies in their start responded to these with firmer political steps. In fact, their proclamation of the autonomous governments was a reaction to those (Abrahamian, 1982: 221). Following the declaration of the autonomous government in Azerbaijan and Kurdistan the Tehran Government sent troops to suppress the movements. Their entrance to the regions was prevented by the Soviet troops (Ghods, 1989: 143). Therefore, Chehabi mentions, the autonomous movements could not go so far without the existence and support of the Soviet army in the north of Iran (Chehabi, 1990: 10).

Ghods notes that a military cooperation among the Tudeh, Azerbaijan and Kurdish Democrat Parties was not possible due to the existing "[r]acial, ideological, and personal differences among these organizations" (Ghods, 1989: 173). Tudeh was a party of Persian intellectuals; the Azerbaijan Democrat Party members were Soviet oriented Azerbaijanis; and the Kurdish Democrat Party included significant number of conservative tribal chiefs having historical enmity against the Russians (Ghods, 1989: 173; Cottam, 1964: 72). Moreover, throughout the repressive reign of Reza Shah the leaders of these movements lacked the chance to make open politics. Therefore they did not have the experience of politics to cooperate against the Tehran government (Ghods, 1989: 173). The cleavages were reinforced by the historical ethnic hostility between the Kurds and Azerbaijanis.[50]

The pro-Soviet Prime Minister Qavam's very first policy after coming to the rule was an alliance with the political left, even with the autonomous governments. In June 1946, he came to an

---

[50] Throughout the Qajar time the Kurds and Azerbaijanis were "reluctant to cooperate with one another in military campaigns and were hostile to other ethnic groups garrisoned in their provinces" (Ghods, 1989: 14-15). When a number of Kurdish tribes from Turkey invaded Azerbaijan in 1907, a strong anti-Kurdish sentiment had stemmed not only among the Tehran politicians but also the Azerbaijanis. The anti-Kurdish sentiment was related also to the fact that most of the Kurdish tribes in Iran were following the Sunni sect of Islam while the Iranians, including the Azerbaijanis, followed the Shi'a faith (Cottam, 1964: 69).

agreement with the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan. "According to the agreement, the central government recognized the 'National Government of Azerbaijan' as the Provincial Council of Azerbaijan; the 'National Assembly' as the Provincial Assembly; and the armed volunteers (*feda'is*) that had carried out the rebellion as the local security forces" (Abrahamian, 1982: 229-230). For the elections of the Fifteenth Majles Qavam announced that "the Democrats [his party] would form an electoral alliance for the forthcoming parliament not only with the Tudeh and Iran parties, but also with the Azerbaijan and Kurdish Democratic parties". This was considered to be an intention to form a strong alliance to "raise the explosive constitutional issue against the Shah" (Abrahamian, 1982: 235).

The plans of Qavam caused severe reaction of the right wing politicians in Tehran. "[T]ribal insurrections, spearheaded by the southern chiefs; unrest in the army, led by the Shah; and pressure from the Western powers, particularly Great Britain" all caused Qavam to step back. In fact this was not a mere step-back, but a definite change in the direction of his policies. He seemingly preferred not to take a risk of a probable civil war if he furthered the alliance with the left (Abrahamian, 1982: 235-237). On December 1946, Qavam ordered the military to enter Azerbaijan and Kurdistan to establish order and law for the forthcoming Fifteenth Majles elections. In this way the Soviet supported autonomous governments were ended, ironically, by a pro-Soviet premier, who had already came to an agreement with them (Abrahamian, 1982: 239-240).

The provincial movements in the 1920s were characteristically different from the ones in the 1940s. The latter emerged as a reaction to the ethnic homogenization policies of Reza Shah. The former, on the other hand, were more a result of the lack of a central power in Tehran. The latter aimed at political representation of their ethnic identities by means of an autonomous government, to some extent with separatist inclinations. The former aimed at changing the overall Iranian regime; they did not have any sort of separatist agenda. As Atabaki states, "[a] comparison of the stand taken by the old Azerbaijani Democrats on the language issue with that expressed in the ADF's [Azerbaijan Democratic Party] declaration clearly demonstrates how the Azerbaijani language had evolved from being a means of communication to being a means of identity… It is undeniable that the drastic measures promulgated by Reza Shah to suppress languages other than Persian elicited a negative reaction from members of the non-Persian intelligentsia" (Atabaki, 2000: 105).

The rise of ethnic identities in a political form was the result of the repressive assimilationist policies of Reza Shah. The repressions contributed to the political consciousness of the minorities about their ethnic identities. The claim of the autonomous governments to the provincial councils as promised in the Constitution of 1906 resonated with the spirit of the Constitutional Revolution. The from-below and umbrella characteristics of Iranian citizenship were revitalized with the autonomous movements. These movements were indicators that the attempt of Reza Shah to equate the Iranian identity with Persian ethnicity could not be successful. This was in contrast to the case

in Turkey that the state was more successful to equate the Turkish national identity with Turkish ethnicity. The difference in the success of the programs of the states can be expected to be reflected in the difference of the degree of ethnic basis in the Turkish and Iranian citizenships, respectively.

3.6 Mossadeq, National Front, and the Coup of 1953

The successful overthrow of the Azerbaijani and Kurdish autonomous movements reinforced the prestige of the Iranian army and Mohammed Reza Shah closely affiliated with it. Determined to consolidate his power, the Shah intended to influence the deputy elections. He started "to indicate his choice for the next prime minister, and, in 1950, went a step further by naming a prime minister without consulting the Majlis" (Wilber, 1981: 138-139). In February 1949, due to an assassination attempt to the Shah, martial law was declared, all the main newspapers were closed, the Tudeh Party was outlawed, premier politicians were repressed, and all opposition was crushed (Abrahamian, 1982: 249-250). All these contributed to the resentment of the liberal currents that would create the National Front against the Shah. Before convening of the Sixteenth Majlis a crowd of university students and bazaar traders led by Mossadeq protested the lack of free elections. The protest took place in the palace grounds. The court promised to avoid mistreatments in the elections. This ended the demonstrations and the commission of the twenty moved to Mossadeq's house where they took the decision to form the National Front (Abrahamian, 1982: 251-252).

The foreign invasions during the Second World War and the following provincial movements were the two causes of the nationalist sentiment that rose in the aftermath of the war. Ghods states, "Iranian nationalism was intolerant both of foreign influence and of ethnic barriers that might facilitate it. This attitude eventually culminated in Mossadegh's liberal nationalism" (Ghods, 1989: 124-125). Hostility towards external influence was a characteristic of the Iranian nationalism from the time of the Tobacco Movement (1891). Halliday suggests that, unlike the case in many other countries, the nationalism in Iran was directed against both the West (Britain, the US) and Russia/Soviets at the same time (Halliday, 2004: 28-29). This was most apparent in the nationalism of Mossadeq. However, Cottam argues, there was a significant difference between the nationalism of the Constitutional Revolution era (1910-1921) and the nationalism of early 1950s, regarding to political liberalism. Mossadeq's policies were liberalist in the sense of being opposed to the regime of the Shah, but did not advocate the "virtues of liberal democracy" as strong as the former nationalists. "Favor of patriotism and bitter attack on Western imperialism" were the strongest features of Mossadeq's policies (Cottam, 1964: 254). Nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company was the most important issue that excited the masses. The foreign policy of Mossadeq was described as a "negative equilibrium", which meant not to side with any of the foreign powers and not to give any concession to any of them (Ghods, 1989: 185). Cottom considers the program of the National Front as the only type that could bring different political factions together against the Shah (Cottam, 1964: 268).

Mossadeq was in the opinion that, rather than a party of firm ideology, a loose coalition of different forces united for a general goal was needed for Iran. His National Front was exactly such a coalition. In the following days the Iran Party, the Toilers' Party, the National Party of Iran, and the Society of Muslim Warriors joined the National Front (Abrahamian, 1982: 253-260). The National Party of Iran and Society of Muslim Worriers constituted the right wing, while the Iran and Toilers' parties constituted the left wing of the movement. These were representing the traditional middle class and the intelligentsia, respectively. The right wing was "conservative, religious, theocratic, and mercantile" while the left wing was "modernistic, secular, technocratic, and socialistic". The main thing that brought these two forces together was their opposition to the court (Abrahamian, 1982: 253-260).

On May 1951, Mossadeq was elected the prime minister. In the parliament, the first issue the National Front put in discussion was the social reforms needed to lessen the gap between the lower and upper classes. This was a clear attack at the upper classes. On July 1952, Mossadeq nominated the war minister using his constitutional right. "When the Shah refused to accept his nomination, Mossadeq resigned and appealed over the heads of the deputies directly to the public." "For the first time, a prime minister had publicly criticized the Shah for violating the constitution, accused the court of standing in the way of the national struggle and had dared to take the constitutional issue directly to the country" (Abrahamian, 1982: 270-271).

This appeal found a reflection in the public. The protests, strikes and demonstrations initiated by the National Front and supported by the Tudeh Party were making the call for Mossadeq's return to premiership. "The Shah at first tried to deal with the crisis by calling in the military; but after five days of mass demonstrations, bloodshed, and signs of dissension in the army, he gave up and asked Mossadeq to form a new government. The victory went into Iranian history as Siyeh-i Tir (July 21st)" (Abrahamian, 1982: 271). The Siyeh-i Tir was won after violent confrontations between the protestors and the armed forces. "250 demonstrators died or suffered serious injuries in Tehran, Hamadan, Ahwaz, Isfahan, and Kermanshah. The most violent confrontations took place in Tehran" (Abrahamian, 1982: 271).

When Mossadeq came to the premiership after the victory of the masses, he took firm actions against the Shah, military, and landed aristocracy. The royalists were this time totally excluded from his cabinet. He took all powers back from the Shah, which the Shah had regained till 1941 after his father's abdication. The War Ministry was renamed as the Defense Ministry, a sign that in future only defense equipments would be purchased for the army. The budget of the army was, therefore, decreased by 15 %.

> Mossadeq exacted from Parliament emergency powers for six months [later extended to another twelve months] to declare any law he felt necessary for obtaining not only financial solvency, but also electoral, judicial, and educational reforms…With these powers, he declared a land reform law that established village councils and increased the peasant's share

of the annual produce by 15 percent. He drafted a new tax bill… He also instructed the ministers of justice, interior, and education to reform thoroughly the judicial, electoral, and educational structures (Abrahamian, 1982: 272-274).

The Senate, which was objecting to the reforms, was dissolved with a new law that reduced the period of the Upper House from six to two years. Furthermore, the Seventeenth Majlis was also dissolved with a referendum in July 1953 and by acknowledgement of a great majority. After all these, Mossadeq was in full control of the bureaucracy and cabinet in August 1953. These were the clear signs that Iran was going into a phase of radical change in all levels.

The second important political current in between 1941-1953 was that of the Tudeh Party. Tudeh was a pro-Soviet communist party with a considerable social base among the intelligentsia and workers. "[T]he Tudeh had up to 25,000 members: it was not only the first, and indeed only, national party to have emerged in modern Iranian history, but it had by far the largest following of any communist party ever seen in the Middle East" (Halliday, 2004: 24). While the National Front was preoccupied with national sovereignty and constitutionalism, "the Tudeh had a serious focus on the social question[s]…such as redistribution of Crown lands, labor law reforms, equal pay and voting rights for women" (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 42).

One pillar of the policy of Mossadeq was to distance itself from the communist oriented Tudeh Party (Ghods, 1989: 131). This party was considered to be an ally of the Soviets, hence a means of foreign influence on Iran. The Tudeh Party initially opposed the National Front movement of Mossadeq accusing him to be an American agent. It was only half-heartedly that the Tudeh supported him towards the end of the National Front (Halliday, 2004: 25). However, the street protests in favor of Mossadeq against the Shah were largely organized and attended by the Tudeh members. The nationalism of Mossadeq, as being against any foreign influence did not open a door for cooperation with the Tudeh Party despite the latter's attempts in the eve of the 1953 coup by the Shah.

The nationalism of Mossadeq aimed basically two things. The first was nationalization of the oil industry. This would bring considerable income to Iranian economy. His second aim was to exacerbate the already emerged hatred against the Shah, "to undermine the royal powers", and eventually to establish a republic in Iran (Wilber, 1981: 143). These were policies that found support from a wide range of the political factions, which united under the National Front (Cottam, 1964: 211). Despite the uniting factors, the historical cleavage between the secular and religious factions again proved to be detrimental to the common ground. The opposing secular and religious inclinations of Mossadeq and Kashani, respectively, resulted in the split of the latter from the National Front in February 1953. This split had a remarkable impact on the National Front resulting in the loss of the support of many religious masses (Ghods, 1989: 187).

The nationalist, leftist, and rightist groups in Iran during the Mossadeq period built their policies on criticism of each other (Katouzian, 2004: 169). Following the xenophobic tenets of the Iranian politics they accused each other of being agents of the external powers. "If [one] read the rightist or communist press of the time, he would see that the Nationalists were American agents with secret British sponsorship; in the Nationalist and communist press he would learn that the rightists were long-term British agents; and in the Nationalist and rightist press he would discover that the Tudeh Party was the joint property of the British and the Russians" (Cottam, 1964: 219). The conflict between the right and left wings of the National Front was also severed by the twelve-month extension of Mossadeq's emergency powers, because it was considered to be an authoritative attempt (Abrahamian, 1982: 275-279). The enmity and rivalry between the nationalist and leftist groups resulted in the weakening of the National Front movement vis-à-vis the royalist powers and eventually prepared its collapse with a military coup of the Shah in July 1953.

The secret committee that performed the coup was established by the retired officers after the triumph of Siyeh-i Tir in July 1952. The coup, in fact, could not be successful in the first attempt. The "pro-Mossadeq chief of the army, tipped off by the Tudeh military network" stopped the imperial guards; namely, the attempt of coup was countered by another group of military on the side of Mossadeq. Afterwards, the American ambassador convinced Mossadeq to overthrow the demonstrators by promising for "aid if law and order was reestablished". "Mossadeq…instructed the army to clear the streets of all demonstrators. Ironically, Mossadeq was trying to use the military, his past enemy, to crush the crowd, his main bulwark" (Abrahamian, 1982: 279-280). "On August 19, while the Tudeh was taken aback by Mossadeq's blow against them, Zahedi, commanding thirty-five Sherman tanks, surrounded the premier's residence, and after a nine-hour battle captured Mossadeq" (Abrahamian, 1982: 280). The era of Mossadeq was ended; the Shah returned home, the armed forces started a harsh attack on the National Front and the Tudeh. "Muhammed Reza Shah, like his father Reza Shah, could now rule without an organized opposition" (Abrahamian, 1982: 280). Many of the National Front leaders were put in prison to stay there for the following three years. The National Front tradition continued under the new name of National Resistance Movement (Abrahamian, 1982: 451).

In the National Resistance Movement the prominent religious nationalists were Taleqani and Bazargan who aimed to conciliate Islam and reformism (Abrahamian, 1982: 459). They aimed to bring together the secular-intellectual-professional reformists with the traditional bazaaris and anti-regime clerics. Bazargan and Taleqani argued that the National Resistance Movement should take a radical stand, namely should denounce the Shah and the regime openly as illegitimate. On the nationalist side were the members of the Iran party and the Marxist Khalel Maleki. They argued the National Resistance had a chance to take part in the parliament and to raise an opposition from there; therefore the movement should have made an alliance with the more liberal wings of the upper classes. Due to the police repression the National Resistance Movement could last only four

years. What remained from this movement for the future was the remembrance that the Islamic reformists had not sided with the secularists, who were willing to make an alliance with the factions of the ruling elite. In other words, the Islamic reformists were more uncompromising than the secularist reformers (Abrahamian, 1982: 457-459; Ghods, 1989: 191).

The dissolution of the National Resistance Movement was followed by the formation of the Liberation Movement of Iran (LMI) by the Islamic oriented Bazargan and Taleqani in 1961. Bazaragan and Taleqani's policies appealed to many intellectuals, professionals and technocrats who "sought to synthesize Islam and Western sciences" (Abrahamian, 1982: 460-470). The LMI could stand as a political party only for nineteen months. "[I]n January 1963 most of its leaders went to prison" (Chehabi, 1990: 160). However, the LMI would be the most important heritor of the National Front to take an important role for the upcoming Islamic Revolution (Abrahamian, 1982: 460-470). For the LMI the Constitutional Revolution of 1906 and the National Front Movement of early 1950s were the historical moments of inspiration. Mossadeq was their political hero. America, which had a significant role in suppressing the National Front movement was the supreme external enemy (Abrahamian, 1982: 472). The LMI regarded nationalism as the only way of standing against the danger of Western colonialism. If nationalism could not succeed, the other option was "falling victim to communism" (Chehabi, 1990: 149).

Between the coup in 1953 and the early 1960s the Shah aimed to establish his power on solid grounds. Mirsepassi writes, "[t]he returning Shah's most important political 'contribution' was to successfully and effectively limit or destroy all forms of democratic and secular political organization and institutions" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 70). Repression of the Tudeh and National Front movements was one current of this policy. In order to control the political opposition he declared in 1957 that there would be only two parties in the Majlis. The Nationalist Party, being the majority, would support the government, and the People's Party would "fulfill the functions of a loyal opposition, free to criticize the internal policies of the government but not the conduct of foreign affairs" (Wilber, 1981: 152). For the control and suppression of any opposition the National Security Organization, SAVAK, was established in 1957 (Wilber, 1981: 153). The goal of this organization was to "suppress the opposition to the Shah's unpopular rule" (Ahmed, 1973).

The early 1950s was marked by the National Front Movement and the political activity of the Tudeh party. These two movements had considerable mass support. They can be argued to have vitalized the mass protest tradition in the late Qajar Empire. Therefore they can be expected to have reinforced the from-below characteristics of the Iranian citizenship. Moreover, the economic nationalization policy of Mossadeq was inline with the xenophobic character of Iranian citizenship. It should be noticed that both of the Tudeh and Mossadeq movements were directed to collapse the regime and found a republic. On the other hand, the coup and following regulations of the Shah were directed to totally smash these movements. Namely, there was a considerable gap between the opponents of the regime and the state. This situation gives way to the observation that the state in

Iran was not central to the Iranian citizenship. Moreover, the same situation reinforced the coercive characteristics of the Iranian state.

3.7 1963 Upheavals, White Revolution, and Protests Leading to the Islamic Republic

In the late 1950s Mohammed Reza Shah followed an open-door policy which favored foreign investment, import of luxury items, and domestic consumption. This economic policy resulted in the rise of the power of the comprador bourgeoisie in the expense of the national bourgeoisie (small and middle scale entrepreneurs) and the landowners (Amjad, 1989: 66). The Iranian economy was in ruins towards the end of the 1950s (Amjad, 1989: 67). The number of strikes and demonstrations rose to more than one hundred in the year 1960 (Amjad, 1989: 67). The repressive methods of the Shah antagonized many of the religious groups and progressive intellectuals (Chehabi, 1990: 184). The result was a rise of opposition representing the national bourgeoisie, bazaaris, clergy, and the poor masses in the early 1960s. Since the secular movements were repressed and banned after the coup in 1953, the opposition had a religious character. "New political spaces for dissent emerged in the mosques, seminary schools, bazaars, universities, underground organizations, and groups organized outside of the country" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 71).

Mohammed Reza Shah announced the reform program of "White Revolution" in 1963. The six points of the program were "land distribution,…nationalization of forests, sale of state factories to private entrepreneurs, profit-sharing for industrial workers, extension of the vote to women, and establishment of a rural literacy corps" (Abrahamian, 1982: 424). This reform program was brought to public referendum and claimed to be approved by 99.9% of the population. The ulama conceived the land reform within the White Revolution as an attack at their social and economic interests. Keddie comments, "land reform was a less radical attack on the ulema than many measures by Reza Shah, but by now many of the ulema were better organized and in closer communication than before" (Keddie, 1982). Especially after the abdication of Reza Shah in 1941, the ulama had the chance for "a gradual rebuilding of clerical power and organization" (Keddie, 1982).

The street protests presented a different scene than the claimed public approval of the Shah's White Revolution. In June 1963, "thousand of shopkeepers, clergymen, office employees, teachers, students, wage earners, and unemployed workers poured into the streets to denounce the Shah" (Abrahamian, 1982: 424). It was the first time with these demonstrations that Ayatallah Ruhallah Khomeini appeared in the political arena. The three days of demonstrations were repressed harshly by the police. The result was "hundreds – maybe thousands – dead" (Abrahamian, 1982: 426). The bloody suppression of the 1963 uprising "reinforced the opinion of Iran's more radical intellectuals that it was no longer possible to challenge the state through legal and peaceful means" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 34).

It should be noted that the attitude of the Pahlavi regime towards the leftist and liberalist movements was different than towards the religious groups. "[T]hroughout the 1960s and 1970s,

while the Left and liberal/social democratic forces and their institutions were hounded and banned by the Pahlavi state, the religious establishment expanded considerably and its institutions proliferated" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 163). Therefore, the religious realm was the only arena left for the opposition to represent and organize against the regime. According to Boroujerdi the clergy was in an advantageous position also for their financial independence from the state, strong communication networks, legal centers of mobilization – such as mosques, seminaries, Islamic associations, and religious foundations – and a centralized leadership with a well-defined hierarchical structure (Boroujerdi, 1996: 78). Ayatollah Khomeini, settling in Iraq, was the leader of the group of radical ulama. This group had a secret network within Iran. The 1963 crisis was crucial for Khomeini to start his radical attempts to denounce the regime. He announced that the regime of "monarchy was anti-Islamic since the Prophet had denounced hereditary kingship as satanic and paganistic" (Abrahamian, 1982: 473-478).

It is remarkable that in this period there emerged groups of religious political activists organized in religious schools and seminars. Among them the circle *Mahfel* published the content of the seminaries between 1959 and 1965 under the title *Maktab-e Tashayo* (School of Shi'ism). A more formal version of this organization was the monthly religious society. The latter was concerned more with the daily politics. The clerics and lay intellectuals of the monthly religious society did pay less attention to the Koran and the Prophet's tradition than those of the Mahfel circle. The *Hoseyniyyeh-ye Ershad* organization led by Ali Shari'ati was the most successful to attract a wide audience and disseminate its ideas. "Most importantly, Hoseyniyyeh-ye Ershad was able to attract youth – high school and college students – and the modern petty bourgeoisie, segments of the Iranian population which were, for the most part, newcomers to religious lectures and politics" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 88-91). The foundations established by *Abedzadeh* beginning from the mid 1940s are also worth mentioning as societal organizations. "Anyone wishing to learn the Arabic language or the Qur'an could attend one of these endowments, which served both as free religious reading and lecture halls and affordable medical clinics". Boroujerdi further states "the popularity of Abedzadeh's grass-roots foundations, which continued until the 1979 revolution, also translated into political clout" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 103).

The oppositional intellectual realm of the 1960s and 1970s in Iran can perhaps be best represented by the view of Jalal Al-e Ahmad (1923-69) and Ali Shari'ati (1933-77). Al-e Ahmad's "earlier writings, mainly fiction, challenged the ignorance of blindly following Iranian and Islamic values and habits". "His later works, as a social critic, focused on developing a discourse extremely critical of Western secularism" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 98). The term *Gharbzadegi* (Westoxication) was used by Al-e Ahmad to represent the hostility towards the Western influence, namely towards the secularism and modernism as practiced in Iran. The term made reference to a romanticized Islamic and Iranian culture and tradition. It criticized the "secular-political ignorance of the Islamic culture of Iran" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 77). Westoxication was "a disease that had infected the Iranian society

from outside and debased Iranian life and cultural identity" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 105). According to Al-e Ahmad, "the Iranian secular intellectuals had no 'roots' in the country's culture and were inordinately influenced by ideas and politics that were foreign and even irrelevant to the problems of Iran" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 101). He "adopted an instrumentalist view of Shi'ism as a mobilizing political ideology" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 75).[51]

Ali Shari'ati, on the other hand, aimed at constituting a modern Shi'a ideology and popularizing it in order to respond to the Western influence. Rather than criticism of secularism and modernism, he wanted to develop a popular and modern ideology with religious and cultural elements to oppose the imperialist intrusion of the West (Mirsepassi, 2000: 77). According to Shari'ati while the occidental culture and philosophy sought for "the reality that is", that of the orient sought for "the truth that shall be" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 108). His ideas had an anti-clerical tone. For him "there was no need for a professional clerical class to mediate between the believers and God". "It was a more secularized Islam, based more on individual preferences and choices" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 116). Shari'ati advocated that "Islam needed to be reformed both theoretically and organizationally". "Theoretically, it had to undergo a transformation process from a culture into an ideology, from a collection of assorted learning into an organized body of social thought". Organizationally, "more qualified and fitting agents of change would emerge in vanguard positions". The leadership would be transformed from the clerics to the "religious intellectuals" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 111). Shari'ati aimed at bringing together the religious-traditional values with the Marxist and Third-Wordlist methods of struggle against imperialism and capitalism (Mirsepassi, 2000: 92, 120). He wanted to reach an "Islamic classless society" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 117). "Shari'ati's Islamic reformism granted a sense of self-respect combined with a collective and national identity based on cultural authenticity" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 92).

It should be noted that neither Al-e Ahmad nor Ali Shari'ati advocated a cultural or political return to a glorified Islamic past. Theirs was an attempt to find a place to the cultural/religious values within the contemporary political struggle. For example, "Shari'ati describes technology (and science) as the liberator of humanity from the prisons of 'nature', 'heredity', and 'history' – but this is possible only in a society which has achieved union with God" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 123). The ideas of the two were a reaction to the ignorance of the local values in favor of Western centered ideas (Mirsepassi, 2000: 105).

Mirsepassi regards the ideas of Al-e Ahmad and Shari'ati as parts of an "authenticity discourse". This discourse "represents a cultural attempt to reconfigure modernity to make it more inclusive and diverse, and less homogenizing and totalizing". "Here, the discourse of authenticity is presented as an attempt in reconciling the 'universal' culture of modernity with the Iranian's local

---

[51] Matin-Asgari comments that the Marxist-Leninist ideology of the Tudeh party was influential in the cold war years for "[t]he intellectual 'paradigm shift' towards a largely negative depiction of an entity called 'the West'" (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 44). The idea of westoxication by Al-e Ahmad, in fact an ex-Tudeh member, was an example for the impact of the anti-imperialist discourse on the Iranian intellectuals (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 45).

cultural context" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 97). It is remarkable that Al-e Ahmad explicitly mentioned his pursue of attachment to an authentic and local identity while living in a modern age. He contrasted this pursue with the situation in the secular modern Turkey: "Let's stick to something, perhaps we can hold onto our identity. Not the way Turkey ended up" (Mirsepassi, 2000: 113, transfers from Al-e Ahmad).

White Revolution of the 1960s aimed at transforming the pre-capitalist formation of Iran into more capitalist by rapid industrialization of the economy (Amjad, 1989: 30). The "centerpiece of the shah's reform program…was land reform" (Behrooz, 2004: 192). According to Wilber (1981: 177) "by October 1971 there would be no farmer in Iran who did not own his own land". Despite the centrality of the land reform in the program the regime clearly prioritized industrial development over the agricultural. The advance in agricultural production was far behind that of the industrial and service sector.

> [T]he average annual rate of growth of value added in agriculture between 1959 and 1977 (in constant prices) was 3.9 percent…The performance of the agricultural sector in these years must be evaluated, however, in the context of the dynamics of the growth rate differentials between different sectors. In the 1959-77 period, the average annual rate for growth of manufacturing was about 13 percent, for construction about 17 percent, and for services about 12 percent. Some activities had even higher growth rates. For example, banking and financial services grew at the average annual rate of 21 percent. Therefore, agriculture was obviously trailing far behind (Behdad, 1992).

Under the program of the Literacy Corps established as a part of the White Revolution, by 1972 around 85,000 young people were sent to work in the rural in activities such as teaching, building, and repairing. Similarly the Health Corps were established in 1964 to bring health service to the villages, Extension and Development Corps in 1965 to bring modern methods of farming and animal husbandry, Religious Corps in 1971 to bring preachers and religious services that would link the modern world with Islam and Iranian society (Wilber, 1981: 178). Amjad considers these policies of the White Revolution as an attempt to change the traditional social structure in order to give way to state domination (Amjad, 1989: 84-85). It aimed at breaking the pre-capitalist social formation of Iran, but did not have an egalitarian purpose. Therefore, it "widened the gap between the poor and the rich peasants" (Amjad, 1989: 81). Many pauperized peasants left the countryside to find jobs in the urban centers (Ghods, 1989: 204; Abrahamian, 1982: 432-435, 447).

The main source of income that financed the reforms of Mohammed Reza Shah and the import of industrial and military equipment was oil. In the 1970s the oil prices considerably increased and the great national product (GNP) grew dramatically (Abrahamian, 1982: 448).

> By 1960 oil exports contributed 41 percent of total revenue. Oil contributions to government revenues continued to increase through the rest of the decade, and by 1971 oil accounted for 55 percent of total revenue. After the 1973 Arab oil ambargo, Iran's oil income more than

quadrupled and contributed 84 percent of the total budget in the 1974-75 fiscal year (Shambayati, 1994).

The Plan Organization, which was established in 1949 as a "financially independent institution outside the regular administrative machinery of the government", "was brought under the control of the Prime Minister's office in an effort to greater co-ordination of government economic policy". From that time on the Plan Organization "concentrated on national planning, supervision over the implementation of the projects by responsible ministries and agencies, and financing of the approved programmes through the plan budget" (Karshenas, 1990: 93). Between 1956-72 the Plan Organization controlled 71 per cent of the total oil revenues (Karshenas, 1990: 94). The rise of the oil revenues and the direct control of the state in its investment and distribution significantly increased the autonomy of the state vis-à-vis the societal powers. In 1975 the Shah announced that the state would be ruled in a one-party system. He merged the existing New Iran and People's parties to form the Resurgence Party (Abrahamian, 1982: 439-441).[52] The autonomy of the state enabled the Shah to attack at the power centers which he considered to be an obstacle for his modernization and nationalization ideal.

The military and bureaucracy were the groups that most benefited from the state policies and the large oil revenues. "Given extravagant titles…and generous salaries and privileges, they remained loyal to the crown" (Ahmed, 1973). The regime of the Shah spent tremendous amounts of its revenues for buying arms from the West, especially from the US (Ahmed, 1973). Mohammed Reza Shah "built one of the most powerful armed forces ever seen in the Middle East (Zunes, 2009). On the other hand, the groups hit by the policies of the Shah were "the clergy and the urban poor, the modern lower bourgeoisie, and, closely tied to them, the traditional middle class of the bazaars" (Ghods, 1989: 206). The Shah aimed at weakening the bazaaris, who had gained power after the nationalist policies of Mossadeq. The anti-profiteering campaign of 1975-1976 was an attempt in this regard. During this period "more than forty thousand shops were closed and eighty thousand bazaaris were imprisoned and exiled" (Amjad, 1989: 31). The economic basis of the bazaar was disturbed by the newly established "state corporations to import and distribute basic foods, especially wheat, sugar, and meat". The institutional basis of the religious groups was disturbed by the clear attempts to "nationalize the religion" (Abrahamian, 1982: 442-445).

The regime of the Shah did not suffer from an economic crisis in the form of a lack of money. Rather, the economic discontent was due to the unequal distribution of the wealth, which resulted in an economically marginal mass of population and rising expectations of lower classes (Abrahamian, 1982: 529, 427, 535).

---

[52] The Resurgence party "would observe the principle of 'democratic centralism', synthesize the best aspects of socialism and capitalism, establish a dialectical relationship between the government and the people, and help the Great Leader (Farmandar) complete his White Revolution and lead his Iran toward a new Great Civilization" (Abrahamian, 1982: 439-441).

Mohammed Reza Shah continued the policy of homogenization of the ethnic identity of Iran on the basis of the Persian ethnicity. Prior to the Islamic revolution, the Tehran regime did not allow the usage of any other language than Persian in any official department. It was almost impossible to get permission to publish in minority languages. The literacy campaign started in the 1960s should be regarded as an attempt for assimilation. As Shaffer states, this campaign aimed to camouflage the assimilation policy of the state especially towards the Azerbaijanis and Kurds. The campaign aimed at making Persian the spoken language in all parts of Iran. In general, the Tehran government was successful to promote the idea that Persian was superior to all other ethnic languages. Speaking Persian was perceived as prestigious by most of the non-Persian people. Before the Islamic Revolution, most of the educated Azerbaijanis spoke very good Persian, used it in reading and writing (Shaffer, 2008: 84). As a follow up of this assimilation policy, "[e]thnic minorities [were] rewarded with jobs and other resources when they…conformed to modernization schemes…, but [were] denied resources or even attacked when they…refused to assimilate or attempted rebellion" (Moghaddam and Crystal, 1997). The social and economic programs of the Shah regime in between 1960-1970 increased the economic and social gap between the Azerbaijani regions and the Persian dominated centre. The provinces benefited minimally from the development of the economy due to the increase in the oil prices in the 1970s (Shaffer, 2008: 75).

The repressive policies of the Pahlavi regime left no place for legal organization of oppositions. "[A]ll legitimate political parties, independent trade unions, and free associations" were closed; the constitution and Majlis lost their significance (Behrooz, 2004: 197). Therefore the oppositions in the 1960s and 1970s organized underground and aimed at demolishing the Pahlavi regime. The Islamic movement of Khomeini and the Marxist/Islamist guerilla movements were the result of these circumstances. The young intelligentsia of the guerilla movements of both Marxist and Islamist currents were "addressing the previous generation, nationalist, Islamist, and Marxist, by letting them know that bygone methods of purely political opposition had been a failure and that a new, violent phase had begun, if only because the regime had left no other choice" (Behrooz, 2004: 190).

The start of guerilla movements against the regime took place in 1971 when a group of armed men attacked a gendarmerie post in the Caspian forests of the Gilan region. After this attack there emerged many Marxist and Islamic guerilla groups, the biggest of which were the Marxist Feda'i and Islamic Mujahedin. Both of the groups recruited their members from the young intelligentsia, namely university students (Abrahamian, 1982: 480-482). The Feda'i had developed from the ranks of Tudeh Party and the left wing of the National Front. The Mujahedin had developed from the right wing of the National Front, which later evolved into the LMI. The ideology of Mujahedin was again an attempt to conciliate Islam with the revolutionary Marxist ideas. Therefore, the ideology of Mujahedin and ideas of Ali Shari'ati were closely related. It would be no wrong to state that Shari'ati's arrival to the Husseinieh-i Ershad in 1967 and the spread of his ideas from there

reinforced the already started ideology of Mujahedin. The Mujahedin, at least some of its leaders, came more close to Marxism than Islam in the mid 1970s As a result of the guerilla movements between 1971 and 1977 around 341 guerillas lost their lives (Abrahamian, 1982: 480-482, 489-494).

The policies of the Shah brought the bazaaris and ulama against the regime and united them again, as in the Constitutional Revolution of 1906, to form the main social basis of the forthcoming Islamic Revolution (Abrahamian, 1982: 498). Although the government took measures against the activities of the high-ranking ulama, it did not control the law-ranking ulama as such. Therefore the low-ranking ulama could work among the urban poor and establish a network that would be effective to spread Khomeinie's ideas and organize the mass movements (Abrahamian, 1982: 498).

In the late 1970s, the external world was pressing the Iranian state to relax its repressive police controls and conform to the requirements of human rights (Abrahamian, 1982: 499). The Shah did not want to disturb his relations with America, the main provider of the military arms. Therefore he had to relax the police controls on the people (Abrahamian, 1982: 500-501). The relative relaxation encouraged the oppositional groups. "In May 1977, fifty-three lawyers – many of whom had supported Mossadeq – sent an open letter to the imperial palace and thereby initiated an intense campaign of protests through public communiqués". "[I]n June, forty prominent poets, novelists, and intellectuals sent an open letter to Premier Hoveida and revived their Writer's Association, which had been suppressed since 1964". "In July, a number of writers and publishers formed a Group for Free Books and Free Thought". In Autumn "[t]wenty nine opposition leaders…formed the Iranian Committee for the Defense of Freedom and Human Rights". "Sanjabi, Foruhar, Bakhtiyar, a bazaar merchant, and representatives from the Society of Socialists revived the National Front, calling it the Union of National Front Forces". "Similarly, Bazargan revived the Liberation Movement, worked closely with the National Front and the bazaar community, and called for the implementation of the 1905-1909 constitution". It should be noted that none of these oppositional groups advocated an Islamic republic to replace the regime of the Shah. Rather, they aimed the reestablishment of the fundamental laws declared after the Constitutional Revolution of 1906 (Abrahamian, 1982: 501-504).

The LMI, founded in 1961 and officially closed in 1963, played a crucial role in the protests against the Shah, during the Islamic Revolution. In the 1960s and 1970s the LMI operated mostly in abroad. Many of its founders were members of the Islamic Society, the Engineers Association, or the Muslim Student Association (Chehabi, 1990: 119). The movement aimed to establish a link with the population through the Monthly Talks Society. "The object of [the] speakers [in these talks] was to shake up the religious community, to put an end to the lethargy that had characterized

it, and to attempt to make Islam relevant to social, economic, and political problems of the day" (Chehabi, 1990: 171).[53]

The first event that led to the demonstrations preceding the Islamic Revolution was the one on November 19, 1977. A poetry-reading session organized by the Writer's Association was interrupted by the police to break up its tent session. The students protested this interference by rushing into the streets and shouting out "antiregime slogans". The following protest took place in January 1978. The regime supportive newspaper *Ittila'at* had published an article in which it denounced the anti-regime clergy, and put forward discourteous claims about Khomeini. "The seminaries and the bazaar closed down, demanding a public apology; and some 4,000 theology students and their sympathizers clashed with the police as they took to the streets, shouting 'we don't want the Yazid government', 'we want our constitution', and 'we demand the return of Ayatallah Khomeini'" (Abrahamian, 1982: 505).

While the first of these two demonstrations was dominated by the intelligentsia (students), the second was dominated by the traditional middle classes and the clergy (bazaar and theology students). The missing class in these demonstrations was the workers, which appeared with the rising strikes and workers' protests after June 1978, in Mashad, Tehran, Tabriz, Qum, Isfahan, and Shiraz. In Isfahan martial law was declared in August. "[B]y September 7 the demonstrations in Tehran attracted more than half a million participants". Martial law was declared in Tehran on September 7. The following day, "[t]he worst clashes occurred in southern Tehran". "That night the military authorities announced that the day's casualties totaled 87 dead and 205 wounded. But the opposition declared that the dead numbered more than 4,000 and that as many as 500 had been killed in Jaleh Square alone". "September 8 became known as Black Friday and left a permanent mark on Iran" (Abrahamian, 1982: 510-511, 515-516).

The Shah regime had closed the Tehran airport to avoid Khomeini's return to Iran. During the protests against the closure of the airport, twenty-eight people were killed on 27-28 January 1979. This was followed by a street protest of three million people in Tehran, which eventually resulted in Khomeini's return (Abrahamian, 1982: 526). On February 11, 1979, the last fight took place. The rebellious were composed of the "armed volunteers, the four main guerilla organizations [Marxist Feda'i, Islamic Mujahedin, Marxist Mujahedin, small Marxist and Islamic groups], the Tudeh, and defectors from the military". They managed to conquer the state and military buildings. The armed phase of the revolution was over (Abrahamian, 1982: 529, 481).

The period between the 1953 coup of Mohammed Reza Shah and the 1979 Islamic Revolution was marked by the repression of the state and rise of religious and leftist oppositions outside the political framework monopolized by the state. In this period the mass protest tradition of Iranian

---

[53] However, the effect of the talks on the people was not comparable to that of Khomeini in his Qum sermons. "[A]ttendance at the meetings of the Monthly Talks Society was about 200, whereas when Khomeini spoke in Qum thousands would come to listen" (Chehabi, 1990: 174).

society was revitalized and continued by organizing in modern institutions such as seminaries, religious schools, writers' association, and monthly talk activities. The state resorted to coercion to silence the opposition; the religious and Marxist oppositions attacked directly to the regime rather than demanding for reform. Therefore, the gap between the societal powers and the state widened. The close alliance of the regime with the USA resulted in the rise of xenophobic feelings among the oppositional masses. The ulama leading the opposition promoted the religious values to raise nativism against the West. The xenophobic and nativist characteristics of Iranian citizenship can be expected to have been reinforced.

3.8 Political Left in Iran

The power of the political left in Iran in the early twentieth century is remarkable in comparison to other Middle Eastern countries. "[T]he first social democratic organization in the Middle East was established in Tabriz in 1905-06. In 1920 the Iranian Communist Party, the first communist party in Asia [(Halliday, 2004: 20)], was founded and local communists joined with the Jangali movement to produce in Gilan the first declaration of a Soviet republic in the Middle East" (Cronin, 2004: 1).

The societies and councils (anjomans) established in the Azerbaijan, especially the Society of Azerbaijan associated with the Tabriz forces in the Constitutional Revolution (Ghods, 1989: 34) reflect the early politically-leftist activities in Azerbaijan. The lack of a developed industry resulted in the weakness of the working class in the Iranian society. However, the Azerbaijan and Gilan regions were exceptions in this regard. In the early twentieth century a lot of Iranians immigrated for work to the Tsarist Russia, especially to Baku, from these regions. They were exposed to Western political ideologies in the Tsarist Russia and in this way gained political consciousness. Moreover, in Russia they were "released from the hierarchical, religion-centered political culture of Iran" (Ghods, 1989: 20). The political consciousness of the workers and relative freedom of the peasants in Azerbaijan and Gilan underlay the emergence of leftist-political parties of Iran from these regions. The anjomans "had spread southward during and after the Russian Revolution of 1905" and "became important political centers" during the Constitutional Revolution (Ghods, 1989: 33).[54]

The Social Democrat Party of Iran (SDP) was founded in Baku in 1904 by the socialists in close relation with the Russian Social Democrat Party (Ghods, 1989: 34). SDP was the first organization of the socialist tradition in Iran to be continued as Edalat and Communist Parties in the period of 1907-37. The other leftist parties in the first half of the twentieth century were the

---

[54] It is interesting to observe that the role of the anjomans in the Constitutional Revolution of Iran resembles the role of the village governments in the French Revolution of 1789. The existence of such peripheral bodies made it possible in both occasions to organize the peripheral powers against the center in order to raise the armed struggle and bring the movements to triumph. Downing cites the fiscal problems, the influence of the French aristocracy over many independent institutions, and the preserved village governments in the countryside as the three pillars that reinforced the triumph of the French Revolution (Downing, 1998: 32-33).

Azerbaijan Democrat Party, Persian Communist Party, the Tudeh Party in 1941-53, again the Tudeh Party in the 1960s and 1970s, and the political left guerilla movements in the 1970s (Mirsepassi, 2000: 162). In accordance with the nationalist sentiments in the early twentieth century, SDP supported the idea of a strong central state. Ghods writes, "all the organization's publications, including those in Azerbaijan, Gilan, and Khorasan, were written in standard Farsi" (Ghods, 1989: 35). Ghods further mentions that this attitude of supporting centralization in the expense of local autonomies was followed also by the Persian Communist Party, Tudeh, and the National Front.

After the abdication of Reza Shah the communist Tudeh Party was formed in 1941. This party recruited also the Azerbaijani leftist groups who were in strong opposition to Reza Shah's policies. Shaffer mentions that there were three different tendencies among these Azerbaijanis regarding to the question of national identity. One group advocated being assimilated into the Persian language and culture. According to them, Persian language and culture could unite all the people of Iran and ease the realization of social and political programs. Most of these people associated themselves more with the idea of Iranian, rather than the Persian. The second group, wanted to carry the official identity of Iranian together with the ethnic identity of Azerbaijani. They aimed at the autonomy of the Azerbaijani identity under the rule of Iranian state. They perceived the idea of Iranian as an upper level identity above the ethnic identities, therefore did not associate it with the Persian ethnic identity. The third group was that of the socialists and communists who wanted to bring forward the class identity above all the ethnic identities (Shaffer, 2008: 58-59). The position of the first group should be considered as a sign of the impact of the homogenization policies of Reza Shah. The second group, on the other hand, should be conceived as a sign that the idea of Iranian nationality as an umbrella over all ethnic groups, as in the time of the Constitutional Revolution, was still vital among the intellectuals.

Despite its numerical minority in the Majles, the Tudeh happened to be an effective party in Iranian politics. It is noteworthy that, in July 1942, with the initiative of Tudeh, thirteen editors came together to form the Freedom Front. This front was "directed at class reaction and royal dictatorship". The Freedom Front reached to the number of twenty-seven editors by the time of February 1944 (Abrahamian, 1982: 202). In parallel to Tudeh's activities the labor unions made a rise in this period; the number of union members in 1944 is noted to be 265,000, constituting 75% of the total industrial labor force at that time (Mirsepassi, 2000: 67). The passage of the first labor law in Iran in 1949 was due to the activities of the Central Council of United Trade Unions, organized by Tudeh. Tudeh deputies submitted a Majlis bill for the enfranchisement of women (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 58, footnote 23). Tudeh was also the cofounder of the Confederation of Iranian Students with the Socialist League (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 42).

The Christian minorities, especially Armenians had given enthusiastic support to the Constitutional Revolution. However, the invasion of Iran and developments during the First World

War "destroyed any possibility that Armenians might embrace Iranian nationalism" (Cottam, 1964: 81). What created this alienation was the possibility of being safeguarded by the foreign forces that either occupied Iran or had a political influence on Tehran politics. The religious animosity towards the non-Muslims made the minorities to welcome such a protection. In 1941, for example, "Armenians and Assyrians especially welcomed the Russian troops as liberators; Armenians put flowers on Soviet tanks when they arrived in Tabriz in August 1941". "Considering the anti-Christian bias of the Shah's administration in the last part of his reign, this attitude was understandable" (Ghods, 1989: 122). Ghods transfers the following observation of the British consul in Tabriz in 1944:

> As usual, it is the Assyrian community which is the most restless and lends itself most easily
> to leftist, pro-Russian movements, such as the Tudeh. Their priests told me of their difficulty
> in restraining their hotheads from participating in politics and are full of fears for the safety of
> the Assyrian element when the Moslems can again give full rein to their pent-up fanaticism
> (Ghods, 1989: 129).

The affinity between the Christians and invading/dominating foreign forces resulted in the cleavage between those and the Iranian nationalists. It is noteworthy that such a cleavage did not emerge with the ethnically Persian Zoroastrians.[55]

The Shah openly aligned with the West during the Cold War years. This meant a repressive policy towards the political left (Matin-Asgari, 2004: 44). After the banishment of the Tudeh Party, its members suffered severe suppression in the early 1950s. Anti-communism, realized as the suppression of Tudeh, became a strong pillar of the Pahlavi regime. The Shah made it clear that any government ruling under his reign had to conform to the constitution, namely respect to the monarchy and be against to the Tudeh Party (Katouzian, 2004: 181). The Tudeh Party moved abroad and survived in Europe. The support of communist parties of both Eastern and Western European countries was effective in its survival. As a reaction to the Shah's nationalization programs the policies of Tudeh were in the direction of a decentralized state structure (Abrahamian, 1982: 455).

The leftist movements prior to the Islamic Revolution, the Feda'i and Mujahedin, were influential to mobilize the university students against the regime. Besides these armed groups, there were also intellectually oriented legal organizations that appealed to the leftists. The Writers' Association of Iran (Kanun-e Nevisandegan-e Iran), founded in April 1968 and lasted till March 1970, was one of those. The association discussed issues such as "the meaning of freedom, the social stance of the writer, and the necessity of a committed literature". This association "served to

---

[55] "Where the minority think of themselves as being part of another nation and grant that nation a primary loyalty (as with the Armenians and the Jews), their position in Iranian society deteriorates as Iranian nationalism becomes more pervasive. Conversely, when the religious minority are ethnically Iranian and identify themselves with Iran (as with the Zoroastrians), the growth of Iranian nationalism can help integrate the minority into the Iranian nation." (Cottam, 1964: 89)

sharpen the criticism voiced against the government" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 49). A revival of the Writers' Association occurred in October 1977 by organizing a ten nights of public poetry reading.

> These ten nights are crucial in modern Iranian intellectual history. They provided closer relations between the artists and their audiences, and they helped raise the political consciousness of the young university and high school students. In addition, the writers attending these events were able to maintain a sense of political pluralism among themselves, irrespective of their contrasting political convictions… Because of these factors, the poetry reading nights are considered a prelude to the waves of protest that engulfed Iranian cities only a few months later (Boroujerdi, 1996: 51).

The Autonomous Movements in Azerbaijan in the 1920s and 1940s, the rise of the Tudeh Party in the late 1940s and early 1950s, and the leftist student movements in the 1970s should be considered as the signs of the power of the political left in Iran in comparison to Turkey. The jeo-political conditions underlying the power of the political left in Iran can be explained by the spatial closeness to and economic relation with the Soviet Union as well as the support of the Soviet Union to the ethnic and political left movements in Iran. In the early twentieth century many Iranians came to the Soviet lands as seasonal workers, and carried back the liberal and socialistic ideologies with modern protest methods. In the Soviet lands these workers were free from the restriction of the Islamic clergy. Therefore, they could freely organize groups and parties. The very first socialist groups of Iran were organized in Baku (Shaffer, 2008: 51). It was in the interest of the Soviet government to promote admiration to the Soviet Union among the ethnic minorities in Iran. In this way it could pressure the Iranian government for its own interests. In order to make propaganda for the Soviet Union in the 1940s the Soviet government sent troops to Iran from the Soviet Azerbaijan and supported the publication of newspapers in Azeri language (Shaffer, 2008: 63). Despite this support, Shaffer argues, it would be wrong to consider the Azerbaijan Autonomous Government in 1945-46 as a puppet of the Soviet Union. Although the Soviet Union was effective to supply means for the movement, the targets and demands of the Autonomous Government were local. Moreover, in its early phases there was considerable local mass support to the Azerbaijan Autonomous Government, especially for its policies about economy, infrastructure, and language (Shaffer, 2008: 64). For the communist parties as well, especially for the Tudeh Party, there was considerable Soviet support. Chaqueri (1999) demonstrates that the founding of the Tudeh was a result of the cooperation of its initial leader Solaymen Mirza Eskandari with the Soviet authorities in Iran.

> The evidence…clearly demonstrates that the Tudeh was a creation of the Soviet state, through the agency of its Red Army…[I]t must be added, however, that the Tudeh, though established through the agency of the Soviet Army, reflected and yet masterfully used, a genuine desire by a number of political prisoners who had wished to lead a progressive political party that would play an important, if not decisive, role in the destiny of their country…[T]he Soviets instrumentalized the Tudeh from the very outset for their own national interest. (Chaqueri, 2000)

In the 1970s, the secret radio of the leftist movements in Iran, IUS (*İran'ın Ulusal Sesi*, the National Voice of Iran) broadcasted from the Soviet Union (Shaffer, 2008: 110).

The Soviet support to the political left movements in Iran can be expected to have an impact only because there was a potential for such societal movements. The historical tradition of mass opposition and the support of the Soviets should be considered together to explain the emergence of leftist movements in Iran. The tradition of mass protests and the rise of political left in Iran reinforced each. The call of the leaders of the Azerbaijani movement in the 1940s for their constitutional rights is a sign that they had inspirations from the movement of Constitutional Revolution. This was an example for how the mass protest tradition reinforced a politically left movement. The Marxist inclination of the religious currents in the 1970s is a sign that the leftist political movements provided inspiration for the mass movements leading to the Islamic Revolution. This was an example for how the political leftist notions reinforced the mass protests prior to the Islamic Revolution. The dialectical relation between the political left and mass protest tradition can be expected to have contributed to the active and from-below characteristics of the Iranian citizenship.

3.9 Conclusion for the Modern History of Iran

The modern history of Iran follows a path of 1) mass movements in the late Qajar Empire and a Constitutional Revolution by participation of a wide range of societal forces, 2) the rise of Reza Khan in the absence of a central power, modernization and nationalization under the Pahlavi Regime, 3) the repression and settlement of tribal populations and assimilation policies into Persian ethnicity, 4) the rise of provincial autonomous movements, 5) the mass protests in support of the National Front, and the mass movements culminating in the Islamic Revolution. These five items refer to the differences of the history of Iran from that of Turkey. They also mark the historical moments that shaped the Iranian citizenship.

The lack of a strong central state and bureaucracy in the late Qajar Empire was a contrasting difference to the situation in the late Ottoman Empire. The state was not strong enough to repress and eliminate the potential oppositional groups, namely the ulama and bazaaris in the Qajar period. The common reaction to the Qajar Shahs and external interventions prepared the condition for emergence of united mass movements. The Constitutional Revolution in Iran was a result of such historical situation. This situation underlay the xenophobic character of the initial form of Iranian citizenship. The Constitution of Iran was marked by the participation of variety of societal forces in the revolution. The mass movements in the late nineteenth century and the Constitutional Revolution in the eve of the twentieth century should be expected to mark the Iranian citizenship with a from-below characteristic. The contribution of various ethnic and religious groups to these movements can be expected to have rendered the Iranian citizenship, not to be based solely on Persian ethnicity, but to embrace the other ethnic identities. Furthermore, since the major aim of the

revolution was to limit the power of the Qajar Shahs, it should not be surprising to observe that the rights are emphasized more than the duties in the Constitution.

The Pahlavi regime emerged basically with the aim of maintaining a strong central and national state in Iran. The harsh repressions for the settlement of the tribes and the policies towards assimilation into Persian ethnicity marked the modernization and nationalization policies of this period. Reza Shah ignored the constitution and assembly. His arbitrary rule antagonized the intellectual and national elements that supported him in his initial phases. Therefore, the Pahlavi regime could not maintain a state ideology that would gain the consent of the masses; rather it left a wide gap between the state and the society. The modernization movements of the regime in Iran could not achieve the success of their counterparts in Turkey. It can be expected that the state in Iran did not become a central component of Iranian citizenship as in Turkey.

The policy of suppression of ethnic identities under the Pahlavi regime did not go so far to a systematic rejection of the existence of ethnic identities. However, the limitations on the ethnic languages raised the ethnic consciousness. The autonomous governments in the Azerbaijan and Kurdish provinces were results of such repressive policies of the Pahlavi regime. These movements can be expected to have reinforced the idea that the Iranian identity covers the other ethnic identities besides the Persian. These observations can be related to the idea that Iranian citizenship did not have an exclusionary characteristic to the degree that the Turkish had. However, the Persianization policies of the Pahlavi regime reinforced the central position of the Persian language in the Iranian identity. Many of the prominent intellectuals of the ethnic minority groups spoke both Persian and their local language. This situation can be considered as a sign of the assimilative characteristics of the Iranian citizenship into the Persian language.

The National Front movement led by Mossadeq aimed at nationalization, meaning the change of the regime into a republic and nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. The sipirit was close to that of the Constitutional Revolution; therefore, the movement can be expected to have reinforced the xenophobic character of the Iranian citizenship. The mass movements leading to the Islamic Revolution as well carried this mark. The emphasis on anti-imperialism and non-Western culture can be expected to have reinforced the nativist dimension of the Iranian citizenship. Moreover, these and political left movements in Iran can be expected to have contributed to the from-below characteristic of the Iranian citizenship. The implications of these historical moments on the state formation and citizenship of Iran will be examined in detail in the following two chapters, respectively, in comparison to Turkey.

CHAPTER 4

COMPARISON OF STATE FORMATIONS IN TURKEY AND IRAN

This chapter performs a comparative interpretation of the previous two chapters on modern histories of Turkey and Iran in order to reveal the differences from state formation point of view. This chapter prepares the comparative historical ground for commenting on the citizenship formations in the succeeding chapter.

The state formations in Turkey and Iran were experienced as transformation of their past Empires into nation-states. This transformation was realized by the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes as a modernization project and ethnic homogenization process. The states made use of their "despotic power", in the sense of putting their plans in order without negotiating with the other societal powers (Mann, 1984). Despite the authoritarian modernization aimed by the respective regimes, the path they followed and the degree of success they maintained differed. The differences regarding to the state structure and bureaucratic experience they inherited, existence of potential oppositional groups, existence of organized societal groups and networks, disruption of the state apparatus, and the homogenization of the population underlie the difference in the level of success of modernization and the different paths followed. The difference in the level of success in realizing the state projects is reflected by the differences in the degree of maintaining a state ideology and gaining consent and the degree of resorting to coercion by the states. All these items are examined in this chapter. It is concluded that the state in Turkey was stronger than in Iran in order to impose its regulations on the society. The societal networks in Iran could play significant political role in the absence of such a strong state as in Turkey.

4.1 Inherited State Structure

The inherited state structures are known to have a significant impact on the state formation of nation states. Examples of this impact can be traced in the histories of some states in the West, north-Africa and the Middle East. A striking example for this is perhaps the French Revolution, a remarkable change of an absolutist regime towards a nation state formation. The French Revolution was performed by the middle class against the aristocracy and royal absolutism; therefore, there was a clear class struggle and revolution in the sense that the ruling classes did change. However, such a change of the ruling classes did not necessarily change the central position of the state in shaping the state regulations. The "central rule of the king" was replaced by the central rule of "a united republic of citizens transcending any group division" (Münch, 2001: 29, 30). The centrality of the state was crucial for conscription and tax collection to resource the wars both before and after the revolution. Considering the societal associations there was not much change. Unlike the case in Britain, the doors were closed in France for representation of group particularism via civil societal associations both before and after the revolution (Münch, 2001: 28-29). These were some

features that the French nation state inherited from the absolutist French kingdom. Similarly, the current formation of the German state is related to intense resource mobilization of its own lands in the Prussian era and that of Sweden is related to having mobilized the resources of other lands in the middle ages. These inherited features are considered to be the cause of different levels of social democracy in the respective lands (Downing, 1998: 54).

The importance of inherited state structures is observable also in the Arabic Peninsula and north-African Islamic lands. There is a striking difference between the modern state formations of these two regions although they were both within the Ottoman territory. The difference is due to the fact that it was easier for the Ottoman Empire to reach to the north-African lands in comparison to the Arabic Peninsula. While the lands in the former were ruled by military-bureaucratic cadres appointed by the Sultan, the ones in the latter were left to the rule of local emirates. This caused the modernization attempts of Istanbul to be more influential in the north-African coast in comparison to the Arabic Peninsula. Therefore, in modern north-Africa (Egypt, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia), there appeared "bureaucratic-military oligarchies, characterized by a strong central power and personal authoritarian rule. The best-known example is the rule of Muhammed Ali in Egypt in the early nineteenth century" (Butenschon, 2000: 14).

Considering the inherited state structures by the modern Turkish and Iranian states there is a considerable difference. In comparison to the Qajar Empire, the Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth century was much more centralized with a widespread state bureaucracy, modern institutions, and a centralized army. This was basically because the Ottoman Empire remained intact for centuries on the land of Anatolia till the foundation of the Turkish Republic. In Iran, on the other hand, the strong centralized state of the Safavids disappeared in 1722 and was followed by the emergence of peripheral powers in different districts. After the rise of the Qajars in 1794, the Shahs did not have enough resources to eliminate or even limit these peripheral powers. The Qajars ruled Iran till the 1920s; however, they could never revitalize the authority and centralism of the Safavids (Cleveland, 2008: 62, 125). Sohrabi points out that the "constitutional revolutions" in Turkey in 1908 and in Iran in 1906 were marked by the regimes they replaced. This was because the constitutional paradigm, unlike the communist revolutionary paradigms, did not aim a "complete overthrow of the institutions of the old regime but instead called for the creation of an elective representative body through which they attempted to indirectly dominate the state" (Sohrabi, 1995).

Zubaida mentions that the Ottomans had a considerably developed state organization in comparison to the Qajars. While the Ottomans had well organized and differentiated standing army divisions, the Qajars relied on tribal levies. The bureaucracy in the Ottomans was well developed while the Qajars "did not have a regular bureaucracy beyond the aristocratic court functionaries and their servants" (Zubaida, 1989: 138-139). In agreement with Zubaida, Parsi mentions the bureaucracy and army as the two pillars of the nation state in Turkey. He considers these two

institutions as the representatives of the continuity of the Ottoman state structure. On the contrary, Parsi adds, the "central bureaucracy was never strong" in Qajar Iran (Parsi, 2000: 120-121).

One of the important causes of the early modernization and extended bureaucracy of the Ottoman Empire was the early start of conscription in the Ottoman Empire in 1844. Anderson mentions the impact of conscription in the Ottoman Tunisia and Libya for the penetration of the state administration into the lands. The Ottoman rulers attempted to widespread the governmental control into the countryside of the two lands prior to the respective invasions by France and Italy (Anderson, 1986: 75). "The reorganization and extension of military recruitment had signaled the start of administrative penetration into the hinterlands on an unprecedented scale" (Anderson, 1986: 76). The populations of the lands were integrated into the ruling apparatus; the state bureaucracy and the administration were already extended into the rural areas (Anderson, 1986: 78).

In the Ottoman Empire the army was the most important and hence the most developed institution. The drawback of the army against the Austria-Hungarian and Russian armies further reinforced its importance; because, the army was the only means to rely on to protect the remaining lands (Rustow, 2004: 165). The Ottoman Empire did not hesitate to make extensive expenditures to modernize and develop the army. In the early nineteenth century, the old fashioned Janissary army was abolished. Like in the Western lands, military conscription was assumed in 1844 and various military schools were founded throughout the nineteenth century (Zürcher, 2004: 99). The army, as the first modernized institution in the Ottoman Empire, acted as the guardian of modernization against the tradition throughout the modern Turkish history (Yeğen, 1999: 45, footnote 9). In Iran, on the other hand, the army was basically constituted of the tribal forces of the provinces. When Nasser al-Din Shah sat on the throne in 1848, the Iranian army under his direct disposal was quite small, only about three thousand soldiers. The real military power was in the hands of the tribal leaders, who mostly owned more soldiers than the Shah (Cleveland, 2008: 126).

The Tanzimat reforms of 1839, in the Ottoman Empire, started an extensive modernization of the state apparatus. There emerged a strong and widespread state bureaucracy that the center of the ruling of the state was shifted from the palace to the *Bab-ı Ali* (the bureaucratic center). Especially the center of external affairs was effective in educating state bureaucrats to gain knowledge of European administration. The measures in the Tanzimat era were followed by the emergence of the Young Ottomans and the following Young Turks movements. The members of the latter were basically the bureaucratic and military cadres educated in the modern schools of the Ottoman Empire. "The creation of a national standing army of conscripts, a national monetary system, a nationwide communication network of railways and telegraph lines, a large and self-confident bureaucracy and a secular judicial system (except for family law) had all been achieved in the nineteenth and very early twentieth centuries" (Atabaki and Zürcher, 2004: 10).

Besides the institutions, the Turkish Republic also inherited a political maturity gained via the modern administrative organs. The *Meclis-i Vala-yi Ahkam-i Adliye* (Higher Council of Judicial Matters) was founded in the period of Mahmut II in 1837 to act as a consultancy council for the government. This organ was a source of experience for legislation and judiciary in the modern sense for the forthcoming modernist and nationalist state elite (Çadırcı, 2007: 59). Local councils were established as smaller forms of Meclis-i Vala-yi Ahkam-i Adliye in the provinces (*eyalet*) and districts (*sancak*) (Çadırcı, 2007: 273-275). Some of the members of these local councils were determined by elections. The village (*köy*) and town (*kaza*) headmen were also determined by local elections (Çadırcı, 2007: 61-62, 288-289). The province and district councils were responsible for administration, judiciary, health, inspection, and education in their region (Çadırcı, 2007: 283). Heper (2006: 81-82) states that the decisions of these central and provincial councils, as well as that of the first parliament in 1877, were not considered seriously either by the state or the local notables.[56] However, despite their ineffectiveness in real politics of the day, these councils resulted in the familiarity of the ruling elite and to some extent the provincial notables with elections and participatory administration.

Throughout the Tanzimat era Sultan Abdulmecid increased the number of ministries and ruled through the assemblies and councils. These measures brought with the familiarity of the political circles with the understanding of ruling by a cabinet (Çadırcı, 2007: 60). They were affective in transition to the parliamentary and constitutional government. For the elections of the first Ottoman Parliament in 1876 the rules of the elections of the provincial (*vilayet*) councils were applied (Çadırcı, 2007: 95). Many of the elected deputies had worked as members of the provincial and districts councils (Çadırcı, 2007: 217). In the period of Abdulhamid II the number of people working in the provincial administrations increased; new directories were established. In this period the administration gained a bureaucratic structure (Çadırcı, 2007: 220). In 1864, the administration and judiciary were separated in the districts. The district councils were separated into two as administrative and judiciary. The head of the state administration in the region, the director, became the head of the administrative branch; the judiciary council was headed by a judge (Çadırcı, 2007: 252). The bureaucratic foundation of the Tanzimat and Hamidian eras were useful for the Young Turks in 1908-1918 and for Mustafa Kemal in the first decades of the Republic, in order to found a modern nation state apparatus and perform the modernization attempts (Karpat, 2006: 60). This political maturity underlay the attitude of the members of the first Majlis of the Turkish Republic to stick to legality and constitutionality in their regulations (Tanör, 2006: 246-247, 269). Under the war conditions the Majlis considered itself to be bounded with the last Ottoman Constitution (*Kanun-i Esasi*) in between April 23, 1920 and January 20, 1921, and then with the first constitution of Turkey (*Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu*) between January 20, 1921 and April 20, 1924 (Tanör, 2006: 246-247, 294).

---

[56] Heper is critical of the idea that these councils were important steps towards constitutional and parliamentary government (Heper, 2006: 81-82).

In the Qajar Empire, on the other hand, such extensive reforms did not take place. This was, on the one hand, due to the farther distance between Iran and Europe, on the other hand, due to the less degree of trade with the Western countries, in comparison to the Ottoman case (Keddie, 1999: 90). Keddie notes, compared to the Ottoman Empire, "Iran had only a few reform measures that lasted more than a decade, scant introduction of modern education, and, despite several army reforms, only one truly modern army unit" (Keddie, 1999: 15). Therefore, "[w]hile it is undoubtedly true that there was an old tradition of a state in Iran and a widely shared consciousness of belonging to the realm of the Shah, the indispensable attributes of a modern state, such as efficient taxation, a bureaucratic administration by salaried officials with clear divisions of power and a distinct hierarchy, military conscription and census enabling both conscription and taxation were all practically non-existent" (Zürcher, 2004: 98).

Iran did not experience such centralization of the state as in the Ottoman Empire. The extensive military reforms, which were the main carrier of all other transformations in the Ottomans, did not take place in Iran. Keddie notes "[m]ilitary reform was a prerequisite to having enough central power to launch other major reforms" (Keddie, 1999: 90). One of the reasons of not having viable military reforms was the resistive power of the tribes. Such an obstacle was inexistent in the Ottoman case (Keddie, 1999: 90). Moreover, Nasser al-Din Shah did also not put much effort to educate bureaucrats that would establish the administrative institutions as in Europe (Cleveland, 2008: 133). The organization of the state remained to be an obstacle for the emergence of an educated cadre of state officials. The members of the dynasty and the sons of the locally independent notables took over the most prominent offices. This situation avoided the emergence of professional state bureaucracy who had well defined duties and acted according to written rules (Cleveland, 2008: 125). Lacking of the desire of the Shahs and lacking of educated cadres resulted that Iran did not experience the Tanzimat reforms as in the Ottomans (Cleveland, 2008: 133).

Due to the differences in the inherited state structure "Ataturk, of course, had an incomparable advantage when the process of state building was concerned… [W]here Reza Shah had to build a state, Ataturk, during his 15-year rule (1923-38) could transform an existing one" (Atabaki and Zürcher, 2004: 10). Zürcher states that an almost total continuity of state institutions is observed considering the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic. He mentions the army as an example and states that the success of the independence movement was possible due to the remains of the Ottoman army (Zürcher, 2004: 100). Lower levels of the provincial administration remained almost as before. The bureaucratic cadres of the ministry of finance and the Ottoman public debt administration were inherited to the young Republic (Zürcher, 2004: 101-102).

When Mustafa Kemal was in power, he had a bureaucratic cadre under his disposal, who were skilled in administration and experienced with legitimization of state acts (Elliot, 2004: 84). In Iran, on the other hand, "[t]he frequent bitter outbursts and personal feuds between members of the Majlis [after the Constitutional Revolution of 1906]…indicate a lack of political

maturity…[P]ersonal rivalries and jealousies could bypass discipline and the duty of obedience to the Shah". These brought about the difference in the rule of the two autocratic men, Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah. Elliot further states "Reza's inclinations were despotic, whereas Mustafa Kemal would be better described as a dictator" (Elliot, 2004: 84). The regime of the Republic in Turkey remained authoritarian within the realm of laws and formal regulations. In Iran, on the other hand, the regime transformed from an autocracy into an arbitrary rule (Atabaki and Zürcher, 2004: 10).

In Iran, Reza Shah had to build a modern state starting from a much earlier phase than Mustafa Kemal did in Turkey. Therefore, "Reza Shah was the Iranian counterpart not only of Ataturk, but also of Mahmud II" (Chehabi, 2004: 230). "[I]n some ways Reza Shah's actions were far more radical [than those of Ataturk], since Iran had not previously undergone the extensive human and physical infrastructure development experienced by the Ottoman Empire" (Zirinsky, 2003: 83). Modernization in the Pahlavi regime "meant that people's lives were disrupted and uprooted with extreme rapidity, often without compensatory economic and cultural benefits" (Keddie, 1982).

The years preceding the appearance of Reza Khan in 1921 were "a period of anarchy and collapse" (Cronin, 2004: 131). Reza Shah had to suppress the provincial and tribal powers in order to end the chaos. Due to the lack of a standing army he had to rely on the tribal levies. Therefore, "as in the Qajar military forces, so in Riza Khan's new army the tribal contingents continued to comprise the most significant fighting element" (Cronin, 2003: 39). This meant that Reza Shah had to compromise with some of the provincial sources of power in order to eliminate the others for the purpose of building a modern nation state.

In summary, it can be stated that the Turkish Republic inherited a better established state structure and a more mature bureaucratic administration system than that of the Iran of the Pahlavi regime. The centralization of the state with a widespread bureaucracy, the modernization of the army, the political maturity gained through the modern administrative organs in the center and provinces, and the continuity of the state institutions into the times of Turkish Republic were less evident in the case of the Qajar Empire and the following modern Pahlavi Iran. This difference is considerable considering the link between the state and society. In Turkey the people were confronted with a stronger and more systematic state apparatus. In Iran, the state was not strong enough to eliminate the peripheral powers and peripheral identity belongings.

4.2 Early Repression or Persistence of Potential Oppositional Groups

The actors of modernization are of crucial importance in the state formation of a land. Münch specifically focuses on "the constructors of the nations and their collective identities, their definitions of the situation and their position in the society" in his explanation of the state formations in the West. He cites the constructors of the four western nations as "intellectual representatives of civil society engaged in political practice in Britain, particularly during the

135

glorious revolution of 1688; radical intellectuals in France, particularly during the great revolution of 1789; intellectual entrepreneurs in the United States, particularly in the founding years of the republic, 1776 to 1789; and literary intellectuals – writers, philosophers, historians – in Germany, particularly in the founding epoch from 1770 to 1870" (Münch, 2001: 6).

The actors of the modernization of the states in Turkey and Iran were also of crucial importance in shaping the state formations of the two lands. It can be stated that the actors of modernization in Turkey were the military and state bureaucracy and that of Iran were composed of a larger segment of the population including the intellectuals, bazaaris, ulama, and the state bureaucracy. In Iran the influence of various strata of the population was visible throughout the nation state formation starting from the Constitutional Revolution in 1906 up to the Islamic Revolution in 1979. In Turkey, on the other hand, starting from the Tanzimat era, going through the CUP rule, the foundation of the Republic, and till the coup in 1980, it was dominantly the military and the state bureaucracy that shaped the modernization.

The question to be raised here is how the state bureaucracy and military could manage to be the main actor of nation state building in Turkey. This question can partially be answered by the early suppression of potential oppositional movements that could have emanated from the side of the societal powers in the Ottoman Empire. In this way, the importance of the actors of state formation can be related to the importance of suppression and elimination of potential oppositional powers prior to or during the early stages of the modernization and nation building process. As Ergut states, when the intermediary societal networks and organizations between the state and society disappear, the people start to directly engage with the state (Ergut, 2004: 366). The state is then situated in a central position in the lives of the people as the only means to solve their problems. The lack of strong societal networks in Turkey, compared to Iran, underlay the comparatively more central position of the state in the social life of people throughout the modernization period. Walzer (1998: 137-138) emphasizes that the vanguard is effective and determines the trajectory of the revolution in a somewhat authoritarian way "only in the absence of an economically independent and politically advanced social class". In Turkey, the early elimination of potential oppositions did not only render the state more central, but also enabled the vanguard of the modernization to act freer and more authoritarian than their counterparts in Iran.

The centralization of the state and spread of the bureaucracy in the late Ottoman Empire could be possible with the repression of potential oppositional groups in the early nineteenth century. The Janissaries and the ulama presented potential oppositional forces for the modernization attempts of the Ottoman statesmen. Their repression and maintaining the institutional hegemony of the state were possible partly because the Ottoman Empire traditionally had a centralized state structure and partly because the core of these potential oppositions emanated from the ranks of the statesmen, not of the lower classes of the society. After the elimination of these two forces the modernization programs of Mahmut II and the Tanzimat bureaucracy could be realized without significant

resistance. The elimination of Janissaries and the ulama resulted in the lack of any organized group that could lead the lower classes of the society for opposition to the state regulations. This role was played by the ulama in Iran.

A similar elimination occurred also with the Christian minorities, which could have posed a significant resistance to the nationalization/Turkification of the Turkish Republic. The intervention of the Western states in the internal affairs of the Ottomans, the emergence of non-Muslim groups with separatist inclinations, and the First World War prepared the conditions for the rise of anti-Christian feelings among the Ottomans. The nationalist group ruling throughout the First World War used the War conditions for an ethnic cleansing of Anatolia from the non-Muslim populations. In this way, the main group that would pose a resistance to the state with an economic power, namely the Christian merchants of Anatolia, was eliminated. The Armenian Massacre, the expulsion of Greek merchants during the First World War, and the population exchange of the Greeks in Anatolia are the moments of the elimination of potential Christian proto bourgeois opposition to the nation building in Turkey. At the end, there was no comparable opposition to the Turkish state as the bourgeoisie in the European lands or the bazaaris in Iran.

The weakness of the Qajar Empire resulted in the persistence of strong societal powers in Iranian society. The tribes, which constituted the backbone of the Qajar army, the ulama, which preserved its independent institutionalization, and the bazaaris, which constituted the petty-bourgeoisie of Iran, are remarkable in this regard. The resistance of these groups prevented the state to centralize and reinforce its administration. The rare attempts of modernization in the late nineteenth century remained fragile and eventually unsuccessful. Moreover, the nationalization attempts of modern Iran state did never culminate in ethnic cleansing of the non-Muslims as in Turkey. This was partly because there was no significant separatist threat from the side of the non-Muslim groups and partly because the Iranian nationalism was not fed with the rise of anti-Christian feelings among the Iranian population as the Turkish.

The persistence of the social powers of the ulama and bazaaris created a very different political scene in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Iran, in comparison to that in Turkey. The Tobacco Movement, Constitutional Revolution, and protests against the republican inclinations of Reza Khan were led by the preeminent members of the ulama. The close social connections between the ulama and the bazaaris were underlying both the ideological and the economic support behind the mass protests. The intellectuals advocating the modern European thoughts appeared as an organizing and leading group for the mass protests of this period. The intellectuals, ulama, and the bazaaris constituted the backbone of the many societies (anjomans) that took active part in the Constitutional Revolution.

Another important difference between Turkey and Iran in the early twentieth century was due to the occurrence or lacking of possibilities of a coalition between the oppositional groups. In

Turkey, already weakened oppositions against the modernization attempts of the nationalists – the ulama, non-Muslims, and liberal intellectuals – were separated from each other.[57] They opposed different sides of the nationalist modernizers, hence had no common point to come together. In Iran, on the other hand, opposition to the external powers and the Shahs, both in the Qajar and Reza Shah eras, were common to many social forces extending from the bazaaris to the non-Muslims. The civil war for the constitution is remarkable in this regard. The mass protests leading to the Constitutional Revolution were started by the ulama, supported by the bazaaris, and led by the intellectuals; eventually the Armenians and the Bakhtiyari tribe were crucial for the triumph of the constitutionalists in the civil war.

As a result, it can be argued that while the repression of the potential oppositions in the early nineteenth century Ottoman Empire resulted in the lack of any organized mass opposition to the state regulations, the persistence of societal powers in Iran resulted in considerable mass movements against state initiatives.

4.3 Networks of Societal Groups

Nation-state formation in the West is experienced as a process of modernization of the state apparatus and as a process of nation building. In these processes the state was one of the actors among the aristocracy, bourgeoisie, intellectuals, and representatives of smaller groups. In the West the nation state formation evolved as a result of a struggle between all these centers of societal powers. Depending on the power of the state with respect to the other actors the modernization happened to be a process of either top-down or bottom-up. Bendix notes "the problem of public authority" is in relation with "the group-forming tendencies arising in the social structure" (Bendix, 1964: 142). The group-forming tendency in the middle ages was related to the claims of nobles against the king's absolute power. During the French Revolution it was about the claims of the middle classes against the king and aristocrats and in modern times it is more related to the claims of lower classes for the distribution of the national wealth. Bendix especially points out "the right to form associations" and "the right to receive a minimum formal education" as important factors that influence the struggle of these groups against the ruling power (Bendix, 1964: 79).

Janoski stresses the "size and overlap of spheres of society" and the "strength of civil society vis-à-vis the state" as criteria to be examined for citizenship and state formations. He identifies four intersecting spheres of society: state sphere, public sphere, market sphere, and private sphere (Janoski, 1998: 13, Figure I.I.). The definition of civil society is related to the discursive dialectic between the first three spheres among those. He states, "[c]ivil society represents a sphere of dynamic and responsive public discourse between the state, the public sphere consisting of

---

[57] It can be argued that during the Hamidian era, the non-Muslims sided with the Young Turks (CUP) in opposition to the Abdulhamid regime. The support of the non-Muslim groups for the CUP coup in 1908 can be considered as a sign of this. However, the Turkish centric nationalism of the CUP during its rule alienated the non-Muslim minorities from the regime of the Young Turks.

voluntary organizations, and the market sphere concerning private firms and unions" (Janoski, 1998: 12).

In Britain, the local representatives and societal organizations were strong enough to bring the state to a compromise; hence there evolved a more liberal state formation. In comparison to the continent, "the political modernization of England for all its conflicts occurred in a relatively continuous and peaceful manner", in the sense of including the lower classes to the policy making (Bendix, 1964: 67, 71). This liberal policy towards the internal politics was realized by the "rights of associations" which corresponded to the organization and regulation of the guilds and master-servant relations (Bendix, 1964: 82-83). The intellectuals in Britain mostly represented the civil society associations that "link government to society". Therefore, "Civilian life organized by civic associations is the particular feature that marks British collective identity" (Münch, 2001: 23).

In France, on the other hand, the state was the central, if not the sole, actor of the state formation process; therefore, there evolved a more state centric, etatist, formation. This meant the social regulations emanated basically from the state initiatives with minor influence of societal groups or associations. The centrality of the state resulted that there were no representative organs between the individuals and the state. The idea of the general will of the community reduced the overall society to the state. Instead of the associations of political groups, the individual became the focus of political concern. The intermediaries between the state and the individual were eliminated. With the strengthening of the principle of "plebiscitarianism" and the weakening of associations, the revolution "brought about a fundamental change in the conception of representation: the basic unit was no longer the household, the property, or the corporation, but the individual citizen; and representation was no longer channeled through separate functional bodies but through a unified national assembly of legislators" (Bendix, 1964: 94).

In the Scandinavian lands the societal powers were even stronger than those in the Britain that the resulting formation was more social democratic. The Scandinavian countries remained predominantly agricultural until the nineteenth century. After transition to the absolutist rule from the estate society structure "the governments did little or nothing either to restrict or legalize" the activities of various associations. Therefore these countries "experienced a remarkable proliferation of religious, cultural, economic, and political associations" (Bendix, 1964: 81). As a result of this relative freedom of associations, the traditional organizations of crafts were preserved in the Scandinavian lands and transferred to the modern times in a modified form: "the statutory regulation of master-servant relations and journeymen's associations" were extended "to cope with the new problems". "In modified form this variant represents the medieval concept of liberty as a privilege, a concept which certainly allows for a statutory reinforcement of existing arrangements" (Bendix, 1964: 82-83). All these differences between British, French, and Scandinavian state formations point out the importance of the degree of power of societal organizations vis-à-vis the state in nation building and formation of the nation state.

In parallel with Janoski's stress of the power of civil society in formation of citizenship, Mische's research on the society of Brazil points out the importance of "organizational networks in which new projects and relations are formulated and communicated" in relation to citizenship formation (Mische, 1996: 132). The importance of these organizations is not limited to their contribution to the formation of citizenship. In the case "rights on paper do not translate into rights in practice", like in Brazil, such organizations play the crucial role of constructing the frame for "social practices", which "make citizenship meaningful" (Mische, 1996: 135). Therefore, the function of societal organizations to expand citizenship rights and the function of "the concept of citizenship…as a carrier for…emergent projects and identities" have a dialectical relation that reinforce each other (Mische, 1996: 137). Just like Janoski stresses the strength of civil society, Mische mentions the denseness of networks of societal organizations as an important factor in the construction of citizenship (Mische, 1996: 140). She explicitly writes "citizenship practices emerge from the articulation of national organizations and universal rules with the particularisms and varying political cultures of local environments (types of civil society)" (Mische, 1996: 141). The ulama and bazaari network in Iran and the lack of similar societal networks in Turkey are remarkable in this sense.

The criterion of "size and overlap of spheres of society" by Janoski clarifies the difference of state power in Turkey and Iran. While Turkey inherited a strong state tradition from the Ottoman Empire, Iran inherited a relatively weak state tradition from the Qajars. Since the state in Iran was not strong enough to repress and control the society, the societal groups in Iran persisted and demonstrated significant oppositional power to the state. The societal power centers in the Ottoman and Turkish contexts were either demolished or significantly repressed. In Iran the ulama and bazaaris led the oppositional mass movements in the late Qajar and early Pahlavi eras making use of their extensive and independent networks within the society. The tribes traditionally constituted the backbone of the Qajar army; they strongly resisted to the centralization of the state in the Pahlavi era. Even after their disarmament and forced settlement the tribal links proved to be an influential factor in modern Iranian politics. The political left in Iran also rose as a strong and influential factor. The street protests by the Tudeh Party in support of the Mossadeq are remarkable. In Turkey there were no comparably powerful counterparts of these groups; the masses lacked a leadership like the ulama in Iran due to the early demolishment of the Janissary and Bektashi orders; the economic network of Christian merchants were early eliminated by cleansing of the land from the Christian populations; there were no comparably large tribal populations as in Iran; and the political left in Turkey remained to be too weak to influence the actual politics. Therefore "strength of civil society vis-à-vis the state", with Janoski's terms, significantly differed in the two contexts. In relation to this the "denseness of networks of societal organizations", mentioned by Mische, was also significantly different in Turkey and Iran. The following subsections discuss and demonstrate these differences in Turkey and Iran by focusing on the larger

power of ulama, bazaaris, tribes and political left in Iran compared to in Turkey, and by highlighting the easier repression of political oppositions, religious groups, and civil societal associations in Turkey.

4.3.1   Iran – Ulama, Bazaaris, Active Societal Powers

The terms civil societal groups in this thesis refers to the groups organized within a network for their own material and ideological interests outside the domain of the state. Bendix stresses the distinction between civil society and state by stating "Civil Society is characterized by the groups formed through the coalescence of material and ideal interests. The State, on the other hand, is based on a shared belief in a legitimate order" (Bendix, 1964: 28). Janoski also states that "[t]he social science definition of civil society…emphasizes the interaction of voluntary groups in the non-state sphere" (Janoski, 1998: 12). Kamali consider civil society as "the capacity of a society to organize itself without being organized by a state" (Kamali, 1998: 36). Following the understandings the civil society in Iran refers to the "sphere of local communities, the bazaris, Muslim individuals, and the ulama, where the ulama have had a leading position" (Kamali, 1998: 43). "The socio-cultural alliance between the ulama and the bazaaris made up the core of civil society in Iran and manifested its stability and continuity during the two main revolutions of the twentieth century" (Kamali, 1998: 57). In the mid twentieth century the composition of the civil society in Iran changed in favor of emergent modern political organizations such as parties and associations.

The power of civil societal groups can be discerned by the extent that they resist to the unfavorable regulations of the state for their own interests. Accordingly Kamali states "[t]he basis of a civil society is the existence of influential civil groups and their institutions that can, through established mechanisms, counterbalance state power" (Kamali, 2001). The ulama and the bazaaris in Iran constituted the most important civil societal groups that resisted the state imposed regulations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The Shi'a ulama in Iran owned religious networks with religious schools and waqfs (endowments) and were financially independent from the state. Similarly the bazaaris owned networks of trade and were in close cooperation with the ulama.

From comparison point of view, the relation of the ulama with the state is considerably different in the modern histories of Turkey and Iran. This is basically because the ulama had a different relation with the state in the Ottoman and Qajar empires. The religious institution in the Ottoman Empire functioned more or less as a state department. In Iran, on the other hand, the ulama were "institutionally, socially and financially independent of the state" (Zubaida, 1989: 138-139). This difference resulted in the different paths followed as a reaction to Western intervention. While in many of the Ottoman territories a secularist-modernist opposition took place (like in Turkey and Egypt), in Iran the opposition was most of the time led by the ulama and had

considerable religious connotations (Zubaida, 1989: 138-139). Therefore, unlike the Ottoman case, the clergy in Iran was an important group effective on the socio-political development, especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

> The power of clergy stemmed from their monopoly of knowledge and interpretation of the law; from the influence which they enjoyed over the population in general through the exercise of their professional functions; from their participation in the government bureaucracy; from relationships through marriage; and from their administrative control of *waqf*, such as villages and sources of irrigation water (Upton, 1970: 25).

The ulama were in cooperation with the bazaaris; they together constituted "the core group of alliance" in many of the political movements in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (Kamali, 1998: 239-240). The relation between the two was due to the fact that "[t]he *bazaaris* relied on the *ulama* for political support and protection, and the *ulama* depended on the *bazaaris* for economic support" (Ghods, 1989: 16).

Historically the ulama have been the leading group of the Iranian civil society vis-à-vis the statesmen. Especially after the fall of the Safavid Empire in 1724, the land was under fought of various tribes. Throughout these chaotic years the ulama strengthened its position as the only organized power to sustain order in the society. The people acknowledged the religious and judicial power of the ulama; therefore the ulama could be a very powerful supporter of or opposition to the Shahs. In this way the ulama gained a powerful position in the Iranian politics (Cleveland, 2008: 126). The Shi'a ulama were independent of the government. Their finances were due to the contributions of their followers, basically that of the wealthy bazaaris. This was a significant advantage of the ulama in Iran, compared to their counterparts in the Sunni lands, like the Ottoman Empire (Keddie, 1999: 91).

The ulama took active role in the conflict between the urban people and the local governors appointed by the Shah. During the reign of Fath Ali Shah, 1797-1834, "they could organize the urban population and, against the Shah's will, revolt against the governors… In many of these conflicts, the ulama stayed behind the people and supported them against the oppressive governors" (Kamali, 1998: 65). In the late nineteenth century they acted as the "natural leaders" of the bazaaris and the urban people against the Qajar Shahs (Kamali, 1998: 56). The Tobacco Movement and the Constitutional Revolution were two important instances that with the liberal intellectuals the ulama played the role of organizing and voicing the demands of the societal powers against the state (Kamali, 1998: 12).

The ulama in Iran were not categorically opposed to the modernization attempts. "[A]s long as the reforms would reinforce the state authority against the external threats of the West and the Sunni states", and "as long as the reforms did not influence the traditional structure of civil society of Iran – and the civil leadership of the ulama", they were not reluctant. "Such was the case with Abbas Mirza's 'Nezam-e jadid' [in the 1820s (Keddie, 1999: 22-24)], and Amir Kabir's political

reforms [in the 1840s (Keddie, 1999: 28-29)]. But, if the reforms were intended to reduce the authority of the ulama in favor of the state, they did not accept them and actively reacted against them" (Kamali, 1998: 69, 76-77).

The second important societal power in the traditional Iranian society was the bazaaris, namely the merchants in the cities of Iran. The bazaaris were the most affected group by the intrusion of Western products and life style into the land throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Furthermore, in the late nineteenth century, the Qajar Shahs sold out many of the monopolies to foreign traders. All these deprived the bazaaris from their economic power within the traditional Iranian society. They were the main economic interest group taking part in the protests against the Qajar Shahs in the Tobacco Movement and Constitutional Revolution.

An important factor behind the power of the bazaaris in Iran was that they were overwhelmingly Muslims. In the Ottoman Empire, on the other hand, most of the merchants, especially the ones who had contact with the Western companies, were from the non-Muslim minorities. Therefore, in Iran the bazaaris had a strong ideological solidarity and strong ties with the ulama (Keddie, 1999: 91). Such solidarity and strong link with an ideologically influential stratum of the society was lacking for the nineteenth century Christian merchants of the Ottoman Empire.

The historical relation between the bazaaris and the ulama in Iran can be described as a coalition of the two. The bazaaris were in fact the main economic financers of the ulama with their donations to the religious waqfs and payment for education of their sons in the religious schools. The economic interests of the ulama were linked to the bazaaris. Due to this economic connection the ulama also suffered from the trading activities of foreigners in Iran. The ulama hold the expectation that their influence on the society would increase when the power of the Shahs was limited by a constitution (Cleveland, 2008: 163). These were the underlying reasons for the leadership of ulama in the protests against the state regulations in the late Qajar period. The protests initiated by the ulama were joined by the merchants of the cities and they turned out to be a mass protest in each time.

Contrary to their expectations, with the constitutional regime, the historical leadership role of the ulama deteriorated (Kamali, 1998: 123). This was because the parliamentary system necessitated the emergence of political groups and parties organized in a modern way. "[T]he state was divided among (1) the government, (2) the Shah, and (3) the Majlis. Hence, the complexity of the new socio-political reality and the lack of a new theological justification for the role of the ulama in the new society left the political sphere mainly to the new political groups such as the nationalists and communists" (Kamali, 1998: 141). In a system where parties were the operational organs, there was no need for a leading group to voice the demands of the masses. Therefore, it can be argued that the ulama's role of leadership was reduced to being a mere influential group

appealing only to the religious sentiments of the people. The struggle of Reza Shah against the ulama can be considered to be against not a real powerful societal group in itself but to one that has religious influence on the society as a supporter of other oppositional groups.

Reza Shah initially aimed at replacing the monarchic regime with a republic. This would shift the legitimization idea of the state from being based on religion as the protector of Islam to being a secular one as the representative of the sovereignty of the people (Martin, 2003: 65). This would also transform the "Iranians' source of allegiance and identity from one based on religion to one grounded in pre-Islamic monarchical legacy" (Boroujerdi, 1996: 79). However, the opponents of Reza Shah in Tehran could make an effective coalition with the leading ulama to stop realization of his intention (Martin, 2003: 65). Although the main opposition forces were non-cleric, the agreement of the ulama against the idea of republicanism and their encouragement for public opposition was crucial in the setback of the Shah. The secularization measures in Turkey that emerged as a result of Republicanism were influential on the Iranian ulama to oppose to the republicanism in Iran (Atabaki, 2004: 59).

An important measure for limiting the power of the ulama in Iran was secularization of judiciary. In the traditional Iranian society judiciary was in the hands of the ulama, under the Sharia Law. After Reza Shah sustained power, he promulgated the laws of secularization of the judiciary. In 1928 the parliament accepted the new civil code based on the French model. The Sharia Law and the religious judiciary were not directly abolished, but were limited to only family law. Furthermore, with the law in 1936, the lawyers of the state courts were required to have graduated from the law department of the Tehran University or a foreign university. This law put a lot of the ulama outside the new judicial system by declaring them not to be qualified (Cleveland, 2008: 211). "Measures were taken to curb the number of students enrolled in religiously controlled schools as well as to replace traditional religious teaching with the inculcation of ethical values revolving around citizenship and patriotism" (Matthee, 2003: 132-133). Afterwards, Reza Shah also promulgated the laws limiting the influence and signs of religion in social life. Banning the head cover of women and confiscation of the lands of the religious waqfs were among these measures. The reforms of Mohammed Reza Shah continued to deprive the clergy from their remaining independent sources of revenues. Especially the land reform in 1960s and the state built Endowments Organization in 1964 brought the lands of religious waqfs under the control of the state (Boroujerdi, 1996: 79).

After the modernization reforms of Reza Shah, the social impact of the bazaari-ulama coalition was "drastically marginalized" (Kamali, 1998: 162). The secularization attempts of Reza Shah in judiciary and education did not only impoverish the ulama but also weakened the economic link of interest between the ulama and bazaaris. The remaining link was due to the religious sentiments and mere religious role of the ulama. Although this was still an important link, since the bazaaris remained to be religiously conservative, the binding between the two was not strong. "In

the modern civil society of Iran…the alliance of the ulama and the bazaaris was marginalized and new social groups constructed a modern political sphere based on modern political parties, ideologies, mass media, and so forth. The new political parties and associations…became more representative for a modern civil society in rapid change and more successful in speaking for and mobilizing new as well as old social groups against the state" (Kamali, 1998: 163). Especially for the factions of the bazaaris that were transformed to be the national bourgeoisie, the economic liberalism like in the West was a more central concern than the religious sentiments promoted by the ulama. The relation between Reza Shah and the part of the former bazaaris who now became the leading Iranian bourgeoisie was not of a conflict. The bourgeoisie were in general happy with the economic measures that abolished the foreign monopolies and started a national capitalist economy. The remaining bazaaris engaging in traditional sectors were forced to accept the state imposed economic relations, although they were detrimental to their own interests (Kamali, 1998: 162).

The women's movement in Iran presents a different situation than the traditional societal powers within the same context. This is because the women's movements were themselves modern in the sense of contrasting to the traditional values of the society. The women's movements, on the one hand, supported the modernization attempts of the state in the direction of gender equality, on the other hand, opposed the repressive policies of the state because they demanded autonomy as the other civil groups. The active role of the women's movements in the constitutional revolution, their repression by the Reza Shah regime, their persistence and revitalization after Reza Shah's abdication, and their being manipulated by the Mohammed Reza Shah regime are explained by Hoodfar (2000). He argues that although the women actively participated in the history of modern nation building in Iran they did not get their rights as a result of the hindrance from the side of the ulama.

In the Tobacco Movement of 1892 the women were in the front lines of the crowd that marched towards the palace. During the years that led to the Constitutional Revolution in 1906 women established many secret and semisecret associations in favor of the constitutionalists. Moreover, they formed a "human shield for the ulema who had taken sanctuary in a shrine near Tehran" in 1905 (Hoodfar, 2000: 290). They took part in organizing "strikes and boycotts" against "the influence of foreigners and the despotic rule of the Shah" (Hoodfar, 2000: 290). After the triumph of the constitutionalists, women "organized to raise funds for a national bank, which had become the corner of the first parliament" (Hoodfar, 2000: 290) Despite their active participation the women were not given citizenship rights by the parliaments following the Constitutional Revolution. Moreover, their participation was "overlooked"; "[t]he history of their struggles…was hidden from the world and from their children" (Hoodfar, 2000: 290).

The 1906 Constitution did not give suffrage rights to women, leave aside the right to be elected, "on the grounds that it was against the text of the Qur'an!" (Hoodfar, 2000: 290). Being

left apart from political engagement they turned towards woman based activities to combat the existing situation. Founding semisecret associations to discuss the rights of women and opening girls' schools, writing and publishing about women's problems were among their activities (Hoodfar, 2000: 292). The main target of the struggle of the women was the interpretation of the Islam by the ulama. The ulama were against changing the women's "traditional and customarily subordinate position in the family and society", with the argument that such claims were against Islam (Hoodfar, 2000: 293).

The regime of Reza Pahlavi "sought to depoliticize civil society", and the women's movement was not immune from the repressions in this period (Hoodfar, 2000: 294). "Women's associations, which by then had proliferated in all major cities and had established many girls schools, were…repressed, even though their demands and activities were in line with the goals of the regime" (Hoodfar, 2000: 294). In the period of political freedom following the abdication of Reza Shah, women concentrated their demands on the right of universal suffrage. They linked the citizenship rights with the "reform of the family code" in order to democratize the marriage and family life (Hoodfar, 2000: 294).

The National Front leader Mossadeq considered enacting the enfranchisement of women through a comprehensive election reform in the early 1950s (Katouzian, 2004: 180). This intent was strongly supported by the secular segments of the political circles, especially the Third Force led by Khalil Maleki. However, some influential ulama again hindered the intention. "[T]he government [of Mossadeq] had to shelve the proposed bill because it lacked the strength to face a populist opposition to it on religious grounds" (Katouzian, 2004: 180).

The women of Iran could gain the right of enfranchisement in the time of Mohammed Reza Shah. The Shah repressed the religious opposition – the main obstacle for women's enfranchisement – besides any kind. However, the regime of Mohammed Reza Shah aimed at controlling the women's movements by bringing them under the terms of the state. Nominating the sister of the Shah, Princess Ashraf, as the head of the Iranian Women's Organization, was a clear sign of this attempt. Many of the activist groups of Iranian women became depoliticized as a result of these policies (Hoodfar, 2000: 294-295). In the reign of Mohammad Reza Shah the women issues were discussed mostly on the axis of accordance of the reforms of the state to the Sharia law. The state enacted the Family Protection Law in 1967, "which introduced radical changes in divorce provisions" (Mir-Hosseini, 1996: 289-290). This law initiated a discussion which later culminated in the text "The System of Women's Rights in Islam", by Mortaza Motahhari, "written to offset the harsh criticism of the *shari'a* position on women". In this text Motahhari "glorified geder inequality by arguing that it is in harmony with the law of nature. He dismissed equal rights for men and women as a Western concept and alien to the Islamic world-view" (Mir-Hosseini, 1996: 290). Namely, the women's movement in the time of Mohammed Reza Shah was lagging far behind to gain a genuinely equal socio-political status as men.

Starting from the late nineteenth century there has been politically active networks of societal powers, prominently the ulama and bazaaris, in Iran. The lack of power of the Qajar Empire in comparison to that in the Ottoman resulted that these societal powers in Iran were the main actors of the Constitutional Revolution. The Pahlavi regime aimed at repressing the societal powers and eliminating their active role in shaping the politics. Due to the policies of Reza Shah the societal groups were silenced and the active side of the nation building in Iran was deteriorated. However, the policies of Reza Shah could not totally eliminate the societal power networks and mass protest tradition in Iran. Disruption of the Pahlavi regime resulted in emergence of new forms of societal powers as the National Front Movement which had both secular and religious factions. The repressive policies of Mohammed Reza Shah pushed the oppositional groups to the margins of the legal political framework. In this period many societal powers in Iran politically organized against the regime and finally performed a revolution to collapse the Pahlavi era. The existence of the networks of societal powers in the eve of the twentieth century, the marginalization of these by the Pahlavi regime by repression, and the lack of power of Iranian state to totally eliminate them underlay the persistence, reemergence and political effectiveness of societal networks in the twentieth century Iran.

4.3.2   Turkey – Repression of Societal Powers

The difference between the Caliphate/Sultan (*padişah*) in the Sunni Ottoman Empire and the Shah in Shi'a Iran is remarkable in understanding the difference in the level of dependency of the ulama on the state in the two lands. The Caliphate/Sultan holds both the secular and religious authority. The Shah, on the other hand, has only the secular authority and is not considered to be a religious leader (Deringil, 2007: 145). Therefore, in the Ottoman Empire, the leader of the ulama was the Sultan; the ulama were not independent of the state as in the Qajars. The head of the ulama, *Şeyhulislam*, and the clerics in the provinces were centrally appointed wage earners paid by the state. The ulama in the Ottoman Empire were more close to the state than to the civil society (Berkes, 1972: 116). They had lost their links with the popular culture and lower strata of the population (Berkes, 1972: 49). "Because of the closer connections between the Sunni ulama and the state, they were apparently not able to establish the same leadership role in civil society as the ulama of Iran" (Kamali, 1998: 250; 2001). "This is the reason why, in the Turkish case, unlike that of Pahlevi Iran, opposition to the new secular regime was led by the dervish brotherhoods (*tarikat*) and not by the clergy" (Zürcher, 2004: 102).

The independent religious groups in the Ottoman Empire were the dervish lodges, namely the Bekhtashi orders. Historically these dervish lodges were linked to the Janissaries, the traditional army of the Ottoman Empire. As mentioned before, the Janissaries and dervish lodges were the power centers for opposition to the regulations of the Ottoman palace (Horniker, 1944; Timur, 1998: 111, 124; Berkes, 1972: 107, 114; Başkaya, 2004: 190; Mardin, 2007: 54, 112-113). However, these dervish lodges were significantly weakened with the abolishment of the Janissaries

in the early nineteenth century (Berkes, 1972: 119). Therefore, their power in the late Ottoman Empire and early Turkish Republic was not comparable to the power of ulama in the late Qajar Empire and early Pahlavi regime.

The Bekhtashi orders and Janissaries in the classical Ottoman period, which were more comparable to the ulama and bazaaris in Iran, were weakened and demolished in the early nineteenth century. Afterwards, there was no center of societal power to organize the discontent of the people against the Ottoman state regulations. Therefore, there appeared no mass demonstrations in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, comparable to that of the Tobacco Movement or Constitutional Revolution in Iran. More importantly, there appeared no tradition of mass movement in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. The majority of the masses remained almost outside of the struggle related to the economic and political regulations of the state. The struggle took place between the modernized military and state bureaucracy on the one hand and the beneficiaries of the traditional Ottoman regime on the other hand.

During the Republican era, as well, the ulama did not pose a significant resistance to the secular measures of the state. The state performed tremendous secularization of education and law and diminished the power of religious orders in a few years. "[T]he abolition of the Caliphate, the closing of the *medrese* (religious schools) and the unification of education under the secular Ministry of Education, the elimination of both the office of *Seyh-ul-Islam* and the Ministry of Sheriah (established in 1920) and instead setting up a Religious Affairs Directorate (*Diyanet Işleri Başkanlığı*) under the prime minister, and abolishing the Sheriah courts" all took part in the very early years of the Republic and were ratified by the 1924 Constitution. The *tekke* and *zaviye* (dervish lodges and orders) were closed by a law in 1925. In 1926, the Turkish Civil Law (*Türk Kanun-i Medenisi*) was adopted from the Swiss civil code (Çolak, 2005: 245).

After the 1908 coup of the CUP and declaration of the Second Constitutional Regime, there flourished various parties and associations in the Ottoman Empire. "In the ten years between 1908 and 1918, 12 political parties and 37 political or social associations were established. In addition, there were 157 chambers of commerce in various provinces, several chambers of industry, 51 associations of small businesses, organizations of entrepreneurs and artisans, and sale-credit cooperatives" (Toprak, 1994: 90). Among the social associations 14 of them were women's associations (Toprak, 1994: 115). This situation continued also during the war years, till 1922, "with a total number of 45 political parties or organizations" (Toprak, 1994: 90). The establishment of the Republic in 1923 stopped this period of associational enrichment. Especially after the explicit demarcation of the system as a single-party regime, in the 1931 Congress of the CUP, a lot of associations were closed and civil societal activities were stopped. Keyder cites the following:

> In 1931 the Turkish Hearts, a legacy of Young Turk nationalism, were closed down. Again in 1931, a new press law gave the government the right to close newspapers and magazines for publishing anything that 'conflicted with the general policies of the country'. In 1933 a

university 'reform' expelled two-thirds of the 150 teaching staff at the only institution of higher learning, Istanbul University. In 1935 freemasonry was outlawed despite its roster of former and actual dignitaries; shortly after, the Turkish Women's Association was closed (Keyder, 1998: 204).

The easiness of the state to repress such various associations and their sudden disappearance might be a sign that those associations did not have a comparable social base and power to their counterparts in Iran. Associational activity and pluralist politics revived only after the transition to the multi-party regime in 1946. After this transition there emerged 46 political parties; however, most of them disappeared again, before the DP started to rule in 1950 (Toprak, 1994: 105). The DP government, especially in the second half of the 1950s, resorted more and more to intolerance and repression of oppositions. The oppositional groups demarcated the DP government as a "tyranny of the majority". For them, the military coup of 1960 was the only way to change this situation (Toprak, 1994: 93).

The ulama and bazaaris being intact in the nineteenth century Qajars, the Janissaries and Bekhtashi orders being eliminated in the early nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, both had impacts on the state formations of the two lands. In Iran the ulama and the bazaaris were active participants of the mass protests (Tobacco Movement, Constitutional Revolution) preceding the rise of the modern state. Although their power was lessened in the modern times of the twentieth century, the ulama and bazaaris did not disappear from the political arena. The Pahlavi state had to consider their impact on the population. Sometimes, the Shah had to step back from his policies in state formation. In the period of modern Turkish Republic, on the other hand, there was no comparable civil societal power that would organize the reaction of the lower strata against the state regulations. In Turkey there appeared no comparably strong and organized opposition to the state regulations. All these facts lead to the idea that the impetus of the civil societal masses from below was stronger in state formation of Iran compared to that of Turkey.

4.3.3   Tribes

Tribes in Iran played a significant role in the Qajar Empire as they constituted the cavalry of the Iranian army. The Qajar Empire depended on the tribal forces for the military measures and defense against the Russian invasions. In the beginning of the modern Iranian state Reza Shah aimed at diminishing the power of tribes by disarming and settling their population. Even for that purpose Reza Shah relied on the cavalry of one tribe in order to suppress another. The centralization policy of Reza Shah had to dedicate a lot of state resources to diminish the power of tribes. Therefore, it can be argued that the tribes constituted a significant obstacle for the emergence of the modern Iranian state. This obstacle contributed also to the founding idea that maintaining law and order all over the land was the central mission of the state. The ability of the state to sustain law and order was associated with the disarmament and settling of the various tribes.

In the Ottoman Empire, on the other hand, the tribal life was from the very early times conceived as "uncivilized" (Deringil, 2007: 85). A civilized life was associated with schools, municipality, and military buildings. Therefore, there was a general policy of demolishing the tribal authority and making the tribal groups loyal to the state (Dündar, 2001: 48; Deringil, 2007: 189). After the Tanzimat Reforms a number of laws were declared to settle the nomadic tribes in their winter settlement places, to take a census of them, to make them engage with agriculture, and to transform them into regular tax payers (Dündar, 2001: 55-56). There was an intensive settlement of nomadic tribes after 1839. The security in the countryside was considerably increased in the same period (Çadırcı, 2007: 142). The Ottoman state also followed the policy of separating the tribal leaders from their people and settling them in distinct areas. For example, after the 1877 Ottoman-Russian War, the immigrant Circassian tribes were settled in different places than their leaders in order to speed up their integration with the local people (Dündar, 2001: 48). All these measures resulted in significant degrading of the tribal population in the twentieth century Ottoman Empire, in comparison to that in Iran.[58] It can be stated that due to the settlement policies of the Ottoman state, the modern Turkish Republic did not face a comparable problem of tribes as Reza Shah did during his reign.[59]

After the abdication of Reza Shah, many of the tribal leaders abroad came back to the land and regained their status as the head of their people. The Iranian army was modernized and based on conscription; there was no need of cavalry anymore. Many of the nomadic people were settled and became accustomed to their new life integrated with the modernized urban centers. However, the tribal identities did not disappear in Iranian society. The tribal leaders were still considered to be the representatives of an identity associated with the people of their tribe. The impact of the tribal leaders on their people and the political power the leaders derived from their tribal population were significant considering the parliamentary system based on elections. Therefore, in modern Iran, the tribal leaders appeared to be important political actors backed with the huge amount of votes from their people. This should be considered as a significant difference compared to the socio-political formation in Turkey. While the tribal links still existed in Iran, in Turkey such links were weaker.

The existence of strong tribal resistance to the modernization of Reza Shah was in contrast to the case in Turkey. The regime in Iran spent much of its effort to settle the tribes and to repress the tribal rebellions. This was an effort to maintain the physical central control of the state. Namely, the Regime of Reza Shah had to deal with the centralization problem on a level which was far before over in the late Ottoman period, hence which did not exist for the Kemalist regime in Turkey.

---

[58] However, there were also regions of the Empire that the Tanzimat regulations could not be properly applied. The Hakkari region, between Turkey and Iran, was one of those. The nomadic tribes migrating between Turkey and Iran in this region remained as a problem for the Ottoman Empire (Çadırcı, 2007: 197-198). During the reign of CUP there were one million Turkish, one million Kurdish, and three million Arabic tribal populations all over the Ottoman Empire (Dündar, 2001: 73).
[59] In the turn of the century about one-third to one-quarter of the Iranian population is estimated to be tribal (Bayat, 2003: 213).

While the regime in Iran had to spend effort on maintaining the physical power of the state, the regime in Turkey could put more effort in institutional modernization and developing and ideology for the new Republic. These should be considered as an important impact of the existence of strong tribal links in Iran in comparison to in Turkey.

4.3.4   Political Left

In the late Ottoman Empire and Republican Turkey there appeared no comparably strong political left as in Iran. The lacking of seasonal workers that immigrate to Russia from Turkey in summer times and existence of a considerable Soviet support to the leftist movements in Iran might be a part of the explanation of the difference. However, there should also be a difference in the readiness of the population to accept such bottom based mass political organizations. In Iran, the societal demonstrations and movements against the state were more common. The population was more accustomed to act against the state. The masses were more mature in organizing political movements and demonstrating political activism. The emergence of a stronger left in Iran compared to Turkey should also be considered as a result of this historical maturity of the masses in Iran in reacting against the state regulations. The strong political left in Iran should be considered to be a sign of a stronger potential impetus from below.

On the elite level, it can be stated that the Marxist ideology did not appeal to the intellectuals of the late Ottoman Empire. Unlike that of the Japanese or Chinese, the texts of the Ottoman intellectuals in the late nineteenth century do not refer to the Marxist ideas. Mardin argues that a reason for this can be that the idea of class conflict, which is essential to Marxism, did not provide means to solve the fundamental problems of the Ottoman intelligentsia, namely the danger of disintegration. The Ottoman intellectuals were in search of ideologies that would unite the Ottoman population and save the state. Ideas that promoted conflict and struggle between the social groups did not provide means for what they sought. The same distancing from Marxism can be observed in the attitude of the Kemalist elite after the foundation of the Republic (Mardin, 2007: 183). It was frequently declared by the Kemalist elite that the Turkish nation is not composed of conflicting classes, but it is like an organism the parts of which function together in harmony. The preoccupation of saving the state and maintaining the integrity was an obstacle for acceptance and spread of the Marxist ideology among the intellectuals. Considering this fact with the relative incapability of the masses to raise an oppositional movement provides an explanation for that the political left in Turkey did never become as strong as in Iran.

In comparison to the political left in Turkey, the political left in Iran was more active and more effective in shaping the politics in the twentieth century. Closeness to the Soviets and existence of a Soviet support were combined with the societal networking and mass protest tradition in Iran. The impact of societal networks on the socio-politics in twentieth century Iran was more apparent in comparison to in Turkey. The power of political left in Iran was in relation to this

societal political activity. There were channels of emergence of societal powers in the Iranian society. The political left can be considered to have used these existing channels. In Turkey, it was the state elite that shaped the socio-politics in the absence of any significant mass activity. Because the Marxist ideology did not appeal to these almost sole actors of modernization, the leftist ideology did not intrude into the intellectual realm in Turkey to the extent in Iran. Therefore, the political left in Turkey lacked not only a comparable Soviet support but also a societal network tradition to provide a mass support to the leftist parties.

4.4 Reforms of Modernization

After the First World War, modern Turkish and Iranian states were established with the heritages of a comparatively more centralized state in Turkey and comparatively more extensive network of societal groups in Iran. These heritages played a crucial role in the extent and success of the modernization programs of both states. The Turkish state under Mustafa Kemal did not confront a resistance comparable to that of the ulama and intellectuals in Iran under Reza Shah. Tanör (2006: 321) states "the fundamental reforms starting from 1922…were made in an authoritarian regime in the absence of any opposition". On the other hand, the Turkification attempts of the regime culminated in the Kurdish resistance in Turkey, namely an ethnic based resistance, almost non-existent in Iran till the end of the Second World War. The consequence of the traditions that both states inherited was that, while the Turkish state established strong reforms in the direction of modernization, the reforms of the Iranian state remained weak. 'Strong reform' here refers to not being objected in a severe sense and being determined mainly by the state initiatives, rather than mass movements. Pfaff performed an early analysis of modernization in Turkey and Iran in the 1960s. He argued that Iran could not perform a "positive" modernization like in Turkey. The reason he proposed was that the traditional structure bound to the peasantry could not be "disengaged" from the social life in Iran as it was the case in Turkey (Pfaff, 1963).

The secularist regulations and economic programs of the Turkish Republic did not create a significant opposition, because both the ulama and the proto-bourgeois elements were either weakened or eliminated. However, the program of Turkification, followed by first prohibition of the Kurdish language and then refusal of Kurdish identity, antagonized the Kurdish population. The Kurdish rebels were harshly suppressed by the Turkish state. The sectarian and group rivalries within the Kurdish population caused the failure of the rebels and calming down of the Kurdish opposition till the late 1970s. Therefore, it can be argued even for the Kurdish resistance that the opposition was unorganized against strong state regulations. The Turkish Republic officially denied the existence of Kurdish identity till 1992.

Apart from the Kurdish rebels, there was no severe opposition comparable to those in Iran. This did not mean that the population was in full support of the Kemalist regime. The discontent of the masses was apparent with the mass support to the short Free Party (*Serbest Fırka*) experience in

the early 1930s and to the Democrat Party in the 1950s. Rather this meant, the existent discontent within the population could find no channel of expression that would lead to a significant mass opposition. Meanwhile, any source of political opposition to the ruling Republican Party was easily repressed. Under such circumstances the reforms for secularization, Westernization, and nationalization could easily be established by the state, though not always internalized by the population. Even the non-scientific Sun Language Theory and Turkish History Thesis, which were shelved only after a few decades, purification of the Turkish language, which had to be relieved afterwards, the reform of hat, which gave nothing to the socio-economic engagement of the peasants rather than aiming at changing their external appearance, could be promoted by the state. The more remarkable is that such promotions by the state were accepted and internalized by the majority of Turkish intellectuals.

The intellectuals in Turkey were in support of the Kemalist regime. They sided with the state considering not only the secularist-modernist reforms, but also the attempts of Turkification even using the mentioned non-scientific theories. They did not raise a liberalist opposition to the authoritarian rule of the Kemalist elite. This can be explained by lacking of any societal power center that could organize an opposition with an alternative modernization program rather than that of the state. The intellectuals, as well as the statesmen, aimed modernization and secularization; the state was the sole organization to promote these. Another reason underlying the power of the new Republic in the eyes of the masses was that the leaders had saved the land from the occupying enemies. This was a source of power that Reza Shah lacked. "Atatürk had saved Turkey from disintegration by driving out foreign occupiers, whereas Reza Khan unified Iran by neutralizing internal competitors, some of whom had nationalistic credentials at least as good as his own" (Chehabi, 1990: 16).

Reza Shah attempted similar reforms in Iran, perhaps as ambitiously as Mustafa Kemal. However, his reforms did not reach such a success as in Turkey. His intention to establish a republic was opposed by the religious masses and he had to step back. It was preserved that the state had an official religion, the Shi'a Islam. Despite the attempts of Persianization, the repression on the Azerbaijanis and Kurds did not extend to the degree of persistent denouncing of their identities. Perry makes a comparative study of the language reforms in Turkey and Iran, both of which started in the 1930s, with an approximately three years of time shift. He states Turkey was more successful than in Iran, especially in "bringing the literary language closer to colloquial" (Perry, 1985). Perry bases his analysis on the comparison of the two institutions of Turkish Language Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu*) and Persian Language Academy (*Farhangestan*), which were respectively founded in Turkey in 1932 and in Iran in 1935 for the aim of language reform. He concludes, the language reform in Turkey was more successful than that of Iran because while the reform in Turkey was "focused and persistent", the reform in Iran was "diffuse and vacillating" (Perry, 1985: 309). The attempt of Reza Shah to purify the Iranian language from Arabic words did

not find support among the Iranian intellectuals. Similarly, the promotion of hat and prohibition of women's veil by Reza Shah resulted in severe mass protests. The intellectuals supported Reza Shah only in the first few years of his rule. Towards the end, the intellectuals were antagonized by the authoritarian regime and they sided with the traditional social forces – ulama, bazaris, and landowners – against the Shah. Many of the leading statesmen were critical of the rule of Reza Shah towards the end of his rule.

Based on these, it can be argued that while the Turkish Republic under Mustafa Kemal managed strong reforms without significant mass opposition, the Iranian state under Reza Shah could manage only weak reforms confronting considerable opposition from the societal groups.

4.5 Disruption of the State Apparatus

The durability of the state apparatus is important in state formation in order to gain the consent of the masses for the state regulations. Durability of the state apparatus reinforces the idea that the state has the power to enforce the laws, rules, and regulations after their initiation. The disruption of the state apparatus, on the other hand, corresponds to the case that the state loses power due to some external or societal impacts and cannot enforce the laws, rules, and regulations. The external impact might be an invasion of the land by foreign armies; the societal impact might be the mass movements of oppositional groups. In the cases that the state apparatus is disrupted the masses lose their confidence in and loyalty to the state power. The confidence and loyalty of the mases to the state is important for the success of the reforms. When people conceive the state power as temporary, it is more difficult that they internalize the new rules and social regulations in their daily lives. However, when people think that the power of the state will be durable and that the laws and rules will be consistently enforced, the internalization will be faster and easier. The impact of disruption of the state apparatus is observed by Anderson (1986) in her comparison of Tunisia and Libya.

Tunisia and Libya were two former Ottoman lands, which were occupied by French and Italians, respectively, prior to their independence in the form of nation states in the twentieth century. Tunisia passed to direct French rule after its invasion in 1882. The French did not only maintain the existent local administration but also "extended it into the distant reaches of the province" (Anderson, 1986: 133). Namely, despite the invasion the state apparatus was not so much disrupted as in the case of Tunisia. The existence of a stable political structure was favorable for the French capitalists. Therefore persistence of the administrative structures and increase of the central control over the hinterlands were in the interests of the French Protectorate authorities (Anderson, 1986: 226).

Under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, Libya "underwent much the same economic transformation as Tunisia" in the same years (Anderson, 1986: 97). The Italians attacked Libya in 1911. Unlike the French, the Italians faced with a resistance organized by the local Ottoman

administration (Anderson, 1986: 181). With the collapse of this Ottoman regime and the consequent weakening of the resistance, the Italians established their own state authority excluding the local population (Anderson, 1986: 133). They were "unable and unwilling to install an equally responsive bureaucracy of their own making", which would penetrate into the masses of the land (Anderson, 1986: 181). This was because the "Italian purposes in Libya were different from those of the French in Tunisia" (Anderson, 1986: 226). While Tunisia was important more for the French capitalist economy, Libya was important mostly for prestige for the Italians.

Both Libya and Tunisia were invaded by external powers, but the level of the disruption of the state apparatus was different. Anderson (1986: 4-8) writes that while the French rule in Tunisia sustained and developed the existent local bureaucratic structures, the Italian rule in Libya destroyed those. Moreover, unlike the French in Tunisia, the Italian rule in Libya did not permit the local population to take part in the government (Anderson, 1986: 9). Inherited to the independent nation states was an "extensive, stable administration in Tunisia" and "absence of such administration in Libya" (Anderson, 1986: 3). Therefore, while the state of Tunisia "entertain[ed] policy alternatives with knowledge that, once selected, a given policy would be implemented", the state of Libya was "unable to envision the impact of various policy alternatives, much less to guarantee their successful implementation once chosen" (Anderson, 1986: 3).

The existent administrative network was preserved and developed under the French rule in Tunisia; the existent administration was almost totally dissolved in Libya under the Italian rule. The discontinuity in the state administration in Libya resulted that administrative network did not evolve towards a stable structure. Anderson comments that the difference between the two lands points out the dependence of the existent administrative networks on the continuity of the state administration. Whenever there is a disruption in the state authority the bureaucratic networks in the society are subject to disintegration. In such a situation in Libya what happened was the revival of the kinship ties as a form of political identity. Anderson (1986: 228) comments that the persistence of kinship ties in Libya was the result of "particularism produced by discontinuities in state formation". After the Italian invasion "[k]inship…once again became the mechanism by which Libyans would distribute resources in the face of an administration that had no place for them" (Anderson, 1986: 133). As a result of this situation "independent governments sprang up in the countryside, and their leaders attempted to negotiate a formal acknowledgement of their autonomy" (Anderson, 1986: 181). "The tribes of the hinterlands had been revived" and the Libyans "retained their political identities in kinship structures". "The tribalism of the Libyans" was therefore "a reflection of the destruction of more elaborate and broadly based political systems; it was a political identity of last resort" (Anderson, 1986: 221).

The comparison of Tunisia and Libya sheds light on the comparison of state formations in Turkey and Iran. The state administration in Turkey remained more stable than that in Iran. In the Turkish Republic the state preserved its power from the time of its foundation up into the twenty-

first century. After its foundation, the Turkish state aimed at consolidating its power, avoided war and severe conflict with other lands (Ergut, 2004: 376). Especially the efforts of bureaucracy of the Turkish government in order to avoid taking part in the Second World War is remarkable. Avoiding wars resulted that there was no external invasion of the land in this period. The state apparatus was not disrupted. Due to the continuation of the state apparatus the masses were convinced of the power of the state and that it will be in charge of the initiated regulations. Therefore the order promoted by the state was more easily internalized. The passage from the Ottoman State to the Turkish Republic, as well, did not come with a lack of central power like in Iran after the First World War. In Turkey, there was always a state and local governments responsible to the central power.

The regime in Turkey experienced military coups in the second half of the twentieth century. However, these coups were not to damage the central power of the state, but on the contrary, to preserve it by limiting the power of the elected parties in the multi-party system. Therefore the coups in Turkey cannot be conceived as disruptions of the state apparatus, but as regulations to avoid the disruption of the state apparatus by mass movements. The state apparatus and the regime survived all three military interventions. Cleveland compares the stability of the regime in Turkey with the other Middle Eastern states. Unlike Turkey, the other Middle Eastern lands did not have a steady period in the early phases of their independence; therefore the responses they gave to the political difficulties were very different than the ones in Turkey (Cleveland, 2008: 318).

The state apparatus in Iran was very much disrupted with the Constitutional Revolution, with the invasion of Iran in 1911 till the end of the First World War, and with the invasion of the land again in the Second World War. Especially the invasion of Iran in the beginning of the Second World War and the following abdication of Reza Shah had a remarkable impact on the state formation of Iran. While the institutions and reforms were continuously supported by the state in Turkey, their counterparts in Iran lost the main support, the power of the Shah. The reforms in Turkey had a better chance to develop and the state ideology eliminated alternative ideas of government. The reforms in Iran were disrupted and the idea of alternative administrations remained vital. While the oppositions in Turkey were bound to the regime within its institutional framework, the oppositions in Iran kept the imaginations of alternative regimes and evolved into more radical movements.

The disruption of the Iranian state was in fact not novel to the Iranian history. The history of Iranian empires starting from the Achaemenids up to the Qajars is full of distinct strong and weak periods of the states, usually dependent on the personality of the rulers. "The persistence of arbitrary rule resulted in greater and more frequent changes than is observed from the history of Europe". Therefore the Iranian history is already marked with "frequent, swift and substantial discontinuities". Katouzian designates this situation as "lack of continuity" of rule in Iranian history (Katouzian, 1997). It can be argued that the lack of continuity of the state power continued

with the modern Iranian state in the twentieth century, but this time less because of the arbitrary rule of the Shah, but more because of the foreign invasions during both world wars.

The First World War and the following years almost totally dissolved the power of the Iranian state. In many regions of the land the Russian and British forces were in charge of the matters for long years. Iran "emerged from that war – to which it was not officially a part – physically, politically and economically devastated, and on the brink of chaos and disintegration" (Katouzian, 1995). It was with the rise of Reza Shah that the state again gained real power. Although the reforms in Iran were weaker than those in Turkey, Reza Shah managed to establish a centralized state with a strong bureaucracy first time in Iran history. It can be argued that, though weaker than that of Turkey, the Iranian state of Reza Shah could have a chance to develop into a durable nation state as that of Mustafa Kemal. The difference would perhaps be that the bottom-up impetus of the civil societal groups would be more observable in Iranian state formation. However, with the invasion of Iran in the Second World War the durability of the established administrative structure was disrupted. Reza Shah abdicated the throne and the land was again under the control of foreign powers. These led to political decentralization and even to the provincial revolts and autonomous governments in Azerbaijan and Kurdistan.

After the abdication of Reza Shah in 1941 the lack of central power gave way to a lot of political freedom and emergence of various political parties. However, there was no framework to maintain a consensus for the various political groups. There was no apparatus to realize any decided policy or regulation. All these caused the loss of confidence of the Iranian masses in the state and its regulations. Therefore their loyalty to the state deteriorated. Just as in the case of Libya under the Italian rule, the tribal loyalties were revived because of the disruption of the central power and the administrative apparatus. The political groups and masses did not have a comparably strong feeling of reliance on the state as in the Turkish case. Therefore, the modern Iranian state had more difficulties to gain the consent of the masses for its programs. This resulted in that the Iranian state in the second half of the twentieth century relied more on coercion than the Turkish state to sustain order on the land.

After the Second World War the central state power was in disarray. The repressed political inclinations had chance to be expressed in various forms. Many political organizations appeared, provincial movements in Azerbaijan and Kurdistan declared their autonomous governments. The lacking was a durable administrative apparatus for which the various forces could compete for. Under such circumstances there did not emerge a uniting nationalist program, but pro-British, pro-Russian policies, autonomous movements, and provincial rebels. The government in Tehran was regarded to be alien by many groups of the population; it was weak to realize its policies. The invasion of Iran had resulted in the destruction of the channels through which the state could administer the land and through which the oppositions could raise their demands. Lacking of such viable channels caused also the oppositions not to unite for a common reform program.

The National Front movement of early 1950s managed to bring together the various societal forces, though via delicate links. The National Front Movement was marked by ideological and factional divisions that at the end brought about its failure. Following the coup against Mossadeq the Iranian state came under the authoritarian regime of Mohammed Reza Shah. The external support to the Shah against the National Front and the mass protests against the Shah during the coup are remarkable. These features differentiate the 1953 coup in Iran from those in Turkey in the second half of the nineteenth century. It can be argued that while the coups in Turkey were welcomed by many of the population in Turkey, the coup of the Shah in 1953 was against the will of a significantly large and politically active mass.

Despite of the emergence of various political groups in the 1940s, after the coup of 1953 the regime of the Shah in Iran did not allow any oppositional political expression. The state resorted to repression and coercion for its regulations. This is because the Shah lacked any established administrative channels that would lead to cooperation with different strata of the population. The state instruments established by his father were demolished in the 1940s; therefore, the state was detached from the Iranian population. In Turkey, on the other hand, the established administrative structures by the single-party regime were already stabilized when Turkey passed to the multi-party system. Therefore, the opposition could be canalized to compete for the existing administrative instruments, within the limits of the Kemalist regime. Oppositional parties and groups were allowed in Turkey within the legal framework in such circumstances. The military coups in the second half of the twentieth century should be considered as attempts to tune the regime in order not to let the oppositions to threaten the fundamentals. The secularism of the state (against the religious/traditional inclinations) and the unity of its land and nation (against Kurdish separatism and communist movements) were the cornerstones of these fundamentals.

After the foundation of the Republic, Turkey maintained its state apparatus without any disruptions. In modern Turkey the preservation of the state administration was effective to convince the population that "once selected, a given policy would be implemented" effectively by the state (Anderson, 1986: 3). In Iran, the disruptions resulted in the weakening of such a confidence. Therefore, the different classes in Turkey were more loyal to and more integrated with the regime than their counterparts in Iran. The consequence for the 1960s and 1970s was that while the regime in Iran adopted more and more repressive measures against any kind of opposition, in Turkey factions of oppositions emerged within the legal framework of politics and civil societal organizations. Therefore, Toprak (1994: 87) argues, although the strong state tradition in Turkey was an obstacle for the emergence of civil societal associations, the state "laid the foundations for their orderly competition". As a result, while the established state structure by the single-party in Turkey was stabilized in the following years, and let the expression of opposition in determined limits, the state structure established by Reza Shah was demolished during the Second World War

and the following years. This made Mohammed Reza Shah's state unable to channel the opposition within the limits of its regime; therefore, he resorted to repression and coercion.

Another consequence of the frequent disruption of the state apparatus in Iran might be about the "outward demarcation" of the idea of nation. "[O]utward demarcation against competing nation states" signifies the "ideas of the nation as intellectual constructions that define the outward boundaries and the constitutive elements of those communities" (Münch, 2001: 6-7). The outward demarcation of the modern Iranian nationalism was mostly due to the idea of 'external powers'. In Iran the first mass movements that led to the foundation of the modern state were organized basically against the Shah and the foreign intruders. These were the two motivations that united the protestors in the Tobacco Movement and Constitutional Revolution. Limiting the power of Qajar Shahs and restricting the economic/political activities of Westerners in Iran were the two binding elements for the largely differentiated groups. Similar sentiments can be argued to have been functional also for the National Front Movement of Mossadeq and the mass movements that led to the Islamic Revolution.

Cleveland (2008: 163) states, the uniting factor for the various groups in the Constitutional Revolution was their hatred of the rule of the Shah and the exploitation of the external powers. The invasion of the land reinforced the xenophobic ideas about the outward demarcation. The xenophobic feeling constituted an obstacle for the modernization attempts of the modern state. The Iranian masses resorted more to local values and life styles in reaction to the Western interventions. Nativism became a cornerstone of Iranian national identity.

> What stirred the embers of nationalism for many Iranians was a century of embarrassment and defeat, as well as unsatisfied expectations and violated dreams. Evidence of nationalist sentiments took numerous forms – sympathy for Ottomans and Germany during the First World War, Germany and Italy during the Second World War, the high-pitched rhetoric directed against the British, calls for pan-Iranism, preoccupation with language as the basis of Iranian identity, and the emphasis on pre-Islamic Iranian history (Boroujerdi, 2003: 148).

In Turkey, on the other hand, the land did not experience such long and intensive invasions. Therefore the xenophobic feelings did not constitute an important side of Turkish nationalism. This might be the reason that Turkish nationalism has been more open to modernization in the sense of Westernization.

The invasion of Iran by the British and Russian forces in 1911, which lasted till the end of the First World War, raised the xenophobic feelings (Katouzian, 1995). After the withdrawal of the Russian troops, in the end of the war, the land of Iran remained under British hegemony till the rise of Reza Khan. The anti Russian and anti-British sentiments brought many of the Iranian political elite close to the Germans during the First World War. When the Russian troops threatened to occupy Tehran in 1914, "[t]he thirty Democrat deputies, accompanied by some journalists and influential politicians, set out on their 'long march', first stopping in Qom where they formed the

'Komiteh-e Defa'-e Melli' (the National Defense Committee), then falling back to Kashan, and finally establishing themselves in Kermanshah, where they called themselves the 'Hokumat-e Melli' (the National Government)" (Atabaki, 2000: 41). The Hokumat-e Melli had the official recognition as the central power and at that time was the only legitimate power of Iran. The movement of Hokumat-e Melli and the political circumstances in which it emerged is comparable to the Eastern Anatolia Defense Organization prior to the Independence War in Turkey. In the Turkish case avoiding the return of the former Christian minorities was an important element of the motivation. In Iran the movement was purely against the occupying powers, it had nothing to do with the minorities. The Hokumat-e Melli could not last long under the British pressure. "In 1916, Kermanshah fell to the British forces and the Hokumat-e Melli came to an end" (Atabaki, 2000: 41). In 1919 the very much disliked Anglo-Iranian Treaty was signed. The influence of this treaty is comparable to that of Serve Treaty for the Turks, because it made Iran almost a protectorate of the British.

Atabaki states that during the First World War, there was no central power in Iran; therefore, one might have expected a disintegration of the land like the case in the Ottoman Empire (Atabaki, 2000: 186). However, the land of Iran did not disintegrate. This should be considered as a sign of a fundamental difference between the late Ottoman and Qajar Empires regarding the Christian minorities. In the Ottoman case the Christian minorities and among them the groups with separatist tendencies were the hottest issues within the political surroundings. The Ottoman elite felt this as a threat throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In Iran, on the other hand, there was no such threat and no such fear of the political elite.

Iran was invaded again by the Russian and British forces during the Second World War. Although this invasion resulted in the abdication of non-famous Reza Shah and in the rise of political freedom, this did not mean that the people were happy with the foreign powers in their land. The xenophobic feelings showed themselves as the mass support for Mossadeq's campaign of nationalization of the oil company. The dislike of the masses for the Mohammed Reza Shah regime can also be argued to have relation with his close link with the USA. The political stress between the Islamic Republic and the USA should also be considered in this regard.

The more disruption of the state apparatus in Iran resulted in the stronger xenophobic character of Iranian nationalism. This observation is also related to the more frequent and stronger mass movements in Iran. The mass movements in the modern Iranian history – the Tobacco Movement, Constitutional Revolution, National Front, and Islamic Revolution – all were marked with strong feelings against external powers. As Zubaida argues, the discourse of nationalism in the Muslim lands is most successful when it aims at mobilizing the masses against the western powers. He also mentions the mass movements in Iran in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in this regard (Zubaida, 1989: 133-134). Such strong mass movements did not occur in

modern Turkey. This is partly because there was no comparable xenophobic feeling that would unite the masses.

In Iran the following line of events was observable: invasion of the land, disruption of the state apparatus, weakening of the central power of the state, rise of xenophobic feelings, and emergence of mass movements. This line of cause and effect did not take place in Turkey, because the state apparatus was not disrupted after the foundation of the Republic. Therefore, the invasion of Iran in the Second World War can perhaps be regarded as a "contingent historical event" that triggered a series of "reactive sequence" of events (Mahoney, 2000). Following Mahoney's conception, the disruption of the state apparatus caused the rise of xenophobic feelings; emergence of mass movements resulted in the weakening of the central state power; the state could not maintain the consent of the masses and therefore resorted to more and more coercion. All the latter events in these couples emerged as a reaction to the former. In Turkey the central state power was preserved after the foundation of the Republic. The state maintained the consent of the masses; therefore it could establish the limits of political freedom and tune these limits when necessary. These constituted a "self-reinforcing sequence" of events that the state maintained central power, gained the consent of the masses, tuned the regime, and further maintained the central power (Mahoney, 2000).

4.6 Consent in Turkey – Coercion in Iran

The extent that a state resorts to coercion is important in understanding the state formation as it is an indicator of to what extent the state has gained the consent of the masses (Boroujerdi, 1996: 30; Hermassi, 1987: 82-83). The more coercion signifies a less capacity of the state to promote ideologies to gain the consent of its people. This is a remarkable item of comparison between Turkey and Iran. In Iran the Pahlavi regime resorted more to coercion than the Kemalist regime in Turkey. In parallel to this, in Turkey the regime was more successful to promote a state ideology. The fundamentals of the Kemalist regime were influential to determine the boundaries and let people know their region of political freedom. In Iran, resorting to coercion resulted in the inflexibility of the Pahlavi regime to adapt itself to the changing political circumstances. The regime was more closed to modifications and more closed to the demands of the masses. In Turkey, on the other hand, the multi-party regime helped to integrate the discontented masses into the legal political frameworks defined by the state. The military coups functioned to tune the regime in order to limit the space of freedom of the elected. This was a precaution to protect the fundamentals against the impetus from the side of the elected.

A remarkable question is why the Turkish state could promote ideologies to gain the consent of the masses while the Pahlavi regime in Iran resorted more to coercion? This question is partially answered in the previous section by referring to the disruption of the Iranian state more than the Turkish. This perspective states that the Turkish state could maintain the consent of the masses

because the state apparatus was not disrupted; the Iranian state was disrupted and therefore could not maintain the consent of the masses and had to resort to coercion.

The explanation in this section will try to demonstrate another side of the phenomenon by referring the oil revenues available to the Iranian state in the second half of the twentieth century. The ultimate source of revenue for the Turkish state was the taxes collected from the masses; therefore, the Turkish state had to consider the demands of the masses. The Iranian state, on the other hand, had an enormous amount of income from the oil revenues. The Iranian state was less dependent on the taxes. The state could finance its regulations without resorting to the contributions of the masses. As a result, while the Turkish state had to (not only could) respond to the demands of the masses, the Iranian state could maintain the financial balance without gaining the consent of the masses (not only because it could not, but also it did not need to). The stability of the Turkish state and its need to gain the consent of the people reinforced each other to result in responding of the state to the demands of the masses. The disruption of the Iranian state and its economic capacity to survive without the consent of the masses reinforced each other resulting in a wider gap between the masses and the state.

The different situations of Turkey and Iran in relying on mass taxes resemble the difference of the European states regarding to their dependence on the masses for recruiting soldiers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this period, the kings needed not only to change the military structure based on forces of separate magnates to a central one, but also to "staff standing armies from their own populations and to force the civilians in their own populations to pay for the armies routinely and well" (Tilly, 1998: 61). This meant a direct rule in the sense of collecting taxes without the mediation of the mandates and in the sense of expanding rights to the masses who will serve in the military. The latter was necessary for gaining their loyalty of the masses to the state (Tilly, 1993: 30). The states that relied more on the contribution of their people for warfare had to provide more rights to their citizens. In Turkey the state relied on the tax contributions of the masses more than in Iran. Therefore, the state in Turkey provided more channels of political representation for the masses than in Iran.

Since the Iranian state resorted more to coercion there was less space for the demands of the masses in the legal political framework. Therefore the discontented masses in Iran were more inclined to illegal political organizations than their counterparts in Turkey. In Turkey the state established a framework of political activity that was more open to the demands of the discontented masses. This served to canalize the masses into the legal framework. The oppositions in Turkey aimed at capturing the legal power of government, while those in Iran aimed at demolishing the regime.

Such phenomenon of emergence of illegal political activities is observable also in other contexts that the state resorts more to coercion than to gaining the consent of the masses. For

example, Hermassi (1987: 82) states, Jacobinism and despotism are the core characteristics of Algerian nationalism to repress any opposition. In such a system there is no place for legal opposition. The oppositional social groups are inclined to capture and "monopolize the system of government" rather than smoothly reshaping it towards a formation of their own interest (Hermassi, 1987: 82). Since there is no organized opposition within the legal frameworks of the regime, the discontent of the masses results in "fundamentalist, ethnic and even social movements to be local and spontaneous in nature" (Hermassi, 1987: 83). "Their gravity lies in how sudden and unpredictable they can be" (Hermassi, 1987: 83).

The situation in Algeria seems to contrast to the case in Turkey, especially considering the canalization of the discontent of the masses into the DP movement in the 1950s. The DP had in fact emerged from the ranks of the Republican elite; therefore, it did not pose a significant challenge to the regime rather than being more oriented towards a market economy and emphasizing more the traditional-religious values. However, letting the emergence of an officially acknowledged oppositional party was functional to integrate the discontented peasantry and religiously oriented urban strata into the regime. In Iran, on the other hand, the regime of Mohammed Reza Shah did not allow any kind of opposition. There was no canalization of the discontent of the urban poor into a legal opposition. This was the case also considering the leftist movements. In Turkey, the Kemalist ideology and the RPP did attract many of the modern classes critical about the governments of the rightist parties. Therefore, there did not appear a radical left movement with a mass support. In Iran, the Tudeh Party in the 1940s, the Mujahidin and Fedaiyan groups in the 1970s had considerable support of the leftist segments of the modern classes. As a result of this difference, the radical masses of the urban poor, supported by the radical left of Iran collapsed the Shah regime. In Turkey any kind of radical movement that appeared in the 1970s almost totally disappeared after the 1980 coup.

Göle observes a process of autonomization of the civil society throughout the history of modern Turkish state. Her explanations can be read as a process of canalization of the civil societal oppositions into the legal framework of politics. She argues Kemalism throughout the single party regime was shaped by the control of the state over the civil society in order to avoid its "autonomization" in politics. She relates this attitude of the state to the lack of democracy as an item among the six founding principles. She regards the Islamist, Kurdish, leftist, and liberal oppositions as the various attempts of autonomization of the civil society against the political control of the state in different conjuncture. She names these four moments of opposition as the "four phobias" of the Turkish state. Symmetrically, she considers those four also as the "main touchstones of Turkish democratization" as they all served for autonomization of the civil society (Göle, 1994: 19-20).

Göle (1994: 32) considers the emergence of the "liberal conservative political tradition of Turkey" with the DP in the 1950s as crucial for the development of civil society. DP basically

163

represented the interests of the commercial bourgeoisie and the traditional-religious values of the rural population. It was with the emergence of DP that while the former manifested its independence from the tight control of the state, the latter had first time found an avenue to oppose to the state regulations. Therefore, Göle writes (1994: 32), "the Democrat Party gave voice to new social groups".

In the 1960s and 1970s the political arena of Turkey experienced the rise of labor and leftist movements with the development of the industrial sector in the economy. Göle (1994: 36) considers the "syndicalism, leftist political movements, and the diffusion of printed material" in this period as another moment in the development of the civil society in the sense of gaining autonomy from the state. However, Göle (1994: 36-37) also notes the "overpolitization of civil society" in the 1970s due to the extensively political leftist and rightist groups. She argues that their overpolitization hindered the democratization process in the Turkish politics.

In Iran, on the other hand, the civil societal oppositions were marginalized by the regime. They could find no means of declaring their political ambitions in legal frameworks. This difference had two consequences. First the oppositions in Iran remained intact from the state ideology and developed a position rejecting the legitimacy of the state. In Turkey, the civil societal powers were offered legal means of expression within the borders that would not contrast to the fundamentals of the state (Kemalism, Turkish nationalism, anti-communism, secularism, the integrity and unity of the state). Being bound to the borders delineated by the state resulted that no radical opposition emerged with a significant social base. Second, although the state did not let declarations of civil opposition in Iran, it also could not intervene into the civil life in order to de-power the oppositional ideologies. The opposition was independent of the state in terms of both social base and ideology. The state ideology in Turkey was strong enough to gain the consent of the civil societal powers and manipulate the oppositions to accept the fundamentals promoted by the state. The legal oppositions in Turkey remained to be dependent on the state. In the following subsections the state ideology of Turkey and the coercive character of the Iranian state are discussed. These two subsections aim at highlighting the consent of the masses maintained by the Turkish state and the gap between the masses and the state in Iran.

4.6.1   State Ideology in Turkey

A remarkable difference between the modern Turkey and Iran is that the former was founded with a change of the regime from monarchy to republic; the latter was founded by preserving the regime as a monarchy.[60] The change and continuation of the regimes have influence on the ideologies promoted by the states. While the Kemalist regime in Turkey found a basis to promote various new ideological elements, the Pahlavi regime in Iran had to compromise the new

---

[60] The author thanks to Touraj Atabaki for noticing him about this fact in their brief interview in Leiden in September 2009.

ideological elements with the existing understanding of the state as a monarchy. For example, declaration of secularism was proved to be possible in Turkey but not in Iran.

The relative easiness in promotion of new ideological elements and a new national identity with a change of the regime is observed also in Egypt after the 1952 revolution. With this revolution the throne of the Muhammad Ali Dynasty, formerly the Ottoman ruling family in Egypt, was overthrown and a republic was founded on ethnically Egyptian terms. The Turco-Circassian privileges emanating from the former dynasty were totally eliminated. The national discourse of the new regime promoted the idea of rights of the "Egyptian people" (Hatem, 2000: 44). The will of the people was no more represented by the royal family but the national army (Hatem, 2000: 45). The ethnic and class divisions were de-emphasized (Hatem, 2000: 52). The 1956 Constitution stressed the Arabness of the people and the state. This was a result of the reaction against the old Turco-Circassian ruling elite. In the new regime the people, the rulers, the Muslims and the Copts all spoke Arabic; therefore, the Arabness was emphasized for the unity of the nation (Hatem, 2000: 48). The Constitution stated Egypt to be an Arab state, the people of Egypt to be a part of the Arab nation, and Arabic to be the official language of the state (Hatem, 2000: 47).

The experiences in Egypt resemble more that of the foundation of the Turkish Republic than that of the Iranian state. In Turkey, the foundation of the Republic followed the abolition of the Ottoman dynasty. Although the Ottoman dynasty was not from a different ethnicity from the majority population as in Egypt, the ideology of the Ottoman Empire was rejected by the new state in favor of the ideology of Turkish nationalism. Therefore state building in Turkey went hand in hand with the abolishment of monarchy, getting rid of the former dynasty, foundation and promotion of a republic, and building an ethnically and linguistically homogeneous nation. Similar processes were observed in Egypt after 1952. In Iran, on the other hand, although the state attempted for ethnic and linguistic homogenization, these were not accompanied with a new idea of the state; the monarchy continued under a new dynasty, the Pahlavi. There appeared no Iranian republic. The idea of a new state in Egypt and Turkey made it easier to promote the idea of a new identity for the nation.

The preservation of the welfare of the state was above all values in the Turkish Republic. Till the end of the Second World War the welfare of the state was associated with institutional and social modernization. Afterwards, within the multi party regime, preservation of the values of the state against the will of the traditionally oriented masses was given priority. During the Cold War years communism was considered to be one of the fundamental dangers to the Republic. Anti-communism became a fundamental ideological element promoted by the state. The protection of the state was this time not against the traditional masses, not against the Kurdish movement, but against the leftist powers. After the 1980s, the armed Kurdish resistance was conceived as the paramount danger for the welfare of the state. In all these moments the state was more or less associated with the military. It was considered to be the responsibility and duty of the military to

protect and preserve the welfare of the state. The military had a much central role in socio-political life in Turkey in comparison to that in Iran.

> …Turkish society always has had a direct relationship with the army (which came to represent the 'state'), and maintained a more fragile, secondary relationship with its politicians and politics (represented as the 'government'). For most of Turkish society, the state took priority over the government…[T]he Turkish paradigm traditionally has rested firmly on a structure in which the armed forces and the society enjoy a relatively complementary and symbiotic relationship… (Aydınlı, 2009).

The ideology of the Turkish Republic can perhaps best be described by referring to the fundamental principles it promoted. These principles were protected regardless of any other political value for the welfare of the state. The protection of the principles was justified by the idea of necessity to protect the newly founded Republic. The fundamentals of the state were the pillars of the "state-centric mode of operation of Turkish modernity" based on "[t]he strong state tradition, national developmentalism, and organic vision of society as the republican model of citizenship" (Keyman and İçduygu, 2005: 7). In the 1931 Congress of the RPP the principles of the state were formulated as the six arrows of nationalism, secularism, populism, republicanism, statism, and revolutionarism. "These founding principles constitute the core of the Turkish Republic" (Kadıoğlu, 2005: 111). The Turkish state is considered to be above all objective and normative values. It is considered to be a supra existence endowed with self-justification (Bora, 2006: 63).

Bora characterizes the Turkish Republic as protectionist and conservative in opposition to being liberal, developmentalist, and democratic. The conservative character of the Republic results in limiting the basic principle of republicanism, especially that of the sovereignty of the people, with an authority that protects the "main principles" (Bora, 2006: 26-27). In fact, this understanding of fundamental principles and the supremacy of the state can be argued to have been inherited from the Ottoman state tradition. As Heper states, the Ottomans had developed an idea of state consistent of "ideals and prime values" for the statesmen of the Empire. The bureaucratic elite internalized these ideals and values throughout their education and selection processes. These ideals and values were legitimized on the grounds of necessity and rationality for the welfare of the state (Heper, 2006: 55). In the decadence period of the Empire, the ideals and prime values of the bureaucratic elite predominated that they could replace the view of the charismatic Sultan with the idea of welfare of the state. In the *Sened-i İttifak*, signed in 1808 between the ayans and the Sultan, one of the sides was the "state", instead of the "Padisah" (Heper, 2006: 72-73). The statesmen of the nineteenth century did perceive themselves as the servants of the state, rather than that of the Sultan (Heper, 2006: 90). The understanding of supreme state that emerged with the authority of the bureaucracy in the Tanzimat era was inherited by the Turkish Republic (Heper, 2006: 91).

Caymaz notes that in the texts for teaching citizenship during the single party regime, the terms "state", "land", and "nation" were used interchangeably. This reflects the understanding that

the nation and the land were considered to be belongings of the protector, namely the state (Caymaz, 2007: 32). In the text book by Faruk Kurtuluş, the explanation of citizenship was based on the understanding that everything on the land of Turkey – citizens, institutions, laws, vehicles, roads, lands – constituted the Turkish state, namely all those entities existed for the welfare of the state (Caymaz, 2007: 40).

Ironically, among the conservatively protected fundamental principles of the state, modernization was the very basic one. Modernization included the import of the Western state institutions and transformation of the society to internalize the Western life style. Both of these measures pointed out a decisive policy of distancing the new state and society from their Ottoman past. The past was associated with backward, traditional and religious elements. The attempt to erase the Islam from the history was a characteristic of the modernization project in the 1920s (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 116). The idea of modernization therefore pointed out rejection of the industrial backwardness, rejection of traditional life style based on religious elements, and rejection of the Ottoman state as a ruling apparatus.

The state intervened in the public life of the people to transform their life style. The citizens were expected to give up the traditional and religious elements in their life style and to adopt the Turkish nationalism with all modern values of the West. The stress was on Turkishness as an ethnic identity, secularism in daily life style, and rationalism as the mental state. However, in the 1930s the elite clearly noticed that the reforms of the 1920s did not penetrate to the daily life of people, especially in the rural regions. The Kemalist ideology did not replace Islam in the lives of people in the periphery. It was internalized only by the elite of the regime (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 47-48).

Nationalism was a fundamental ideological aspect of the young Turkish Republic. It was based on Turkish ethnicity. The official Turkish nationalism did not refer to the Turkish race in the biological sense, but the Turkish language and ethnicity were in the core of the understanding of Turkish lineage (Çağaptay, 2007: 103). It was based on rejecting the existence of non-Turkish ethnic elements on the land. In the 1930s, "being Turkish", "coming from a Turkish lineage", and "being from the Turkic race" were among the requirements of being accepted to many military schools, to state official positions, and even for scholarships of education abroad (Oran, 2004: 90).

In comparison to the modern Iranian state, it can be argued that the Turkish Republic was more flexible to adapt to the changing political conditions due to the emergent demands of masses and the world political system. After the Second World War, the world political system forced Turkey to transit to the multi-party regime in 1945. This transition resulted in the rise of DP, which recruited the traditional and rural masses into its cadres. The rivalry between the DP and RPP in those years reflected the antagonism between the Republican elite and the rural masses. The DP, being loyal to the fundamentals of the state, functioned to canalize the discontent of the masses to the legal frameworks of opposition. In 1950 the oppositional DP won the elections. In fact, DP was

a party that emerged from the ranks of the ex-ruling RPP, not from the lower classes of the Turkish population. It was a group within the elite of statesmen who organized in the late 1940s. In this way the discontent of the masses was channeled to a party, which was ensured not to threaten the fundamentals of the Kemalist regime. As a result, in Turkey there did not appear a separatist or anti-regime opposition, like in Iran, after transition to multi-party regime. The 1960 coup aimed at further defining the limits of the legal framework in order to eliminate the danger of anti-secular measures that could emanate as a political impact of the traditionally oriented masses.

The 1960 coup determined the limits of the oppositions in the multi-party regime. First, it allowed political expression for the secularist groups, including the left, against the religious/traditional inclinations of the masses gathered around the DP. Second, it put boundaries to the power of elected deputies. In this way, threatening the fundamentals of the state, such as threatening secularism, through formal legal channels was closed. The traditionally oriented politicians, namely former DP members and now members of the Justice Party, were brought inside the boundaries of the realm of political activity allowed by the fundamentals of the state. The 1961 constitution allowed expression of socialist policies. The 1971 memorandum, on the other hand, took back the secular liberties introduced by the 1961 Constitution. In the 1970s the socialist and communist ideas were considered to be a more severe threat than the traditional/religious ideas for the fundamentals of the regime. The regulations after the 1970 memorandum were aimed at weakening the leftist groups and labor movement. The regulations of the 1970s were not totally successful; therefore the 1980 coup appeared to put in force a decisive, harsh, and repressive regulation. The coup in 1980 was another moment of suppression of the leftist movements, but also the Kurdish separatist movement, the seeds of which emerged in the late 1970s. The leftist and labor movements were harshly repressed; a lot of leftists were put in prisons, tortured, and killed. A lot more escaped abroad. The act of the state was legitimized in the eyes of the rural and urban masses as maintaining the order and law. The fight between the leftist and rightist groups in the late 1970s was claimed to cause the anarchy on the land. The right oriented masses were convinced about this argumentation of the state.

The regime in Iran did not manage to promote a state ideology as strong as in Turkey. In connection to this, it did not manage to tune itself for the emergent conditions of the era and according to the inclinations of its population. The repressions of the Shah resulted in bringing together many different social forces – from religious groups to secular nationalists and Marxist guerilla groups – against the regime. This gathering culminated in the Islamic Revolution in 1979. The emergence of the political groupings and political deliberation preceding the revolution and existence of various societal forces in the revolution are remarkable for Iran. The opposition did not have ideological links with the state; they aimed at collapsing the regime. The oppositional masses actively participated in the revolution. Such an active mass politics did not emerge in Turkey in its comparatively free political system.

Based on these, it can be argued that while the repressive regime of the Shah in Iran collapsed with the protests of politically active masses, the relatively free regime in Turkey managed to tune itself in accordance with the emerging socio-political conditions. In this way the state canalized the politics into the system of the regime. On the other hand, while the masses in Iran could organize and express their political will through illegal means and manage to change the state from below, the masses in Turkey remained detached from direct active politics. The demands of the masses could be voiced only through mediating parties loyal to the regime. Therefore, the Turkish political system remained to have a top-down formation, though with relative flexibility.

4.6.2   *Coercion in Iran*

Due to the invasion by the British and Russian armies, during the First World War Iran was in total disarray. The lack of a central power caused the provincial and tribal powers get stronger vis-à-vis the state. After the First World War the main political issue in Tehran surroundings was to maintain the central power of the state. Therefore, eliminating the provincial movements (Jangali Movement, Azerbaijan Autonomous Movement) and settling the tribes were considered to be the necessary steps towards a centralized modern state. The centralization policies of Reza Shah were therefore quite popular among the Tehran political surroundings in his early years of rule.

The Reza Shah regime, however, did not maintain the popular support it had in its early years. In the last years of his rule Reza Shah resorted to more and more coercion, repression, and elimination of state independent organizations and politicians, just because he suspected them of being non-loyal. For these he made use of the extensive power of the state and military. "Reza Shah's position was quite [legitimate] at the beginning of his reign, but a few years later he began to lose it when he moved from the position of an authoritarian dictator to that of an absolute and arbitrary ruler" (Katouzian, 2004: 29). "[T]he military were often able to force insufficiently malleable or inconvenient governors to resign, by creating an environment frustrating and humiliating for the civil authorities" (Cronin, 2004: 148).

Cleveland states, Ataturk controlled Turkey via the RPP and placed the seeds of a democratic regime. His government was legitimized by the election victories, the establishment of the rule of law and the constitution declared in 1924. Reza Shah ruled via the army and the institutions of monarchy. His reign was based on coercion rather than consensus. He did not seek for a public support. Reza Shah ignored the political education and institutions that would sustain the reforms after him. He did not hesitate to use the power of the monarchy for his personal interests. The people viewed him as a selfish person (Cleveland, 2008: 216).

Reza Shah did not hesitate to use power to suppress the masses when they acted against his regulations. For example, the protests against the new Pahlavi hat by the ulama and masses were harshly suppressed in Mashad.

> [O]n Friday, 13 July 1935 (20 Tir, 1314) security forces stormed the shrine and the mosque, shot at the demonstrators, killed some, but, failing to dislodge them, withdrew. Now people from all over the city and the surrounding countryside converged on the shrine to protest and listen to the preachers' fiery speeches. The next day troops went into position all over the city, and in the late evening attacked the mosque and put an end to the whole affair amid much bloodshed. The following day the dead were buried in mass graves, and most senior *ulema* in the city were arrested and exiled from Mashad (Chehabi, 2004: 223).

The state actions against the resistance to settlement of tribes were also brutal.

> This program of forced sedentization, which was carried out in Luristan, Fars, Azerbaijan and Khurasan during the years 1933 to 1937, took a very brutal and, in some cases, a genocidal form. In a short period of time the tribal life of Iran was transformed, but this transformation did not come about through the adoption of an idyllic agricultural way of life, as it was initially conceived, but through coercive and violent methods that virtually wiped out a large segment of the tribal population of Iran (Bayat, 2003: 217).

After the 1953 coup of Mohammed Reza Shah, the Iranian regime once more went into the policy of coercion towards the oppositional groups. The Shah regime eliminated the leftist groups with the aid of the USA secret service. In the late 1950s the Iranian Secret Service, SAVAK, was founded. SAVAK was used to bring the population "into submission…through widespread killings, torture and mass detentions. By the mid1970s, most of the leftist, liberal, nationalist, and other secular opposition leadership had been successfully repressed through murder, imprisonment or exile, and most of their organizations banned" (Zunes, 2009). The suppression of the mass movements in the 1960s and the harsh conflicts with the demonstrators in the late 1970s were the results of the fact that the Shah regime did not maintain the ideological support of the masses; but resorted to force and repression to eliminate the opposition. This was a consequence of the fact that the state failed to grow an ideology to bind the masses to itself.

> In an age of democracy and republicanism the regime accorded centrality to a royal ideology whose principle features were Persian chauvinism, loyalty to the person of the shah, depoliticization of the citizenry, and the glorification of pre-Islamic Iranian history. This hierarchically exclusionary ideology failed to fulfill either the ideological needs of the traditional masses or the recently expanded middle class. Because of its lofty nature, the royal ideology was fundamentally incapable of creating an ideological sense of political participation among the people or of subduing its political opponents. Throughout its rule the Pahlavi regime remained a dictatorship not predicated on real consensus. Inevitably, then, it relied increasingly on violence as the key to its security amid the rise of semiorganized countergroups, which were largely coached in Islamic discursive practices (Boroujerdi, 1996: 30).

The lack of a strong state ideology brings about the question that how the regime could maintain to survive till 1979. The answer to this question might be that the Pahlavi regime in Iran

did not need the consent of the masses as much as the Turkish Republic did. This is because the Iranian state economically relied less on the revenues recruited from the masses than the Turkish Republic. The oil income of the land was exclusively in the hands of the state. The expenses of the coercive state were met mostly with the huge oil income rather than the taxes collected from the masses. Especially in the last decades of the rule of Mohammed Reza Shah the oil income raised to excessive amounts. In 1974-75 the oil income constituted 84 per cent of the total budget of the Iranian state. In Turkey, on the other hand, "[o]n average, taxes accounted for more than 80 percent of total revenue" in the years 1974-1979 (Shambayati, 1994).

Shambayati designates the Iranian state in this period as "rentier". Oil income enabled the state in Iran to act independent of the economically productive classes. He argues a rentier state becomes independent of the "economically motivated pressure groups" and creates a state dependent bourgeoisie. Although Turkey and Iran followed a similar economic and political path till the 1950s they diverged significantly afterwards. This was because Iran became more and more a rentier state in the second half of the twentieth century (Shambayati, 1994).

Modernization of the state meant, for both Turkey and Iran, a growth of the public sector and tremendous increase of the number of people employed in state bureaucracy. "Between 1956 and 1976 the number of government employees increased by more than 600 percent, allowing the government to create a large state bureaucracy which for the first time in Iranian history could reach into every small village and touch every aspect of life" (Shambayati, 1994). In Turkey the economic burden of enlarging the public sector and state officials was reflected to the taxes recruited from the people. In Iran on the other hand, such enlargement of state activities did not bring a significant extra burden on the population; it could be financed with the oil revenues. Karshenas points out the economic autonomy of the state from the societal powers due to the oir revenues.

> Two major themes were highlighted in the…[analysis of state economy and oil revenues in between 1953 and 1977]. First the high degree of autonomy of the state executive from the legislature and by implication from the underlying society, and within that the concentration of power in the hands of a small elite centered around the court and the monarch. Secondly, the central role of the state in the distribution of a sizeable share of the investable funds in the economy. These two factors greatly enhanced the power of the state's economic intervention and conferred upon it a high potential for controlling the pace and pattern of investment in the economy (Karshenas, 1990: 107-108).

While the modernization of Turkey depended on the local resources, the modernization in Iran after the 1950s was independent of the local resources (Shambayati, 1994).

As Turkey relied more on economic contribution of its people for modernization, the Turkish politics evolved towards more democracy than that in Iran. The regime in Turkey canalized the oppositional groups into the legal frameworks of politics. "Dependence on a domestically produced

surplus obligated the Turkish state to respond to the demands of the entrepreneurial classes" (Shambayati, 1994). In Iran, on the other hand, the state was not willing to provide representational rights or develop channels of legitimate representation for the opposition. This was simply because the state did not need the cooperation of the oppositional groups for its policies. In order to maintain the order, the state resorted to coercion, which further antagonized the oppositional groups and weakened the bonds between the state and the citizens (Boroujerdi, 1996: 31). The coercive nature of the state did not create a channeling of the oppositions into the legal political frameworks. The state itself also remained inflexible to respond to emerging political situations and demand of the masses.

Kazemi comments that the civil society in Iran has "traditionally been a significant part of Iranian society" (Kazemi, 1994: 119). He relates this situation to the weakness of the Iranian state: "the limited power of the Iranian state provided the needed space for development of many elements of civil society" (Kazemi, 1994: 119). The groups formed outside the sphere of the state were generally organized around "occupation, family and kin ties, tribal lineage, religious persuasion, or political orientation" (Kazemi, 1994: 119). The Iranian state could silence these spheres after adopting the modern techniques and consequently empowering its military, security and economic facilities. The subsequent "hyper-autonomous" Iranian state, with Kazemi's phrase, limited the activities of the civil societal groups and associations in the 1960s and 1970s (Kazemi, 1994: 122). The attempt of the modern nation state to silence the civil sphere was successful to a great extent, however, "the Iranian civil society did not and could not disappear" as a source of opposition to the state power (Kazemi, 1994: 122). This was because the state did not really canalize the opposition into the legal frameworks but just distanced them from legal politics. Therefore, the state regulations did not transform the civil societal groups. Especially the realm of clergy was less affected by the state's monopolization attempts owing to their age-long independence from the state both in economic and institutional sense (Kazemi, 1994: 121-122).

A similar situation of detachment of the state from the masses was observed also in the economic realm. "The rentier nature of the Iranian state...allowed the state elite to function without establishing links with domestic entrepreneurs" (Shambayati, 1994). Instead, the Iranian state resorted again to repression and coercion against the oppositional groups in economy.

> In Turkey, the state adopted a corporatist structure to control and respond to the demands of the private sector. In Turkey, however, corporatism was inclusionary. Associations were not merely instruments of government control [as in Iran]; they also served as the channel through which civil society made claims upon the state (Shambayati, 1994).
>
> The government machinery [in Iran] was dominated by a technocratic elite which was not accustomed to political negotiations with domestic groups. Domestic social groups had no influence over state policies (Shambayati, 1994).

The rentier states provide economic wealth to their population not by their activities in the national economy but simply with the revenues derived from the exportation of the land's natural resources. As a result, such states do not have an economic legitimization for their existence. Therefore they seek for other means of legitimization. This was the reason that, as Shambayati states, the Iranian state resorted more and more to the glory of pre-Islamic Iranian empires and Iranian culture to establish a link between itself and the people of the land (Shambayati, 1994).

The lack of a strongly legitimate ideology resulted that the regime in Iran could not maintain the consent of the masses to the degree as in Turkey. Therefore the regime in Iran did not have the discoursive means to intrude into the society and to manipulate the oppositional groups. In such a situation the Pahlavi state resorted more and more to coercion to suppress the oppositions. Due to the oil revenues the state of Mohammed Reza Shah was far less dependent on the contributions of the masses than the Turkish state was. Therefore the Iranian state in this period was more autonomous vis-à-vis the societal powers. This situation further widened the ideological gap between the state and the societal forces and reinforced the coercive attitude of the regime. The coercion of the regime at the end resulted in the radicalization of the marginalized oppositions to aim at collapsing the regime, which finally came to a success.

4.7 Homogenization – Ethnic Cleansing and Ethnic Repression

One of the fundamental processes in nation state formation is the homogenization of the population both in ethnic and cultural terms. It is mostly the case that nation states impose single language and single national identity to their populations. Ethnic homogenization is realized mostly by assimilation but sometimes by ethnic cleansing. Ethnic cleansing can take place by population expulsion, population exchange, and even massacres of populations that can extend to genocides. Cultural homogenization corresponds to promotion of the cultural elements by the state that are considered to be a part of the national identity. The elements that fall aside the boundary of the promoted national identity are usually ignored if not repressed. For example, the cultural symbols that make reference to the aristocratic status in the regimes former to the nation states are usually subject to repression.

Münch stresses the importance of the homogenization process for the state and citizenship formation in the Western lands. He writes "the nation state has homogenized ethnic, cultural, religious, regional and class-based differences" with the notion of citizenship. This homogenization and holding together of different groups of society happened to be in "a particular way of integration" in every different context. It was "civic community in Britain, state in France, market in the United States and law in Germany" that integrated the citizens under the authority of the nation state (Münch, 2001: 1, 2-3). Similarly, Turkey and Iran too aimed at ethnic and cultural homogenization. It is considered in this thesis that the most fundamental elements of the homogenization processes in Turkey and Iran were the cleansing of the Christian populations and

repression of the Kurdish identity in Turkey and repression of the provincial and tribal movements in Iran.

The cleansing of Anatolia from the Christian minorities was a founding process for the Republican Turkey. The anti-Christian feeling was merged with the idea that the Western powers were willing to disintegrate the Ottoman Empire and that they would do the same with the Turkish Republic whenever there was a chance. Therefore, the anti-Christian feelings constituted an important aspect of the outward demarcation for the Turkish nationalism (Münch, 2001: 6-7). The Christians living in the land of Turkey were considered to be 'outsiders' with the rise of Turkish nationalism. In the second half of the twentieth century this idea was even strengthened and internalized by the Turkish people who never saw Christian populations on these lands. And the same feeling was used more than once in order to transfer the wealth of the Christian entrepreneurs to the state, to gain popular support for external policies, and to promote nationalist feelings in the internal politics. In the 1960s, the representative of the racist current in Turkey, Nihal Atsız, threatened the Kurdish people with being exterminated in this land, as it happened to the Armenians in 1915 and Greeks in 1922, in case they continued to act as moppets of the external enemies and did not give up the idea of a Kurdish state (Bora, 2006: 95, transferred from Nihal Atsız, Ötüken, 15.2.1966, Makaleler/3, p. 381-9). An interesting observation related to the idea of Christian minorities being used to construct the image of the 'other' is about the Kurdish problem. Because of the desire to assimilate the Kurdish population, the Turkish state did not manage to create a proper enemy image of the Kurds. Therefore, there appeared attempts to associate the Kurds with the other images of enemy, namely the Armenians. The Kurdish movement after the 1990s was claimed to cooperate and be in the service of the so-called "Armenian aims" to divide the Turkish land (Bora, 2006: 104-105).

Bora points out the mutual exclusiveness of the notions of being a member of a minority and being a member of the Turkish nation. An interesting example is the case of the Jewish origined Turkish nationalist Munis Tekinalp (Moiz Kohen). Tekinalp wrote various texts as an advocate of Turkish nationalism, even with a strong tendency towards cultural racism. However, he has never been recognized as one of the pioneering scholars of Turkish nationalism. This is a tragic example for that Turkish nationalism does not welcome the non-Muslim minorities into its ideological framework (Bora, 1999: 39). Today it is still the clear case that there is no non-Muslim official employee in the high echelons of Turkish Military, Security Forces, or Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Oran, 2004: 93).

In Iranian modern history, there happened no such cleansing of the land from the non-Muslim groups as in Ottoman Empire and Republican Turkey. The main reason is that the proportion of the non-Muslim population in the Qajar Iran was much less than that in the Ottoman Empire (Atabaki, 2000: 18). Therefore, the problems the country faced with were less associated with the Christian populations. An exception to this is the period of the First World War, in which the Armenian

Christians were regarded to be betrayers as some of them cooperated with the invading Russian army. However, in contrast to Turkey, these events did not raise a significant anti-Christian feeling to influence the national identity of Iran in the following decades. Another reason is perhaps that the Christian minorities, especially the Armenians in Iran, took active part in the very important modernization moments of Iran. The Christian groups in Iran cooperated with the nationalist forces in the struggle against the Qajar Shahs. During the civil war for the Constitutional Revolution the Armenians within the Tabriz forces were crucial to defeat the Shah's army in Tehran. Due to their contributions the Christians were considered to be an element of the Iranian nationalist movement. It should be remembered that the two important pillars of Iranian nationalism were being against the Qajar Shahs and being against the intervention of external powers. Both of these were shared by the Christian populations of Iran as the other nationalist groups. Despite the contribution of the Christians to the Constitutional Revolution, the Constitutional regime preserved the statement that Iran was an Islamic state with the Shi'a religion. Furthermore, the secularist attempts of the Reza Shah regime were strongly opposed by the ulama and the bazaaris. These should be considered to lead to the negative impacts considering the relation between the Iranian state and its non-Muslim minorities. The secularization attempts of Reza Shah were supported by the non-Muslim groups. The non-Muslims raised their economic and social status in the Reza Shah period.

The repression of the Kurdish identity was the second moment of homogenization of ethnicity in Turkey. The state forced the people to believe that all the people on the land were originally Turkish. The state aimed to assimilate the Kurdish population into Turkish ethnicity by forbidding the Kurdish language, ignoring the Kurdish identity, imposing the Turkish language over the Kurdish population, and by promoting the idea that Kurdish people were in fact early Turks that forgot their ethnic origins. In Iran a process of homogenization of ethnic identities took place especially towards the Azerbaijani population. However, although there appeared some nationalist that argued Azerbaijanis to be former Persians who forgot their own language, rejection of the Azerbaijani identity did not happen to be a systematic state policy like in Turkey.

The nation states of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah both aimed at Turkification and Persianization of their respective populations. There is a difference in degree of acceptance of the identity of their minorities in those two lands. Till 1992, the existence of the Kurdish identity was denied by the Turkish state. In the Iranian Constitution prior to the Islamic Republic, the people of the land were named as "the people of the Persian Empire" or "the people of Persia".[61] The names of the respective regions were preserved as Kurdish and Azerbaijani provinces, as in the New Electoral Law of July 1, 1909. Moreover, today's Constitution of the Islamic Republic uses the

---

[61] Peaslee, A. J. (1950), *Constitutions of Nations – The First Compilation in the English Language of the Texts of the Constitutions on the Various Nations of the World*, New Hapshire, Concord: Rumford Press, vol. 2, pp. 197-214. A digital copy of the 1906 Constitution of Iran is available in the following internet link:
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Iran_Constitution_of_1906 (This is the basis of Iranian Constitution. There have been some changes in the constitution after the coup against Mossadeq in 1953, and with the White Revolution in 1963.)

term "Persian" only for three times and only for explanations of the official language.[62] It further states that "the use of regional and tribal languages in the press and mass media, as well as for teaching of their literature in schools, is allowed in addition to Persian". The people of the land are named as "Iranian" or "people of Iran" throughout the Constitution. These are the signs that the Turkishness was more strongly imposed on the people of Turkey than Persianness on the people of Iran.

The provincial movements in Iran – the Gilan and Azerbaijan Democrat Party movements in the 1920s, the Azerbaijan and Kurdish Autonomous movements in 1945 – signify, on the one hand, that the Qajar Empire was far less centralized than the Ottoman Empire, on the other hand, that these movements had a very local character in the sense of being independent from a center. There was a stronger tendency of provincial decentralization in Iran in comparison to that in Turkey. Whenever the central power was weakened the provincial groups organized to build a representative political center of their region. In the case of Turkey, the Defense of Rights Organizations that appeared immediately after the First World War and prior to the Independence War can be compared to the provincial movements in Iran. In Turkey as well, the central power of Istanbul was weakened in the period of these movements. However, the Defense of Rights Organizations were initiated and organized by the members of the CUP cadres. In Turkey these provincial movements were organized more or less centrally. They were more an outcome of a central initiative directed against the possible invasions of the land and turn back of the expelled Christian populations. These movements themselves represented a central power, rather than decentralized provincial movements. In Iran, on the other hand, the provincial movements were more local and individual. The conflict between the leaders of the Azerbaijan Democrat movement and the Gilan movement because of the difference of political orientation, and the conflict between the Azerbaijan Autonomous Movement and the Kurdish Autonomous Movement because of ethnic differences point out their decentralized character and the lack of cooperation between them. In Turkey, all the Defense of Rights organizations were directed against the external enemies and externalized Christian populations and were geared to the service of nationalist movement in Ankara.

The difference in the character of these two currents signifies that the provincial movements in Iran had a local identity. This was also reflected in the official framework of the modern Iranian state that the names of the regions were indicative of the ethnicity of the population living in the provinces. Article 6 of the 1906 Constitution states the following.

> The number of persons elected by the people in the different parts of Persia shall correspond
> with the total number of the inhabitants of that locality. In each province (ayálat) six or twelve
> persons shall be elected in accordance with the following table, save in the case of Tihrán,

---

[62] Hamed, A. (1980), *Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, California, Berkeley: Mizan Press. A digital copy of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran is available in the following internet link: http://www.servat.unibe.ch/law/icl/ir00000_.html

when [where] the number of those elected shall be as follows: (i) Princes and members of the Qájár family, 4: (ii) doctors of Divinity and students, 4: (iii) merchants, 10: (iv) land-owners and peasants, 10: (v) trade-guilds, 32 in all, one from each guild.

In other provinces and departments the numbers shall be as follows: (i) Ázarbáyján, 12: (ii) Khurásán, Sístán, Turbat, Turshíz, Qúchán, Bujnúrd, Sháhrúd and Bistám, 12: (iii) Gílán and Tálish, 6: (iv) Mázandarán, Tunkábun, Astarábád, Fírúzkúh and Damáwand, 6: (v) Khamsa, Qazwín, Simnán and Dámghán, 6: (vi) Kirmán and Balúchistán, 6: (vii) Fárs and the Persian Gulf Ports, 12: (viii) Arabistán, Luristán and Burújird, 6: (ix) Kirmánsháhán and Garrús, 6: (x) Kurdistán and Hamadán, 6: (xi) Isfahán, Yazd, Káshán, Qum and Sáwa, 12: (xii) ' Iráq, Malá'ir, Túy Sirkán, Niháwand, Kamra, Gulpáyagán and Khwánsár, 6.

The different ethnic characters of different provinces are recognized also today in the Constitution of the Islamic Republic. The following articles are indicative.

Article 19 [No Discrimination, No Privileges]:

All people of Iran, whatever the ethnic group or tribe to which they belong, enjoy equal rights; color, race, language, and the like, do not bestow any privilege.

Article 15 [Official Language]:

The Official Language and script of Iran, the lingua franca of its people, is Persian. Official documents, correspondence, and texts, as well as text-books, must be in this language and script. However, the use of regional and tribal languages in the press and mass media, as well as for teaching of their literature in schools, is allowed in addition to Persian.

Azerbaijani, Kurdish, Luri, Mazandarani, Gilaki, Baluchi and Arabic languages are all recognized today by the Islamic Republic. In contrast to the case in Iran, in Turkey the ethnic differences were rejected by the state. The Kurdish identity was denied in the legal framework; even the existence of Kurdish identity and Kurdish language were rejected. The ethnic characters of the provinces in Iran were better recognized by the state throughout the modern Iranian history. In Turkey, on the other hand, the state applied a more repressive policy in order to assimilate the different ethnic identities into Turkishness. The ethnic characters of provinces in Turkey were not recognized in the official framework.

The homogenization process in Turkey was based on the ethnic-cleansing of non-Muslims and assimilation of the Kurdish population into the Turkish ethnicity. Therefore both exclusion and assimilation were put in practice. The assimilation policy towards the Kurds in Turkey aimed at making the Kurds totally forget their identity. The existence of Kurdish identity was rejected. The assimilation in Turkey was not only a matter of language, was also a matter of accepting the superior position of Turkish ethnicity. In Iran, on the other hand, the homogenization process did not include an ethnic cleansing process. There was no ethnic group that disappeared from the land in modern Iran. Exclusion was not a practice in Iranian homogenization. The Iranian homogenization was based on assimilation of the ethnic groups especially through the Persian

language. The ethnic identities in Iran were not subject to a systematic rejection by the state as it happened in Turkey. They were but forced by the Pahlavi Regime to use the Persian language in official and educational matters.

4.8   Conclusion for Comparison of State Formations in Turkey and Iran

The modern state formations in Turkey and Iran were both founded on a peculiar historical inheritance from their empire traditions. The modernization of the state was a transformation of their past Empire formations into a modern state. The transformation was realized as a project of the state elite; therefore it differed from the European lands where the very societal powers and economical developments dynamically changed the formations in a longer period. On the other hand, the modernization processes in Turkey and Iran also differed from that of the many north-African and Middle Eastern countries which gained their independence after the Second World War and started a modernization process approximately thirty years later than the two. Consequently, a determinant factor for the characteristics of the state formations of Turkey and Iran is what kind of state structures they inherited from the past Empires. Besides that what kind of societal structures they had in the eve of modernization, what kind of ethnic homogenization they pursued, whether the states could sustain the central power, and how they responded to the discontent of the masses are the items that mark their state formations. These items are especially highlighted when the modern histories of Turkey and Iran are read from a comparative perspective.

The modernization of Turkey and Iran can perhaps be traced following a line of *implementation*, *enforcement*, and *adaptation* of modernization regulations. 'Modernization' here refers to all the processes of transformation and foundation of modern state institutions, building of a national identity, importation of Western life styles, and transformation towards a national market economy. In the implementation phase the state elite aimed at initializing the modern institutional apparatuses of the state. Modernization of military, foundation of a parliament, secularization of education and law were initialized in this phase. This phase corresponds roughly to the years 1905-1924 in both contexts, namely to the rise of nationalist groups and the two leaders. This implementation phase was very much constrained by the existent structure and available resources for the initializations of modernization. In Turkey, the nationalists benefited much from the results of early modernization in the Ottoman Empire starting from the 1830s. What the nationalists did was more close to continuing an already started process than making radical breaks with the past. In Iran on the other hand, the Qajar Empire did not leave a comparable degree of modernization experience to the Iranian nationalists. The nationalists of Iran the first time experienced a parliamentary regime, the first time pursued for a widespread bureaucratic structure, the first time started a discussion of secularization of law and education, and the first time experienced conscription and an orderly army. All these differences in the inherited state experience underlay the faster and more extensive initialization of modernization reforms in Turkey compared to in Iran.

Another important factor inherited from the past was the societal structures on both lands, regarding to the potential societal groups to organize against the state and raise demands. In fact this factor is in close relation to the capability of the Ottoman and Qajar states to intervene into and reorganize the society by means of the state bureaucracy. The Ottoman Empire was far beyond the Qajars in this sense. Therefore, the Ottoman Empire had more effective means of binding the societal groups to the state, as well as repressing and eliminating the oppositions. The early elimination of the Janissary troops and the Bekhtashi orders was especially important to enhance this capability. With this elimination, the almost only potential leadership of opposition was crushed in the very beginning of the modernization. In Iran, on the other hand, the traditional leadership of the oppositions, the ulama, remained to be strong and influential. Besides that the bazaaris, tribes, and provincial groups were much more organized and powerful compared to their counterparts in Turkey. The secular nationalists of Iran were only a part of the overall opposition within these groups. All these civil societal groups took active part in the initialization phase of the modernization in the early twentieth century. In Turkey, it was the state elite – the military, bureaucracy, and the nationalist intellectuals derived from those – that initialized and realized the transformation of the state. The inclusion of the societal and local groups was only for the Independence War due to the fear of invasion by the Western powers and turn back of the expatriated Christians, but still in the leadership of the bureaucratic and military elite.

These differences in the implementation period resulted that the reforms in Turkey were more extensive and effective than the ones in Iran. The most striking example is the foundation of a Republic. The nationalist elite in Turkey were successful to declare a Republic in one day without a significant opposition. Reza Shah, on the other hand, had to shelve this idea due to the opposition led by the ulama. Moreover, Turkey declared the state to be secular; Iran preserved in its constitution that Iran was a Shi'a state. The Kemalist elite in Turkey managed to promote a nationalist state ideology and a new Turkish identity; the Pahlavi regime was less successful in this regard.

The period of *enforcement* of modernization corresponds to the ethnic and cultural homogenization in both lands. These happened during and after the First World War till the end of the Second World War, roughly in between 1915 and 1945. In Turkey the Christian populations were perceived by the nationalist as a threat to the unity of the Ottoman lands. The First World War conditions constituted an opportunity for the ruling elite to clean the land from Armenian and part of the Greek populations. The cleansing in this period was performed by murdering and expatriation. After the foundation of the Republic the remaining Greek population was cleaned away by the population exchange in 1923 between Greece and Turkey. These two events of ethnic cleansing were determining for the ethnic homogenization of the population in Turkey in terms of religion. In Iran, the Christians did not constitute such a large portion of the Qajar population; therefore, they were not conceived as a potential danger. Although there were some massacres and

deportation of Christians also in Iran during the First World War, these were far less significant than those in Turkey. Anti-Christian feelings did not constitute a significant element of Iranian national identity. The Christian populations in Turkey were externalized as potential threats to the welfare of the state. The cleansing process therefore was considered by the nationalists as an act against the intrusion of external powers, rather than being against the very local peoples of the land. The process reinforced the idea of 'protecting the welfare of the state' as an element of the national identity in Turkey. The cleansing of the Christian populations in Turkey was therefore not only an internal homogenization process in ethnic terms but also a process that constituted part of the demarcation of the external enemies. The events in this period contributed to the development of the idea of protecting the welfare of the state in any condition and in the expense of anything. The state was more fetishized in the Turkish national identity than that of Iranian. Loyalty to the state became the main determinant of Turkish nationalism.

The outward demarcation in Turkey and Iran was constructed differently. In Turkey the threat of disintegration of the land was in the core of the outward demarcation. This threat was reflected to the local non-Muslim minorities. They were conceived as the local material correspondents of this perceived threat from the Western powers. The Christian minorities were seen as the local agents of the disintegration policies of the external powers. All these resulted in the cleansing of the land with murders, departures, and exchanges. Materializing the conceived threat of the West on the local minorities and getting rid of those minorities, at the end resulted in weakening of the xenophobic feelings towards the Western powers. As Üstel states "the notion of 'external enemy' that appears as an important actor in the discourse of the Independence War, is not transferred to the times of peace" (Üstel, 2009: 324). After the cleansing of the land from the non-Muslims, the regime did not feel a significant threat from the West. This eased the modernization in the sense of copying the lifestyle of the West and imitating the state institutions from the West.

In Iran, on the other hand, there happened no cleansing of minorities. The outward demarcation in Iran was shaped by the actual invasions of the land by Western powers. This was not a fear of disintegration due to local powers, but a fear of invasion in the sense of losing the resources of the land to the external powers. The national identity was constructed on the hatred against the invaders of Iran. This hatred towards the external powers was not materialized in any form towards any local group. Rather, the xenophobic feelings caused nativism to become a constitutive element of Iranian nationalism. The xenophobic feelings and the idea of nativism made it difficult to imitate the Western values and Western state institutions. The same feeling fed the opposition against the regime of Mohammad Reza Shah in close cooperation with the USA. The resentment of the Islamic Regime against the Western powers and Western life style should also be related to these historical xenophobic feelings of the Iranian population.

In Iran, the homogenization process was realized by enforcement towards the provincial movements and tribes. The invasion of the land prior to and during the First World War resulted in

the weakening of the central power and emergence of provincial groups declaring autonomy in their regions. These conditions made the nationalists look for a strong leadership to eliminate the decentralizing movements and establish the central power of the state. Reza Shah emerged in the political arena as a response to this demand. The military troops he organized suppressed the provincial movements. The tribes constituted an important obstacle against the central rule of the state. Disarmament and settlement of the tribes took much of the effort of the Pahlavi regime in its early decades. The homogenization process in Iran served for sustaining the central state power. It did not demarcate such an idea of protection of the welfare of the state against the external powers as in Turkey. It was a process served for sustaining the central power. Therefore, although the homogenization process brought Reza Shah to power and provided him with his early reputation, it did not form an enduring element of the national identity in Iran. The idea of nativism – making reference to Shi'a Islam, Persian literature, and sometimes the glorious past Persian Empires – remained as the cornerstone of Iranian nationalism. In Turkey cleansing of the remnants of the Christian populations continued with the wealth taxation in the early 1940s and the September 6-7 events in 1955. In Iran, the provincial movements and tribal representations emerged again in the 1940s after the abdication of Reza Shah.

In Turkey and Iran, the imposition of Turkish and Persian languages and ethnicities over the Kurds and Azerbaijanis were other moments of ethnic homogenization. This second moment was not related to external demarcation or sustaining the central power, but was directly related to building of the national identity. In Turkey the state perceived the Kurds as potential groups to be assimilated into the Turkish ethnicity. The Kurdish identity and anything related to Kurdishness were rejected. This corresponded to associating the national identity in Turkey with the dominant ethnic group, namely the Turks. In Iran, the Pahlavi regime aimed at the same process. However, the Persians in Iran did not constitute such a large ratio of the population as Turks in Turkey. Moreover, there were various and large ethnic groups in Iran such as Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Lurs, Mazandarans, Gilakis, Baluchis, and Arabs. Imposition of a single ethnic identity was more difficult. Added to this demographic variety were the less power of the state to enforce its regulations, the historical fact that the Azerbaijanis played important role in the Constitutional Revolution, and the fact that the provincial regions of Azerbaijanis, Kurds and other ethnic groups were officially recognized by the state with the names that reflected their ethnic identity. In the Constitution of Iran, the identities of these regions were clearly recognized by the state. It is remarkable that during the Constitutional Revolution the national identity advocated by the most revolutionaries was an umbrella identity over all ethnic groups. Although this idea was not promoted by the Pahlavi regime, it still remained vital that with Islamic Republic the understanding of "Iranian" was adopted as an umbrella identity. In Turkey the total rejection of the Kurdish identity resulted in the still continuing war between the PKK and the Turkish army since the 1980s.

The Turkish national identity as promoted by the state is still based on the dominance of Turkish ethnicity and Turkish language.

The *adaptation* process corresponds to the period after the Second World War till the 1980s. In this period Turkey passed to the multi-party regime and experienced three military coups. In Iran the early 1950s were marked by the Mossadeq movement and later the repressive regime of the Mohammed Pahlavi. The state ideology promoted by the Kemalist regime proved to be successful in gaining the consent of the masses. The peasant masses, the less beneficiaries of the Kemalist regime, were convinced to support a party loyal to the regime, the DP, and their discontent was canalized into the legal frameworks of the multi-party regime. In Iran, on the other hand, the Mohammed Reza Shah regime was lacking a comparable state ideology that would gain the consent of the masses at a degree as in Turkey. Therefore, the Pahlavi regime after 1953 resorted more and more to coercion, declaring a one-party system in 1975. This policy further antagonized the opponent groups culminating in political organizations outside the legal framework and aiming at collapsing the regime. While the Kemalist regime was more obliged to respond to the demands of the discontented masses, the Pahlavi regime relied on the oil revenues to sustain the economic and military power of the state. The regime and people in Turkey came closer to each other in the second half of the twentieth century. The Pahlavi regime in Iran did not perform as much as its counterpart in Turkey to lessen the gap between itself and the people of Iran. The military coups in Turkey functioned to redefine the boundaries of legal political framework of the multi-party regime. It should be noted that this tuning was preoccupied with maintaining the welfare of the state rather than bringing more freedom or fulfilling the demands of the oppositions. The coup in 1961 brought relative liberalization as a reaction to the repressive rule of the DP; but, the memorandum in 1972 and the coup in 1980 eliminated the liberal sights of the former constitution to repress the political left. It should also be noted that none of the military coups in Turkey caused an oppositional mass movement comparable to that in Iran prior to the Islamic Revolution.

In view of the notions by Migdal, Turkey is fitting more to the model of a "strong state" than Iran, as it was more capable to "penetrate society" and "regulate social relations" (Migdal, 1988: 4-5). Turkey inherited from the Ottoman Empire a "basis for an independent bureaucracy" and the experience of modern government which created "skillful leadership" in state building (Migdal, 1988: 274-275). These were lacking or less powerful in the heritage of the Pahlavi Iran from the Qajar Empire. The tremendous demographic changes and the ethnic cleansing in Anatolia resulted in "massive societal dislocation, which severely weaken[ed] social control" (Migdal, 1988: 269). Migdal (1988: 269) states that "[s]ocieties must be weakened before a new distribution of social control is possible". The weakening of society vis-à-vis the state gave way to easier modernization in Turkey than in Iran. The society in Turkey demonstrated more "compliance" to the modernization projects of the Kemalist elite, in the sense of posing less resistance than their counterparts in Iran; the Kemalist ideology promoted by the state had higher "legitimation" than

the ideology of the Pahlavi regime; the passage to the multi-party regime and flexibility of the system in Turkey resulted in the "participation" of the masses within the legal politics (Migdal, 1988: 33). Considering all these the state in Turkey was stronger than in Iran. The societal networks in Iran persisted and played important political roles in the absence of such a strong state as in Turkey.

In Turkey the state inherited a state structure which had performed significant modernization and had repressed potential oppositional groups. Afterwards the nationalist elite performed a rather easier modernization compared to that in Iran. In this process the ethnic homogenization of the land by cleansing of the non-Muslim minorities marked the national identity as an item enforcing the protection of the welfare of the state. Repression of the Kurdish identity was a result of the idea of identifying the national identity by Turkish ethnicity. In Iran, the Pahlavi regime inherited a state structure which did not experience the early modernizations of the Ottomans. The Constitutional Revolution was performed by a broad social based mass movement, which culminated in the understanding of an umbrella Iranian identity over the ethnic groups. The Reza Shah regime put much of its effort for maintaining the central power of the state against the provincial and tribal groups. Neither the centrality of the state nor the Persian ethnicity became the prominent characteristics of the national identity in Iran. In Turkey the state managed to canalize the oppositional groups into the legal political framework by means of the promoted state ideology, transition to the multi-party regime, and redefining the boundaries of the legal political framework. In Iran, the state relied on the oil revenues and resorted more to coercion. In Turkey there appeared no strong mass movements to challenge the legitimacy of the Kemalist regime. In Iran the Pahlavi regime collapsed with the Islamic Revolution in 1979. Using the term "basic idea" from Münch (2001: 3-5) and the term "[political] loyalty" from Brubaker (1990), it can be stated that the basic idea of Turkish nationalism has been *loyalty to the state*; that of Iranian nationalism has been *preserving the nativity*.

CHAPTER 5

COMPARISON OF CITIZENSHIP FORMATIONS IN TURKEY AND IRAN

This chapter performs a comparison of the citizenship formations of Turkey and Iran in view of the ethnicity and state formation discussions given in the previous three chapters. It is demonstrated in the previous chapters that the modern history of Turkey and Iran followed different paths due to the differences in inherited state structures, the power and centrality of the states, existence of strong societal networks in the society, and the impact of the Second World War. In this chapter the implications of these historical differences on the citizenship formations are examined. The citizenship formations are compared on the bases of the development of rights and whether they are central to the citizenship formation, the usage of the notion of citizenship by the states to promote their projects and national identities, the weight of duties and rights as implied in the promoted citizenships by the states, the active participation or passivity of masses in the citizenship formation, the closeness of the citizenship formations to the exclusionary German or assimilative French model, and the existence of a gradual citizenship. Each of these items of comparison is first introduced by referencing to the citizenship literature and then examined in the contexts of Turkey and Iran.

5.1 Rights: Civil, Political, Social

Marshall analyses the citizenship formation in Britain and concludes that citizenship formation is a process of expansion of rights of individuals (Marshall, 1992). The expansion of rights signifies a social development towards a more egalitarian society.[63] This expansion reflects the historical stages of the development of citizenship in Britain that came about as a result of the struggle of lower classes. Marshall distinguishes the three categories of civil, political, and social rights as constitutive elements of citizenship. He relates these three groups of rights with the emergent institutions of their time. Among those the civil rights are related to individual freedom such as "liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the rights to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice" (Marshall, 1992). These first appeared in the eighteenth century very close to their modern form today. The accompanying institutions to civil right were the "courts of justice", which guaranteed the experience of individual freedom. The political rights signify the participation of individuals in the political action within the society. These rights are related to both having the chance of serving as a member of the governmental body and having the right to franchise. The associated institutions with political rights are "parliament and councils of local government" which mainly became dominant in the nineteenth

---

[63] The link that Marshall has established between the expansion of citizenship rights and egalitarian movements has found considerable reflection on the citizenship discussions. For example: "An ideal of universal citizenship has driven the emancipatory momentum of modern political life", Young, I.M. (1995), Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Idea of Universal Citizenship, in *Theorizing Citizenship*, ed. by R. Beiner, (New York: Sunny Press), p.175.

century. The social rights refer to the conditions of being able "to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society" (Marshall, 1992). The right to education, health, social security, and insurance system are examples of social rights. The social rights emerged in the last half of the twentieth century with the understanding of welfare state and were accompanied by the institutions of education system and social services.

Following Marshall's approach, Janoski extends the spectrum of citizenship rights by adding the participation rights to the former three.

> Participation rights involve the state's creation of rights in private arenas, whether in market or public organizations. Just as political rights are public powers of action, participation rights are state-assured private powers of action. They refer to the individual and group rights to participate in private decision making through some measure of control over markets, organizations, and capital (Janoski, 1998: 30-33).

Similar to Marshall, Janoski also considers citizenship as "universalistic rights enacted into law" and observes these four kinds of rights from the official indicators (Janoski, 1998: 28).

The citizenship formations in Republican Turkey and Pahlavi Iran are difficult to be understood from the perspective of expansion of rights as formalized by Marshall and later Janoski. The nation state building in Turkey and Iran differed a lot from that in Britain. It was more a project of the modernizing elite from above, rather than the result of class struggles from below. The rights to the citizens were given by the state in order to comply with the image of a modern state and modern nation, rather than as a result of the struggle of the lower classes. In the process of giving rights to the citizens, these two states behaved selective and sometimes contrary to the cases in the modern Western states. Sustaining the central power of the state and modernization of the state and society were prior to the rights of the citizens.

The situations in Turkey and Iran, besides in many other Western and non-Western lands, are perhaps counter examples to the conception of Marshall. Mann is one of the scholars that raised criticism about Marshall's conception (Mann, 1987). Mann agrees with Marshall's idea that citizenship functions to strengthen the class system by eliminating the inequalities. But this strengthening of the system does not have to be in the way Marshall argues. Namely, he criticizes the perspective of evolutionary development by expansion of citizenship rights towards an egalitarian society. Mann writes "all regimes have guaranteed some citizen rights" for stabilizing their system, but "the overall picture" is "less optimistic" than what Marshall argues, in the sense that they do not all happen to result in more equal societies. Mann argues that what Marshall explains is specific to the case of Britain and therefore it cannot be generalized to other lands. He gives the example of the US in which the social rights did not appear in the sense of Marshall. The case in Turkey and Iran support the criticism of Marshall by Mann that the citizenship formation in Britain, that took place as expansion of civil, political, and social rights, cannot be generalized as essential features of citizenship formation in other lands.

Turner (1990)'s criticism of Marshall is based on the idea that the latter ignored the effect of the state, especially as a "stabilizer" of class struggles. Turner states, Marshall regards expansion of citizenship rights as an irreversible process. He opposes this view with the example that the welfare-state rights, namely the social rights, were reversed in the last decades of the twentieth century. Although Turner agrees with Marshall about the importance of class conflicts and struggle for citizenship formation, he also gives an equal weight of importance to the effect of the state. He states "theory of citizenship also requires a notion of the state". Considering the fact that the state in the Republican Turkey and Pahlavi Iran were the dominant actors of modernization and nation building, the criticism by Turner is acknowledged in the context of these two lands. The rights in both lands demonstrate not a straight line of expansion on behalf of the individuals. The women's organizations, for example, demonstrate an example of reversal of associational rights in both lands, whenever the states decided to do so. In both lands the state repressed the existing women's organizations, the state gave right of franchise to women in the absence of a mass demand, and the state later organized western looking women's organizations under its own control. The development of rights of women was not a result of the struggle of women against the state, but a result of the ambitions of the state elite to look more like the states in the Western lands.

Cohen and Hanagan criticize Marshal's approach as he considers citizenship formation as expansion of rights in a consistent manner. They give the example that while the right of suffrage expanded the political rights, it also enhanced the idea of individualism, which created an ideological obstacle for the organizations promoting social rights. The assimilative side of the French citizenship, accordingly, was used by the state to silence the claims for social rights: "the expansion of political citizenship" was used as "an alternative to the expansion of social citizenship" (Cohen and Hanagan, 1996: 115). Rather than considering the expansion of rights as realization of an egalitarian tendency, they view it "as political outcomes of social conflict and negotiation among antagonistic organized groups" (Cohen and Hanagan, 1996: 93). Therefore, citizenship rights in general might involve conflicting elements. The political rights of women in Turkey demonstrate an example for Cohen and Hanagan's argument. The political right of enfranchise was given to the women in 1936, quite early in comparison to many European countries. Immediately after this, the women's organizations were closed with the argument that there was no need to such organizations anymore. The right of franchise of women was used by the state to silence the demands of other political and social rights for women. The minor representation of women in the parliament and other state institutes and the inferior status of women in family and society in the twenty first century show that the women in Turkish Republic did not attain the political and social rights to the degree as in the West.

Ferrajoli criticizes Marshall as he reduces all fundamental rights to the category of citizenship rights.[64] He claims that Marshall's aim was in accordance with pursuing some "solid foundation" for "welfare policies" of the after War years in West Europe. "His aim…was to use this category [of citizenship] to offer a theoretical basis to social rights…" (Ferrrojoli, 2001). Reducing fundamental rights to citizenship rights results in equalizing political rights (citizenship rights) to human rights. The criticism by Ferrojoli points out that citizenship rights should not be associated solely with a specific historical development in Western Europe, namely to the emergence of welfare states. In Turkey and Iran the understanding of welfare state did not prevail as strongly as in Western Europe. Therefore, the social rights in Turkey and Iran were never as developed as there. Associating the citizenship formations with the rise of this specific form of rights and relating it to the institutes of welfare state does not provide much insight into the formation of citizenship in Turkey and Iran.

The citizenship formation in Turkey did not follow a consistent line of expansion of rights; moreover, the rights were not equally distributed among the ethnically different groups. As it is discussed in a following section, rights in Turkey were arranged in a gradual way according to the understanding of the 'welfare of the state', not of 'welfare state'. The Kurds were implicitly considered to be the second level citizens. The Christians were the third level. The first level citizens of the Turkish Republic were the ethnically Turkish people. In Iran the state was more ready to accept the full citizenship status of the minorities if they were individually assimilated into the Persian culture. Therefore, a gradual citizenship as in Turkey is not observed in Iran. The Iranian nationality, though dominated by the Persian ethnic characters, was an umbrella identity over the minority ethnicities.

In the late Ottoman Empire the separatist tendencies of the Christian minorities and the impact of the Western powers were influential in recognizing the citizenship rights. "It was in this context that the Sublime Port began to feel an urgent need to substitute the inegalitarian aspects of the classical system with a substantive equality of Ottoman citizenship cutting across ethno-linguistic, religious and sectarian affiliations" (Soner, 2005: 292). The first phase of the citizenship rights in the Marshallian sense, namely the civil rights, started to be recognized with the Tanzimat reform. With this reform first time in the Ottoman Empire the people of the land obtained the civil rights

---

[64] Ferrajoli defines fundamental rights as "all those subjective rights to which 'all' human beings are universally entitled by virtue of having the status of persons, or of citizens, or of persons of capable of acting". Namely, Ferrajoli stresses that citizenship rights are different and more specific than the human rights in general: "…*human rights*…are the primary rights of persons, to which all human beings are entitled without distinction, such as…the right to life and the integrity of the human being, personal freedom, the freedom of conscience and of expression of thought, the right to health and to an education; *public rights*…are those primary rights to which only citizens are entitled, such as…the right of residence and free circulation in the metropolitan territory, the right to hold meetings and form associations, the right to work and the right of those unable to work to receive assistance and insurance…; *civil rights*…are secondary rights ascribed to all human beings capable of acting, such as the power to negotiate, the freedom to enter into a contract, the freedom to choose and change job, the freedom of enterprise, the right to initiate legal proceedings and, in general, all those subjective rights in which private autonomy is manifest and on which the market is based; and finally *political rights*…are those secondary rights that are reserved only to those citizens who are capable of acting, such as the right to vote, the right to be candidate for election, the right to hold public office and, in general, all those subjective rights in which political autonomy is manifest and on which representation and political democracy are based" (Ferrrojoli, 2001).

put on paper such as living, ownership, and judiciary (Esendemir, 2008: 66). The Islahat Reforms in 1856 brought the idea of equality of Muslim and non-Muslim citizens. This meant ending the superior position of the Muslims in the Ottoman society (Mardin, 2007: 14). The egalitarian change of statuses caused revolts of some Muslim groups, like in the case of the *Kuleli* Revolt in 1859 (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 25). In the classical Ottoman period the lowest strata of the population of the Empire, namely the peasants, were termed as "*reaya*", meaning being under the rule of the Sultan (Karpat, 2006: 99). In the nineteenth century this term was replaced with the word "*tebaa*", meaning the subjects of the Sultan and including also the Christian populations. This term was close in meaning to the word "subject" used in the same period in the British Empire and conceived as a kind of proto-citizenship (Deringil, 2007: 82).

Some political developments as well forced the Ottoman statesmen to think about who is an Ottoman citizen and what Ottoman citizenship is. For example, the Algerian Muslims who immigrated to the Ottoman lands due to the French invasion of Algeria since 1830, created such a situation. Some of these immigrants demanded living on the Ottoman lands and at the same time preserving their French passport and benefiting from the concessions provided to the French citizens. The Ottoman government declared in 1889 that these immigrants, in two years after their arrival should either remain as French citizens and leave the Ottoman lands or accept the Ottoman citizenship and stay where they are settled (Deringil, 2007: 131).

The Tanzimat and Islahat Reforms promoted the idea of equality between the subjects of the Empire. The aim was to bring both the Muslim and non-Muslim populations closer to the state by "replacing the old compartmentalization of subjects into religious groups…by the universalistic concept of subjects" (Mardin, 1969). In this way the influence of external powers on the internal matters could be eliminated. Besides that the population was expected to side with the central state against the local *ayans* (notables). The power of ayans could be diminished if the people objected them on the side of the state (Heper, 2006: 79-80). The aim of creating an Ottoman identity and Ottoman citizenship was shared also by the Young Turks in the last quarter of the nineteenth century (Yeğen, 1999: 85). Towards the end of the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire went further and aimed at transforming the status of its people from a passive "tebaa" to active citizenship and sought for support for such a project (Deringil, 2007: 139). Deringil states that the Ottoman rulers were aware of the need for an active social basis for the state. In the past what the state expected from its population was a passive obedience; but now the statesmen expected an active support for the normative values promoted by the state (Deringil, 2007: 161). The libertarian attitude of the Young Turks was in fact motivated by the pragmatist aim of saving the state from disintegration. They expected that if the liberties and order of law were maintained the number of people willing to separate from the state would decrease (Yeğen, 1999: 99-100). The pragmatic aim behind the libertarian politics was the cause that the libertarian discourse of the Young Turks turned out to be superficial. They resorted more and more to centralized, Turkist, and repressive

policies especially after the Balkan Wars. The result was the predominance of the state over the peoples of the land, which later marked also the history of the Turkish Republic (Yeğen, 1999: 101).

Before the 1908 coup of the CUP the Liberals within and outside the party were seeking for regulations that would develop the basic individual rights, individuality in the social life, and the private entrepreneurship in economy. However, especially after the Balkan Wars it was evident that the politics of *ittihad-i anasir*, namely uniting all the Muslim and non-Muslim populations of the Ottoman Empire, had failed. "Non-Muslim minorities and the persistence of *millet* divisions, hence, came to be considered one of the major causes behind the dissolution of the empire. As a result, minority issues [were perceived] as the instrument of ethnic dismemberment and as a pretext for external interference" (Soner, 2005: 293). Therefore, "[a]dherence to a common religion was placed in the foundational basis of the Turkish national identity" (Soner, 2005: 296). The Progressives within CUP sought for a state that would perform a top-down revolution (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 79, 84). The Progressives also undermined the ideal of a common Ottoman citizenship by equating Ottomanism with Turkish nationalism (Rustow, 2004: 167-168). The suppression of the liberal politicians by the Progressives in this period resulted in the weakening of the idea of basic individual rights among the Young Turks.

The citizenship definition in the Constitution of 1921, during the war years, was quite inclusive. The "Turkish people" were defined as "the masses who were living within the boundaries of the armistice, regardless of their ethnic origin, that got together on the bases of political unity and independence". This definition was based on "political and geographical parameters" (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 126, translates from Tanör). Tanör states that the Constitution of 1921 was the most and perhaps the only democratic one among the Ottoman-Turkish constitutions. The "modernists" and "traditionalists" within the Majlis of 1921 managed to come to a consensus for the fundamental problems and postponed the unresolved problems, all based on discussions. On the other hand, the 1924 Constitution was the product of a Majlis more or less recruited by Mustafa Kemal; 1962 and 1982 constitutions were products of military coups and regimes (Tanör, 2006: 250). The understanding of inclusive citizenship of the 1921 Constitution changed gradually with the following constitutions and laws of the Turkish Republic.

Despite its inclusiveness in the general sense, the 1921 Constitution did not regulate the rights of individuals in a systematic way (Tanör, 2006: 253). This was because the 1921 Constitution was not aimed for limiting the authority of the government – as it is the case for constitutions in general – but it was aimed for maintaining national unity and giving an independence war (Tanör, 2006: 288-289). The lack of a systematic definition of rights made it possible to promulgate laws that restricted the rights and freedom of individuals during the war conditions. The Law of National Tax Orders (*Tekalif-i Milliye Emirleri*), prepared by Mustafa Kemal, forced the individuals to contribute to the army by goods and labor. Each demand of extension of the law caused

considerable opposition within the Majlis. When the third demand of extension did not get the enough number of votes from the Majlis, Mustafa Kemal's intimidation was affective to get enough number of votes in a new round (Tanör, 2006: 276).

The development of formal citizenship in Turkish Republic can be traced through the line of the Constitution of 1924, the Citizenship Law of 1928, the Law of Compulsory Settlement in 1934, and the Constitution of 1961 (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 125). The Constitution of 1924 formally remained still inclusive in the ethnic sense, as it stated "the people of Turkey regardless of their religion and race are Turkish in terms of citizenship" (Tanör, 2006: 309; Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 126). According to this definition the criterion of inclusion to citizenship was not race or ethnicity but political loyalty (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 126). Moreover, the existence of different ethnicities was clearly recognized (Tanör, 2006: 309). However, the inclusiveness of the Constitution was based on rejection of the judicial and political representation of the Kurds. The Constitution of 1924 declared all Kurds and other ethnic groups as Turks. This meant rejecting the Kurdish identity on the judicial and political frameworks (Yeğen, 1999: 119). The change of mind, in comparison to the 1921 Constitution, was put one step further by rejecting the physical existence of the Kurds in the 1930s (Yeğen, 1999: 126). The program of the RPP in 1931 renewed the requirements for membership to the party cadres. Being a Turkish citizen was not sufficient anymore; only the citizens that have been speaking the Turkish language for a while and that have internalized the Turkish culture could be accepted as a member (Yeğen, 1999: 95). The 1961 Constitution declared that the sovereignty belonged to "the Turkish nation", instead of "to the nation" as it was stated in the preceding constitutions (Yeğen, 1999: 122).

The Constitution of 1924 formally had a "liberal and individualistic approach, and that the limits of the liberties were not drawn by the benefits of the state, public or the society, as has been the case in the following constitutions" (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 127). The various concepts – such as 'public welfare', 'public order', 'national security', 'the inseparability of the state, land and nation', 'general ethics' – all used to limit the individual rights and freedoms in the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions – were absent in that of 1924 (Tanör, 2006: 308). However, in practice the period of the 1924 Constitution was experienced as severe limitations of individual liberties for sake of the welfare of the state. The martial law regulations, the decisions of the Courts of Martial Law (*Sıkıyönetim Mahkemeleri*) and the Court of Independence, the Law of Compulsory Settlement, the pressures on and the forced labor work of the peasants, restrictions on freedom of religion, restrictions on freedom of thought were among the practices that limited the individual rights and freedoms (Tanör, 2006: 318). In the statements of the Republic in its early years "there was no emphasis on the rights of the citizen". "Rather, the process repeatedly emphasized the duties of the citizen toward the state… The 1924 Constitution is an example of the differences and contradictions between the discourse and actual practice" (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 127).

The Law of Compulsory Settlement (*Mecburi İskan Kanunu*) promulgated in June 14, 1934 was an attempt to limit the individual rights. This law basically aimed at Turkification of the Kurdish population by forceful resettlement of some Kurdish groups in the Turkish dominated regions (Yeğen, 1999: 92). Around 25,831 people living in 5,074 houses in the Kurdish regions were settled in Western Anatolia. Till 1947, these people were not allowed to live in any other place than where they were settled. With the abolishment of the compulsory residence in 1947, 22,516 of those people turned back to their former regions (Yeğen, 1999: 137, footnote 16). Therefore, the rights of freedom of movement of these Kurdish people were suspended in between 1934 and 1947. Freedom of language was also violated as the people were forced to use the Turkish language (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 130). The Law of Compulsory Settlement also initiated the attack to the Jewish population in the Thrace region of Turkey, known as the *Trakya* Olayları (Thrace Incidents). During these incidents there were attacks on the Jewish quarters in Thrace, the houses and properties of the Jewish community were ravaged, and some Jewish women were raped. The Jewish community in Thrace had to run away from their region to Istanbul leaving behind their assets or selling them for very low prices (Bali, 2010: 247). These instances were violations of the most primary individual rights in which the state acted reluctantly to repress.

The 1924 Constitution did not give place to any social rights, in the Marshallian sense, except for the right of free education (Tanör, 2006: 311). The 1961 Constitution, in accordance with the understanding of welfare state in the West, recognized many social rights (Tanör, 2006: 392). It was also "a liberal constitution and aspired to a more liberal kind of citizenship". "The exposition of basic rights and liberties took up almost two thirds of the Constitution, and was very detailed" (Soyarık-Şentürk, 2005: 132). Unlike the 1982 Constitution which reinforced the authority of the state, the 1961 Constitution raised the human and reinforced the rights and freedoms of individuals (Tanör, 2006: 378). The 1961 Constitution recognized the rights of individuals to working, to resting, to a just wage, to forming trade unions, to going on strike, to social security, and to medical treatment. Soyarık-Şentürk (2005: 133) considers the 1961 Constitution as "an evolution toward the social phase of citizenship in Marshal's…analysis".

The amendments on the 1961 Constitution after the 1971 memorandum significantly limited the fundamental rights and freedoms and enlarged the scope of duties of citizens. The change of the title of the eleventh item in the constitution is remarkable in this sense: the title was changed from "The Essence of Fundamental Rights" (*Temel Hakların Özü*) to "The Essence of, Limitations on, and Avoidance of Misuse of the Fundamental Rights (*Temel Hakların Özü, Sınırlanması ve Kötüye Kullanılmaması*) (Tanör, 2006: 416). The amendment increased the number of excuses for limiting the freedoms and defined those with ambiguous terms such as "the unity of the state with its land and nation" (*devletin ülkesi ve milletiyle bölünmez bütünlüğü*) (Tanör, 2006: 416-417). In this sense, the 1971 memorandum was an initial step for limiting the rights and freedoms before the coup in 1980.

The civil, political, and social rights in Turkey were given from above either before the emergence of demands from below or after repression of such demands (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 34-35). The borders of these rights, on the other hand, have been determined by the state by means of judiciary. The citizens are expected to enjoy their rights only within these borders. The citizens are not endowed with the right to demand anything more than what is provided by the state (Caymaz, 2007: 54). Therefore, there have been conflicting issues regarding the citizenship rights as understood in the West. It is perhaps more frequently experienced in Turkey compared to the Western democracies that the items of civil liberties in the constitution are not enough to guarantee these rights in daily life (Ergut, 2004: 367). Banning of veil in the universities and prohibition of the Kurdish language can be considered as limitations of the civil rights (Esendemir, 2008: 87). These measures demonstrate that in Turkey the state is ready to limit the civil rights whenever they are associated with the perceived dangers to the state. In this case the veil is considered as a threat to secularism and the language of Kurdish is considered to be a threat to the unity of the land.

The political rights of franchise and being elected to the parliament were recognized in Turkey by the foundation of the Turkish Republic. It can be argued that the political rights are enhanced by transition to the multi-party regime in 1945. However, the political rights as well were limited whenever there was a perceived danger for the fundamentals of the state. The closing down of many parties in the multi-party system is a result of this understanding (Esendemir, 2008: 88).

In Iran, the first and most important moment for recognition of citizenship rights was with the Constitution of 1906 after the revolution. It was with this revolution that "for the first time in Iranian history, the problematic became that of demolishing arbitrary government rather than just getting rid of an arbitrary ruler or dynast" (Katouzian, 1995). The first assembly gathered in October 1906 proclaimed two laws that reorganized the distribution of power in Iranian politics. The first one, the Fundamental Laws, transferred the authority of decision about taking loans, capitulations, agreements and state budget to the elected parliament. Muzafereddin Shah signed the Fundamental Laws a few days before his death. This was the first step of the emergence of political rights in Iran. The document of Fundamental Laws was realization of "the most important and immediate programme of its modernizing intellectuals": "to abolish the traditional system of absolute *and* arbitrary rule (*estabdad*), and replace it by the rule of law (*qanun*); hence their campaign for constitutional, constrained or 'conditioned' (*mashruteh*) government" (Katouzian, 1995). Namely, the power of the Shah was limited and many of the power were transferred to an elected assembly.

The second law, the Supplementary Fundamental Laws, determined the rights of the Iranian citizens and gave further rights to the parliament including the appointment and disposal of the ministers (Cleveland, 2008: 163). The document contained two main sections. "The first was a 'bill of rights' guaranteeing each citizen equality before the law, protection of life, property, and honor, safeguards from arbitrary arrest, and freedom to publish newspaper and to organize associations"

(Abrahamian, 1982: 89). This was the first extensive recognition of the civil rights in Iran. From that time on the Shah was in principle not allowed to decide arbitrarily on confiscation of the properties or execution of the individuals. "The second section, while accepting the separation of powers in principle, concentrated power in the legislative branch at the expense of the executive. The legislature now obtained, in addition to the powers given to it earlier, the authority to appoint, investigate, and dismiss premiers ministers, and cabinets, to judge ministers for 'delinquencies', and to approve annually all military expenditure" (Abrahamian, 1982: 89). This second part meant recognition of further political rights by extending the power of the assembly.

The constitutional government after the revolution in Iran did not last long. The invasion of the land in 1911 and the First World War put the government in disarray. The Pahlavi regime turned out to be an authoritarian one overriding the participatory and from-below characteristic of the Constitutional Revolution.

> From the accession of Reza Shah Pahlavi to the throne in 1925 to his deposition in 1941, there was a sort of constitutional holiday in the country. He was an absolute king and did all that he wished, including dismissing and appointing prime ministers (Farmanfarma, 1954).

Therefore, the from-below characteristic of the Constitutional Revolution in Iran did not evolve into a democratic regime in which the rights of citizens were respected. In Iran the rights of individuals were frequently violated. The attitude of the Reza Shah regime towards the tribal leaders exemplifies this. The SAVAK of the Mohammed Reza Shah in the 1960s and 1970s is a further example of how the Iranian government arbitrarily violated the civil rights of its citizens, especially the ones in opposition. Ahmed mentioned in 1973 about the denial of many civil and political rights by the Shah's regime.

> The people of Iran have no freedom of expression or freedom of assembly or the freedom of the press, and have no resource to justice. Political acts, considered normal rights of the citizens elsewhere, are punishable crimes in Iran. The concept of justice has withered away and the concept of accountability does not exist (Ahmed, 1973).

The women's rights in both lands demonstrate a good example of how the state recognized the citizenship rights in a selective way and only when the state decided about those, rather than the citizens demanded for them. In Turkey the women's movement made a rise on the early years of the Republic. This movement was repressed in the early 1930s by the policy of the state to control all societal powers. It was in 1936 that the state gave the right of franchise to the women in the absence of any popular demand. The same situation happened in Iran. The women's organizations and journals, such as *Alam-e Nesvan*, were in support of the Reza Shah regime in its early years (Rostam-Kolayi, 2003: 175). The women's journals were appraising Reza Shah stating that Iran was such a free country that the women could chose whatever to wear as there was no banning of the veil at that time. By 1935, Reza Shah started the policy of repressing all independent initiatives, including the women's movements.

> [H]e banned the last surviving women's journals and organizations and established the state-run Ladies' Center (Kanun-e Banuvan). As the state grew in strength, even pro-government women reformers, such as those in *Alam-e Nesvan*…were silenced. As long as the state remained weak, as it did under Qajar rule, women reformers could exercise expression of citizenship in appeals to the state through the women's press. However, when the state became strong under Reza Shah, and women's demands were partially met, such expressions were suspended altogether (Rostam-Kolayi, 2003: 158).

At this time the veil was also banned as a policy to repress the religious symbols in the social life. "Women were ordered to take off their *chadurs*, and were not allowed to wear a scarf instead. The effect for most women – especially for those over the age of forty – was as if in 1936, European women had been suddenly ordered to go topless in the streets" (Katouzian, 2003: 30). "The attempt to force all men and women to wear Western-style clothes in the late 1920s and 1930s represented an attempt to eliminate regional and tribal dress differences in favor of a homogenized Western tradition, matching the identity of modern Iran" (Moghaddam and Crystal, 1997). "Iran was the world's first country to outlaw traditional forms of head and body veiling" (Keddie, 1982). This should be considered as a case where the civil rights were easily suspended for the modernization ideals of the state.

It can be stated that in both Turkey and Iran the rights of citizens did not constitute a genuine concern for the state. The rights were important only to the extent to resemble the regimes and life style of the Western world. Whenever the states perceived a threat from any part of the society, they did not hesitate to suspend the citizenship rights. In that sense, the citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran were both quite far from the liberal understanding of citizenship as in Britain and the USA. Moreover, there was no consistent and sequential development of citizenship rights that can be associated with some societal movements in the Marshallian sense.

5.2 Ruling Strategy

Mann considers citizenship as a strategy of ruling classes to cope with the class struggle in modern societies (Mann, 1987). Different forms of citizenship emerged in different lands due to the different strategies adopted by the rulers. Therefore, although the aim was always avoiding the class struggle, the resulting form of citizenship changed. Mann distinguishes five strategies of citizenship. These are liberal, reformist, authoritarian monarchist, Fascist, and authoritarian socialist strategies that emerged in the US, in Britain, in Germany, Russia, and Japan, and in after War Germany and Soviet Union, respectively. Among these, Marshall's theory corresponds only to the reformist ruling strategy applied in Britain (Marshall, 1992); the rest demonstrate that Marshall's theory cannot be applied to all possible citizenship formations. Mann argues that all these five strategies were successful since "they all converted the head-on collision of massive, antagonistic social classes into conflicts that were less class-defined, more limited and complex, sometimes more orderly, sometimes more erratic". The difference of these strategies is due to the

different roles of ruling classes in different contexts as well as the different political traditions of the lands. The preoccupations of the ruling classes and the surrounding historical and traditional conditions determined the strategy, consequently, the resulting mode of citizenship.

The liberal strategy was applied by the US, where the civil and political rights of citizenship were attained very early due to the fact that "a broad coalition" of social strata "had made the Revolution" (Mann, 1987). Because of this early attainment of civil and political rights, the most reactionary groups – "labour and socialist movement" – were already "absorbed into the liberal regime" as "interest groups". Therefore, in the US there was no strong movement that claimed for social rights as in the West Europe. There is almost no social citizenship in the US today in the Mashallian sense. The evolution of citizenship in the US did not follow the line of civil, political, and social rights, hence "the most powerful capitalist state has not followed Marshall's road". Germany, Russia and Japan before the war were three representatives of the strategy of "authoritarian monarchy" (Mann, 1987). In the German case the rulers were a coalition of the Prussian bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie. The formal status of citizenship they formulated was based on "civil and political exclusion" of labor. This resulted in a strong labor movement in Germany but the "authoritarian monarchy was still successfully dividing-and ruling and modernizing". Mann considers the Russian type of strategy as the less successful among the authoritarian monarchies, since it was based on more "repression and exclusion". The Japan case was probably the most striking one regarding to the effect of tradition on the ruling strategy. The modernizers in Japan were the Meiji elite who had their roots in the traditional Japanese society. What they did was to adopt the organizations of "liberal-reformist countries" in a way that would fit to their authoritarian mode of ruling. In all these strategies of authoritarian monarchy the class conflicts were managed in ways different from Marshallian expansion of citizenship rights. Fascism and authoritarian socialism both lacked civil rights and "real political citizenship"; however both, especially authoritarian socialism, had strong social citizenship. These were forms of citizenship that contrasted Marshall's model.

Similar to the authoritarian regimes mentioned by Mann, Turkey and Iran share the characteristic of the centrality of the state in restructuring the social and political realm. The state, rather than any domestic power group, played the central role of regulation and managing the distribution of wealth. Arat regards the development of citizenship in Turkey as a result of the choices of the "enlightened ruling elites", rather than a struggle of the people for their rights. The choices of the ruling elite were motivated by the aim "to promote social integration and strengthen the state" (Arat, 2000: 275). Therefore, she mentions the Mann model of citizenship – a ruling strategy – as fitting to the Turkish case (Arat, 2000: 277). In Iran too, it was the ambitions of Reza Shah, rather than the demands of the social forces that initiated the modernization attempts of the Pahlavi regime and restructured the state apparatus. In the 1960s and 1970s, the state was the main actor deciding on the distribution of power and wealth in the society.

Janoski names authoritarian regimes, mentioned by Mann, as traditional regimes, where "an elitist model of governing" is applied. "Peak institutions and their experts are highly influential in the governance of citizenship policies, and little direct democratic participation is present." The state, rather than the market, has a central role in solving the social problems by regulative policies. "[T]he market can often be extensively organized into somewhat noncompeting firms." The regime of traditional countries can be characterized as "elite-guided communitarianism that emphasizes obligations as opposed to rights in society" (Janoski, 1998: 109). Janoski's description comes very close to the cases in Turkey and Iran. In Turkey a military-bureaucratic elite was the actor of initiating regulative policies. In Iran the ruling elite controlled the market with enormous oil revenues and acted as the main actor of social regulations by repressing the oppositional groups.

Most of the states in the Middle East were imposed on the society either as a result of foreign invasions or as a result of capturing the state power by a militarist-elitist group. Zubaida mentions that this situation is not a consequence of an inherent patrimonialism in the Asiatic societies, but a result of "modern creations of the capitalist world market" (Zubaida, 1989: 141). Perhaps, due to this characteristic of the states, in most of the Middle Eastern countries citizenship is considered to be linked to the security of the state; therefore, both its definition and political use are under the control and manipulation of centralized authorities. Consequently, the formation of citizenship in the Middle East is very much in relation with the "dynamics of regime formation" and the "state-idea" (Butenschon, 2000: 6).

A characteristic that is observed in Lebanon is the use of citizenship as a political instrument by the state in order to control the political power of different groups. Throughout its history, the Maronite regime in Lebanon used formal citizenship to "reduce the political impact of the Muslim majority" and "maintain the Christian character of the state" (Maktabi, 2000: 160-161). This was achieved by excluding a great number of Muslim inhabitants from the right to citizenship. The result was the ethnocratic character of the Lebanon regime favoring the Christians against the Muslims. As Maktabi demonstrates, in the census of 1932 the Lebanon state registered a number of Muslim residents as foreigners, without even mentioning their religious affiliation (Maktabi, 2000: 166-167). On the other hand the Christian emigrants to Lebanon were registered as citizens of the state (Maktabi, 2000: 164). "As a result, the demographic proportion of Christians was increased along with their political influence, but the demographic proportion of Muslim residents decreased along with their political representation" (Maktabi, 2000: 164). In the 1960s "statelessness" of the excluded Muslims was "a matter of dispute between subjects demanding citizenship and a regime reluctant to admit Muslim members to the citizenry" (Maktabi, 2000: 172). In order to protect its Christian bases the state considered citizenship not as a right of its people, but as a "bestowed privilege" given to the people by the state (Maktabi, 2000: 200). In this way the state legitimized the rejection of citizenship demands of its inhabitants.

In Republican Turkey and Pahlavi Iran, the state formations were results of the projects of military-bureaucratic elite imposed on the populations of the land. The projects did not emanate from the dynamic development of the society, but as an external program inspired from the Western world. The citizenship formation emerged as a ruling strategy, in Mann's terms, in order to realize the state projects. Charrad states that although the nation states following the colonial period established universal male and female suffrage, these were not the result of some dynamics emanating from the society. Rather, they were results of imitating the world models and the intent to gain acceptance from the international community (Charrad, 2000: 86). This argument is valid also for Turkey and Iran. As mentioned before, the universal suffrage both in Turkey and Iran were the results of the initiatives of the states, rather than any mass movements. This is true also for the rights of women in both lands.

In Turkey and Iran the understandings of citizenship were influenced by the very nation building process of the young modern states. This process was the result of the social engineering of the elite to reshape the society by regulations from above (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 20-21). Therefore the rights and duties of citizens, the idea of a good citizen, and in fact the restrictions of the citizenship rights as well were conceptualized to serve for the nation building and modernization program of the state elite. Gülalp states for Turkey that the concept of citizenship was in relation to the project of the modern nation state to disconnect the individuals from pre-modern relations and bring them under its own hegemony (Gülalp, 2007: 12). Therefore, the many sides of the citizenship formation in Turkey and Iran can be understood by the idea of "ruling class strategy" proposed by Mann.

The very first agenda of the Turkish and Iranian modern states was modernization.

> [I]t is no exaggeration to say that for them, constitution and parliament were a *means* to further the modernization process by making the subjects into stakeholding citizens, rather than an *end* in themselves. This helps to explain why, when faced with the choice between strong government and swift reforms on the one hand, or, on the other, broader political freedoms that could benefit the opponents of reform, as in the Ottoman Empire after 1913 and in Turkey and Iran from 1925 onwards, most intellectuals tended to support the former (Atabaki and Zürcher, 2004: 4).

The development of rights of women in Turkey and Iran can be considered as a result of the "ruling strategy" in the two lands. In Turkey the right of franchise in the municipal elections was given to the women in 1934. In 1935 the women were given the right to vote in the general elections. It is interesting to note that just before these rights were given by the state, the women activists were pacified in between 1924-34. Therefore, all the rights given to the women were the result of the regulations of the reformist male elite (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 107-108). The aim of the state in giving these rights was to comply with their image of a modern state, in which women had a modern appearance and equal franchise rights as men. In this process, there was no moment for the

development of the individuality of the woman. The Turkish woman found herself as a citizen before being a real individual in the social and political life (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 122).

Baban writes that the citizenship discourse of the Turkish Republic was based on the idea of a "neutral" public sphere, and adds, however, this public sphere was far from being neutral as it "reflects a certain interpretation of modernity and functions as an integral part of national discourse". The citizenship status of the groups that conflicted with the national discourse was problematic. Therefore, "despite the claim to neutrality, the universal citizenship regime in Turkey has a communitarian orientation: the sites of citizenship practices are reserved for national identity, easily becoming hostile to differences that fall outside of it" (Baban, 200: 65). Kahraman mentions that citizenship in Turkey "has always functioned in the service of the nation-building process as a cultural and legal code for the historical and discursive construction of the Turkish National Identity" (Kahraman, 2005: 70).

School and army have been two state apparatuses to disseminate the state ideology and the official national identity to the masses, especially in France (Brubaker, 1990). This was also the case for the Republican Turkey and Pahlavi Iran. As Üstel states, the school education of citizens constituted "an important dimension of the nation building project" of the Republican elite. The school had a central place in order to make the "young generation to internalize the norms and values that define the project" (Üstel, 2009: 127). Üstel states, it was clear from the text of the law on village teachers in 1937 that the primary education was conceived as a tool for transforming the peasants into citizens and in this way making them a part of the regime (Üstel, 2009: 148)

According to the Republican elite of Turkey the aim of the education in schools was not only the general education for knowledge but also a political education in order to create the citizens of the land (Caymaz, 2007: 13). The elite considered education, especially that in the course of "Knowledge of the Land" (*Yurt Bilgisi*), as a means to transform the ignorant masses into a nation. This way of constructing the national identity was in parallel with imposing the idea of citizenship that was in the minds of the elite (Caymaz, 2007: 14). Education was perceived as an instrument for their ruling strategy. Other important instruments for disseminating the state ideology in Turkey were the popular educational institutions, People's Houses and Village Institutes. The aim of these institutions was to build the modern citizens who will support the promoted modernization (Yeğen, 1999: 55, 181, 197, 202). With these institutions the regime aimed at gaining the support of the villagers for the Kemalist reforms. In that sense they were the instruments of the ruling strategy of the state. Although this aim was not totally achieved, the houses helped to create "a dedicated middle class cadre for the Kemalists in the towns" (Zürcher, 2004: 107).

In Iran, too, modernization of the state was the first agenda of the political elite. This modernization meant maintaining the central power of the state with less attention to the real spirit of the modern state institutions in the West. Elliot states, "Persia under Reza Shah, like

the...Republican Turkey, preserved the institutions of representative government while deriving out their liberal spirit". He gives the example of the formation of the party *Iran-e Now* in 1927 and the following *Taraqqi* for that purpose. The objective of these two were "the creation of a powerful, pro-Shah party intended to form disciplined majority in parliament and to ensure that radical, reforming proposals could be passed into law; and…mobilisation or organization of army officers, officials and some elements of the wider public behind the Shah through a large-scale membership" (Elliot, 2004: 67). The opposition was also controlled by founding a so-called opposition party, the Anti-Foreigner (*Zedde-i Ajnabiha*), by Reza Shah's Chief of Police (Elliot, 2004: 69). The parliament during Reza Shah's rule lost its representative functionality as his influence made the elections meaningless. Reza Shah reduced the parliament to a mere approval institution for the laws he wanted to make (Cleveland, 2008: 210).

In the period of Reza Shah, the school education was devised to promote single language throughout Iran. The state aimed at having an official medium of expression by eliminating the languages other than Persian (Matthee, 2003: 132). The teaching of Persian citizenship became compulsory for the Iranian students (Matthee, 2003: 135). Military and education were effectively used by Mohammed Reza Shah to disseminate the state ideology. "He vastly expanded the educational system and the army, making basic education and two years military service compulsory for both men and women, and he used the school and the army as socializing agents to manufacture a new national consciousness" (Moghaddam and Crystal, 1997). At schools, the children who by mistake used Azerbaijani or any other ethnic language were punished (Shaffer, 2008: 84). The military was in the core of the state rule of Reza Shah. Much of the state resources were directed for the military expenditures. In many cases the military was effective to force civil governors to resign (Cronin, 2004: 148). Martin mentions that if the resources of the state were not enough to gain the loyalty of the military cadres, Reza Shah would probably rely less on coercion for the state regulations and tend towards more political development (Martin, 2003: 74).

In Iran, the parliament, military, and education were conceived as the instruments to realize the policies and projects of the state. The education of students was not more important than construction of the desired national identity. Or the initiatives of the people being reflected to the parliament, did not precede the policies shaped by the Shah. In the 1960s the Tehran government initiated a literacy campaign, functioned for comparable purposes to that of the People's Houses and Village Institutes in Turkey. This campaign in Iran should also be considered as a ruling strategy as it aimed to camouflage the assimilation policy of the state, especially towards the Azerbaijanis and Kurds (Shaffer, 2008: 73). Therefore, in Iran too, the state perceived these institutions as instruments of its ruling strategy.

Both Turkey and Iran experienced modernization as a project of the state elite. The citizenship formations promoted by the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes were directly linked to this project. The regimes conceived the notion of citizenship as an instrument to disseminate the ideologies and

values in service of their program. The citizenship formations promoted by the Kemalist and Pahlavi states was marked by the images of the regimes of "good citizens" in accordance with their image of a civilized and modernized society. The states used the citizenship as an instrument to convey these messages to the public. Therefore, the official definitions of citizenship were shaped by the ruling strategy of the regimes. It is not surprising that the duties were more emphasized than the rights in the citizenship formations promoted by the Kemalist and Pahlavi states.

5.3 Citizenship as a Project: Duties over Rights

The weight of rights and duties are different in different citizenship formations. In the lands where the state is the central actor of social regulations it is expected that the weight of duties is greater than that of the rights. In the lands where associational civil organizations take part in shaping the social regulations the weight of rights are usually greater. In Turkey and Iran the states were the main actor of modernization, therefore the duties of the citizens were more stressed by the state compared to their rights. In other words, the citizenship promoted by the states in Turkey and Iran were more duty oriented. The duties of citizens were taught and reminded in official documents, throughout the national education and during military service. Observing the duty oriented characteristic of the citizenship formation in Turkey and Iran does revel not only the centrality of the state in social regulations, but also how the states used citizenship in order to make their people act in the way they wanted; namely, how the states used citizenship as a ruling strategy. In this section the mode of citizenship as promoted by the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes in the official documents and institutions are compared. Therefore the term 'citizenship' in this section should be read as the 'official citizenship promoted by the state'.

Janoski stresses the "balancing of public rights and obligations" in understanding the citizenship from a comparative historical perspective (Janoski, 1998: 3). According to him different forms of citizenship result from the different strength of rights and obligations vis-à-vis each other. Based on the perspective of rights and obligations, he defines citizenship as follows: "Citizenship is passive and active membership of individuals in a nation-state with certain universalistic rights and obligations at a specific level of equality" (Janoski, 1998: 9). The preeminence of rights and obligations in Janoski's theory inevitably forces him to stress the civil society vis-à-vis the state for formation of citizenship. Therefore, the analysis of civil society understood as the "interaction of voluntary groups in the non-state sphere" is central in his theory (Janoski, 1998: 12).

Janoski argues that rights and obligations are "positively" correlated, in the sense that "a balance of rights and obligations forms at different levels" whatever the regime type is (Janoski, 1998: 129). According to this understanding, if the level of rights is high in a regime the level of obligations will also be high, but the voluntary associational activism will be low; if the level of rights is low in a regime the level of obligations will also be low, but this time the voluntary

associational activism will be high. The level of balance is used as a criterion of distinguishing three types of regimes.

> Social democratic regimes have a high level of rights and obligations, with high voluntary association membership and participation.
>
> Liberal regimes have a low level of rights and obligations, which are made up for by a high level of voluntary association activities, mainly by churches and non-profit social welfare agencies.
>
> Traditional regimes probably have the highest level of rights and obligations, which may contribute to voluntary association activities in civil society being the weakest of the three different regime types. (Janoski, 1998: 136-139)

It is difficult to put Turkey and Iran in one of these schemes. This is mainly because in both lands there was no balance of rights and duties as in those three regimes; the duties were heavier than the rights. The duties of the citizens towards the state were emphasized in every possible occasion, without mentioning their rights vis-à-vis the state. The underlying ideas guiding this attitude were how to be a good citizen of the nation, how to serve in a best way to the progress of the land, and how to protect the welfare of the state by individual sacrifice. These ideas point out that in both Turkey and Iran the official citizenship formation accompanied the process of state formation. Namely, a very new nation state was founded in both contexts by transforming the ex-monarchic state traditions. The understanding of citizenship was geared to the purpose of state formation, which necessitated the citizens to adapt new life styles and new understanding of political regulations. The citizens were asked to transform themselves according to the transformation of the state. What the citizens should do were more than what the citizens should expect. As a result, although the mentioning of weights of rights and obligations sheds light on the understanding of citizenship in Turkey and Iran, the idea of balance between these two as in the three models proposed by Janoski is not applicable.

The case in Turkey and Iran come close to the understanding of Republican citizenship, which impose more duties than individual rights with the argument of a common good for the public. The best representative of the Republican citizenship is perhaps the French model. In French nationalism the political unity was based on the idea of "the general will of the community of all citizens". This idea was used to subordinate any group interest to the general policy; therefore, there did not emerge any associational liberalism in France, as it was the case in Britain (Münch, 2001: 33; Bendix, 1946: 82). After the Revolution, but especially with the rule of Napoleon, a "highly standardized administrative hierarchy" was established in order to replace the indirect rule of the past with a central and direct rule of the state (Tilly, 1996: 229). "[T]he creation of an effective, pervasive national police system after 1799" was crucial in sustaining this central control (Tilly, 1996: 229). In the lack of associational liberalism, the working class could not be integrated into the societal community as easily as in Britain (Münch, 2001: 33). The lack of an associational

representation created a gap between "public republicanism and private particularism" in French nationalism (Münch, 2001: 42). This resulted in "an elitist model of governing" in which the state had the primary role to force "regulative solutions, and the market can often be extensively organized into somewhat noncompeting firms" (Janoski, 1998: 109).

Mouffe mentions that unlike liberal citizenship, republican citizenship "puts strong emphasis on the notion of public good" (Mouffe, 1992). Due to this understanding of public good, citizens have a deal with the politics of the state. They are not considered as mere consumers of what is given but as active participants of realization of the common good. The determinations of rules and duties and the formal regulations have to be based on the common good. Mouffe's criticism of republican citizenship comes at the point that this idea of common good turns out to be a suppression of individual liberties. She states "a modern democratic political community cannot be organized around a single substantive idea of the common good". Therefore every idea of common good results in suppression of some liberties in the society. The common good in Turkey and Iran were defined by the state as modernization in the Western style by the hand of the state. Therefore, modernization, Westernization, and welfare of the state were the guiding mottos and they were used to suppress individual liberties. For example, for sake of national homogenization, the citizens were asked to forget their ethnic background and to assimilate into the Turkish and Persian ethnicities.

The citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran developed in parallel to the formations of the newly founded modern states. Therefore, the ultimate aim of the ruling elite in both lands was to found the institutions of a modern nation state by replacing the ones from the past empire tradition. They also aimed at modernizing the social life of their people, namely importing the Western life styles and getting rid of the many local, traditional, and especially religious patterns. All these meant that the agenda of the ruling elite was founding a modern state and creating a westernized society. Citizenship, as defined in the official documents and as promoted by the state, was one of the means for that purpose. Therefore, the citizenship promoted by the state was a 'deductive' one, introducing the people how a citizen of a modern state should be. It was a regulatory instrument for the state to manipulate and control its population. As a result, the citizenship in these two lands happened to be based on the duties of the citizens rather than their rights vis-à-vis the state.

The political arena in Kemalist Turkey and Pahlavi Iran were under the hegemony of the state elite. In this respect both of these regimes resemble the Italian fascism, in the sense that the state was the sole actor of regulations in the society, most of the times by repressing the reactions and demands of the masses. This statist tradition was one of the most important factors underlying the Italian fascist regime. The fascist regime tried to solve the problem of social division by totally monopolizing the political arena. In fact, this monopolization and the following nation building practices of the fascist regime were in accordance with Italy's peculiar history of unification. The fascist practice in Italy lacked a biologically descendant understanding of nation, which was the

case with the German fascism, but pursued a strong state under which the social cleavages could be demolished. Koenig-Archibugi states, "fascist project of national mobilization did not rest on the idolization of the nation, but of the state" (Koenig-Archibugi, 2003). He mentions that the nationalism of Italian fascism had a "voluntaristic" character, which signifies more loyalty to the state than being a descendent of the Italian nation. In Turkey and Iran, too, an understanding of biological descent was lacking in the main stream official ideology. Loyalty to the state and following the state order were central to the state policies as in Italian fascism.

In the Kemalist regime of Turkey, especially in its first twenty years, the ruling elite decided about the modernization program; the people had no initiative in the decision making; they were expected to follow the state regulations. Therefore, the principle of democracy did not happen to be intrinsic to Turkish Republicanism. It was considered to be a notion only desired to exist; it would not be a vital problem if democracy was not maintained. For the ruling elite it did not worth to risk the fundamentals of the Republic for sake of democracy (Bora, 2006: 29). Keyman notes that the idea of state in Turkey is not based on the sovereignty of the people, but on the sovereignty of the nation. This means the state is defined as the rational and sovereign subject of the modernity. The Turkish Republic is not the liberal state that plays the role of a referee for the conflicting interests of the groups, nor a state that represents a particular class. This state is an active subject that decides on and regulates the social relations and imposes the institutions and rhetoric that reproduce these relations (Keyman, 2008: 228). In the official language the word "Republic" does not refer only to the state, but also to modernity/modernism, civilization, and laicism; namely to all values promoted by the state (Bora, 2006: 17-19).

Keyman notes unlike the Western understanding, the nation state in the Kemalist project is a subject that defines and organizes the society. The state is not a mere regulator of the social relations, but the subject that defines those relations. This conception results in two things: first, the understanding of a homogeneous and organic society in which the state has a privileged position, and second, the understanding of citizenship that lacks the notion of individuality and that is loaded with duties towards the state. Therefore, Turkish citizenship is neither a liberal citizenship based on rights and duties, nor a virtuous citizenship that encourages participation in ruling. Turkish citizenship is a value that should be internalized. It does not represent the civil rights, but represents the duty to internalize the will to civilization. It represents the militant citizenship that serves for the welfare of its nation. Citizenship is used as a disciplinary technique throughout the early Republican years. It is functional in the sense of legitimization of the status of the state as an active subject to decide and organize the societal relations (Keyman, 2008: 232-233). Kahraman mentions that Turkish citizenship "has never contained in itself the language of individual rights and freedoms" (Kahraman, 2005: 70). On the contrary the state emphasizes the duties of the citizens as it is evident in the words of Ziya Gokalp: "there is no right but duty". The citizenship in Turkey is

"positioned toward the Kemalist will to modernity as civilization, and in this sense citizenship involves duties and services to the state rather than rights and freedoms" (Kahraman, 2005: 77-78).

The Turkish constitutions of 1924, 1961, and 1982 explicitly stress the duties of the citizens towards the state and the nation.[65] In the 1924 Constitution of Turkey the word 'duty' (*ödev*) is used for six times: three times to mention the duties of the government offices and the prime minister and three times to mention the duties of the citizens of Turkey. The three duties of the citizens are mentioned in the following phrases: "the duty of the Turks to obey the law", "the duty of payment in cash, kind, and as labor work in extraordinary conditions", "the duty of all Turks, women and men, to pass through the primary education". It is noteworthy that there is no mentioning of the 'right to education' in this last item. In the 1961 Constitution the number of the word 'duty' increases to 29, including the ones in the titles of the subsections. Among them fourteen are used to mention the duties and tasks of the government offices and statesmen. The remaining fifteen mention the duties of the citizens. Some examples of phrases which mention the duties of citizens are as follows: "fundamental rights and duties" (title of a subsection), "the right and duty to work", "the right and duty of every Turk for defense of the land and for military service". The 1982 Constitution uses the term for 30 times, including the ones in the subtitles. Thirteen of them mention the duties of the government offices and statesmen. The rest seventeen mention the duties of the citizens. Some examples of phrases from the 1982 constitution are "the rights and duties of citizens towards the national existence", "duty of citizenship", "social and economic rights and duties", "duties of individual towards the family and other people", and "duty of citizens to environment". These examples demonstrate that the ruling elite intended to stress the duties of the citizens towards the state. This is unlike the general understanding that a Constitution raises the rights of citizens in order to limit the power of the state.

The Turkish Constitutions, especially the ones of 1961 and 1982, give priority to the state rather than the citizens. They accept a citizenship defined by duties, rather than the rights (Esendemir, 2008: 87). The citizens are expected to give priority to their duties towards the state and the nation, rather than to their individual rights or to the services to be provided by the state (Keyman, 2008: 231). Being a citizen of the Republic is considered to be a matter of being educated to a degree to deserve citizenship. One of the elite of the early Republic, Agah Sırrı Levend, ends his speech given in the tenth year of the Republic, by saying "loving the Republic is possible only by being worthy of becoming a citizen of the Republic" (Bora, 2006: 31). Citizenship is considered to be a high level status that can be attained by education and adapting the proper manners. The existence of the Republic is considered to precede the existence of the citizens. The duties of the citizens exist not for the welfare of themselves but for the welfare of the Republic, external to and above the citizens (Bora, 2006: 31). The Turkish men and women, "in the course of

---

[65] Gözübüyük, T. (2007), *Açıklamalı Türk Anayasaları*, Ankara: Turhan Yayinevi. Digital copies of the Turkish Constitutions are available in the following internet link: http://www.anayasa.gen.tr/

serving grand social and political projects, denounce their individual identities"; they "perceive themselves as Turkish citizens who are responsible for performing certain duties" (Kadıoğlu, 2005: 106).

The Pahlavi Regime was also a project to transform the Iranian Society towards a Western style. Disarming and settling the tribes was the step for centralizing the power. The regime aimed at eliminating the religious symbols in order to limit the power of religion and the ulama. Chehabi considers the conscription and the dress code as the measures that reflect the "aspects of the Pahlavi state's increasing meddling with people's lives" (Chehabi, 2004: 220). Iranian nationalism was considered to replace religion as the social binding element. As both of the states were newly formed, the understanding of citizenship were geared to transform the society and to make the individuals comply with the state regulations. Despite of this general similarity, the degree of the stress on duties in the official citizenship formations was different in Iran and Turkey. In Iran, the understanding of duty did not take place as much as in Turkey in the official documents. The difference is remarkable especially when the 1906 Constitution and the Constitution of the Islamic Republic are compared with those of Turkey.

In the 1906 Constitution of Iran the word 'duty' is used for six times.[66] In contrast to the Turkish constitutions none of these six mention a duty of the citizens or individuals. They are used to mention the duty of the elected, duty of the shah, duties of the assembly, duties confined to the deputies (in the oath), duties of the departments of the government, duties and rights of military, and in the title of a subsection as "on the duties of the assembly and its limitations and rights". In the text of the 1906 Constitution a section is titled as "Rights of Persian Nation" (in the Supplementary Fundamental Laws of 1907). This title reveals that the rights of the citizens were defined vis-à-vis the state with a clear intention of limiting the arbitrary treatment of the Shah towards the people. The Articles 21 and 90-93 recognize the provincial societies (anjomans) and state that they are free throughout the Empire. The recognition of anjomans is remarkable as they were influential in the Constitutional Revolution.

The nonexistence of the understanding of duties of citizens in the 1906 Iranian Constitution can be interpreted as there was a stronger emphasis on the rights of citizens in comparison to the Turkish constitutions. This difference is perhaps because the constitution in Iran was a result of a civil war given against the Qajar Shah. It was therefore considered to be a manifesto of the rights of societal groups against the state of the time. The actors of constitution making in Turkey were the ruling elite; there was no impetus for stressing the rights of people in the Turkish case. In Iran, on the other hand, many societal power centers took part in the Constitutional Revolution and the

---

[66] Peaslee, A. J. (1950), *Constitutions of Nations – The First Compilation in the English Language of the Texts of the Constitutions on the Various Nations of the World*, New Hapshire, Concord: Rumford Press, vol. 2, pp. 197-214. A digital copy of the 1906 Constitution of Iran is available in the following internet link:
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Iran_Constitution_of_1906. This was the basis of Iranian Constitution till 1979. There were some amendments in the constitution after the coup against Mossadeq in 1953, and with the White Revolution in 1963.

following civil war. This difference in the actors of constitution making marked the difference in the level of duties of the citizens as mentioned in the constitutions of both lands. In the time of Reza Shah, the Constitution of 1906 was preserved, but the practice resembled to that of Turkey: the state elite, law makers, and law practitioners turned out to be the same people and the demands of the masses were mostly ignored within the Pahlavi regime.

It is noteworthy that despite the change in rule and regime, the Constitution of Islamic Republic too had no comparable stress of duties of citizens to that in the Turkish constitutions. The Constitution of Islamic Republic uses the term 'duty' for 12 times.[67] Seven of them are devoted to mentioning the duties of the Islamic government, the court, and the Guardian Council. The remaining five mention the duties of citizens and people: two times in the form of "duty of people with respect to each other and with respect to the government", one time as "duty of all Muslims towards the non-Muslims", one time as "public duty to preserve the environment", and one time to explicitly mention the duty of citizens by stating "[i]n the Islamic Republic of Iran, the freedom, independence, unity, and territorial integrity of the country are inseparable from one another, and their preservation is the duty of the government and all individual citizens". In the Iranian constitutions one observes no mentioning of duty of education, duty of military service, duty of work, or so. All these are defined as the rights of the citizens and as services that should be provided by the state. Even the duty of tax payment is not mentioned in the Constitution of the Islamic Republic. This continuity of the nonexistence of a stress on duties in the Iranian constitutions should be considered to be a result of the impetus from below in foundation of the very first constitutional regime in 1906 and the Islamic Republic in 1979.

The education of citizenship in the Republican Turkey and Pahlavi Iran come close to each other considering the weight of duties and rights in the understanding of citizenship. In both cases the nationalistic sentiments are praised, the life style of a modern citizen is described, and the norms of act of being a good citizen are stated. The citizens are expected to comply with those norms in order to cooperate with the state to modernize.

Üstel demonstrates that the citizenship books in Turkey till the end of the 1940s promoted a citizenship loaded with duties to the state. She states, the citizenship books in schools till the end of the single-party period emphasized the duties of the citizens as their debts to the state, nation, and family. The education defined the rules of conduct in both the public and private domains. Üstel mentions this education policy as "behavior engineering" (Üstel, 2009: 323). The Republican elite expected the schools, especially the primary schools, to generate the "national citizen", the defining elements of which were "loyalty" and "sacrifice" (Üstel, 2009: 326). The text of the curriculum of primary schools in 1926 emphasized the role of primary education in the process of citizenship

---

[67] Hamed, A. (1980), *Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, California, Berkeley: Mizan Press. A digital copy of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran is available in the following internet link:
http://www.servat.unibe.ch/law/icl/ir00000_.html

building (Üstel, 2009: 131). In 1936 the primary education program stated that every course in the school should be considered as a "means for realization of the national goals" (Üstel, 2009: 138). The book of *Malumat-i Vataniye* (Knowledge of the Land) written by Mehmet Emin for high schools and secondary schools in 1926, stated the aim of the course as to teach the "duties towards the nation" (Üstel, 2009: 130). In the Project of Village Primary School Program in 1939, the "duty" of the teacher was stated as to educate the children in order make them "able to fulfill their duties loaded by the Republic" (Üstel, 2009: 151).

Caymaz also performed a detailed study of the understanding of citizenship in the school text books in Turkish Republic. It is observed that in the period of the single-party regime, the courses on citizenship emphasized the duties, rather than the rights (Caymaz, 2007: 24). The course of Knowledge of the Land (*Yurt Bilgisi*), in the early years of the Republic, emphasized the duties in order to describe how to be a good citizen. The text of the course, written by İbrahim Hilmi, stated "[t]he one who knows the land very well, feels the love to the land and freedom, respects to the rights and justice, respects to the laws of the land, and is ready to make sacrifices at any moment for the family and the other citizens can be named as a good citizen" (Caymaz, 2007: 16-17). The same text points out two different senses of love for the land. The first one is about the emotional feelings towards the land and culture: loving the fields, mountains, the folkloric lyrics, songs. The other side is about the duties and obeying to the rules: respecting the laws, considering the interests of the land at a higher level than the self, and being ready to sacrifice anything for the welfare of the land. İbrahim Hilmi further states: "[e]very Turk takes it as a duty to love the land, is ready to give his/her life for the interest and honor of the land, and considers this as an honor" (Caymaz, 2007: 20). Another textbook written for the same course in primary schools, by Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, comments, the rights of citizenship are necessary in order to accomplish the duties of the citizens. Namely, the ultimate aim and the fundamental issue is the fulfillment of the duties; the rights are useful only if they serve for that purpose. Caymaz notes, this is exactly the opposite of the understanding of citizenship rights and duties in the Western models (Caymaz, 2007: 25).

In the 1950s, the change in the political system was reflected in the text books of citizenship for the secondary schools. Üstel states that the citizenship profile in the textbooks started to make a distinction between the public and private domains (Üstel, 2009: 327) In the text book by Fikriye Sunuki Arsan, the emphasis on the love of the land and being ready for individual sacrifices is replaced with the emphasis on individual hard working and the consciousness of responsibility. The one who loves the land should work hard. The good citizens should be in harmony with the social surrounding, namely the family, school, and people of the town (Caymaz, 2007: 34-35). Here, what is observed is not a raise of rights against the duties, but a change of the form of duties of the students in accordance with the emergent politics. The liberal economy promoted by the DP is associated with the hard working of the individuals. The conservative values advocated by the party are associated with being in harmony with the traditional social institutions.

In the same years, there were also text books that preserved the understanding of the preceding single party regime. The text book by Faruk Kurtuluş states the following question as an exercise for the students: "What are the debts of the citizens towards the state?" (Caymaz, 2007: 38-39). In the text book of Faruk Kurtuluş, the explanation of citizenship does not dwell upon the rights. The duties of the citizens towards the state and the duties of the state towards the citizens are explained in detail. The book promotes the understanding that everything on the land of Turkey – citizens, institutions, laws, vehicles, roads, lands – constitutes the Turkish state, namely everything exists for the welfare of the state (Caymaz, 2007: 40). Therefore, all the obligations – duties of the citizens and duties of the state – are defined to serve for that purpose. Accordingly, another text book, by Hasan Ali Yücel and Ragıp Calapalı, states that the rights of citizens are in fact nothing else than the duties of the state (Caymaz, 2007: 45). The rights of the individuals are defined by referring to the state. The individual is invisible in the understanding of citizenship. The citizen is pacified, because the right is something that the state should provide; the citizens should not go after that.

The Reza Shah regime as well considered the education of students as an effective way of promoting the understanding of citizenship of the state. An important step was making the instruction of Persian citizenship compulsory in schools. Matthee states that the educational policy initiated by Reza Shah stressed the virtues of civic obedience, discipline, and morality. The boy-scouting was particularly promoted for that purpose. The boy-scouting was a part of the physical education after 1933. In 1939 membership to boy-scouting was compulsory for the boys in the classes between the fifth and ninth grades. The stress on obedience, discipline, and morality was also present in the program of the institute aimed at the moral education of the nation in 1937, Department of Public Enlightenment (Matthee, 2003: 134). The regime of Reza Shah also considered the military service as a means to promote obedience and discipline as the virtues of being good citizen. The military service was considered to be "the biggest and most important school for uplifting both the bodies and the spirits of citizens" (Boroujerdi, 2003: 148).

In both Turkey and Iran the state perceived citizenship as an instrument to promote the modernization project. Therefore, the welfare of the state preceded the rights of individuals. This resulted in a stronger stress on the duties of the citizens, rather than the rights vis-à-vis the state, in the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes. The rights associated by citizenship were the ones that can be considered as the natural rights that emerge from being a human, rather than being a citizen of a particular state. The citizenship rights were not aimed at protecting the individuals from maltreatment of the states. The stress was on the duties. The duties are stated to shape the individuals to be worth of being a citizen of the modern state. Despite the similarity of practice in Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes, a remarkable difference was about the degree of mentioning of the duties in the constitutions of the lands. In the Iranian constitutions the duties of citizens were far less mentioned than the Turkish. This was because the masses took significant part in the 1906 and

1979 revolutions that led to the making of the two constitutions. In Turkey the state elite were almost the sole actors of state building and constitution making.

5.4 Active – Passive

An important feature of citizenship formation is whether it emerged as a result of societal impetus from below or as a result of the initiatives of the ruling elite from above. In this respect there is quite difference between the state formations of Turkey and Iran. This difference is due to the participation of large masses in important historical moments of social transformation in Iran, such as the Constitutional Revolution, the provincial movements, the National Front Movement of Mossadeq, and the protests prior to the Islamic Revolution. In Turkey, on the other hand, there happened no comparable mass movements throughout the modern history.[68] The consequence of existence of mass movements in modern Iranian history is that the citizenship formation in Iran has more bottom-up features than that in Turkey. This results in the understanding that the citizenship in Iran is more open to changes and modifications with the impetus of political masses. In Turkey, on the other hand, the understanding of citizenship remains to be within the frameworks of state regulations.

Turner makes a classification of citizenship formation of the Western lands based on the two dimensions of "active/passive" and "public/private" (Turner, 1990). If a form of citizenship is designated as passive then it is developed from above as an act of the state. On the other hand, if the form is active, then it is developed from below, as a consequence of very societal initiatives and movements. Trade unions, interest groups, associations and other societal groups might have come together and affect the formal status of citizenship, possibly against the will of the state. The Revolutionary French and Liberal American citizenships are considered to be from below since large social movements of broad cooperation of different social strata contributed to the both. On the other hand, English and Fascist German citizenships are considered to be from above. The English citizenship was constructed with reformative attempts of the state, rather than active claims of societal powers. The German citizenship was more clearly from above since it was a result of a relatively late unification and modernization project of the German state.

---

[68] Ergut mentions the 1908 coup by the CUP as a "revolution" and emphasizes the "mass movements" in Anatolia in support of this "revolution" (Ergut, 2004: 153-162). He gives as an example the uprise in Erzurum in the late 1907 led by the Muslim merchants and wealthy of the region, to raise demands about economic issues as well as reinstallation of the constitutional regime and opening of the majlis (parliament). He states that the underlying reason for the support of the Muslim wealthy for the CUP was the superior economic position of the Christian merchants and entrepreneurs within the Ottoman society. Ergut further states that the Muslim ownership of the enterprises in the Ottoman Empire in 1908 was only 3%. According to the understanding of the author of this thesis two factors avoid to delineate the support of Muslim merchants to the CUP as a "mass support" comparable to that of the bazaaris in Iran for the 1906 Constitutional Revolution. The first is that the ratio of Muslim merchants was so low that they did not represent the bourgeoisie of the Ottoman society. Their number and power was far less than having the capacity of being the economic and ideological basis of the movement of the CUP. Second, the bourgeoisie of the time was actually composed of the non-Muslim merchants and entrepreneurs with which the former was in conflict. Therefore, the support of the Muslim merchants for the CUP was because of the ethnic and religious nationalism of the CUP against the non-Muslim population in general and entrepreneurs in particular. Their support was not due to some bourgeois-nationalist preoccupations against an aristocracy or monarchy. The author of this thesis considers that the power of such movements in Anatolia were much less than to be nominated as a "mass support" to the CUP, especially in comparison to that of the bazaaris in Iran to the constitutionalists.

The "public/private" dimension refers to "the relation between the public and the private arenas within civil society" (Turner, 1990). In making the distinction between public and private, Turner considers the dominance of one of those realms in shaping the "subjectivity of the individual consciousness" of the citizen. He argues, in the case that some religious and cultural factors create a strong private space, the individual separates oneself from the public domain and gives up being an active participant. When such a strong division between public and private occurs individuals construct their identity more in their private realm than the public. Then the result is the form of private citizenship. On the other hand, when citizenship identities are constructed by participating actively in the public realm – namely taking part in common events, contributing to public ideas, sharing the public culture, and participating in public politics – what comes out is a public citizenship. It might be interpreted that while the active/passive dimension of citizenship refers to the initial dynamics of formation of citizenship, the private/public dimension refers to the realization of citizenship in daily life.

The early twentieth century Ottoman and Qajar Empires were both marked by the constitutional movements and the effects of the First World War. The enactment of the first significant political rights in the Ottomans and Qajars can perhaps be associated with the CUP coup in 1908 and the following constitutional regime, and the Constitutional Revolution in 1906, respectively. The constitutional movements in both contexts were the result of the political antagonisms prepared throughout the late nineteenth century. It was the modernized bureaucratic-military cadres against the traditional cadres and Abdulhamid despotism in the Ottoman Empire and the civil opposition against the court in the Qajar Empire that performed the respective coup and revolution. Due to this structural difference of the oppositional groups in both contexts, it can be argued that while the constitutional revolution in Iran was from below, the constitutional movement in the Ottoman Empire was in accordance with the traditional way of capturing the state power, namely from above.[69] The counterrevolution to the CUP coup in the Ottoman case lasted only ten days; after the suppression 200 people were publicly hanged (Sohrabi, 1995). The counterrevolution in Iran, on the other hand, resulted in a civil war that lasted around one year.[70]

The mass movements in the twentieth century Iran point out the active dimension in the formation of Iranian citizenship. The main initiation of the Iranian citizenship formation with the Constitutional Revolution, the resistance of the masses to Reza Shah's policies, the mass movements and National Front in the 1940s and 1950s, and the mass protests and the movements prior to the Islamic Revolution underlie the active side of the Iranian citizenship. This active side was due to the mass protest tradition in Iran and resistance of the masses to the state regulations.

---

[69] Sohrabi (1995) argues that the CUP movement also had mass participation during the 1908 "revolution". However, compared to the case in Iran it makes much more sense to regard the CUP "revolution" as a coup from above. In fact, even Sohrabi's argument states that the mass participation in the movement was led and totally controlled by the military officers of the CUP cadres.
[70] Abrahamian notes when the Cossack brigade of the Shah attacked Tehran in June 1908, the fight with the revolutionaries caused more than 250 deaths (Abrahamian, 1982: 96).

The citizenship promoted by the Pahlavi state, on the other hand, did not welcome the active participation of the masses to shape the politics. The repressive and coercive attitudes of the Pahlavi regime towards the oppositions reveal that the state imposed a passive citizenship. Considering the oppositions of the masses to the state regulations the citizenship formation in Iran was more active than the citizenship formation in Turkey. Considering the forms of citizenships as imposed by the respective states the citizenship formations in both Turkey and Iran were passive. The active dimension in Iranian citizenship formation marks the difference between the citizenship of the two lands.

When it comes to the public/private dimension, the citizenship formations of the two lands again demonstrate a difference. The Pahlavi regime in Iran was reluctant to receive demands from the oppositional groups. Therefore, the oppositions were marginalized from the legal political framework. The masses did not take part in shaping day to day state regulations; it was the state that decided and implemented the regulations. Due to the oil income the Iranian state was less dependent on mass contribution. In this sense the citizenship promoted by the Pahlavi regime was private. In Turkey, especially after transition to the multi-party regime in 1945, the political regime was open to demands of discontented masses. The right wing parties canalized the discontented masses into the legal political frameworks. As a result, the masses could voice their demands within the political limits determined and tuned by the military/bureaucratic ruling elite. The result was more contribution of the masses to the daily politics in Turkey in comparison to Iran. In Iran the individuals, especially those belonging to the traditionally oriented masses, were departed from the public space; they were left to the private religious realm of Shi'a Islam. In Turkey, through the right wing parties, the traditionally oriented masses were included into the public realm to shape the daily politics. The citizenship formation in Iran was more active in formation and private in realization; the citizenship formation in Turkey was more passive in formation and public in realization, in comparison to each other, respectively.

Janoski stresses the power of civil society vis-à-vis the state considering citizenship formation. When the civil society is stronger vis-à-vis the state, it is more plausible that the citizenship formation will be an active one. If the civil societal organizations are not strong there will be a passive citizenship. Janoski states, "strong civil societies produce particular institutional structures that bolster citizenship… Weak civil societies will most often be dominated by the state or market sphere" (Janoski, 1998: 17). Janoski's demarcation quite applies to differentiate the citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran. Due to the early repression of leading groups, there did not appear an organized oppositional movement in the late Ottoman and early Republican years. The state was comparatively free to act and perform modernizing regulations. In Iran, on the other hand, the ulama, bazaaris, and intellectuals led the masses to oppose to the regulations of Qajar Shahs, and it was these mass movements that performed the Constitutional Revolution. The impact of those societal groups was observable also in the twentieth century. They were active in

211

prohibiting the promulgation of a republic, supporting the National Front movement, and organizing the mass protest that led to the Islamic Revolution. The state in Iran was not as strong as the state in Turkey to eliminate the impact of the masses. Although the state marginalized the oppositional groups from the public arena, the state also could not intervene into these societal groups, could not manipulate, and could not diminish their power. In Turkey, on the other hand, the state was more effective to silence, diminish, and manipulate the oppositional groups. Mische's research on the society of Brazil, as mentioned before, points out the importance of "organizational networks in which new projects and relations are formulated and communicated" in relation to citizenship formation (Mische, 1996: 132). The ulama and bazaari network in Iran and the lack of similar societal networks in Turkey are remarkable in this sense. Due to the existence of such networks of societal groups in Iran and due to the less power of the Iranian state to control the masses, strong mass protests shook and eventually collapsed the Pahlavi regime. In Turkey, there happened no comparable mass protests and comparable impact on the state regulations.

Considering the last half of the twentieth century – namely the multi-party regime in Turkey and the Mohammed Reza Shah period in Iran – the Turkish state was more successful to canalize the masses into the public realm. In Iran the state regulations marginalized the oppositional groups from the legal political frameworks and the state conquered the public realm; however, the state could not diminish the societal networks. The oppositions organized outside the legal political framework through strong societal networks, which proved to be functional raising strong protests against and finally collapsing the regime.

Both Iranian and Turkish states promoted citizenships to serve for their modernization projects. Citizenship was considered by the states as an instrument for their purposes. Therefore, the citizenship formations promoted by the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes were both passive. This is in accordance with the understanding of citizenship as loaded with duties. The understanding of official citizenship, as formalized by the state, in both lands raised the duties of the citizens to comply with the modernization regulations. The citizens were expected to fulfill their duties, not to oppose or discuss the decisions and regulations of the state. The rights of citizens have been weak in comparison to the duties. Therefore, both Iranian and Turkish citizenships promoted by the respective states are closer to the communitarian aspect of the French model, in comparison to the liberal model based on rights of individuals. They emphasize the welfare of the nation instead of the rights of the individuals. On the other hand, although the French model encourages the citizens to actively participate in the political decision making processes, according to the Iranian and Turkish citizenships the citizens are expected to acknowledge the decisions of the elite in a passive way (Caymaz, 2007: 27). Especially in the early decades of the Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes, the citizens were not expected to take initiative to influence the regime or government. The expectation was to comply with the regulations that came from the top of the state. The modern state in both lands did not content by hegemonizing the public domain but also aimed at intrusion into the

private domain of its population (Esendemir, 2008: 122). This was because the state did not aim at modernization of only the state institutions but also the social life of the people.

Kadıoğlu states that according to the citizenship model in Turkey the citizens do not make self decisions but obey to the rules and regulations declared by the state (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 14-15). Therefore, the citizenship in Turkey is a passive one. Its passiveness is noted to resemble the Fascist German citizenship. This passiveness due to the top-down reforms of the Young Turks and the Republicans is also related to the immaturity of the public life (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 63). It is possible to describe the Turkish citizen as the one whose private realm is intruded by the state and who is forced to move within a weak and uninstitutionalized public space (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 128). Kadıoğlu stresses the passive character of Turkish citizenship by observing that civil, political, and social rights are given from above either before the emergence of demands from bottom or by repression of such demands. The emergence of Turkish citizenship precedes the emergence of a national bourgeoisie and urbanization. The Turks became citizens before they became individualized members of an urban society. The essence of Turkish citizenship lies, not in the idea of being a member of the city, but in the idea of sustainment of the national unity (Kadıoğlu, 2008: 34-35). "Turkish citizenship is defined from above (passive) within an exaggerated public space which smothers the individual and invades the private space of the family and religion" (Kadıoğlu, 2005: 115, 117).

A text book about citizenship, written by Recep Peker, states that the individual is nothing compared to the whole of the nation. The welfare of the individual is dependent on the welfare of the nation. Therefore, the interests of the individuals should be sacrificed for the interests and welfare of the whole nation. According to this text, being a patriot and adoring to the nation are the prerequisites of being a citizen (Caymaz, 2007: 23-24). The textbook promotes the idea that the citizens should not be active to pursue their individual or group interests, but should serve for the welfare of their nation. Unlike the French model, the citizens are not encouraged to participate in the political decision making processes. In the Turkish citizenship the citizens are expected to acknowledge the decisions of the elite in a passive way (Caymaz, 2007: 27). The citizens are not endowed with the right to demand anything more than what is provided by the state (Caymaz, 2007: 54).

In accordance with the passive understanding of citizenship as stated by Recep Peker, the RPP of the time was organized to minimize the influence of its members on the regulations. Koçak states that although anyone could become a member of the party, the activities of the members within the party were kept at minimum. Becoming a member did not mean having any important function. Despite the widespread organization of the party, there was no important and effective provincial organization in the process of decision making (Koçak, 2004: 120).

The impact of the Turkish Grand National Assembly was also limited in the rule of the land. The foreign policy issues, which were considered to constitute the most important political realm, were generally not discussed in the assembly; the decisions were taken by "a narrow circle in Çankaya with (Atatürk and) İnönü alone having the last say… The government's proposals were always accepted at the RPP Parliamentary Group" (Koçak, 2004: 122). "Parliament has always unanimously approved all foreign policy proposals brought to its agenda by the administration, without feeling the need for any debate or discussion" (Koçak, 2004: 123).The parliament "served only to legitimize decisions taken by the government" (Koçak, 2004: 126).

The passive character of Turkish citizenship was observable even in the understanding of the political tradition of the Democrat Party (DP) and the Justice Party (JP) which organized the discontented masses against the Kemalist RPP. These former parties, although relied on the votes of masses reactionary to the central state, always advocated limiting the political activity within the civil society. They did not welcome the organized political power blocks outside their control. It was not desired that the masses continuously took part in politics and influenced the government through various channels. According to the understanding of this tradition the role and duty of the masses was to elect the people that would rule. The elected represented the national will. After electing the people to rule, the masses should not intervene into the government and should not take part in politics. Governing was the job of the government and politics was the job of the politicians (Tanör, 2006: 421). This understanding underlay the repressive policies of the DP government in the 1950s, and the advocacy of the JP in the 1960s and 1970s to limit the rights and freedoms within the civil society.

The Constitutional Revolution was a result of a mass movement in Iran. Therefore it was a result of a moment from below. The influence of this is visible especially in the recognition of the provincial anjomans (societies) in the constitution. The anjomans are aimed to voice the interests of the provinces vis-à-vis the central state in Tehran. In the constitutional period the anjomans acted as semi provincial governing organs. In the time of Reza Shah the state ignored the anjomans; however the articles related to the anjomans were preserved in the constitution. The Reza Shah regime did not only oversee this active character of Iranian constitutionalism, but also promoted a passive citizenship. The passive character of the citizenship promoted by the Reza Shah regime was most visible in the 1930s, when reform from above dominated the political realm at the expense of all independent initiatives (Rostam-Kolayi, 2003: 158). When the state became stronger in those years, the independent movements were weakened and eventually eliminated (Rostam-Kolayi, 2003: 175). The Reza Shah regime, as in Turkey, expected the citizens to comply with the state regulations, rather than voicing their ideas and interests. The active character of Iranian constitutionalism preserved in the constitution, turned out to be functional in two periods. The first one was after the abdication of Reza Shah in 1941. In this period the provincial movements, especially the Autonomous Government of Azerbaijan, claimed for the constitutional right to

provincial anjomans. The second moment was before the Islamic Revolution that the claim for anjomans and provincial representative bodies were raised also in this period by referencing to the Constitution.

5.5 Comparison with Respect to the German and French Models

One of the determinants of citizenship formation is the naturalization process inherent in the historically built national identity. Brubaker (1990) studied the naturalization processes in France and Germany considering their soil centric (*jus soil*) and blood centric (*jus sanguinis*) national identities, respectively, structured in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century and inherited to the modern times. The study of Brubaker became a landmark for identification of citizenship formations as soil or blood based, the French and German models being the representatives, respectively. For Turkey, it has been long discussed whether the national identity and citizenship formation is based on the French or German model. The secular and egalitarian tendencies in the most primary official documents, like in the constitutions, and the assimilationist policies in practical regulations are associated with the soil based French model. The discriminatory and sometimes racist statements in the secondary official documents – like announcements to acceptance to military schools – and in other actual practices are associated with the German model. Therefore it has been a discussion about the Turkish national identity whether it is based on the French or German model, or whether it is officially based on the French model and there are some deviant practices from that, or whether both French and German models are inherent in the theory of Turkish citizenship pointing to an undecided situation in the theory itself. For the Iranian national identity the assimilationist policies seem to dominate, hence it is more close to the French type soil based identity.

Brubaker examines the twentieth century naturalization policies of France and Germany towards the immigrants. "The expansive French politics of citizenship vis-à-vis immigrants…reflect a state-centered, assimilationist, essentially political national self-understanding, while the restrictive German politics reflects an ethnocultural understanding of nationhood as prior to and independent of the state" (Brubaker, 1990). He observes "[w]hile birth and residence in France automatically transform second-generation immigrants into citizens, birth and residence in Germany have no bearing in citizenship"; the foreign residents "naturalize at a rate four times higher in France" compared to in Germany. The French national identity carries the stamp of the revolution against the monarchy and the stamp of the following republican regime.

> The nation, in [French] tradition, has been conceived in relation to the institutional and territorial frame of the state: political unity, not shared culture, has been understood to constitute nationhood.
>
> If the French conception of nationhood has been universalist, rationalist, assimilationist and state-centred, the German conception has been particularist, organic, differentialist and *Volk-*

centered…[The] pre-political German nation…in search of a state, was conceived not as the bearer of universal political values, but as an organic, cultural, linguistic or racial community… On this understanding, nationhood is constituted by ethnocultural unity and expressed in political unity (Brubaker, 1990).

The citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran cannot be equated exclusively to one of the soil based French citizenship or to the blood based German citizenship. The characteristics of Turkish and Iranian citizenships are that they were instrumental in building up the nation state. Therefore the two states adopted some characteristics of these models in different times, based on the needs of the nation building process. Kadıoğlu states that the Turkish nationalism has the feature of both the French and German type nationalisms (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 17). She considers the attempt of bringing together the missions of the French and German models as a paradox of the non-Western nationalisms (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 37). However, once the citizenship is considered as a means for nation building and modernization, as modeled by the state elite, the resulting picture is not a paradox. The citizenship was formalized and promoted very pragmatically according to the needs of the modernization. Citizenship is used as a disciplinary technique. It is functional in the sense of legitimization of the status of the state as an active subject to decide on and organize the societal relations (Keyman, 2008: 232-233).

Although they cannot be equated solely to one of these models, the citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran have features from both of the models to varying extent. A consideration of the shared characteristics of Turkish and Iranian citizenship with these Western models clarifies the differences between the two. In comparison to the Turkish citizenship, the Iranian citizenship is more close to the French type as the mass protests and especially the civil war for the constitutional regime were impetuses coming from the lower classes to shape the modern history. Moreover the Iranian citizenship is closer to the French model, also as the term Iranian is almost always used to mean the people living in Iran, as an umbrella term encompassing all ethnic groups. "The territorial conception of Iran as a kingdom with succession of dynasties has existed since the beginnings of Iranian traditional history including irānšahr and irānzamin, or al-Fors (Fārs), [Arabic] form of Pārs (Persia)" (Ashraf, 2006). "Difference and diversity were accepted as a defining characteristics of Iran's identity and were reflected even in the name of the country that was widely used during the Qajar period: The Protected Countries of Iran (Mamalek-e Mahruseh-ye Iran)" (Asgharzadeh, 2007: 122). It was especially in the Constitutional Revolution that the notion of Iranian covered all ethnic groups.

> [The] national idea of mellat-e Irān encompassed all peoples of Iran regardless of their religious affiliation, ethnic origin, spoken language, or socio-economic status. It was in terms of these principles that the Constitutional Revolution became a patriotic, nationalist movement. Thus from its inception the idea of "national sovereignty of Iranian people" became the slogan of those who advocated constitutionalism, secularism, progress, and equality (Ashraf, 2006).

The Iranian identity was not based on the Persian ethnicity, but the language and literature of Persian was its main assimilating power.

> [A] conscious belief in "Iran's cultural distinctiveness" served as the foundation and common denominator of Iranian identity and the binding force among Iranians for centuries, with Persian literature, and more specifically, Persian poetry, as its core element. Furthermore, with a strong tradition of oral literature, particularly poetry, the idea of "Iran" and its elements in Persian cultural heritage have been widely disseminated through naqqāli and Šāh-nāma ḵʷāni, to the masses in urban, rural, and tribal areas. There are many illiterate people who know verses from the Divāns of Hafez and Saʿdi and the Šāh-nāma of Ferdowsi by heart and often refer to them in their daily social discourse (Ashraf, 2006).

It is due to the power of the Persian language and literature that "Iranian identity appeals more to areal and elective affinity than genetics" (Perry, 2001). In the Turkish case, the understanding of citizenship, in comparison to the Iranian, is closer to the German model. Ethnic Turkishness was considered to be superior over the other ethnic minorities.

The Turkish citizenship was not based on 'blood' as the German model. The requirement was to be assimilated into the Turkish 'ethnicity'. Ethnicity here refers not only to the language of Turkish and the religion of Islam, but also to the ideological notions that acknowledge a superior position for the Turks above the other ethnic groups. The assimilation forces the ethnic minorities to acknowledge that the state and land belongs to the Turks. Kahraman argues that Turkish citizenship is a "learned category" as it "does not involve ethnic and territorial references" as in the German and French models. It is also "exclusive", in the sense that it excludes the groups resisting to assimilation into its values (Kahraman, 2005: 78). Considering the order of the formation of the nation and the state, the process in Turkey was the opposite of the one in Germany. It can be argued that in the late 19th century the German nation was seeking for its German state. In Turkey, on the other hand, the Turkish state was searching for its nation (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 57). In the Turkish Republic the process of nation building was guided by the question of "how and who should be the Turks?" rather than "who are the Turks" (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 34). Despite its difference from the German model, the Turkish citizenship also had an ethno-cultural dimension (Kadıoğlu, 2005: 111). Based on Kahraman's interpretation, the Turkish citizenship involves characteristics from both the German and French model in order to answer the question of "who should be the Turks" (Kahraman, 2005: 79).

In the official documents and the constitutions, the first perception is that the Turkish citizenship is based on the land as the French model, rather than ethnic descent as in the German (Esendemir, 2008: 80-81). This is mostly because the Turkish Republican elite took the French style as a model for themselves. The French citizenship was not based on ethnocultural qualities. "Membership of [French] sovereign nation was conceived and institutionalized in the political-legal form of citizenship" (Brubaker, 1990). In the Turkish case, however, the preceding *millet* system in

the Ottoman Empire and the antagonism between the ruling elite and Christian minorities in the nineteenth century did not give way to defining Turkish nation in pure political-legal form. These causes underlay the ethnocultural, in this case Islamic, grounding of Turkish citizenship. The ruling elite believed that there was no way "to win the political loyalty" of the Christian populations to the Turkish nation state they imagined.[71]

The political-legal grounding of French nationalism was based on the power of the French ethnicity to assimilate the minorities. The Turkish Republican elite aimed at following the same line to assimilate the Kurdish population into Turkishness. However, the Kurds, who are age old settlers in Anatolia, resisted assimilation into another ethnic culture. Considering the Kurdish population the Turkish nationalism lacked "the assimilative virtues of France" towards its minorities (Brubaker, 1990). The reaction of the Turkish regime towards the resistance of the Kurds was again to resort to ethnocultural definitions of citizenship, as it was the case towards the Christian minorities, by stressing the Turkish language, banning the Kurdish language, and sometimes tending towards racist regulations. As a result, although the Republican elite aimed at following the soil based French model of citizenship, two things drove them towards the ethnoculturally based German model: the antagonism with the Christian minorities and the resistance of the Kurds to assimilation.

The Constitution of Iran had the impact of the participation of various societal and provincial powers in the civil war. It considered the Iranian nation as being constituent of different ethnic groups in the land. Reza Shah wanted to replace this with the dominance of the Persian ethnicity; namely, he defined the Iranian nation in Persian ethnic terms and aimed at assimilation of the others. This state policy continued also in the Mohammed Reza Shah period. Assimilation into the Persian culture opened the ways to enter the upper echelons of the nation, especially of the state government. Although the regime discriminated the non-Persian groups, this was not the case for the non-Persians who accepted the Persian culture and language (Shaffer, 2008: 83). Therefore, the discrimination and assimilation policies towards the minorities were not as strong as in Turkey. Even in the time of Reza Shah, when the nation was defined on the basis of Persian ethnicity, "the Azerbaijanis were considered to be an ethnic group, while the term Iranian was applied to them as members of a nation" (Atabaki, 2000: 26).[72] The "ethno nationalism" promoted by the Pahlavi regime was "challenged by the popular nationalist movement that began in the mid-20th century"

---

[71] Brubaker mentions the anatagonism between the Polish ethnic culture and German nationality, as the latter was incapable of assimilating the former during the time of Prussian Empire: "Having failed to win the political loyalty of Poles to the German nation-state, and having failed to assimilate them to German language and culture, Prussian-German *Polenpolitic* was increasingly 'dissimilationist', treating ethnically German and ethnically Polish citizens differently in an effort to 'strengthen Germandom' in frontier districts" (Brubake, 1990).

[72] Shaffer states, in Pahlavi Iran, the Azerbaijani and Iranian identities could not exist together. The Iranian identity was defined as the Persian identity. The idea of Iranian was not an upper identity above all other ethnics. The group rights were given to the non-Persian identities (Shaffer, 2008: 83). Although what Shaffer states was the intention of the Pahlavi regime, in practice the regime could not go far in equating the Iranian identity with the Persian ethnicity. The fact that the term Iranian is used as an umbrella identity within the Islamic Republic is a sign that within the society the Iranian identity remained to cover all ethnic groups in Iran.

(Ashraf, 2006). After the Islamic Revolution the centrality of the Persian ethnicity was replaced with that of the Islam. "Ethnic minorities have been rewarded with jobs and other resources when they have conformed to modernization schemes (before the revolution), or to Islamitization schemes (after the revolution), but have been denied resources or even attacked when they have refused to assimilate or attempted rebellion" (Moghadddam and Crystal, 1997).

In Iran, there was no inclination to exclude the Christians from citizenship. Moreover, the understanding of Iranian nationality, though based on Persian ethnicity, functioned as an umbrella identity over the ethnic groups; hence, there was less resistance to assimilation to the Iranian nationality in comparison to that in Turkey. All these lead to the conclusion that in comparison to the Iranian citizenship, the Turkish citizenship was more inclined towards the ethno-culturally based exclusionary German model.

5.6 Gradual Citizenship in Turkey

As described by Brubaker, the ideal conception of citizenship as an "ideal-typical model of membership" should be egalitarian.

> There should be a status of full membership, and no other… Basic and enduring gradations of membership status are inadmissible. This norm derives, most immediately, from the French Revolution, which opposed a unitary, unmediated, undifferentiated, and therefore (formally) egalitarian conception of state-membership to the plural, differentiated, essentially inegalitarian ancient-regime notion of state-membership as mediated by corporate bodies (Brubaker, 1990).

The actual practices in the Western and non-Western lands deviate from this ideal-typical egalitarianism. An example of gradual citizenship was observed in early nineteenth century France towards its citizens in the colonies. Dubuis states that the slave emancipation movement that took place in the French colony of Saint Domingo in 1793 was something totally unexpected in Western thought (Dubuis, 2000). After this unexpected revolutionary movement slavery was abolished in all French empire. The slave insurgents claimed for "Republican citizenship and racial equality" and their struggle "brought about the institutionalization of the idea that the rights of citizens were universally applicable to all people within the nation, regardless of race". Although slavery was abolished, the response of the rulers to the claim of Republican citizenship was not in the direction to entitle the ex-slaves with full citizenship. The rulers claimed that the ex-slaves "owed something to the nation that had fed them". The mission assigned to these new citizens was "to cultivate the soil as labourers". Cultivation was considered to be their responsibility for the nation, which was not the case for other citizens of France. Dubuis states, "[t]his limitation was necessary to maintain the plantation economy, whose disturbance would cause damage and inconvenience to the nation" (Dubuis, 2000). As a result of this, a layered understanding of citizenship came about. The ex-slaves were citizens who had special responsibilities and who could not have elections to determine their rulers. The case of America after the slave emancipation was not different from that of the

French colonies. The ex-slaves in America too were confronted with racial exclusion from many citizenship rights with the rationale that they were "incapable of acting as free citizens" (Dubuis, 2000).

Romania was another example where gradual citizenship was exercised towards its inhabitants of Dobrogea (*Dobruca*), an ex-Ottoman territory acquired by the Romanian state after the Russian-Ottoman War in 1877-78 (Iordachi, 2003). Naturalization of the inhabitants of Dobrogea was an important problem for the Romanian state. The naturalization took two different forms: "a 'narrow naturalization'…granted residence rights, transforming all permanent inhabitants of the country into virtual Romanian subject and a 'broad naturalization'…conferred full political rights" (Iordachi, 2003). In the period between 1878 and 1909 the Romanian state applied a separate administration with this gradual citizenship for the inhabitants of Dobrogea. According to this legislation the inhabitants of Dobrogea were granted with the status of local citizenship and they were excluded from participation in Romanian politics (excluded from the parliament and participation in political parties). This double kind of naturalization might be considered as a "ruling strategy of state" in Mann's (1987) terms. With this strategy the state managed to bind the residents to itself in the sense of assigning them duties and at the same time not entitling them with full citizenship rights. The Dobrogean movement managed a gradual development towards full citizenship; the crucial step owed a lot to the Bulgarian threat during the Balkan Wars in 1912-1913. During these years the Romanian state decided that the separate administration could increase the danger of Bulgarian threat. In 1913 Romania abolished the separate administration and legislation of Dobrogea and in this way the Dobrogeans attained the right to full Romanian citizenship.

In the Middle East there are practices that the official formation of citizenship in the twentieth century, not only the accidental practices, assumes a gradual definition; namely the principle of egalitarianism is not preserved in the theory of official citizenship. Butenschon states, "[t]he distinction [among citizenship statuses] is particularly useful for conceptualizing the legislation and the application of first- and second-class citizenship in Middle Eastern states (illegal under international law) as well as the mechanisms employed to veil such legislation and practice from the scrutiny of world community" (Butenschon, 2000: 7-8).

The distinction between *jinsiyya* and *muwatana* types of citizenship in Israel is an example of gradual citizenship in which the idea of egalitarianism is rejected. The first of those, *jinsiyya*, corresponds to the mere right of abode in the land. Davis names the *jinsiyya* citizenship as "passport citizenship" (Davis, 2000: 53). The second one, *muwatana*, which is termed as "democratic citizenship", corresponds to having the rights of both abode in the land and access to the civil, political, social, and economic resources of the state (Davis, 2000: 53). The state of Israel exercises a discrimination against its non-Jewish citizens on the legal platform based on this distinction in the understanding of citizenship. While the Jewish citizens are considered to have the

muwatana citizenship, hence can access to the state resources, the Palestinian citizens of Israel have only the *jinsiyya* citizenship. "Thus, the Palestinian citizens of Israel have equal access to the courts of law (civil rights) and equal access to the political process of voting and elections (political rights) but not to the welfare and educational resources of the state (social rights) or to its land and water resources (economic rights)" (Davis, 2000: 55). Davis regards the state of Israel as an "apartheid state" with two classes of citizenship (Davis, 1997: 198).

A characteristic that is observed in Kuwait is the different understanding of citizenship by its tribal and urban populations. As Longva states the tribes consider citizenship in the sense of *taba'iyya*, which signifies loyalty to a leader. The leader in the context of Kuwait corresponds to the ruling family. For the tribes nationality means being subordinates, followers of the ruling family. It signifies a "hierarchical and vertical" understanding. The urban understanding of citizenship, on the other hand, corresponds to the idea of *jinsiyya*, signifying being alike. *Jinsiyya* is used for the term nation. Therefore in the understanding of the urban population citizenship corresponds to "similarity and horizontal community" (Longva, 2000: 192). This difference in understanding of citizenship by different groups points out a varying distance of the state with these groups. "[B]eing Kuwaiti in the sense of *jinsiyya* implies an indissoluble bond between the citizen and the state of Kuwait…Being Kuwaiti in the sense of *taba'iyya*, on the other hand, means that one's allegiance goes to a leader whom one follows and not to a territorialized sovereign state" (Longva, 2000: 192). While the *jinsiyya* citizens are considered to be attached to the idea of nation state, the *taba'iyya* citizens are considered to be loyal only to the ruling family. Considering the idea of nation state, the *jinsiyya* citizenship is in the center of the Kuwaitian citizenship, while the *taba'iyya* remains in the periphery.

Turkish nationalism aimed at equalizing the notions of state and nation. The most important myth of the nation state was that such a unity was not only possible but it actually existed. Whenever it was realized that such a unity did not exist, the ideology of nationalism created the notion of minorities (Gülalp, 2007: 13). This is the reason that the notion of Turkish nationalism included religious elements despite of its secularist rhetoric. The non-Muslim populations inherited from the Ottoman times were considered as 'minorities', rather than the genuine citizens of the Republic. The non-Muslim minorities were in the periphery of Turkish citizenship. These groups were implicitly considered as the potential betrayers to the state; potential collaborators of the external powers. Oran argues, the notion of the unity of the nation is against the democratic principles. This notion refuses the identities of minorities and promotes an assimilative policy that imposes the ethnic and religious values of the majority dominating the state (Oran, 2004: 84). Soner (2005: 290) states, "despite the fact that the republican state adopted a legal-political neutrality in conceptualizing Turkish-citizenship, Turkish practices have often made a clear distinction between 'national' and 'formal' citizens of the country". The non-Muslim minorities, in this sense, were only formal citizens. The parliamentary discussions for the 1924 Constitution

reveal that "formal membership of the Turkish citizenry was not sufficient to guarantee the full-fledged scope of citizenship status… A strict distinction between possession of 'Turkish nationality' (*milliyet*) and 'Turkish citizenship (*tabiiyet*) was preserved… [T]he republican regime…opted to create two categories of citizens: 'national citizens' (citizens by nationality) and 'formal citizens' (citizens by law)" (Soner, 2005: 297).

In the center of the Turkish citizenship were the ethnically Turkish people. Then the non-Turkic Muslim population, namely the Kurds came. The Kurds were expected to assimilate into the Turkish ethnicity. This was the reason that their ethnic identity was rejected by the state. After the Sheikh Said rebellion in 1925, the Kurdish ethnic identity was implicitly considered to be a fundamental danger. Any opposition to the understanding of the Turkish nationalism was perceived as a threat to the welfare of the state (Kadıoğlu, 1999: 57-58). The Kurdish ethnic movement was associated with religious conservatism and backwardness; the ethnic character was not declared. The state was protected against the Kurdish ethnicity within the same framework of struggle as it was protected against the religious backwardness.

The rejection of the Kurdish identity in Turkey and the semi-discriminatory policies of the Turkish state towards the Kurds can be considered to imply an implicitly gradual citizenship formation. Especially in the last decades, it is observed that the statesmen mention about "so-called citizens", pointing to the formal citizens who are considered to violate the laws in the context of the Kurdish problem (Yeğen, 2006: 79). Yeğen (2006: 47-88) demonstrates that the place of the Kurdish population has followed a path of from the "prospective Turk" (*müstakbel Türk*) to the "so-called citizen" (*sözde vatandaş*), all meaning something different than the genuine Turkish citizenship. This points out that the modern state of Turkey does not accept all its formal citizens as the genuine citizens of the state. In this regard Turkey shares the characteristic of having gradual citizenship in an implicit way.

In the school text books and many other official documents of Turkey there has been a clear referencing to blood ties with racist connotations. For example, the İnönü regime made changes in the texts of citizenship courses of primary schools in that direction (Caymaz, 2007: 32). The renewed text, prepared by Tarık Emin Rona, carried a racist tone regarding to the understanding of Turkish nation and Turkish citizenship. The Turkish nation was described as follows: "The whole of the people that live in the land of Turks, that speak the language of the Turks, and that carry the blood of the Turks are named as the Turkish Nation" (Caymaz, 2007: 33-34). In the 1930s, "being Turkish", "coming from a Turkish lineage", and "being from the Turkic race" were among the requirements to be accepted to many military schools, to state official positions, and even for scholarships for education abroad (Oran, 2004: 90). The requirement of being Turkish for acceptance to official state positions was replaced with "being a Turkish citizen" in 1965 (Oran, 2004: 143). Following the 1980 coup, the text books again emphasized race and religion, besides the common language, culture and history, as the constitutive elements of a nation. The books

promoted the understanding of the unity of the state, land and the nation, placing the state at the top. The book by Kemal Dal defined the land as follows: "The land is the piece of earth on which the people of the state live" (Caymaz, 2007: 48-49). The people and the land were defined with referencing to the state. The emphasis on the race and the dominance of the state over the individuals resembles the understanding of citizenship in the single party regime of the 1930s (Caymaz, 2007: 50).

The official definitions of citizenship in the Turkish constitutions at first sight look like they were based on the soil based French model. The actual policies and some other documents, on the other hand, reveal the ethnic centered citizenship practices as in the German model. Yeğen shows that the difference between the understanding of citizenship at a first glance perception from the constitutions and as demonstrated in various other practices and official documents is not an accidental violation of the theory of Turkish citizenship. He shows that a close reading of the Turkish constitutions reveals the "inconsistency" intrinsic to the theory itself. In fact, this inconsistency of terminology is due to the "undecidability" in the Turkish Constitutions about whether the land or the Turkish ethnicity is the basis of the Turkish citizenship (Yeğen, 2004).

> It is…evident that the practices in Turkish citizenship, which are argued to have violated the theory of Turkish citizenship, are by no means some accidental instances having no textual reference at all. Instead, it appears that the inconsistency found between the theory and practice of Turkish citizenship is actually an inconsistency, more specifically an undecidability, in theory. Henceforth the so-called 'deviant' practices in Turkish citizenship are by no means accidental. Instead, what made these deviant practices possible was the theory of Turkish citizenship itself (Yeğen, 2004).

> [T]here are different degrees of Turkishness, being a subject of the Turkish Republic, being a Turkish subject, and being Turkish and, more importantly, that Turkish citizenship fails to overlap with or exhaust Turkishness in the full sense of the term. What is even more interesting is that there is a remarkable correlation between the different levels of state apparatus and different degrees of Turkishness. For instance, the institutions at the heart of the state (military) match themselves with being of Turkish race, while the institutions at the edge of the state (state dormitories) are content to match themselves with Turkish Republic citizenship (Yeğen, 2004).

The undecidability in the theory of Turkish citizenship in the constitutions can in fact be argued to be the result of an implicit gradual citizenship formation, which means an implicit ethnic based classification of the citizens as first, second, and third class citizens. In this respect, while the people of Turkish descent are first class citizens, the Kurdish are the second, and the non-Muslims are the third. This graduation was based on the assumption that the Kurds could be assimilated into the Turkish culture and the Christians can never become loyal members of the state. Therefore dominantly the assimilationist French model but also ethnoculturally based German model of citizenship were pursued towards the Kurdish population; ethnoculturally based and discriminatory

German model was pursued towards the Christians. These were the two sources of existence of undecidability in the theory of Turkish citizenship.

The situation of gradual citizenship is observed also in other official documents throughout the Turkish Republican era. For example, the fourth item of the Law of Civil Servants with number 788 in 1926 required to be Turkish, instead of a Turkish citizen, to be a civil servant of the state (Esendemir, 2008: 85). This idea of gradual citizenship can be observed even in the official documents of the 1990s. The statements of the Constitutional Court for the decision of the closure of the Democracy Party (DEP) in 1994, makes a distinction between being "the self of the nation" and "the minorities". It accuses the DEP for having the intention of transforming a group of the population that is a part of the real nation, to a minority. This understanding assumes that the minorities are inferior citizens with respect to the ones that are assumed to constitute the real nation (Oran, 2004: 98-99).

In both Turkey and Iran the first sight view of the official documents point out a soil based citizenship formation as in the French model. The understanding of Iranian citizenship is closer to this first sight view as the term "Iranain" is used as an umbrella identity, dominated by the Persian ethnic elements, but open to assimilation of other ethnic groups. Once assimilated, the citizens are considered to be equal.[73] Moreover, the understanding of Iranian citizenship does not reject the existence of other ethnic identities in Iran. In Turkey, the understanding of Turkish citizenship, on the one hand, rejected the existence of Kurdish identity, on the other hand, accommodated the Kurdish and non-Muslim populations in categorically lower statuses than the ethnically Turkish population. Therefore, there appeared no umbrella identity in Turkey that would recognize the existence of all ethnic groups and that would provide totally equal status after being assimilated to Turkishness. In Iran the formation of citizenship was closer to the soil based and assimilative French model. In Turkey the soil based French model and the blood based German model were mixed within a gradual formation of citizenship.

5.7 Conclusion for Comparison of Citizenship Formations in Turkey and Iran

One of the common exercises in citizenship literature is to demonstrate that the classical citizenship formations as observed in the West cannot be applied directly to understand the citizenship formations in non-Western lands. In case of Turkey and Iran, the situation is not different: none of the land based French, ethno-culture based German, liberal British or US, and social-democratic Scandinavian models can totally explain the Turkish or Iranian citizenship

---

[73] It is interesting to note that a kind of gradual citizenship is applied in the Islamic Republic towards the naturalized Iranian citizens in comparison to the ones that acquired Iranian citizenship by descent of being borne in the land of Iran: "A person who has acquired Iranian citizenship by following the above procedure [naturalization], unlike those who are Iranian citizens either by the rule of descent blood or the country of birth will not enjoy all the rights to which Iranians are entitled. For instance, according to the Civil Code Article 982, such citizens might not practice law, become Majlis deputies or members of the Guardian Council, or provincial and urban councils as well as president." [Interview with Shahram Mohammadzadeh about Iran's Citizenship Laws, Etemaad, Daily Newspaper, Jun. 26th, 2002, Page 9, url: http://www.parstimes.com/law/citizenship_law.html]

formations. Both of them differ from the Western citizenship formations due to their peculiar historical and socio-cultural heritages. Each of the lands has its own basic determinants for citizenship formation, which are not much different from those for their peculiar state-formations. In fact, the peculiarity that applies to both of the lands is that their official citizenship formations evolved as an epiphenomenon to their nation-state formation, namely in charge of serving for the building up of the nation state.

The Marshallian theory of evolution of citizenship as expansion of rights is of crucial importance to reveal the relation between the notions of citizenship and rights (Marshall, 1992). His theory, however, is correctly criticized as being specific to the case in Britain. What is criticized about Marshall's theory is not the relation between rights and citizenship, but the path of evolution of this relation as expansion of rights in time, towards a more egalitarian society. This criticism applies also considering the Turkish and Iranian cases that the rights in Turkey and Iran did not evolve as in the line of civil, political, and social rights. Moreover, except for the Constitutional Revolution in Iran, which can be associated by the political rights, the rights in Turkey and Iran did not emerge as a result of class struggle of masses.

The civil rights in Turkey were mostly promulgated by the state elite in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, either to maintain the loyalty of the Christian populations or as a result of the pressures of the Western powers. However, the understanding of civil rights, especially that of the freedom of speech and thought never matured as in the Western World. Since the last decade of the twentieth century the Turkish government was severely criticized for putting numerous people into prison because of declaring their oppositional ideas. The civil rights in Qajar Empire or modern-Iran also did not mature as in the West. The Qajar Shahs could easily replace any statesmen, Reza Shah could arbitrarily depart or murder tribal leaders, Mohammed Reza Shah could ban the parties and torture their members; even in the Islamic Republic, a lot of Tudeh members and leaders were tortured and forced to give state supportive speeches (Abrahamian, 1999: 177-208). As a result, the civil rights did mature neither in Turkey nor in Iran as in the West.

The political rights in Iran can be argued to have been initiated as a mass struggle against the Qajar state. The Constitutional Revolution resulted in establishment of a parliament and a constitutional regime. However, the impact of the parliament and the constitution in shaping the following historical developments was minor. Due to the invasion of the land in 1911, the parliament could not sustain its power to rule the land. Reza Shah used the parliament as a stamp for the laws and ignored the constitution throughout his rule. Another invasion of the land during the Second World War destroyed the legal frameworks of political rule and political representation for which masses could struggle. The regime of Mohammed Reza Shah filled this void of political framework with a repressive policy and marginalized the political demands of the masses. The repressive regime of Mohammed Reza Shah in the third quarter of the twentieth century, and furthermore the declaration of single-party regime in 1975 by the Shah, should be considered as a

sign that political rights did not mature in Iran. Perhaps the Islamic Republic maintained a stronger understanding of political rights by basing the regime on republicanism. In Turkey, the political rights were established on a stronger basis in the early years of the Republic, in comparison to the early years of the Pahlavi regime. The Republican elite were geared to perform the state regulations not in an arbitrary manner but according to the laws sanctioned by the parliament. Moreover, the constitution was taken into consideration. The difference with the Iranian case is that the Turkish ruling elite had grown a more mature experience of participatory representation and participatory government since the second quarter of the nineteenth century starting with the consultancy assemblies and provincial councils of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, although the foundation of the parliament and constitutional regime in Turkey was not due to a mass movement as in Iran, the experience with the participatory government led to better developed political rights. Moreover, the ability of the regime to canalize the mass opposition into legal political frameworks, starting from 1950s, was influential to develop the understanding of political participation in Turkey. The 1980s and 1990s further experienced the rise of civil societal movements, which can perhaps be considered as the initial development in the direction of participatory rights, in Janoski's terms (Janoski, 1998: 30-33).

The expansion of rights was not the determinant factor for the citizenship formation in Turkey and Iran. The determinant factor was the foundation of a new nation-state and dissemination of the new state ideology to the masses. In the background of all these was the project of modernization in the Western style. The citizenship formation was only one of the instruments to serve for that purpose. Therefore, the states used the understanding of citizenship to convince their populations about the new regulations and new ideologies. Dissemination of the ideas of the state with the notion of citizenship was a ruling strategy of both states, with Mann's (1987) terms. This ruling strategy was not geared to managing class struggles, as Mann observed in the Western lands, but to promote the new regulations and ideologies and to gain the consent of the masses for those. As a result, the official citizenship-formation promoted by the states emphasized the duties of the citizens and did rarely mention their rights. Unlike what Janoski (1998: 129) observes in the Western world, there was no balance between duties and rights of the citizens in Turkey and Iran. Duties over weighted the rights.

In Turkish modernization, starting from the Ottoman reforms in the first half of the nineteenth century, there was no significant mass contribution to the social transformation. The Ottoman and Turkish states confronted much less mass opposition than the Qajar and Pahlavi states. The state in Turkey was clearly in the center of nineteenth and twentieth century modernizations in Turkey. Therefore the citizenship formation in Turkey was passive. In Iran, on the other hand, the masses were politically active in the early twentieth century. The transformation to a constitutional regime was a result of a mass revolt against the Qajar Shah. However, the invasion of Iran resulted that the constitutional regime could not maintain the central power. The regime initiated by a mass

movement was not effective to promote a modernization shaped by the impetus of people from below. The central rule of Reza Shah marked the modernization to be a state imposed project mostly against the will of large segments of the population. The repressive policies of Mohammed Reza Shah also indicate that the state expected the citizens to be passive in the political realm. The provincial autonomous governments in the early 1940s, the Tudeh movement in the second half of the 1940s, the National Front in the early 1950s, and the protests prior to the Islamic Revolution mark other moments of mass movement from below in Iran. The citizenship formation in Iran was active considering the mass protest tradition and impact of masses to challenge the regime from below. The citizenship formation promoted by the Iranian state, on the other hand, was passive like that promoted by the Turkish state, considering the state centered modernization by Reza Shah and the coercive policies of Mohammed Reza Shah.

The regime of Mohammed Reza Shah dominated the political sphere by marginalizing the oppositional groups from the legal political framework. The religious and leftists groups did not find an avenue to impact the state regulations by legal means. However, the marginalized masses were not passive; they organized and developed their own oppositional ideologies underground. As mentioned before, Turner (1990) distinguishes two domains as public/private and active/passive citizenship. It was stated before that citizenship promoted by the Pahlavi regime was private, in the sense that the oppositions were marginalized from the legal political frameworks. However, the realm of the mass oppositions, which is said to be marginalized by the state, cannot be considered to be private. Although religion was the main factor of these societal networks, the members of these networks did not close themselves to their homes or mosques. Quite contrary, they gathered in seminaries, they demonstrated, and they used the mosques as places of political networking and to disseminate oppositional ideas. These groups were not in a private domain, but in a politically marginalized public domain. This was a situation where the official-legal state regulations were determined from above intended to force the masses to remain in their private domains, but the masses were active to organize oppositions in a marginalized-illegal public domain. The state regulations were from above, but the masses were active. Turner (1990) considers the notions of the couples of 'active-from below' and 'passive-from above' to be connected to each other. The situation in Iran demonstrates that a passive understanding of official citizenship can coexist with politically active masses. This is perhaps a situation that can be observed in the lands that the state cannot maintain the consent of the masses but have enough power to impose its regulations by coercion. This situation in Iran is an indicator that the formal Iranian citizenship in Iran is less integrated to the national identity and cultural consciousness of the people in comparison to that in Turkey.

The farther distance between formal citizenship and national identity in Iran might be the reason that citizenship discussions are not as central to the Iranian socio-political literature as they are to the Turkish. Although there are numerous studies about Iranian national identity, Iranian

state ideology, and Iranian culture, it is difficult to come across some literature dedicated to Iranian citizenship formation. In Turkey, on the other hand, there has been a flourishing of citizenship discussions especially in the last decades. Although the European Union discussions and the Kurdish resistance are the major factors for this flourishing in Turkey, it is not unrelated to the strong bind between the official citizenship promoted by the state and the national identity and cultural consciousness of the masses in Turkey. The difference between Turkey and Iran in this regard is a result of the deeper intrusion of the Turkish state to the Turkish society than that of the Iranian state to the Iranian society.

The citizenship formation in Iran was more close to the soil based French model than the one in Turkey. Put in another way, the citizenship formation in Turkey had more features from to the ethno-culturally based German model than that in Iran. In Iran, the emergence of the notion of Iranian as an umbrella identity over the various ethnic groups and the power of the Persian language and culture to assimilate the ethnic minorities brought the Iranian citizenship more close to the French model than the German. Moreover, there appeared no significant exclusion of local groups from the Iranian citizenship due to the ethno-cultural differences; the Christians in Iran were also considered to be a part of the Iranian population.[74] In Turkey, on the other hand, the Christian minorities were never considered to be loyal citizens of the land. The religious homogenization of Anatolia was a cleansing of the land from Christians by murder of the Armenians, murder and exchange of the Greeks. The remaining non-Muslims in Turkey were subject to forced tax payment and pogroms. Towards the non-Muslims, the state followed the ethno-cultural based discriminatory German understanding of citizenship. The Kurdish population was expected to assimilate to the Turkish culture; therefore assimilative French model of citizenship was pursued towards the Kurds. However, for more central positions of the state, like the military, the Kurds were also not considered to be as loyal as the ethnically Turkish citizens. In those occasions the discriminatory German model was again in order, this time towards the Kurds. This co-existence of features of assimilatory French model and discriminatory German model in Turkish citizenship was in fact a result of the understanding of an implicit gradual citizenship in Turkey.

The ethnic Turkish people were considered to be the genuine and the loyal citizens of the Turkish state. Afterwards the Kurdish people came as the secondary degree Turkish citizens. The secondary degree citizens were considered potentially to be assimilated into the Turkish ethnicity in time. However, they were not immune from ethnic exclusion; the state was determined to exclude the second level citizens from key state positions up to the time that the Kurds would forget their Kurdishness. Lastly, the non-Muslim populations in Turkey came as the third degree Turkish citizens. These people were only the remnants of the cleansing of the land from Christian populations. These third degree citizens were considered to be non-loyal to the state. They were

---

[74] In the Islamic Republic Baha'ism is banned and the Baha'is are rejected from the citizenship, but this is more a matter of considering the Baha'i religion as heretical and conceiving it as a threat to Islam, rather than a matter of ethno-cultural discrimination. The Baha'i religion originated in Persia.

mostly left alone in their private domain without letting much interference with the ruling and administrative matters.

A curious question is why in Iran a genuine public-and-active kind of citizenship as in France did not occur, although the initiation (Constitutional Revolution) was active and from below, comparable to the case as in the French Revolution. The answer is related to the emergence of the autocratic regime of Reza Shah and the following regulations to realize the modernization project by the Pahlavi elite. The impetus of the masses from below to initiate the Constitutional Revolution could not survive the autocratic regime of Reza Shah. Then the question of why an active and public citizenship did not occur in Iran is reduced to why could the impetus of mass movements not survive and the Pahlavi regime happened to be an autocratic one. The answer lies in the desire of the Iranian political circles for a strong man to centralize the state power in the very years preceding the rise of Reza Shah. This desire was a result of the loss of the central power of the parliamentary regime. The cause of this loss of control and prestige all around Iran is very much related to the invasion of the land by British and Russian armies prior to the First World War. The invasion of the land by Western powers raised the desire for an autocratic regime which diminished the power of impetus of the masses from below. Therefore, although the Constitutional Revolution was a result of mass movements as in the French Revolution, Iran did not evolve towards a democratic regime at a degree as in France.

Throughout the Pahlavi regime, the masses were politically active within the religious and leftist societal networks, which were marginalized from the official legal framework. Despite this activity the political impetus of the masses could not influence the legal citizenship formation; the channels were closed for their impact. In Turkey, on the other hand such channels were open and the state managed to integrate the masses to the political regime. Why did the impetus of such a politically active mass remain isolated from the official legal framework in Iran? The partial answer to this question is related to the coercive policy of the state against the oppositions. However, coercion of the state might be the result of a deeper cause that distanced the political masses and the state in Iran. Why was the gap between the political masses and the state wider in Iran than in Turkey, despite the existence of societal networks and despite the political activity within these networks?

Mouffe states that the claims of different political groups happen to be within an existing hegemony of ethico-political norms emerging in the given conditions of the cultural realm (Mouffe, 1992). The confronting participants come to the arena with the acknowledgment of the authority of these conditions of norms. It can be possible only on the basis of such commonly acknowledged conditions that the parties can attain a communication platform for their confronting claims of citizenship. The formation of citizenship is changed as a result of new hegemonies resulting from these confrontations. The acknowledged conditions – namely the acknowledged ethico-political

norms with which communication can be possible – change in time with the policies of the hegemonic claim, struggles of non-hegemonic claims, and as well changing material conditions.

If Mouffe's conception of "hegemony on ethico-political norms" is considered for the citizenship formation in Turkey and Iran, one can argue that the spectrum of acknowledged ethico-political norms by the oppositional masses and the state was narrower in Iran than in Turkey (Mouffe, 1992). The wider spectrum of acknowledged norms in Turkey made it possible to open channels for the consensus of oppositional masses and the Turkish state. In Iran, on the other hand, the spectrum was too narrow that neither the oppositional masses could find an avenue to raise their demands nor the state could develop strategies to gain the consent of the masses. The reason why the spectrum of ethico-political norms was narrower in Iran can be related to the disruption of legal political frameworks in Iran in the twentieth century, especially by the invasion of the land in the Second World War. The invasion did not only disrupt the state apparatus, but also the political values and norms that could evolve into a wider spectrum in the second half of the twentieth century. The disruption caused the resetting of the initial basis of political norms founded by the Pahlavi regime, though in an autocratic way. In Turkey, the initial basis of such commonly acknowledged political values were founded in the first two decades of the Republic again in an autocratic way by the single-party regime. The difference in Turkey was that this basis was not disrupted; it could continuously evolve into and be tuned towards a larger spectrum of ethico-political norms.

It was this larger spectrum of ethico-political norms in Turkey that brought the notion of citizenship in a more central position in the discussions about national identity and ethnic problems, in comparison to the case in Iran. The Kurdish problem in Turkey in 2010 is very much related to the understanding of citizenship and the definition of Turkishness. It is noteworthy that the Peace and Democracy Party (*Barış ve Demokrasi Partisi*) representing the Kurdish population demands the redefinition of Turkishness in the constitution by replacing the term "Turkish citizenship" (*Türk vatandaşlığı*) with "citizenship of Turkey" (*Türkiye vatandaşlığı*).[75] This is a clear sign that the Kurdish movement that started in the late 1970s with separatist demands evolved towards demanding legal-political representational rights with an equal citizenship status. The recent political attempts of the ruling party (White Party, *Ak Parti*) in 2009 under the banner of "democratic opening" (*demokratik açılım*) should be considered as attempts of the Turkish state to redefine Turkishness and Turkish citizenship in order to end the ongoing war between the PKK guerillas and the Turkish army.[76] These developments can be considered as recent examples for that the Turkish state aims at canalizing the opposition into the legal political framework. They also reveal that in Turkey the notion of citizenship does relate to an arena of struggle for liberty and

---

[75] Media source: A news article in the newspaper Milliyet, dated to 27.03.2010: http://www.milliyet.com.tr/bdp-turkluk-tanimi-istedi/siyaset/haberdetay/27.03.2010/1216991/default.htm
[76] The internet link for the brochure of the White Party to disseminate the program of Democratic Opening: http://www.demokratikacilimkitabi.com/

equality, as suggested by Mouffe: "[s]ince there will always be competing interpretations of equality and liberty there will therefore be competing interpretations of democratic citizenship" (Mouffe, 1992). One of the central questions to Turkish political discourse in the first decade of the twenty first century can be claimed to be 'what kind of a citizenship the Turkish state should have'.

In Iran, the less amount of literature dedicated directly to the Iranian citizenship formation should be considered to be a sign that the notion of citizenship is not as central in the national identity discussions as in Turkey. The oppositional groups in Iran throughout the twentieth century raised the sentiment of being against the Iranian state, rather than changing the official settings. Considering the mass movements that led to the Islamic Revolution the main motivation was being against the Pahlavi regime and collapsing the regime. Iranian citizenship formation or national identity did not constitute the major concerns of the oppositional groups. The slogans of the masses during the "Green Movement" that emerged after the Iranian Presidential Elections of June 2009 used phrases such as "down with the dictator", "death to the dictator", besides "give us our votes back".[77] These are signs that the question 'what kind of a state do Iranians should have' is still more central than the question of 'what kind of a citizenship the Iranian state should have'.

---

[77] Media Source: BBC News, "Ahmadinejad defiand on 'free' Iran poll", June 13, 2009:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/8099115.stm.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Major Ideas

The inherited state structure by the Turkish Republic and Pahlavi Iran are quite different in the sense of modernized institutions, established bureaucracy, and administrative rituals. The Turkish Republic inherited a more developed state structure from the Ottomans, in comparison to that of the Pahlavi Iran from the Qajars. A strong state structure reinforced the idea of belonging to a political group, the nation. Therefore the citizenship formation in Turkey evolved with a stronger emphasis of belonging to a political group as represented by the state. **The state in Turkey has therefore been more central to the national identity in comparison to the case in Iran.**

In the nineteenth century, the state of Qajars was weaker than the Ottomans, in the sense of modernization of state institutions and establishment of a widespread state bureaucracy. Therefore, the societal powers in Iran remained stronger in comparison to their counterparts in Turkey. The ulama, bazaaris, tribes, and leftist organizations managed to organize mass protests and resistance to influence the regulations of the state. Considering the participation of masses and their political influence, there appeared no comparable movement in Turkey to the Tobacco Movement and Constitutional Revolution in Iran. Moreover, the tradition of mass movements continued in Iran with the Azerbaijanis and Kurdish provincial movements of 1945, the National Front Movement in the early 1950s, protests of the early 1960s, and finally the mass movements of the late 1970s that brought the collapse of the Pahlavi Regime. There appeared no comparable mass movements that shook the regime in Turkey to that extent. **The citizenship formation in Iran happened to be more active compared to that in Turkey in the sense of having the tradition of mass revolts from-below against the state regulations.**

The ethnic side of the formations of citizenship in Turkey and Iran can be examined by considering the relation of Turkish and Iranian nationalism to the Kurdish and Azerbaijani ethnic identities, respectively. By the foundation of the modern Turkish and Iranian states, a policy of Turkification and Persianization started in the respective lands. In Turkey, first the political representation of the Kurdish identity was forbidden, than the existence of such an identity was totally rejected, accompanied by prohibition of the use of the Kurdish language. The Kurdish people were considered potentially to be assimilated. In Iran the Pahlavi regime aimed at assimilating the ethnic minorities. However, the assimilative regulations were less coercive. The constitution always recognized the existence of the Azerbaijani and Kurdish ethnic groups, among others, with even their political representative rights, though these rights were never used in the Reza Shah period. **Turkish ethnicity was more strongly imposed on the people of Turkey than**

Persian ethnicity on the people of Iran. Turkish ethnicity was more central to the Turkish citizenship than Persian ethnicity was to Iranian.

The foundation of Turkish Republic went hand in hand with cleansing of Anatolia from the non-Muslim minorities. Non-Muslims were from the beginning not accepted as a genuine member of Turkish citizenship. It is possible to observe in official documents and actual regulations in the early years of the Turkish Republic that the Kurdish people as well were excluded from many of the security related high level state positions. Besides that, being Turkish and coming from a Turkish lineage were emphasized as requirements to being genuine Turkish citizens. In Turkey, it is possible to identify a gradual citizenship of three levels: on the top are the ethnically Turkish people, in the second level are the Kurdish people that were considered potentially to be assimilated into Turkish ethnicity or otherwise might be subject to discrimination, and at the bottom are the non-Muslim people that are clearly excluded from the many benefits of being a Turkish citizen. In Iran, the idea of being Iranian was above the ethnic affiliations. This understanding emerged in the period of Constitutional Revolution. Despite the attempts of Reza Shah to assimilate other ethnic groups into the Persian ethnicity, the idea of Iranian as an umbrella identity survived. The attempt of assimilation in Iran did not evolve into exclusion. Any Azerbaijani person, who has learned a good level of Persian, could take place in the high level echelons of the state. **In Turkey the idea of ethnic lineage was stronger than that in Iran in the formation of citizenship. This resulted in a gradual formation of Turkish citizenship. In Iran, on the other hand, the national identity of Iranian had more power of assimilation than the national identity of Turkish had in Turkey.**

The outward demarcation in Turkey and Iran were constructed differently. In Turkey the threat of disintegration of the land was in the core of the outward demarcation. The Christian minorities were considered to be internal betrayers cooperating with the external powers. **The hatred towards the enemies of the state was directed to the very internal non-Muslim minorities.** This resulted in the catastrophic events of the early twentieth century: the Armenian genocide, massacres of many Greek people, and the population exchange of the Greeks. The outward demarcation in Iran was shaped by the actual invasions of the land by the Western powers. Therefore, **the hatred towards the enemies of Iran was directed to the very external Western states.** This hatred did not result in an internal mass massacre like in Turkey. It resulted in the xenophobic feelings to be a part of the national identity.

In the Turkish Republic, the state preserved its power from its foundation up into the twenty-first century. There was no interruption or external invasion within this period. The continuity made the masses to be convinced about the state that it will survive and be in charge of the regulations. In Iran, on the other hand, the state apparatus was disrupted before, during, and after the First World War, and especially during the Second World War. All these caused the loss of confidence in the regulations and the weakening of the loyalty to the state among the Iranian

masses. **The loyalty to the state was stronger among the Turkish people in comparison to the Iranians.** This loyalty resulted that the modernization project of the Turkish state was more effective than that of the Iranian state to change the state apparatus and the life style of the people in the Western direction.

A difference between Turkish and Iranian states is the level that they resorted to coercion and the level of flexibility in emergent socio-political conditions. These are also related to the continuity of the state apparatus and the loyalty to the state. The Turkish Republic promoted some fundamental principles such as inseparability of the land, secularism of the state, and Turkish nationalism. These principles were protected for the welfare of the state regardless of any other political or humanitarian value. **With its ideological framework based on these fundamental principles, the Turkish state maintained the consent of the masses in a higher level than the Iranian state.** Apart from the issues related to these fundamental principles, the state was flexible to adapt itself to changing internal and external conditions. The constitution could be changed; the economic policy could be adapted in response to the internal and external demands. The Iranian state did not promote such strong principles. It was also inflexible to adapt to the changing societal power centers and changing demands of the masses. Rather than adapting itself, the state resorted to coercion and repression more often than in Turkey. **The Turkish state was more successful to accommodate the internal discontent within the regime; the Iranian state resorted more to coercion in repression of the societal resistances.**

In Turkey and Iran the understandings of citizenship was influenced by the very nation building process of the young modern states. **The Kemalist and Pahlavi regimes perceived citizenship as an instrument of their modernization projects.** The understanding of ruling strategy of Mann (1987) is very relevant to understand the citizenship formations in these two lands. The citizenship formations in Turkey and Iran were both quite far from the liberal understanding of citizenship as in Britain and the US. Moreover, there was no consistent and sequential development of citizenship rights that can be associated with some societal movements as in the theory of Marshall (1992). The citizenships promoted by the regimes were deductive, indoctrinating people how a citizen of a modern state should be. The citizenship rights were not aimed at protecting the individuals from maltreatment of the states. **In citizenships imposed by both states the emphasis was on the duties.** The duties are stated to shape the individuals to be worth of being a citizen of the modern state.

The term Iranian is almost always used to mean the people living on the land of Iran. The language of Persian has had a strong assimilation power and appealed to the many intellectuals of ethnic minorities. In Turkey, on the other hand, the very local non-Muslims and Kurds were not considered to be genuine Turkish citizens. Therefore, **in comparison to the Turkish citizenship, the Iranian citizenship was more close to the soil based assimilative French model**. The Iranian citizenship was less associated with the Persian ethnicity than the Turkish citizenship was with the

Turkish ethnicity. **In the Turkish case, the understanding of citizenship, in comparison to the Iran, is closer to the descent based exclusionary German model**. Ethnic Turkishness was considered to be superior over the other ethnic minorities and non-Muslims, considering the citizenship status.

6.2 What about the Contemporary Turkey and Iran? Reflections and Questions

The major ideas of this thesis are based on the examination of the modern histories of Turkey and Iran beginning from the late nineteenth century till the 1980 and 1979, respectively. In the rest of this conclusion chapter the period after 1980 and 1979 up to 2010 will be briefly considered in view of these major ideas. It is an interesting question whether such ideas make sense to understand the contemporary Turkey and Iran, still with a comparative perspective. This examination will be performed, on the one hand, by trying to observe the patterns delineated in this thesis in today's Turkey and Iran, on the other hand, by raising questions and discussions about the contemporary Turkey and Iran. If the major ideas of this thesis can be used to observe historically connected patterns of politics and ideas in current Turkey and Iran or if they can point out questions that worth discussion on current Turkey and Iran, then they can be considered to make sense.

After the military coup in Turkey in 1980 and the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979 many political and social changes took place. The coup in Turkey was an attempt of the military to "restore" the order, which can be translated as maintaining the fundamentals of the state as associated with the Kemalist regime. After three years of military rule the system again turned into a multi-party regime; however, being eliminated from the main oppositional movement of the former years, the political left. Under the rule of the Prime Minister Turgut Özal, the Turkish economy was extremely liberalized by opening the gates to foreign capital and encouraging export oriented industry. These economic measures continued with privatization of state-owned economic enterprises in the 1990s and 2000s. Namely, the Turkish state again managed to first *eliminate the strongest obstacle*, in this case the political left, and then to *realize its policy*, in this case the regulations to transform the import-substitution oriented economy to an export oriented one.

Another aim of the coup in 1980 in Turkey was to *preserve the fundamentals of the state*: the anti-communist stand against the political left and centrality of Turkish ethnicity in national identity against the Kurdish movement. These were maintained by demolishing the leftist organizations, imprisoning, torturing, and murdering many political leftists, by putting into order a repressive military rule in the Kurdish regions, and declaring Kurds to be "mountainous Turks". In the 1990s the "deep-state" powers were active in the war between the Turkish army and the PKK.[78] While the army was fighting on the mountains, the branches of the deep-state were more active

---

[78] The term "deep state" became widely used within the media and by Turkish people after the Susurluk incident in November 1996, "when a car carrying the deputy chief of the Istanbul police, a parliamentarian who was in charge of the biggest village-guard clan, and the former leader of the Turkish Gray Wolves (also wanted on Interpol's Red List due to his involvement in most of the pre-1980 massacres) were involved in a car accident" (Ünver, 2009). These three people being in the same car marked a network with roots within the police, politicians, ultra-nationalist and fascistic political currents.

within the civil life. "[T]he 1990s…witnessed the lowest point in Turkish human rights practices, as extra judicial killings, massacres, and village evacuations became commonplace" (Ünver, 2009). The branch of the deep-state in this period strongly linked to the military was JITEM (Gendarmerie Intelligence and Counterterrorism, *Jandarma İstihbarat ve Terörle Mücadele*). The bombing of a Kurdish bookstore in Şemdinli in 2005 by two JITEM members and the following incidents convinced many people about the existence of the JITEM organization and its activities in the Kurdish regions.

The act of preserving the fundamentals was observed also against the religiously oriented political currents, especially with the "post-modern coup" initiated on February 28, 1997 (Aydınlı, 2009). The National Security Council issued a statement warning the Islamic oriented Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*), the leading party in the coalition government, for its 'anti-secular' acts (Ünver, 2009, footnote 40). The Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan resigned on June 18 and his party was banned on January 16, 1998.

A major determinant in reshaping the understanding of Turkish citizenship has perhaps been the Kurdish movement led by the guerilla warfare of PKK, especially starting from the early 1990s till today. The war between the Turkish army and Kurdish guerillas, the political consciousness of the Kurdish masses, and the politics of the legal Kurdish oriented parties forced the Turkish state to *adapt* its understanding of Turkish citizenship to accommodate the partial demands of the Kurdish movement. This adaptation started by recognition of the existence of the Kurdish ethnic identity, allowance of Kurdish publications, radios, and televisions, and in recent years, foundation of a state owned television channel broadcasting fully in Kurdish, and opening of Kurdology departments in some state owned universities. These developments can be interpreted as the Turkish state is adapting to recognize the cultural rights of the Kurdish population. The current dispute between the Turkish state and Kurdish movement seems to be about recognizing the political representative rights. The Kurdish groups demand a political framework in which their ethnic identity will be represented on the political level and the people of their region will decide on the policies about their region in a semi-autonomous manner from the central state. The Turkish state, on the other hand, opposes to such claims based on the idea of unity of the nation state and preservation of the national identity of the state. The discussions about the terms *Türk* (Turk) and *Türkiyeli* (from Turkey) can be read in this context. It remains as a question whether the Turkish state will be further flexible and recognize the political representational rights besides the cultural, or the Kurdish movement will content with the cultural rights and accept the idea of Turkishness as a political umbrella identity, as it is the case with the idea of Iranian in Iran.

Another determinant in shaping the understanding of Turkish citizenship in the last decades has been Turkey's candidacy to the European Union (EU). Turkey applied to the EU for full membership in 1987; signed the customs union agreement with the EU on March 6, 1995 to come into effect on December 31, 1995. On December 17, 2004, the European Council decided to start

accession negotiations with Turkey on the date of October 3, 2005. The negotiations started; the earliest possible year that Turkey can join the EU is noted to be 2013, but there is also the possibility that the negotiations can last till 2020. The EU candidacy of the Turkish state is a clear indication that the Turkish state is committed to integrate with the Western world. A major step in this sense was the reforms about the National Security Council, in the direction to limit the power of military and put it under civilian control. On July 23, 2003, the Turkish National Assembly passed the seventh reform package for this purpose. This reform limited the executive and monitoring power of the council and declared it as a consultative body. Furthermore, the council could be led by a civilian. Aydınlı (2009) argues that the military itself is also experiencing a transformation in parallel to the regulations for the EU membership. He argues the progressive wing of the army advocating democratization and EU membership is replacing the traditional wing. The latter pursues the centrality of the military for preservation of the fundamental principles of the regime if necessary regardless of democracy or human rights concerns.

> To understand the 'Pashas'' readiness to adapt to this shift requires exploring an apparent gap between two groups within the military leadership. The first is a traditional conservative majority group that views the Turkish military as the ultimate guard of the *status quo* – the Republican regime, its territorial integrity, and its political parameters as established at the beginning of the Republic (e.g. secularism, assimilation into a unified national body, and the primacy of security over politics) (Aydınlı, 2009).

> The progressives are most clearly associated with Hilmi Özkök (the Turkish Chief of Staff between 2002 and 2006), and those who, like him, seek to speed up Turkey's global engagement and integration with the EU. They see a better chance for the preservation of the essence of Ataturk's revolutions via forward movement rather than an emphasis on the *status quo* (Aydınlı, 2009).

Namely, the military, bureaucracy, and government are day by day internalizing "[t]he European paradigm of civil-military relation…based on the complete separation, unquestioned subordination, and almost radical isolation of the armed forces from civilian politics" (Aydınlı, 2009). All these measures and change can be associated with the *flexibility* of the Turkish state according to the emergent political needs.

In parallel to this transformation within the military, there appear signs that the high echelons of military in Turkey are less likely to perform coups against the civil governments. Within the state bureaucracy there seems to have been a decisive attempt to clear out the potential power groups that can initiate a coup. The *Ergenekon* trial started in June 2007 against the alleged coup attempts of the ultra-nationalist clandestine network is perhaps the most important attempt in this direction. The Ergenekon network has been claimed to have members within the ex high level military officers, intelligence service, the civil state bureaucracy, politicians, academia, and media. The network is accused of "aiming to topple the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) through a military coup" (Ünver, 2009). It is remarkable that the attitude of the high echelon

officers is not negative towards such a trial, in which many ex high level officers are persecuted. The military also seems to be willing to be cleared off the clandestine groups which are not under control. However, the question remains whether the military will totally withdraw from politics or whether there will appear new forms of "post-modern coups" in the coming decades.

All these events point out the following. First, many people in Turkey are nowadays convinced that there has been a deep-state which influenced the socio-political events to promote nationalist-Kemalist political ideas. This deep-state is not a mere criminal network that infiltrated into the state institutions, but an organization that is inherent to the ideological and organizational structure of the state institutions like the military, police, secret service, bureaucracy, and politicians. This deep-state is acting behind the curtains and resorting to illegal and criminal acts. The deep-state can be interpreted as the outcome of historical *centrality of the state* in Turkish modernization. With transition to the multi-party system the central powers representing to the hard-core of the Kemalist regime organized in a less visible but still active and effective way partly behind the curtains in order to protect the *fundamental principles* of the regime. The deep-state corresponds to this behind the curtains part of the organization of the hard core nationalists within the multi-party regime.

Second, the same events reveal that there has been a struggle in the last decades between the people representing the state apparatus. At first sight, the struggle seems to take place between the ruling party, AKP, and the nationalist-Kemalist political groups, pointing out the *stress between the state bureaucracy/military and the elected* throughout the second half of the twentieth century. This view is promoted by the nationalist-Kemalist groups raising the danger of Islam against the secularist fundamentals of the Republic. A closer look, at least for the author of this thesis, reveals that the Turkish state is going into a transformation in order to eliminate the clandestine organizations within its body, to partially accommodate the demands of the Kurdish movement, and finally to comply with the requirements of the European Union standards. The developments in these directions can be related to the *flexibility* and *adaptability* of the Turkish regime to changing conditions.

The commitment of the Turkish state to integrate with the West is in contrast with the distancing of the Islamic Republic of Iran from the Western world. The Islamic Republic seems to be willing to preserve the national values and national culture in a stronger way than the Turkish state. This can perhaps be related to the existence of a *xenophobic character in the Iranian national identity* towards the external powers. In Turkey, on the other hand, the outward demarcation was more directed to the local Christians than the external powers. There appeared no such xenophobic character in Turkish national identity. A curious question is what the extent is that the Turkish state accepts being integrated with the EU. It is clear that full EU membership is not only an economic and cultural integration but also a partial political subordination, which means delivering part of the national sovereignty to an upper level political body than the Turkish nation. There have been signs

that some of the nationalist groups and some of the military will resist to the political subordination to EU. The masses seem to be convinced that membership to EU will bring economic benefits, but it is not clear whether the same masses will as easily be convinced about losing from their national and cultural identity on behalf of a European identity.

In Iran the Islamic Revolution in 1979 was a result of large mass movements by variety of political groups including religious leaders, religious and traditionally oriented urban poor, political leftist groups, workers, intellectuals, and liberals. The unification of these political groups against the Shah was quite similar to that during the Constitutional Revolution in 1906. The tradition of *mass movements in Iran* was again clearly observed in 1979. Despite the participation of variety of political groups, the government was captured by the religious clerics within a period of a few years. The Islamic Republic started the repression against the leftist and Kurdish groups which had participated as active elements during the revolution. Throughout the Islamic Republic *coercion* is intensively used. This attitude of the Islamic Republic resembles the coercion of the Pahlavi regime against any opposition. It is argued that after the revolution the "[p]olitical personalities at the very top are different, but the deeper structure of authority relations are not…Members of the political opposition still face oppression, persecution by the secret police, and even torture" (Moghaddam and Crystal, 1997). The ruling elite again did not have flexibility to accommodate different political groups within a legal political framework.

Despite the turmoil of the state apparatus during the Islamic Revolution there appeared no significant separatist tendency among the major ethnic minority, the Azerbaijanis, in Iran (Bruinessen, 1986).[79, 80] This should be considered as a consequence of the understanding of *Iranian nationalism as an umbrella identity*. "The constitution of the Islamic Republic has specific provisions guaranteeing equal rights to minority groups, such as the rights to practice minority religions and use minority languages in schools and the media and education" (Bayat, 2005). Many Azerbaijanis took high level state positions in the Islamic Republic (Olson, 2002). The current Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and his strongest opponent Mir-Hossein Mousavi are both Azerbaijani and can speak both Azeri and Persian. Mousavi, originally from Tabriz, served as the prime minister of Iran between 1981 and 1989 and is now the leader of the oppositional Green Movement.[81] The separatist tendencies occurred within the Kurdish population, however even those remained not to be significant to threaten the unity of the land. The Iran-Iraq War between 1980 and 1988 further strengthened the bonds between the Azerbaijani population and the Islamic Republic as Azerbaijan was one of the provinces from where a lot of martyrs came. Various top level leaders of government and military in the Islamic Republic are Azerbaijanis who can speak

---

[79] The Kurds and Baluchis raised demands for self-determination and autonomy (Beck, 1980; Bruinessan, 1986).

[80] The Azerbaijanis nationalist organization National Liberation Movement of Southern Azerbaijan (NLMSA, *Güney Azerbayjan Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi*) was founded "in the early 1990s by a group of political émigrés of Azeri origin from Iran. The NLMSA declared that its principle goal was the independence of Southern Azerbaijan, that is, Iran-Azerbaijan" (Olson, 2002). It is difficult to argue that this organization has a significant mass support in Iran.

[81] Media source: Euroasianet.org, June 22, 2009, "Iran: Azeris Cautious About Supporting Native Son Mousavi in Tehran Political Fight" by Shahin Abbasov, http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insightb/articles/eav062309c.shtml.

Azeri as well as Persian. This demonstrates a clear contrast to the case in Turkey that it would be quite difficult, if not impossible, to find Kurdish high level bureaucrats or military, who could speak both Kurdish and Turkish. This reflects that the citizenship in Islamic Republic is still *closer to the soil based French model* in comparison the citizenship in Turkey.

In October 1981, Ali Khamenei, the nowadays Supreme Leader of Iran, was elected as the third president of Islamic Republic and Mir-Hossein Mousavi, the leader of nowadays' Green Movement, became the prime minister of Iran. Mousavi remained the prime minister till August 1989, after the death of the Supreme Leader Ruhollah Khomeini. Ali Khamenei belonged to the right wing of the Islamic Republic elite; Mousavi belonged, from the beginning, to the left wing, which can be better identified as the reformist wing of the ruling elite. Therefore there was a conflict between the president and the prime minister throughout these eight years. In this conflict the Supreme Leader Khomeini backed Mousavi. After his death, Mousavi lost the main support against the conservative side of the elite. Ali Khamenei was elected as the new Supreme Leader by the Assembly of Experts. In July 1989, the constitution was amended and the position of prime minister was abolished. In the 1990s, under the rule of the conservative wing, the regime in Iran went into a considerable change.

> The financial burden and destructive effects of the war with Iraq, the considerable decline in gross as well as net investment, the rationing of subsidized consumption goods, the persistently high population growth, and the steady decline in *per capita* income and welfare – all in the face of rapidly declining oil prices and revenues, and increasing difficulties of obtaining foreign credit – necessitated the use of more practical economic and social policies (Katouzian, 1995).

Economically the regime opened its gates to the external world. Politically the more orthodox ulama dominated the regime and turned it into more repressive and authoritarian than it was. A clear sign of this turn was the elimination of Mousavi, the Prime-Minister of Khomeinie, from the political arena by not calling him for a high level government position after the chair of prime-ministry was abolished. Afshari states that beginning from the 1990s the regime in Iran "has tacitly allowed secular Iranians to keep their relatively modern lifestyle…in the privacy of their homes…They were…expected to remain apolitical" (Afshari, 2009).

Afshari argues that the main reason for the crisis of legitimacy of the Islamic Republic "emanates from the denial of at least two internationally recognized human rights: freedom of assembly/association and political participation" (Afshari, 2009). Afshari relates the restriction by the Guardian Council on the candidacy for presidency to the *inflexibility* of the regime: "its inflexibility undermined its legitimacy" (Afshari, 2009). The inflexibility of the state was also observed within the rule of the Pahlavi regime. The inflexibility of the Pahlavi regime was an obstacle to canalize the discontent of the masses to the legal political framework. The Islamic Republic as well aims at marginalizing the oppositional movements by relating them to external

powers and by banning oppositional activities. In May 1997, one of the leading figures of the reformists, Mohammad Khatami, was elected president with "20 million or 70%" of the votes (Kamrava, 2001). Mousavi worked as the Senior Advisor of the President throughout Khatami's presidency. The government of Khatami stressed the importance of civil society for democratization and freedom of the Iranians. The reformist forces "were boosted by the outcome of the parliamentary elections of February 2000, giving them control of the Majles" (Zubaida, 2000). In this period "the imagination of Iranian intellectuals has been captured by the origins, nature, and prospects of civil society" (Kamrava, 2001). Although the election of Khatami was considered as a victory of the reformists against the conservatives, it was reversed in August 2005, by the victory of Mahmoud Ahmedinejad in the presidential elections. Ahmedinejad, the current president in 2010, represents the religious hard-liners within the regime. The election of Ahmedinejad as the president was a setback on the reformist movement. However, the mass demonstrations immediately after the elections of presidency in June 2009 are the signs that the reformist movement in Iran is growing and gaining significant power.

The protests in July 2009 are recorded to be the largest mass demonstration ever in the Islamic Republic. It is claimed that on July 15 around three million people gathered in streets of Tehran in support of Mousavi.[82] Afshari considers the size of these protests as a sign that "[a] significant sociocultural realignment has taken place in recent years" (Afshari, 2009). The attendants of the demonstrations were not affiliated with a single political party or a group; numerous political parties, non-governmental organizations and societal networks were represented in the demonstrations and within the movement. They were a group of different social strata and political affiliations that *gathered against the ruling elite*; a similar pattern observed in the Constitutional Revolution of 1906 and in the Islamic Revolution of 1979. Afshari writes for the July 2009 demonstrations that "[t]he spectacular interruptions of public discontents occurred almost independently…The noticeable 'social-networking' was a collection of individuals sharing news, view and images. They gathered by their thousands mainly through cell phone connections and words of mouth. Individuals have been at the heart of that historic moment in Iran" (Afshari, 2009). This should be considered as a result of the *mass protest tradition in Iran* which started with the Tobacco Movement (1891) and continued with the Constitutional Revolution (1906), National Front Movement (1951), the protests led by Khomeini (1963), and the Islamic Revolution (1979). This tradition underlies the potential of individuals to start an opposition not necessarily initiated by a leading political institution. In comparison to Turkey, it seems to be more probable that masses go in the street and perform mass protest against the state in Iran.

The inflexibility and coercion of the Pahlavi regime resulted in marginalization of the oppositional groups from the legal political framework. The religious groups and leftists organized

---

[82] Media source: Time Magazine, June 15, 2009, http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1904764,00.html?xid=rss-topstories.

in underground and promoted a struggle to collapse the regime. The inflexibility and coercion of the Islamic Republic, on the other hand, are seemingly responded in a different way than going underground or aiming at the collapse of the regime. The slogans of the masses in the July 2009 demonstrations attack the leadership of Ahmedinejad rather than the regime itself. The government is called to follow the laws. The leader Mousavi criticizes the Ahmedinejad government for not following the constitution, rather than criticizing the constitution itself. The leaders of the Green Movement constantly call their followers to remain within the legal framework of protest and not to resort to violence. [83, 84] This attitude of the Green Movement leaders point out a possible change in the mass opposition tradition of Iran from aiming at collapsing the regime towards demanding reforms within the legal political frameworks.

---

[83] Media source: Iranian Labor News Agency, http://www.ilna.ir/fullStory.aspx?ID=71086.
[84] Media source: The Guardian, June 19, 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/jun/19/iran-election-mousavi-ahmadinejad.

REFERENCES

Abrahamian, E. (1982), *Iran Between Two Revolutions*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Abrahamian, E. (1999), *Tortured Confession – Prisons and Public Recantations in Modern Iran*, California: University of California Press.

Afary, J. (2004), "Armenian Social Democrats, the Democrat Party of Iran, and *Iran-i Naw*", in *Reforms and Revolutionaries in Modern Iran – New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 67-84.

Afshari. R. (2009), "A historic moment in Iran". *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 31, pp. 839-855.

Ahmad, F. (Feroz) (1999), *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*. Trans. into Turkish by Yavuz Alogan, Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.

Ahmed, F. (Feroz) (1973), "Iran: subimperialism in action", *Pakistan Forum*, vol. 3, no. 6/7, pp. 10-18+20.

Akçam, T. (2006), *A Shameful Act – The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility*, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Akçam, T. (2002), *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu – İttihat ve Terakki'den Kurtuluş Savaşı'na*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Aktar, A. (2008), *Varlık Vergisi ve 'Türkleştirme' Politikaları*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Aktar, A. (2006), *Türk Milliyetçiliği, Gayrimüslimler ve Ekonomik Dönüşüm*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Altorki, S. (2000), "The Concept and Practice of Citizenship in Saudi Arabia", in *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, ed. by Suad Joseph, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 215-236.

Amjad, M. (1989), *Iran – From Royal Dictatorship to Theocracy*, New York, London: Greenwood Press.

Anderson, L. (1986), The State and Social Transformation in Tunisia and Libya, 1830-1980, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Arat, Y. (2000), "Gender and Citizenship in Turkey", in *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, ed. by Suad Joseph, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 275-286.

Arı, K. (1995), *Büyük Mübadele – Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç (The Big Population Exchange – Compulsory Migration to Turkey)*, (Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1995).

Arkoun, M. (2002), "Locating civil society in Islamic contexts", in *Civil Society in the Muslim World – Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Amyn B. Sajoo, London, New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, pp. 35-60.

Asgharzadeh, A. (2007), *Iran and the Challenge of Diversity – Islamic Fundamentalism, Aryanist Racism, and Democratic Struggles*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 121-129.

Ashraf, A. (2006), "Iranian Identity – iv. 19th-20th Centuries". *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Online Edition, December 15, 2006, available at http://www.iranica.com/articles/iranian-identity-iv-19th-20th-centuries.

Atabaki, T. (2004), "The Caliphate, the Clerics and Republicanism in Turkey and Iran – Some Comparative Remarks", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 44-64.

Atabaki, T. and Zürcher, E.J. (2004), "Introduction", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization Under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, ed. by Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd. Publishers, pp. 1-12.

Atabaki, T., (2000), *Azerbaijan – Ethnicity and the Struggle for Power in Iran*, Great Britain, Cornwall: I. B. Taurus and Co Lt.

Aydınlı, E. (2009), "A pragmatic shift for the Turkish generals and an end to the coup era in Turkey". *Middle East Journal*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 581-596.

Baban, F. (2005), "Community, citizenship and identity in Turkey", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 52-69.

Başkaya, F. (1997), *Paradigmanın İflası - Resmi İdeolojinin Eleştirisine Giriş*. Istanbul: Doz Basım ve Yayın Ltd. Şti.

Başkaya, F. (2004), *Yediyüz – Osmanlı Beyliğinden 28 Şubat'a: Bir Devlet Geleneğinin Anatomisi*. Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı, Ankara: Maki Basım Yayın.

Bayat, K. (2003), "Riza Shah and the Tribes – An Overview", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 213-219.

Bayat, K. (2005), "The ethnic question in Iran", *Middle East Report,* vol. 237, winter 2005, pp. 42-45.

Beck, L. (1980), "Revolutionary Iran and its tribal peoples", *MERIP Reports,* no. 87, *Iran's Revolution: The Rural Dimension*, May 1980, pp. 14-20.

Beck, L. (1990), "Tribes and the State in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Iran", in *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*, ed. by Philip S. Khoury and Joseph Kostiner, USA: University of California Press, pp. 185-225.

Behdad, S. (1992), "Review". *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 702-704: Review of *Oil, State and Industrialization in Iran* by Massoud Karshenas, (Cambridge: Cambridge Uni-versity Press, 1990).

Behrooz, M. (2004), "The Iranian Revolution and the Legacy of the Guerrilla Movement", in *Reforms and Revolutionaries in Modern Iran – New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 189-205.

Bendix, R. (1964), *Nation-Building and Citizenship*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York, London, Sydney.

Berkes, N. (1972), *100 Soruda Turkiye İktisat Tarihi, 1. Cilt*, Gercek Yayınevi.

Bora, T. (1999), *Türk Sağının Üç Hali – Milliyetçilik Muhafazakarlık, İslamcılık*. Istanbul: Birikim Yayinlar.

Bora, T. (2006), *Medeniyet Kaybı – Milliyetçilik ve Faşizm Üzerine Yazılar*. Istanbul: Birikim Yayinlari.

Boroujerdi, M. (1996), *Iranian Intellectuals and the West – The Tormented Triumph of Nativism*, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Boroujerdi, M. (2003), "Triumphs and Travails of Authoritarian Modernisation in Iran", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 146-154.

Brice, W.C. (1954), "The Population of Turkey in 1950". *The Geographicl Journal*, vol. 120, no. 3, pp. 347-352.

Brubaker, W.R. (1990), "Immigration, Citizenship, and the Nation-state in France and Germany: a Comparative Historical Analysis". *International Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 379-407.

Butenschon, N.A. (2000), "State, Power, and Citizenship in the Middle East: A Theoretical Introduction", in *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*, ed. by Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis, and Manuel Hassassian, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 3-27.

Caymaz, B. (2007), *Turkiye'de Vatandaşlık – Resmi İdeoloji ve Yansımaları*, Istanbul: Bilgi Universitesi Yayinlari.

Chaqueri, C. (1999), "Did the Soviets Play a Role in Founding the Tudeh Party in Iran?". *Cahiers du Monde Russe*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 497-528.

Charrad, M.M. (2000), "Becomin a Citizen: Lineage Versus Individual in Tunisian and Morocco", in *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, ed. by Suad Joseph, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 33-57.

Chehabi, H. (2004), "Dress Codes for Men in Turkey and Iran", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 209-238.

Chehabi, H.E. (1990), *Iranian Politics and Religious Modernism – The Liberation Movement of Iran under the Shah and Khomeini*, Cornell University Press: Ithaca, New York.

Cleveland, W.L., (2008), *Modern Ortadoğu Tarihi*, trans. by Mehmet Harmancı, Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığğ (Original: A History – The Modern Middle East, 2004, Colorado: Westviews Press) .

Cohen, M. and Michael, H. (1996) "Politics, Industrialization and Citizenship: Unemployment Policy in England, France and the United States, 1890-1950", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 91-129.

Cottam, R.W. (1964), *Nationalism in Iran*, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.

Cronin, S. (2003a), "Introduction", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 1-12.

Cronin, S. (2003b), "Riza Shah and the Disintegration of Bakhtiyari Power in Iran, 1921-1934", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 241-268.

Cronin, S. (2004), "Introduction", in *Reformenrs and Revelotionaries in Modern Iran: New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 1-15.

Cronin, S. (2004b), "Iran's Forgotten Revolutionary – Abulqasim Lahuti and the Tabriz Insurrection of 1922", in *Reforms and Revolutionaries in Modern Iran – New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 118-146.

Cronin, S. (2004c), "The Army, Civil Society and the State in Iran", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 130-163.

Çadırcı, M., (2007), *Tanzimat Sürecinde Türkiye Ülke Yönetimi*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.

Çağaptay, S. (2007), "Turkluğe Geçis: Modern Turkiye'de Göç ve Din", in *Vatandaşlık ve Etnik Çatışma – Ulus-Devletin Sorgulanması*, ed. by H. Gülalp, Istanbul: Metis Yayinları, pp. 86-111.

Çolak, Y. (2005), "Citizenship between secularism and Islamism in Turkey", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 242-266.

Davis, U. (1997), *Citizenship and the State: A Comparative Study of Citizenship Legislation in Israel, Jordan, Palestine, Syria and Lebanon*, Garnet Publishing Ltd.: Berkshire, UK., pp. 1-38, 179-206.

Davis, Uri (2000), "Conceptions of Citizenship in the Middle East: State, Nation, and People", in *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*, ed. by Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis, and Manuel Hassassian, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 49-69.

Deringil, S., (2007), *Simgeden Millete – II Abdulhamid'den Mustafa Kemal'e Devlet ve Millet*, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

Downing, B.M. (1998) "War and the State in Early Modern Europe", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 25-54.

Dubuis, L. (2000), La République Métissée: Citizenship, Colonialism, and the Borders of French History, *Cultural Studies*, 14(1): 15-34.

Dündar, F., (2002), *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikasi (1913-1918)*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ebbinghaus, B. (1996) "The Siamese Twins: Citizenship Rights, Cleavage Formation, and Party-Union Relations in Western Europe", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 51-89.

Elliot, M. (2004), "New Iran and the Dissolution of Party Politics under Reza Shah", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 65-97.

Erden, M.S. (2004), "The Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations in the 1920s and its Socio-Economic Impacts on Life in Anatolia", *Crime, Law, and Social Change*, 41: 261-282.

Ergut, F. (2004), *Modern Devlet ve Polis – Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Toplumsal Denetimin Diyalektiği*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Esendemir, S. (2008), *Turkiye'de ve Dünyada Vatandaşlık – Eski Sorular Yeni Arayışlar*, Ankara: Birlesik Yayınevi.

Farmanfarma, A. (1954), "Constitutional law of Iran", *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 241-247.

Ghods, M.R. (1989), *Iran in the Twentieth Century – Apolitical History*, Boulder: Lynne Riener Publishers, London: Adamantine Press Limited.

Göle, N. (1994), "Authoritarian secularism and Islamist politics: The case of Turkey", in *Civil Society in the Middle East*, ed. by Augustus Richard Norton, Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, pp. 17-43.

Gourevitch, P.A. (1998) "The Political Sources of Democracy: The Macropolitics of Microeconomic Policy Disputes", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 210-229.

Gülalp, H. (2007), "Giriş: Milliyete Karşı Vatandaşlık", in *Vatandaşlık ve Etnik Çatışma – Ulus-Devletin Sorgulanması*, ed. by H. Gülalp, Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 11-34.

Halliday, F. (2004), "The Iranian Left in International Perspective", in *Reforms and Revolutionaries in Modern Iran – New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 19-36.

Harik, I. (1987), "The Origins of the Arab State", in *The Foundations of the Arab State*, ed. by Ghassan Salamé, London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm Ltd., pp. 19-46.

Hatem, M.F. (2000), "The Pitfalls of the Nationalist Discourses on Citizenship in Egypt", in *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, ed. by Suad Joseph, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 33-57.

Heper, M., (2006), *Turkiye'de Devlet Geleneği*, Doğubatı Yayınları.

Hermassi, E. (1987), "State-building and Regime Performance in the Greater Maghreb", in *The Foundations of the Arab State*, ed. by Ghassan Salamé, London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm Ltd., pp. 75-88.

Hoodfar, H. (2000), "Iranian Women at the Intersection of Citizenship and the Family Code", in *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, ed. by Suad Joseph, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 287-313.

Horniker, A.L. (1944), "The Corps of Janizaries". *Military Affairs*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 177-204.

Ikegami, E. (1996) "Citizenship and National Identity in Early Meiji Japan, 1868-1889: A Comparative Assessment", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 185-221.

İpek, N. (2000), *Mübadele ve Samsun (~Population Exchange and Samsun)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

İslamoğlu, H.C., (2007), "Hukuk, piyasa, siyaset üçleminin yeniden düşünülmesi ve bir liberalizm eleştirisi", in *Tarihsel Sosyoloji – Stratejiler, Sorunsallar e Paradigmalar*, ed. by Ferdan Ergut and Ayşen Uysal, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Janoski, T. (1998), *Citizenship and Civil Society: A Framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional, and Social Democratic Regimes*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Kadıoğlu, A. (1999), *Cumhuriyet İdaresi Demokrasi Muhakemesi*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kadıoğlu, A. (2005), "Can we envision Turkish citizenship as non-membership?", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 103-123.

Kadıoğlu, A. (2008), "Turkiye'de Vatandaşlığın Anatomisi", in *Vatandaslığın Dönüşümü – Üyelikten Haklara*, ed. by A. Kadıoğlu, Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 167-184.

Kadıoğlu, A. (2008), "Vatandaşlığın Ulustan Arındırılması: Turkiye Örneği". *Vatandaşlığın Dönüşümü – Üyelikten Haklara*, ed. by A. Kadıoğlu, Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 31-54.

Kahraman, H.B. (2005), "The cultural and historical foundation of Turkish citizenship – Modernity as westernization" in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 70-86.

Kalaycıoğlu, E. (2002), "State and Civil Society in Turkey: Democracy, Development and Protest", in *Civil Society in the Muslim World – Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Amyn B. Sajoo, London, New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, pp. 247-272.

Kamali, M. (2001), "Civil Society and Islam: a Sociological Perspective". *European Journal of Sociology*, 42: 457-482.

Kamali, M. (1998), *Revolutionary Iran: Civil Society and State in the Modernization Process*, England, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Kamrava, M. (2001), "The civil society discourse in Iran", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 165-185.

Kaplanoğlu, R. (1999), *Bursa'da Mübadele (~Population Exchange in Bursa)*, İstanbul: Avrasya Etnografya Vakfı Yayınları.

Karpat, H.K. (2006), *Osmanlı'da Değişim, Modernleşme ve Ulusallaşma*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.

Karshenas, M. (1990), *Oil, State and Industrialization in Iran*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katouzian, H., (1995), "Problems of political development in Iran: democracy, dictatorship or arbitrary government?", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1/2, pp. 5-20.

Katouzian, H, (1997), "Arbitrary Rule: a Comparative Theory of State, Politics and Society in Iran", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 24 (1): 49-73.

Katouzian, H. (2003), "Riza Shah's Political Legitimacy and Social Base, 1921-1942", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 15-36.

Katouzian, H. (2004), "State and Society under Reza Shah", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 13-43.

Katouzian, H. (2004b), "The Strange Politics of Khalil Maleki", in *Reforms and Revolutionaries in Modern Iran – New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 165-188.

Kaynar, M. (2001), *Devletin Milleti ve Ülkesi*, Ankara: Maki Basın Yayın, Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı: 33.

Kazemi, F. (1994), "Civil society and Iranian politics", in *Civil Society in the Middle East*, ed. by Augustus Richard Norton, Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, pp. 119-152.

Keddie, N.R. (1981), *Roots of Revolution: An Interpretive History of Modern Iran*, New York: Yale University Press.

Keddie, N.R (1982), "Comments on Skocpol". *Theory and Society*, 11: 285-292.

Keddie, N.R. (1999), *Qajar Iran and The Rise of Reza Khan*, California: Mazda Publishers.

Keddie, N.R. (1998) "Ideology, Society and the State in Post-Colonial Muslim Societies", in *State and Ideology in the Middle East and Pakistan*, ed. by Fred Halliday and Hamza Alavi, Monthly Review Press, New York, pp. 9-30.

Keyder, Ç. (1998), "Class and State in the Transformation of Modern Turkey", in *State and Ideology in the Middle East and Pakistan*, ed. by Fred Halliday and Hamza Alavi, Monthly Review Press, New York, pp. 191-221.

Keyman, E. F. (2005), "Articulating citizenship and identity – The "Kurdish question" in Turkey", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 267-288.

Keyman, E.F. (2008), "Türkiye'de Cokkültürlü Anayasal Vatandaşlık ve Demokratikleşme", in *Vatandaşlığın Dönüşümü – Üyelikten Haklara*, ed. by A. Kadıoğlu, Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 218-244.

Keyman, E. F. and İçduygu, A. (2005), "Introduction: citizenship, identity, and the question of democracy in Turkey", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 1-27.

Koçak, C. (2004), "Some Views on the Turkish Single-Party Regime During the Inonu Period (1938-45)", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 113-129.

Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2003), National and European Citizenship: The Italian Case in Historical Perspective, *Citizenship Studies,* 7 (1): 85-109.

Lapidus, I.M. (2002), *A History of Islamic Societies*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, Second Edition, pp. 469-511.

Longva, A.N. (2000), "Citizenship in the Gulf States: Conceptualization and Practice", in *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*, ed. by Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis, and Manuel Hassassian, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 179-197.

Mahdi, A.A. (2003), Review of *Human Rights in Iran: The Abuse of Cultural Relativism* by Reza Afshari, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 192-196.

Mahoney, J. (2000), "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology". *Theory and Society*, vol. 29, pp. 507-548.

Maktabi, R. (2000), "State Formation and Citizenship in Lebanon", in *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*, ed. by Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis, and Manuel Hassassian, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 146-178.

Mann, M. (1984), "The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results". *European Journal of Sociology*, vol. 25, pp. 185-213.

Mann, M. (1987), Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship, *Sociology*, 21 (3): 339-354.

Marashi, A. (2003), "Performing the Nation – The Shah's Official State Visit to Kemalist Turkey, June to July 1934", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 99-119.

Mardin, Ş. (1969), "Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 258-281.

Mardin, Ş., (2007), *Türk Modernleşmesi*, Istanbul: İletiŞim Yayınları.

Marshall, T.H. (1992), *Citizenship and Social Class*, (London: Plute Press), pp.1-51.

Martin, V. (2003), "Mudarris, Republicanism and the Rise to power of Riza Khan, Sardar-i Sipah", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 65-77.

Marx, A.W. (1996) "Contested Citizenship: The Dynamics of Racial Identity and Social Movements", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 159-183.

Marshall, T.H. (1992), *Citizenship and Social Class*, (London: Plute Press), pp.1-51.

Matin-Asgari, A. (2004), "From Social Democracy to Social Democracy", in *Reforms and Revolutionaries in Modern Iran – New Perspectives on the Iranian Left*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, London: RoutledgeCurzon, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 37-64.

Matthee, R. (2003), "Transforming Dangerous Nomads into useful Artisans, Technicians, Agricuturalists – Education in the Reza Shah Period", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 123-145.

Mir-Hosseini, Z. (1996), "Stretching the Limits: A Feminist Reading of the *Shari'a* in Post-Khomeini Iran", in *Feminism and Islam – Legal and Literary Perspectives*, ed. by Mai Ymani, New York: New York University Press, pp. 285-319.

Mirsepassi, A. (2000), *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization – Negotiating Modernity in Iran*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mische, A. (1996) "Projecting Democracy: The Formation of Citizenship Across Youth Networks in Brazil", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 131-158.

Moghaddam, F.M and Crystal, D.S. (1997), "Revolutions, Samurai, and Reductons: The Paradoxes of Change and Continuity in Iran and Japan". *Political Psychlogy*, 18 (2): 355-384.

Mouffe, C. (1992), Democratic Citizenship and the Political Community, in *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*, ed. by C. Mouffe, (London: Verso), pp.225-239.

Moore, B.J. (1993), *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy – Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Münch, R. (2001), *Nation and Citizenship in the Global Age*, New York: Palgrave, Printed in Great Britain.

Natali, D. (2002), "*Kurdayeti* in the Late Ottoman and Qajar Empires". *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 177-199.

Olson, R. (2002), "The 'Azeri' question and Turkey-Iran relations, 2000-2002", *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 61-85.

Oran, B. (2004), *Turkiye'de Azinliklar – Kavramlar, Teori, Lozan, Ic Mavzuat, Ictihat, Uygulama*, Iletisim Yainlari, Istanbul

Ortaylı, İ. (1999), *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Pfaff, R.H. (1963), "Disengagement from traditionalism in Turkey and Iran", *The Western Political Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 79-98

Parsi, R. (2000), "Reformin Society: Intellectuals and Nation-Building in Turkey and Iran", in *Between Europe and Islam - Shaping Modernity in a Transcultural Space*, ed. by Almut Höfert and Armando Salvatore, Preses Interuniversitaires Européennes, Brussels, pp. 109-140.

Perry, J.R. (1985), "Language reform in Turkey and Iran." *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* vol. 17, pp. 295-311.
Perry, J.R. (2001), "Introduction". *Asian Folklore Studies*, vol. 60, pp. 191-202.

Ross, G. (1998) "Fin de Siécle Globalization, Democratization, and the Moore Theses: A European Case Study", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 230-255.

Ross, G., Skocpol, T., Smith, T., and Vichniac, J.E. (1998) "Barrington Moore's *Social Origins* and Beyond: Historical Social Analysis since the 1960s", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 5-21.

Rostam-Kolayi, J. (2003), "Expanding Agendas for the 'New' Iranian Women – Family Law, Work, and Unveiling", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 157-180.

Rustow, D.A. (2004, original: 1959), "The Army and the Founding of the Turkish Republic", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 164-208.

Salamé, G. (1987), "'Strong' and 'Weak' States, a Qualified Return to the Mudaddimah", in *The Foundations of the Arab State*, ed. by Ghassan Salamé, London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm Ltd., pp. 205-240.

Savran, S. (1985), "Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriteye: Türkiye'de Burjuva Devrimi Sorunu". *11. Tez*, No 1, pp. 172-214.

Savran, S. (1987), "1960, 1971, 1980: Toplumsal Mücadeleler, Askeri Müdaheleler". *11. Tez,* No. 6, pp. 132-168.

Shaffer, B. (2008), *Sınırlar ve Kardeşler – İran ve Azerbaycanlı Kimliği*, trans. by Ali Gara and Vusal Kerimov, Istanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayinlari. (Original: *Borders and Brethren: Iran and the Challenge of Azerbaijani Identity*, Belfer Center and Science for International Affairs, 2002)

Shambayati, H. (1994), "The Rentier State, Interest Groups, and the Paradox of Autonomy: State and Business in Turkey and Iran". *Comparatice Politics*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 307-331.

Shambayati, H. (2004), "A tale of two mayors: courts and politics in Iran and Turkey", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 36, pp. 253-275.

Skocpol, T. (1997), *Social Revolutions in the Modern World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skocpol, T. (1998), "Did the Civil War Further American Democracy? A Reflection on the Expansion of Benefits for Union Veterans", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 73-101.

Smith, T. (1998), "The International Origins of Democracy: The American occupation of Japan and Germany", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 191-209.

Sohrabi, N. (1995) "Historical Revolution: Constitutional Revolutions in the Ottoman Empire, Iran, and Russia, 1905-1908". *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 100, no. 6, pp. 1382-1447.

Sohrabi, N. (2002), "Global waves, local actors: what the Young Turks knew about other revolutions and why it mattered", *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, vol. 2, pp. 45-79.

Soner, B. A. (2005), "Citizenship and the minority question in Turkey", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 289-311.

Soyarık-Şentürk, N. (2005), "Legal and constitutional foundations of Turkish citizenship – Changes ans continuities", in *Citizenship in a Global World – European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, ed. by E.F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 124-143.

Steinberg, M.W. (1996) ""The Great End of All Government…": Working People's Construction of Citizenship Claims in Early Nineteenth-Century England and the Matter of Class", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 19-50.

Süvari, Ö. (2000), *Ekonomide 'Gizli El' Askeri Sanayi Kompleks*, Ankara: Maki Basım Yayın Ltd. Şti., Özgür Üniversite Defterleri: 4.

Tanör, B. (2006), *Osmanlı-Türk Anayasal Gelişmeleri*, Istanbul: Yapi Kredi Yayınları, Cogito.

Tapper, R. (2003), "The Case of the Shahsevan", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 220-240.

Tilly, C. (1993), *European Revolutions*, Blackwell Publishers: Oxford, Cambridge (Massachusetts), pp. 1-51.

Tilly, C. (1996) "Citizenship, Identity and Social History", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 1-17.

Tilly, C. (1996) "The Emergence of Citizenship in France and Elsewhere", ed. by Charles Tilly, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 223-236.

Tilly, C. (1998) "Where Do Rights Come From", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 55-72.

Timur, T., (1996), *Osmanlı Çalışmaları – İlkel Feodalizmden Yarı Sömürge Ekonomisine*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayinlari.

Toprak, Binnaz (1994), "Civil society in Turkey", in *Civil Society in the Middle East*, ed. by Augustus Richard Norton, Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, pp. 87-118.

Turner, B.S. (1990), Outline of the Theory of Citizenship, *Sociology* 24 (2):189, 217.

Turner, B.S. (2000), "Islam, Civil Society, and Citizenship: Reflections on the Sociology of Citizenship and Islamic Studies", in *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*, ed. by Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis, and Manuel Hassassian, Syracuse University Press: New York, pp. 28-48.

Upton, J.M. (1970), *The History of Modern Iran – An Interpretation*, Harvard Middle Eastern Monograph Series, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Ünver, H.A. (2009), "Turkey's 'deep-state' and the Ergenekon Conundrum". *The Middle East Institute Policy Brief*, no. 23, April 2009, pp. 1-25.

Üstel, F. (2009), *"Makbul Vatandaş"ın Peşinde*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Vichniac, J.E. (1998), "Religious Toleration and Jewish Emancipation in France and in Germany", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 167-188.

Van Bruinessen, M. (1986), "The Kurds between Iran and Iraq". *MERIP Middle East Report*, no. 141, *Hidden Wars* (July-August 1986), pp. 14-27.

Walzer, M. (1998) "Intellectuals, Social Classes, and Revolutions", in *Democracy, Revolution, and History*, ed. by Theda Skocpol, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 127-142.

Wilber, D.N. (1981), *Iran Past and Present – From Monarchy to Islamic Republic*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeron University Press, Ninth Edition.

Yeğen, M. (1999), *Devlet Soyleminde Kürt Sorunu*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yeğen, M. (2004), "Citizenship and ethnicity in Turkey", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 6, 51-66.

Yeğen, M. (2006), *Müstakbel Türk'ten Sözde Vatandaşa*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yıldız, A. (2001), *Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Zirinsky, M. (2003), "Riza Shah's Abrogation of Capitulations, 1927-1928", in *The Making of Modern Iran – State and Society under Riza Shah, 1921-1941*, ed. by Stephanie Cronin, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 81-98.

Zubaida, S. (2000), "Trajectories of Political Islam: Egypt, Turkey and Iran". *The Political Quarterly*, 71(s1): 60-78.

Zubaida, S. (1989), Islam, The People and The State: Essays on Political Ideas and Movements , Routledge: London, New York, pp. 121-182.

Zunes, S. (2009), "Iran's history of civil insurrections", *The Huffington Post*, June 19, 2009, internet address: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stephen-zunes/irans-history-of-civil-in_b_217998.html, last accessed on May 31, 2010.

Zürcher, E.J. (1994), *Turkey- A Modern History*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd. Publishers.

Zürcher, E.J. (2004), "Institution Building in the Kemalist Republic: The Role of the People's Party", in *Men of Order – Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, ed. by T. Atabaki and E.J. Zürcher, London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, pp. 98-112.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Erden, Mustafa Suphi
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 21 October 1977, Ankara
Marital Status: Single
Phone: +90 542 631 96 49
email: mustafasuphi.erden@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
PHD	METU Electrical and Electronics Engineering	2006
MS	METU Electrical and Electronics Engineering	2001
BS	METU Electrical and Electronics Engineering	1999
High School	İzmir Scientific High School, İzmir	1995

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2010- Present	École Nationale Supérieure de Techniques Avancées – Paris Tech, Paris, France	Post-doc Researcher
2007-2010	BioMechanical Engineering, Faculty of Mech. Eng., TU Delft, The Netherlands	Post-doc Researcher
1999-2006	METU Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering	Research Assistant

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English, intermediate Dutch, beginner German, beginner French

THESES

1. Erden, Mustafa Suphi, *PhD Thesis – Six-Legged Walking Machine: The Robot-EA308*, METU, Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, July 2006.

2. Erden, Mustafa Suphi, *MS Thesis – Conflict Resolution in Air Traffic Management*, METU, Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, September 2001.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS

Robotics

1. Erden, M.S. and Tomiyama, T., **2010**. "Human intent detection and physically-interactive control of a robot without force sensors". *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 26(2): 370-382, (April 2010), ISSN: 1552-3098, DOI: 10.1109/TRO.2010.2040202.

2. Erden, M.S. and Tomiyama, T., **2009**. "Identifying welding skills for training and assistance with robot". *Science and Technology of Welding and Joining*, 14 (6): 523-532. DOI 10.1179/136217109X437150.

3. Erden, M.S. and Leblebicioğlu, K., **2008**. "Free gait generation with reinforcement learning for a six-legged robot." *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 56: 199-212, DOI:10.1016/j.robot.2007.08.001.

4. Erden, M.S. and Leblebicioğlu, K., **2007**. "Analysis of wave gaits for energy efficiency." *Autonomous Robots*, 23 (3): 213-230, DOI: 10.1007/s10514-007-9041-z.

5. Erden, M.S. and Leblebicioğlu, K., **2007**. "Torque distribution in a six-legged robot." *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 23 (1): 179-186.

6. Erden, M.S., Leblebicioğlu, K., Halıcı, U., **2004**. "Multi-agent system based fuzzy controller design with genetic tuning for a service mobile manipulator robot in the hand-over task." *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems*, 38: 287-306.

Function Modeling and Design

7. Van Beek,.T., Erden, M.S., and Tomiyama, T., **2010**. "Modular design of mechatronic systems with function modeling". Accepted for publication in *Mechatronics,* DOI:10.1016/j.mechatronics.2010.02.002.

8. Cabrera, A.A.A., Foeken, M.J., Tekin, O.A., Woestenenk, K., Erden, M.S., De Schutter, B., Van Tooren, M.J.L., Babuska, R., van Houten, F.J.A.M., and Tomiyama, T., **2010**. "Towards automation of control software: a review of challenges in mechatronic design". Accepted for publication in *Mechatronics,* DOI:10.1016/j.mechatronics.2010.05.003.

9. Erden, M.S, Komoto, H., van Beek, T.J., D'Amelio, V., Echavarria, E. and Tomiyama, T., **2008**. "A review of function modeling: approaches and applications". *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing,* 22: 147–169, DOI: 10.1017/S0890060408000103.

Social Science

10. Erden, M.S., **2004**. "The exchange of Greek and Turkish populations in the 1920s and its socio-economic impacts on life in Anatolia." *Crime, Law & Social Change* 41: 261–282.

BOOK CHAPTER

Erden, M.S., Leblebicioğlu, K., **2006**. "Multi legged walking in robotics and dynamic gait pattern generation for a six-legged robot with reinforcement learning." Book chapter in *Mobile Robots: New Research*, Nova Publishers, New York, (ISBN: 1-59454-359-3).

EDITED PROCEEDING

Özgen, C., Leblebicioğlu, K. and Erden, M.S., **2002**. *Otomatik Kontrol Ulusal Toplantısı – TOK Bildiriler Kitabı (Proceedings of the National Conference of Automatic Control)*, 9- 11 September, Ankara.

A CONFERENCE PAPER RELATED TO SOCIAL SCIENCE

Erden, M.S., **2003**. "Positivistic tendencies due to engineering education.", In *Proceedings of ACE2003- 6th IFAC Symposium on Advances in Control Education, Oulu, Finland*, 389-394.

HOBBIES

Classical guitar, bağlama (Turkish folk instrument), chorus, reading, singing, fishing, travelling (inter-rail), swimming

TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu tezde Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıkları karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmektedir. Vatandaşlık, ulus devlet oluşumu ve etnik homojenleştirme süreçleriyle yakından ilişkilidir. Bu iki ülkedeki vatandaşlık yirminci yüzyılın başındaki ulus devletin kurulumu, yirminci yüzyıl boyuncaki ulus oluşum süreci, ve bu süreçler boyunca devlet toplum ilişkisini inceleyerek anlaşılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Tezde incelenen dönemler Türkiye'de 1980 İran'da 1979'a kadar olan ondokuzuncu yüzyılın son çeyreği, yirminci yüzyılın ilk yarısı ve yirminci yüzyılın son çeyreğidir. Türkiye ve İran'da ulus kimliği oluşumunun temellerinin ondokuzuncu yizyılın sonu ve yirminci yüzyılın ilk yarısında atıldığı, ulus devletin temellerinin karşılıklı olarak 1908-1945 ve 1905-1941 dönemlerinde atıldığı, yirminci yüzyılın üçüncü çeyreğinin ise temelleri atılan ulus kimliğinin ve ulus devletin değişip dönüşmeye zorlandığı düşünülmüştür.

Tezin amacı İran ve Türkiye'nin kendilerine özgü tarih ve kültürlerinin bu iki ülkedeki vatandaşlığı nasıl farklı kıldığını incelemek ve anlamaktır. Bu nedenle tezin odak noktası iki ülke tarihlerinin ve iki ülkedeki toplumların farklı olan yönleridir. Türkiye ve İran 1920 ve 1930'larda görünürde çok benzer bir modernleşme süreci yaşamalarına rağmen 1980'lerde apayrı rejimlere sahip olmuşlardır. Devlet kurucu elitlerinin iki ülkede de amaçlarının çok yakın olasına rağmen projelerini gerçekleştirmedeki başarı oranları, ulus devletlerin yöneldikleri patikalar ve toplumlarından gelen dirençler farklı olmuştur. Bu tezin araştırma sorusu bu farklılığın nedenini sorgulamaktadır: **hangi soyopolitik ve kültürel farklılıklar iki ulus devletin farklı patikalarda yol almasına yol açmış ve yirminci yüzyılın ilk üç çeyreği sonunda farklı vatandaşlık ve devlet oluşumları ortaya çıkmıştır?** Bu soruyu cevaplamak üzere ulus devlet oluşumunda etnik homojenleştirme süreçleri, kitle harketlerinin büyüklüğü ve yaygınlığı, devletin sosyopolitik gelişmeleri belirlemede ne kadar merkezi bir konumu olduğu, devlet uygulamalarına karşı oluşan toplumsal dirençler ve devletlerin değişen koşullara uyum sağlama yetenekleri karşılaştırmalı incelemenin konusu yapılmıştır. Bütün bunların iki ülkede farklı tecrübe edildiği, bu nedenle vatandaşlık oluşumunun farklılaşmasına yolaçtığı düşünülmüştür.

Tezin literatüre katkısı Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıklarını ve devlet oluşumunu karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemesidir. Bu ülkelerin tarihlerini tek başına okumakla görünmeyen bazı boyutların karşılaştırmalı bakış açısı ile görünür kılınabileceği düşünülmüştür. Türkiye ve İran birçok yönden benzerlik gösterir: ikisi de bir imparatorluk mirası üzerine kurulmuştur; ikisi de İslam toplumlarının güçlü Batı devletleri ile sınır komşusu olduğu coğrafyalarda yeralmaktadır; ikisi de Batı devletlerinin politik ve ekonomik baskısı ve etkisi altında kalmıştır; ikisi de modernleşmelerini hemen hemen aynı dönemde ve Batı devletlerinden cok sonra otoriter devletlerinin projeleri olarak yaşamıştır; ikisi de geleneksel kimlikleri ve grup bağlarını kırmayı amaçlamıştır; son olarak ikisinin de toplumunun çoğunluğu Müslüman'dır. Bu özellikler Türkiye ve İran'ı Batı ülkelerinden

ve modernleşmelerini daha geç tamamlayan Orta Doğu ve Kuzey Afrika ülkelerinden farklı bir yere koymaktadır.

Sözü edilen benzerliklere rağmen İran'daki Pehlevi Rejimi 1979'da İslam Devrimi ile son bulurken Turkiye'deki Kemalist Rejim sürmektedir. 1970'lerdeki ekonomik ve askeri gücüne rağmen Pehlevi rejimi neden çökmüştür? Üç askeri darbenin yaşandığı, anayasasının iki kere tamamiyle değiştirildiği Kemalist rejim yirmibirinci yüzyılda ayakta kalmayı nasıl başarmıştır? Bu soruların cevabı, iki ülkenin bütün benzerliklerine rağmen, farklı olan sosyal, tarihsel, kültürel unsurlarında aranmalıdır. Bu tezde bu iki ülkeyi karşılaştırma unsuru olarak öne çıkarılan farklılıklar şunlardır: Osmanlı devleti Qajar devletine göre daha merkeziydi ve daha gelişmiş bir bürokrasiye sahipti; Türkiye'deki etnik homojenleştirme süreci Müslüman olmayan gruplara uygulanan bir etnik temizleme sürecini içerdi; İran'da güçlü kitle hareketleri ve bölgesel otonom oluşumlar gerçekleşti; yirminci yüzyıl başında İran'da Osmanlı'dakinden çok daha fazla göçebe aşiret toplulukları vardı; İran toplumunun çoğunluğu İslam'ın Şii meshebinden iken Türkiye toplumunun çoğunluğu Sunni mesheindendir; İrani'da *bazaari* denilen esnafın ve dini liderler olan ulemanın örgütlü sosyal ağları Türkiye'dekilere göre çok daha güçlüydü; İran'daki politik sol hareketler Türkiye'dekilere göre daha güçlüydü; İran İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Sovyetler ve İngilizler tarafından işgal edildi ve İran devleti önemli bir darbe aldı; son olarak yirminci yüzyılın ikinci yarısında İran devleti önemli ölçüde petrol gelirine sahip oldu. Bu unsurlar iki ulkenin kendilerine has özellikleri olarak göze çarpmaktadır. Bu farklılıklar bir yanda Türkiye'de İran'a göre devletin daha merkezi bir konumda olduğuna, öte yanda İran'da toplumsal hareketlilik ve muhalefetin Türkiye'ye göre daha etkili olduğuna işaret etmektedir. Bu tez işaret edilen bu farklılığı bu unsurları yakından inceleyerek görünür kılmaya çalışmaktadır.

Turkiye ve İran'daki ulus-devlet oluşum süreçlerinin en belirgin farklılığı Türkiye'de cılız bir toplumsal muhalefet geleneğinin karşısında güçlü merkezi bir devlet geleneğinin ve yagın bir bürokrasinin bulunması, İran'da ise örgütlü ve yaygın toplumsal ağların ve güçlü bir toplumsal muhalefet geleneğinin karşısında daha az merkezi bir devletin ve daha az güçlü bir bürokrasinin yeralmasıdır. Burada belirleyici olan bir yanda devletlerin homojenleştirme ve modernleştirme projelerinin gücü ve yaygınlığı, öte yanda devletin projelerine gösterilen toplumsal direncin etkinliğidir. Türkiye devleti modernleştirme projesini İran devletine kıyasla daha yaygın ve yoğun olarak gerçekleştirmiştir. İran'da ise toplumsal muhalafet odakları devletin modernleştirme projesine daha güçlü ve etkili bir direnç göstermiştir. Türkiye'de 1920'lerde kurulan rejimin hala devam ettiği, İran'da kurulan rejimin tabandan gelen toplumsal hareketlerin devrimi ile yıkıldığı gözönünde bulundurulmalıdır. Bu tezdeki "güçlü/güçsüz devlet" ve "güçlü/güçsüz muhalefet" gibi niteleyenler mutlak belirleyiciler olarak değil, Türkiye ve İran'ı karşılaştıran göreceli belirleyiciler olarak okunmalıdır. Türkiye'de güçlü devletten söz edildiğinde "İran'dakine göre güçlü devlet" denilmek istenmekte, "İran'da güçlü muhalefet" denildiğinde "Türkiye'dekine göre güçlü muhalefet" denilmek istenmektedir.

Ondokuzuncu yüzyılın başında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki potansiyel muhalefet odaklarının ortadan kaldırılması, Mustafa Kemal döneminde reformların daha yaygın bir şekilde ve güçlü bir toplumsal muhalefetle karşılaşmadan yaşanması, Türkiye'nin İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda işgal edilmemesi ve rejim sekteye uğramadan çok partili sisteme geçilmesi, çok partili sistem içinde rejimin sınırlarının askeri bürokratik elitler tarafından darbelerle yeniden belirlenmesi Türkiye'de devletin merkezi konumuna işaret eden etmenlerdir. Bu dönemde tabandan gelen bir toplumsal politik hareketliliğin olmaması dikkat çekicidir. İran'dakine göre çok daha cılız olan toplumsal muhalefet odakları önce bastırılmış, sonra rejime sadık partiler aracılığıyla yasal politik düzlem içine çekilmiş, en sonunda da devlet tarafından tanımlanan ve değiştirilen politik özgürlük sınırları içinde tutulmuştur. Bu sürecin önemli belirleyenleri sosyopolitik sitemin devlet trafından tepeden aşağı doğru oluşturulması, güçlü toplumsal hareketlerin bulunmaması ve yeni durumlar karşısında devletin sisteme ayar yaparak temel değerlerini koruyabilmesidir.

Son dönem Kajar İmparatorluğu'nda toplumsal güç odaklarının yerinde duruyor olması ve devlet düzenlemelerine karşı güçlü toplumsal hareketlerin yeralması, Rıza Şah'ın reformlarının güçlü toplumsal muhalefet sonucu Türkiye'ye göre daha güçsüz kalması, İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra devletin otoritesini yitirdiği bir dönemde toplumsal hareketliliğin canlanması, Muhammed Rıza Şah'ın toplumsal muhalefeti rejimin tanımladığı yasal sınırlar içine çekememesi, Şah'ın baskı rejiminin toplumsal hareketlerin devrimi sonucu yıkılması yirminci yüzyıl İran'ındaki güçlü toplumsal hareketler ve muhalefet geleneğine işaret eder. 1906'daki Anayasal Devrim, 1950'lerin ilk yıllarında Musadık önderliğindeki Milli Cephe Hareketi ve 1979 İslam Devrimi tepeden gelen toplumsal politik hareketliliğin sonucudur. Bu hareketlerde birbirinden farklı toplumsal güçleri birleştiren Şah rejimine ve yabancı güçlerin etkilerine karşı durmak olmuştur.

Türkiye'de devletin daha merkezi konumu ve İran'da toplumsal muhalefet hareketlerinin yaygınlığı ve gücü iki ülkenin vatandaşlık oluşumları üzerinde belirleyici olmuştur. Tezde İran ve Türkiye vatandaşlığı ile ilgili olarak şu iddiaların geçerliği gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır. İran'da vatandaşlık haklarının ilk olarak sağlanması tabandan gelen Anayasal Devrim sonucu gerçekleşmiştir. Bu nedenle İran vatandaşlığı Türk vatandaşlığından daha aktif unsurlar içerir. Bu aktiflik Milli Cephe Hareketi ve İslam Devrimi öncesi protestolarda da gözlendiği gibi devlete karşı toplumsal muhalafetin oluşması ile ilgilidir. Turk vatandaşlığı askeri bürokratik elitlerin modernleştirme projelerinin bir ürünüdür. Bu nedenle pasif karaterli ve tepeden inmeci bir yapıdadır. İran vatandaşlığı Qajar Şah rejimine karşı hakların yücetilmesi üzerine kuruludur. Türk vatandaşlığı askeri-bürokratik elitlerin ideolojilerini yayma işlevi ile yüklenmiştir. Bu nedenle Türk vatandaşlığı görevlerle yüklü iken İran vatandaşlığı haklara daha çok ağırlık verir. Rıza Şah da Mustafa Kemal gibi tepeden inmeci bir modernleşmeyi hedeflemiş ve ona uygun bir vatandaşlık empoze etmeye çalışmıştır. Rıza Şah döneminde de Türkiye'deki gibi tepeden inmeci ve pasif bir vatandaşlık politikası gözlenir. Pehlevi rejiminin modernleşme politikalarının cılız kalması ve

rejimin darbe alması sonucu İran vatandaşlığındaki aktif unsur yok olmamış yirminci yüzyılın üçüncü çeyreğinde toplumsal muhalefet olarak tekrar kendini göstermiştir.

İran 1906 Anayasal Devriminde göze çarpan bir unsur devrimi yapan güçlerin geniş bir sosyal yelpazeyi içermesidir. Bazaari'leri, ulama, İran Azerileri, Ermeniler ve bir kısım aşiretler devrimci güçlerin içinde yeralmıştır. Bu durum İranlı kimliğinin, Fars etnisitesi ile birlikte diğer etnik grupları da kapsayan bir "şemsiye kimlik" olarak anlam kazanmasını güçlendirmiştir. Türkiye'de ise etnik temizleme üzerine kurulu Türk kimliği Müslüman olmayan grupları dışlayıcı özelliğini korumuştur. Kürtler'e karşı çoğu zaman asimilasyoncu yer yer dışlayıcı olagalmıştır. Pehlevi rejimi Fars etnisitesine asimilasyon politikası gütmüştür. Bu politika Türkiye'deki gibi etnik azınlıkların kimliğinin sistematik olarak reddedilmesi derecesine varmamış ama Fars dilinin asimilasyon gücünü pekiştirmiştir. Bütün bunların ışığında Türk vatandaşlığı İran vatandaşlığına göre kan bağı üzerinden tanımlı ve dışlayıcı Alman vatandaşlığı modeline daha yakındır. İran vatandaşlığı ise Türk vatandaşlığına göre asimilasyoncu Fransız modeline daha yakındır. Bununla birlikte Türk vatandaşlığında hem dışlayıcı hem de asimilasyoncu özelliklerin güçlü şekilde yer alması İran vatandaşlığında gözlenmeyen kademeli bir vatandaşlık görüntüsü çizer: merkezde etnik Türkler, ortada asimile olması beklenmiş etnik Kürtler ve en dışta sadakatlerinin sağlanmasının imkansız olduğu düşünülen gayri-Müslimler yeralmaktadır.

Türkiye ve İran'da Devlet Oluşumu Karşılaştırması

Tükiye ve İran'daki ulus devlet oluşumu bir imparatorluk mirası üzerine kurulması nedeniyle hem Avrupa devletlerinden hem de Kuzey Afrika ve Orta Doğu'daki Müslüman toplumlu devletlerden ayrılır. İki ülkede de devlet oluşumu bir modernleşme projesi olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Modernleşme en genel anlamında bir imparatorluk devletinin ve ona karşılık gelen yaşam şeklinin bir ulus devletine ve ulusal yaşam tarzına dönüştürülmesidir. Bu iki ülkedeki devlet oluşumları da kendi tarihsel ve toplumsal özelllikleri nedeniyle birbirinden farklılık gözterir. İki ülkenin ulus devletinin oluşumunu farklı şekilde belirleyen unsurlar miras aldıkları farklı imparatorluk gelenekleri, uyguladıkları farklı etnik homojenleştirme süreçleri, devletin sürekliliğini koruyup koruyamadığı ve devletin toplumsal muhalefetlere karşı tutumudur.

Türkiye ve İran modernleşme süreçleri *oluşum*, *zorlama* ve *adaptasyon* olarak tanımlanabilecek üç aşamalı bir gelişme olarak düşünülebilir. Bu ülkelerde modernleşme modern devlet kurumlarının oluşturulması, bir ulusal kimliğin oluşturulup yayılması, Batı yaşam tarzının uyarlanması ve bir ulusal pazarın oluşturulması süreçlerini içerir. *Oluşum* evresi modern devlet kurumlarının kurulması süreci olarak her iki ülkede 1905-1924 yılları arasına karşılık gelir. Bu yıllarda ordu modernleştirilmiş, parlamentolar kurulmuş, eğitim ve yargı sekülleştirilmiştir. Bu süreçlerin başarısı ve gücü o dönem devletlerinin elindeki kaynaklarla ve verili toplum yapısıyla belirlenmiştir. Türkiye'de Kemalist Rejim altındaki modernleşme ondokuzuncu yüzyıl Osmanlı modernleşmelerinden ve Osmanlı'dan devralınan bürokrasi kadrolarından faydalanmıştır. Kemalist

Rejimin modernleşmesi geçmişle bir kopuş olmaktan çok son dönem Osmanlı modernleşmesinin bir devamı olarak yaşanmıştır. İran'da Anayasal Devrim Hareketi ve Pehlevi Rejimi ise böyle bir mirasa sahip olmamış, neredeyse bütün modernleşme programlarını sıfırdan başlatmıştır. Bu dönemlerde İran'da ilk defa bir parlemento kurulmuş, ilk defa yaygın bir bürokrasi oluşturulmaya çalışılmış, ilk defa eğitimin ve yargının sekülerleştirilmesi tartışması yaşanmış, ilk defa mecburi askerlik getirilmiş ve düzenli bir ordu kurulmuştur. Çok daha mütevazi sayılabilecek Batılılaşma adımları İran toplumu tarafından çok daha radikal değişimler olarak algılanmıştır.

İki ülke toplumu arasındaki farklar da oluşum süreçlerini etkilemiştir. Osmanlı toplumsal formasyounun önemli muhalefet odakları olan Yeniçeriler, Bektaşi tarikatları ve ulema ondokuzuncu yüzyılın ilk yarısında etkisiz hale getirilmiştir. Böylece yirminci yüzyıla gelindiğinde devlet otoritesine devlet katmanı içindeki askeri bürokratik elitten başka muhalefet gösterebilecek odak kalmamıştır. Bu da toplumsal hoşnutsuzluğun örgütlenememesi ve devlet karşısındaki toplumsal muhalefet hareketlerinin cılız kalması sonucunu doğurmuştur. Aynı dönemde İran'da sivil toplumun önderi işlevi gören ulema güçlü örgütlülüğünü korumuştur. Bunun yanısıra İran'da bazaariler, göçebe aşiretler ve bölgesel güçler muhalefet odakları olarak yeralmıştır. Bütün bu geleneksel toplumsal güçler Batı hayranı ulusalcı entellektüellerle birleşerek modernleşmenin ilk adımı olan Anayasal Devrimde aktif rol almışlardır. Aynı toplumsal güçler daha sonra Pehlevi Rejiminin batılılaşma programlarına Türkiye'de olandan daha güçlü direnç göstermişlerdir. Türkiye'de ise sosyal güçlerin katılımı olmadan devlet eliyle başlatılan modernleşme İran'daki gibi güçlü bir dirençle karşılaşmadan gerçekleşmiştir. Miras alınan devlet yapısındaki ve toplumsal yapıdaki bu farklılıklar Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ndeki modernleşme adımlarının Pehlevi İran'ındakilerden çok daha hızlı ve yaygın olmasına yol açmıştır. Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet ilan edilebilirken İran'da Rıza Şah toplumsal dirençten dolayı geri adım atmak zorunda kalmıştır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti laik bir devlete dönüşürken İran Anayasasında devletin dininin Şii İslam olduğu korunmuştur. Türkiye'de Kemalist elit Türk etnisitesi merkezli yeni bir ulus kimliği oluşturup bunu yaygınlaştırken İran'da Pehlevi rejim aynı başarıyı gösterememiştir.

Modernleşmenin *zorlama* süreci iki ülkede de etnik ve kültürel homojenleştirme olarak yaşanmıştır. Bu süreç yaklaşık olarak Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nın başından İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın sonuna, yani 1915-1945 arasına karşılık gelir. Osmanlı'nın son döneminde milliyetçi kadrolar arasında gayri-Müslim toplulukların, özellikler Ermenilerin ve Yunanların, devletin bütünlüğüne bir tehdit oluşturduğu düşüncesi hakim olmuştur. İktidardaki İttihat ve Terakki yöneticileri gayri-Müslim nüfustan "kurtulmak" istemiş, Birinci Dünya Savaşı böyle bir operasyon için uyugn ortamı sağlamıştır. Bu dönemde Ermeni Kıyımı yada Ermeni Soykırımı olarak anılan olaylarda Ermeniler katledilmiş, yerlerinden göçürülmüş, Anadolu Ermenilerden "temizlenmiştir". Aynı dönemde Yunan nüfusa da kıyım ve göçürme politikası uygulanmıştır. Anadolu'nun Yunan nüfustan "temizlenmesi" büyük ölçüde 1923'te gerçekleştirilen nüfus mübadelesi ile olmuştur. Bu iki süreç Türkiye nüfusunun din temelinde homojenleştirilmesinin temelini oluşturur. Cumhuriyet

döneminde de geride kalan Ermeni ve Yunan nüfusla birlikte Yahudilere baskı, sindirme ve mallarına el koyma politikaları uygulanmış, nihayetinde Türkiye coğrafyası gayri-Müslimlerden arındırılmıştır. Kajar İranındaki Hristiyan oranı Osmanlı'dakinden cok azdır. Bu nedenle İran'da son zaman Osmanlı'sında olduğu gibi bir gayri-Müslim düşmalığı oluşmamıştır. Birinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında Hristiyanlara karşı katliamlar ve göçürme olmuşsa da bunların boyutu Türkiye'de olanlarla kıyaslanacak ölçüde değildir. İran'da etnik temizlik yaşanmamış gayri-Müslim nefreti Türkiye'deki gibi ulusal kimliğin bir unsuru haline gelmemiştir. Türkiye'de homojenleştirmenin bir etnik temizlik olarak gerçekleşmesi devletin merkeziliğini güçlendirmiş devletin bekası anlayışının bütün insani değerlerin üstüne çıkabilecek şekilde ulusal kimliğe oturmasına yolaçmıştır. Devlete sadakat Türk ulusal kimliğinin en temel öğesi olmuştur.

Yirminci yüzyıl başında Türk ulusal hareketinin "diğeri" olarak belirtebileceğimiz tehdit unsuru gayri-Müslimler olarak kodlanmıştır. Batılı güçlü devletlerden gelen tehdit algısı yerel gayri-Müslimlere yansıtılmıştır. Batılı devletlerin gayri-Müslimler aracılığıyla ülkeyi parçalayacağından korkulmuştur. İran'da ulusal hareketin "diğeri"ni direk olarak dış-güçler anlayışı oluşturmuştur. İran ülkesine yönelen en önemli tehdidin Batılı dış-güçlerden geldiği düşünülmüştür. İran'ın yirminci yüzyılın başında, Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Rusya/Sovyetler ve İngiltere tarafından işgal edilmesi bu anlayışı güçlendirmiştir. İran ulusal kimliğinde yabancı-düşmanlığı bu nedenle belirgin bir unsurdur. Anayasal Devrimde, Musadık'ın önderliğindeki Milli Cephe Hareketinde ve İslam Devrimi öncesi protestolarda yabancı düşmanlığı duygusu belirgin bir birleştirici unsurdur. Yabancı düşmanlığı İran milliyetçilerinin yerel değerlere daha çok yönelmesine yol açmış bu durum ulusal kimlikte yerelci unsurların baskın olmasını doğurmuştur. Yabancı düşmanlığı ve yerelcilik Batılılaşma hareketlerinin yavaş olmasına ve cılız kalmasına neden olmuştur.

İran'da homojenleştirme süreci bölgesel etnik hareketlerin ve göçebe aşiretlerin bastırılması şeklinde yaşanmıştır. Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda İran'ın işgal edilmesi sonucu merkezi devlet gücü zayıflamış otonom bölgesel güçler ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu koşullar İran milliyetçilerini otoriter ve merkezileştirici bir lider aramaya itmiştir. Rıza Han bu dönemde ortaya çıkmış ve bölgesel güçleri bastırmıştır. Akabinde göçebe aşiretleri hedef almıştır. Silahsızlandırma ve yerleştirme politikaları kıyıma varan şiddet uygulamaları ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bir çok aşiret isyanı olmuş hepsi Rıza Şah tarafından şiddetli bir şekilde bastırılmıştır. Böylece İran'da ilk defa bölgesel ve aşiret güçlerinin bastırıldığı merkezi bir devlet ortaya çıkmıştır. İran'daki bu homojenleştirme süreci daha önce bahsedilen yabancı-düşmanlığı merkezli "diğeri" anlayışıyla ilişkilendirilmemiştir. Etnik gruplar ve aşiret güçleri yerel unsurlar olarak algılanmaya devam etmiştir. Türkiye'deki homojenleştirme süreci ise Batı devletlerinden gelen dış tehdit dolayımıyla devletin bekası ile ilişkilendirilmiş ve ulusal kimliğin önemli bir parçası olmuştur. İran'daki homojenleştirme ulusal kimliği Türkiye'eki kadar belirlememiş, merkezi gücü sağlamanın bir gereği olarak algılanmıştır.

Türkiye ve İran'da homojenleştirme sürecinin bir veçhesi de Türkleştirme ve Farslaştırma olarak yaşanmıştır. Türkiye'de Kürtler ve geride kalan gayri-Müslimler, İran'da özellikle Azeriler ve Kürtler bu politikalara maruz kalmıştır. Türkiye'de devlet Kürtleri potansiyel olarak asimile edilebilir bir grup olarak algılamış bu nedenle gayri-Müslimlere uyguladığı gibi bir dışlayıcılık uygulamamıştır. Kürtler temel olarak Kürt kimliğinin varlığını reddederek asimile edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Şeyh Said ve Dersim isyanı gibi kürt isyanlarının şiddetli şekilde bastırılması, Mecburi İskan Kanunu ile Kürt grupların yeni yerlere yerleştirilmesi, Kürtçenin yasaklanması, Kürt yer ve insan isimlerinin yasaklanması asimilasyon uygulamalarının başlıcalarıdır. İran'da Fars nüfus Türkiye'deki Türk nüfus gibi toplam nüfusun büyük çoğunluğunu oluşturmaz. İran'da çok daha fazla sayıda ve hepsi birlikte nüfusun yüzde ellisini bulan Azeriler, Kürtler, Lurlar, Mazandaranlar, Gilakiler, Balukiler ve Araplar gibi farklı etnikten topluluklar vardır. Bunların başlıcalarını Azeriler ve Kütler oluşturur. İran'da Pehlevi Rejimi tarafından da Türkiye'deki gibi asimilasyon uygulamaları olmuş ama bunlar hiçbir zaman sistematik olarak Fars dışı etnik kimlikleri reddetme aşamasına gelmemiştir. Azerilerin Anayasal Devrimde İran ulusal hareketinin bir parçası olarak çok önemli bir rol oynadığı belirtilmelidir. İran Anayasasında bölgeler Azerbaycan, Kürdistan gibi orada yaşayan halkın etnik kimliği ile isimlendirilmiş bölgesel komisyonlar, Pehlevi Rejiminde oluşturulmasa da, tanınmıştır. İslam Cumhuriyeti Anayasasında bölgesel etnik dillerin serbest olduğu açık olarak belirtilmiştir. Türkiye'de Kürtlerin Türk etnisitesine asimilasyonu poitikası 1980'lerin sonunda, PKK (Kurdistan İşçi Partisi, *Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan*) önderliğindeki Kürt hareketinin yükselmesiyle iflas etmiştir. İran Anayasal Devrimde "İranlı" kimliği bütün etnik grupları kapsayan bir şemsiye kimlik olarak algılanmıştır. Rıza Şah'ın asimilasyon politikaları Fars etnisitesini İranlı kimliğinin merkezine oturtmada Türkiye'deki kadar başarılı olmasa da Farsçanın asimilasyon gücünü pekiştirmiştir. Farsça İranlı kimliğinin mekezi bir unsurudur, ama Fars etnisitesi İranlı kimliğinin Türkiye'deki Türk etnisitesi kadar merkezi bir unsuru değildir. İranlı kimliği İran'daki diğer etnik grupları da, onların Farsça bilmesini talep ederek, kapsar. Bu anlayışın İran'daki etnik gruplar ve özellikle Azeriler tarafından da paylaşıldığı belirtilmelidir.

Modernleşmenin *adaptasyon* süreci İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasından 1980'lere kadar olan dönemi kapsar. Bu dönemin başında Türkiye çok-partili sisteme geçmiş ve sonrasında üç askeri darbe yaşamıştır. İran'da ise bu dönemin başında Musadık önderliğinde Milli Cephe Hareketi yaşanmış, bu hareket Muhammed Rıza Şah'ın askeri darbesi ile son bulmuş, sonrasında ülke Şah'ın baskı rejimi ile idare edilmiştir. Reza Şah meclisteki iki resmi partiyi 1975'te birleştirerek ülkeyi tek-parti rejimi ile yönetmiştir. Kemalist rejimin resmi ideolojisi toplumun siteme olan rızasını kazanmada İran Pehlevi Rejiminden daha başarılı olmuştur. Cumhuriyet modernleşmesinden en az yarar gören köylü kitleler çok-partili system içerisinde Kemalist Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi karşısında ama rejime sadık Demokrat Parti'yi desteklemişler, böylece rejimin yasal sınırları içine kanalize olmuşlardır. İran'da ise Muhammed Rıza Şah benzer bir resmi ideoloji ile kitlelerin rızasını

kazanamamıştır. Bu nedenle 1953 darbesi sonrasında İran devleti daha baskıcı bir politika gütmüş ve muhalif politik odakları marjinalleştirmiştir. Rejim muhalifi güçler yasal politik düzlemin dışında örgütlenmiş ve rejimi yıkmak üzere politika yapmıştır. Türkiye'de rejim muhalif kitlelerin taleplerini hesaba katmak zorunda kalırken, İran'da rejim petrol gelirleri sayesinde ekonomik ve askeri gücünü kitlelerin taleplerini gözardı ederek koruyabilmiştir. Türkiye'de kitleler ve devlet birbirine daha çok yaklaşmış, İran'da devlet ve kitleler arasındaki boşluk kapatılamamıştır. Türkiye'de askeri darbeler çok-partili sistemin sınırlarını tekrar belirleme işlevi görmüştür. Bu belirlemedeki temel kaygı daha çok özgürlük getirmek ya da muhalefet grupların taleplerini karşılamak değil devletin bekasını korumak olmuştur. 1961 darbesi, rejimi Demokrat Partinin geleneksel-dinsel eğilimleri karşısında korumak amacıyla özgürlükleri genişletmiş, 1972 muhtırası ve 1980 darbesi rejimi yükselen politik sol hareketlerden ve Kürt hareketinden korumak amacıyla özgürlükleri kısmıştır. Türkiye'de bu darbelerden hiçbirinin, İran'da İslam Devrimi öncesi görülen politik kitle hareketlerine benzer, toplumsal protestolara yolaçmadığı belirtilmelidir.

Türkiye'de ulus devleti oluşum süreci boyunca devlet merkezi bir konumda olmuş devletin düzenlemelerine İran'daki gibi tabandan gelen kitlesen bir muhalefet oluşmamıştır. "Devletin bekası" devlet politikalarının belirleyeni, "devlete sadakat" Türk ulusal kimliğinin temel anlayışı olagelmiştir. İran'da ulus devletin oluşum süreci tabandan gelen muhalefet hareketleriyle zorlanmış, devlet muhalefeti baskı kullanarak susturmaya çalışmıştır. Devlet "baskı araçları"na daha çok başvururken kitleler "toplumsal muhalif hareket geleneği"ni sürdürmüştür. Devletin Batıcı tutumuna muhalif kitleler "yerellik" nosyonunu İran ulusal kimliğinin merkezine yerleştirmiştir.

Türkiye ve İran'da Vatandaşlık Oluşumu Karşılaştırması

Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlık oluşumları sadece Batı'da gözlenen vatandaşlık oluşum modellerini kullanarak açıklanamaz. Toprak merkezli asimilasyoncu Fransız modeli, etnik-kültür merkezli dışlayıcı Alman modeli, liberal İngiltere ya da Birleşik Devletler modelleri ya da sosyal-demokrat İskandinav modelleri tek başına ya da birlikte Türkiye ve İran'ı anlamak için yeterli değildir. Bu iki ülkenin vatandaşlık oluşumları kendi tarihleri ve sosyal yapıları dolayısıyla Batıdaki modellerden farklılaşır. Her iki ülkede de kendilerine has vatandaşlıkların oluşmasına neden olan, kendilerine has devlet oluşumları ile yakından ilintili, tarihsel toplumsal belirleyiciler vardır. İki ülkede ortak olan resmi vatandaşlığın devlet oluşum sürecine parallel olarak gelişmesi, hatta devlet oluşum süreci içinde bir enstrüman olarak kullanılması olmuştur.

Türkiye ve İran'da vatandaşlık, bir çok başka ülkede de olduğu gibi, Marshall (1992)'ın daha özgürlükçü bir topluma doğru hakların genişlemesini öngören vatandaşlık oluşum modeline göre gelişmemiştir. Bu modelin öngördüğü gibi sivil, politik ve sosyal haklar bu sıralamayı izlememiştir. Daha da önemlisi, İran'da Anayasal Devrim sonucu oluşan politik haklar dışında, Türkiye ve İran'daki vatandaşlık hakları tabandan gelen bir sınıfsal/toplumsal hareket sonucu oluşmamıştır.

Türkiye'de sivil haklar büyük oranda ondokuzuncu yüzyıl Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda ya gayri-Müslim toplulukların sadakatini kazanmak ya da Batılı devletlerin baskısı sonucu devlet tarafından verilmiştir. Buna rağmen sivil hak anlayışı hiçbir zaman Batı ülkelerindeki olgunluğa erişememiştir. Son onyıla kadar Türkiye hükümeti birçok insanın düşünce suçlusu olarak hapsedilmesi dolayısıyla Batılı devletler tarafından eleştirilmiştir. Sivil hakların Kajar İmparatorluğu'nda ve Pehlevi İran'ında da bir olgunluğa ulaştığını söylemek zordur. Kajar Şah'ları devlet adamlarını her an istedikleri gibi değiştirebilirler, Rıza Şah aşiret liderlerini keyfi olarak sürgüne gönderebilir ya da öldürtebilir, Muhammed Rıza Şah partileri yasaklayıp liderlerini işkenceye maruz bırakabilirdi. İslam Cumhuriyeti'nde de 1980'lerde birçok Tudeh (Komunist eğilimli Halk Partisi) liderinin işkenceden geçirilip televizyonlarda zorla rejim taraftarı konuşma yapmaya zorlandığını belirtmek gerekir. Sonuç olarak sivil hakların ne Türkiye'de ne de İran'da Batı'daki olgunluğa erişemediği söylenebilir.

İran'da politik haklar tabandan gelen Anayasal Devrim ile oluşmuştur. Buna rağmen sonrasında gelen Pehlevi Rejimi otoriter eğilimi ile İran vatandaşlığının bu özelliğini gölgelemiştir. Rıza Şah anayasayı ve İran parlementosunu görmezden gelmiş parlementoya kendi yaptığı kanunları onaylamaktan başka bir işlev tanımamıştır. Muhammed Rıza Şah iktidarındaki baskıcı rejim ve 1975'te ülkenin tek-partili sisteme dönmesi bu dönemde İran'da politik hakların gelişmediğini gösterir. İslam Devrimi ile rejimin bir Cumhuriyet'e dönüştürülmesi politik hakların gelişmesi yönünde önemli bir adım olarak düşünülebilir. Türkiye'de politik haklar erken Cumhuriyet döneminde İran'dakinden daha güçlü bir şekilde uygulanmıştır. Kemalist elit uygulamalarını meclisin onayladığı programlar üzerinden yapmaya ve anayasaya uygunluğa özen göstermiştir. Bu farkın nedeni Osmanlı devletinde ondokuzuncu yüzyılın ikinci çeyreğinden beri danışma meclisleri ve yerel meclisler gibi kurumların bulunmasıdır. Bu kurumlar sayesinde Osmanlı devlet yöneticileri temsili ve katılımcı yönetim modelleri hakkında fikir ve tecrübe oluşturmuş, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurucuları bu tecrübeyi kullanmıştır. Bu nedenle gerek Osmanlı gerekse Türkiye Cumhuriyeti parlementoları toplumsal bir hareketlilik sonucu kurulmuş olmamasına rağmen, Türkiye'de politik haklar İran'dakine göre daha gelişkin olmuştur. Kitlelerin çok-partili system içine çekilmesi katılımcı demokrasiyi güçlendirmiş 1980'ler ve 1990'larda sivil toplum hareketleri yaygınlaşmıştır.

Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıklarını belirleyen etmen hakların genişlemesi değildir. Kemalist ve Pehlevi rejimlerin vatandaşlık anlayışını belirleyen etmenler yeni kurulan ulus-devlet ve devletin resmi ideolojisini kitlelere yayma amacıdır. Bu iki etmenin temelinde Batı tarzı modernleşme anlayışı yatar. Vatandaşlık anlayışı bu amaca hizmet eden araçlardan birisidir. Vatandaşlık rejimlerin resmi ideolojisini kitlelere kabul ettirmek için bir araç olarak kullanılmıştır. Bu anlamda Türkiye ve İran resmi vatandaşlıkları Mann'ın (1987) terimleriyle "devletin yönetim stratejisi"nin bir sonucudur. Mann'ın Batı devletlerinde gözlemlediğinden farklı olarak Türkiye ve İran'daki devletin yönetim stratejisi toplumdaki sınıfsal çelişkileri control altında tutmak için değil devletin

modernleşme düzenlemelerini ve resmi ideolojisini yaymak için kullanılmıştır. Bu nedenle bu iki ülkede Kemalist ve Pehlevi rejimler tarafından empoze edilen vatandaşlık anlayışı haklardan çok görevlerle yüklü bir vatandaşlıktır.

Turner (1990) vatandaşlık oluşumu için "aktif/pasif" ve "kamusal alan/özel alan" olmak üzere iki farklı boyut öngörür. Türkiye'de Osmanlı'dan başlayarak Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde devam eden modernleşme düzenlemeleri yukarıdan-aşağıya devlet eliyle yapılmıştır. Hiçbir vatandaşlık hakkının oluşmasında kitle baskısı sözkonusu olmamıştır. Bu nedenle Türk vatandaşlığı pasif bir vatandaşlıktır. İran'da ise yirminci yüzyılın başındaki Anayasal Devrim aşağıdan-yukarıya bir kitle hareketinin sonucudur. Bu devrim İran vatandaşlığının başlangıcına aktif bir boyut kazandırmıştır. Rıza Şah dönemindeki modernleşme tepeden inmeci olarak uygulanmış, başlangıçtaki aktif boyut zayıflatılmıştır. Pehlevi rejimi vatandaşlarından pasif uyuglayıcılar olmalarını beklemiştir. Muhammed Rıza Şah döneminde de baskıcı rejim politikaya karışmayan pasif bir vatandaşlığı empoze etmiştir. İran'da devletin baskısına rağmen 1940'larda bölgesel etnik otonom hareketler, 1940'ların ikinci yarısında Tudeh partisi, 1950'lerin ilk yıllarında Milli Cephe Hareketi ve 1970'lerin sonunda İslam Devrimi öncesi protestolar İran'da aşağıdan-yukarıya kitle hareketleri olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Kitle harketlerinin oluşması ve rejimi sarsacak kadar güçlenebilmesi İran vatandaşlığının aktif boyutunu oluşturmaktadır. Pehlevi rejimi pasif bir vatandaşlığı empoze etmiş, kitleler rejime karşı muhalefet hareketi oluşturarak aktif vatandaşlık sergilemiştir.

Muhammed Rıza Şah'ın baskı rejimi kitlelerin politik etkinliğini kısıtlamıştır. Kitleler devlet tarafından özel alanlarında kalmaya teşvik edilmiştir; bu anlamda Pehlevi rejimi "özel alan" vatandaşlığını empoze etmiştir. Rejim muhalif grupları yasal politik zeminden marjinalleştirmiş, bu nedenle dinsel ve politik sol muhalefet yeraltında örgütlenmiştir. Muhalefetin örgütlendiği alanlar özel alan olarak değerlendirilemez. Bunların büyük çoğunluğu camiler, din kursları gibi dinsel mekanlar olmasına rağmen kitleler bu mekanlara hapsolmamıştır. Tam tersine muhalif kitleler seminerlerde toplanmış, gösteriler yapmış, camileri politik ağ oluşturmak ve muhalif düşünceleri yaymak için kullanmıştır. Bu kitleler özel alanda değil ama politik olarak marjinalleştirilmiş bir kamusal alanda yer almıştır. Yasal zeminin baskıcı bir devlet tarafından yukarıdan-aşağıya doğru belirlendiği, muhalif hareketlerin marjinalleştirilmiş bir alanda politik olarak aktif olduğu bir durum sözkonusudur. İran vatandaşlık modeli resmi olarak empoze edilen pasif bir vatandaşlığın politik olarak aktif bir kitle ile yanyana olabileceğini gösterir. Bu durum muhtemelen İran'daki gibi devletin kitlelerin rızasını kazanacak bir ideoljiye sahip olmadığı ama iktidarını sürdürebilecek ekonomik ve askeri güce sahip olduğu ülkelerde gözlenebilir. Bu aynı zamanda, Türkiye'dekinin tersine, devlet tarafından dayatılan resmi vatandaşlık anlayışının kitlelerin bilincindeki İran ulusal kimliğinde merkezi bir yer edinmediğin gösterir.

Brubaker (1990)'i izleyerek, toprak temelli ve asimilasyoncu Fransız modeli ve köken temelli ve dışlayıcı Alman modeli düşünüldüğünde, birbirine kıyasla İran vatandaşlığının Fransız modeline Türk vatandaşlığının ise Alman modeline daha yakın olduğu görülür. İran'da İranlı kimliğinin diğer

etnik kimliklerin üzerinde bir şemsiye kimlik olarak oluşması ve Farsça dilinin asimilasyon gücü İran vatandaşlığını Fransız modeline yaklaştırır. İran'da etnik grupların vatandaşlıktan dışlanması yaşanmamış, Hristiyan gruplar İran kimliğinin bir parçası sayılmıştır. Türkiye de ise gayri-Müslimler ülkenin sadık vatandaşları olarak algılanmamış bu nedenle "esas vatandaşlık" statüsünden dışlanmıştır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti gayri-Müslimlere karşı etnik-kültürel temelli dışlayıcı Alman vatandaşlık modelini uygulamıştır. Kürtlerin Türk kültürüne asimile olması beklenmiş bu nedenle Kürtlere karşı asimilasyoncu Fransız modeli uygulanmıştır. Buna karşın devletin güvenliğini ilgilendiren merkezi konumları sözkonusu olduğunda Kürtler de etnik Türkler kadar sadık vatandaşlar olarak algılanmamış, bu durumlarda Kürtler de ayrımcı Alman modeli uygulamasına maruz kalmıştır. Ayrımcı Alman modeli ile asimilasyoncu Fransız modelinin aynı anda ayer alması Türk vatandaşlığında gizli bir dereceli vatandaşlığın bulunmasının sonucudur.

Etnik Türkler Türk devletinin esas ve sadık vatandaşları olarak algılanmıştır. Bunun ardından ikinci sırada gelen Kürtler potensiyel olarak zaman içinde Türk etnik kimliğine asimile olabilir vatandaşlar olarak algılanmıştır. Buna rağmen Kürtler etnik ayrımcılıktan bağışık değildir. Devlet bu ikinci derece vatandaşları Kürlüklerini unutana kadar devlet güvenliği ile ilgili pozisyonlardan dışlamıştır. Son olarak Türkiye'deki gayri-Müslimler üçüncü derece vatandaşları oluşturur. Bu üçüncü derece vatandaşlar ülkedeki gayri-Müslimlere uygulana etnik temizlikten geride kalanlardır. Bu vatandaşların devlete sadakatlerinden her zaman şüphe edilmiştir. Çoğunlukla kendi özel alanlarında bırakılmış devlet ve yönetim işlerine karıştırılmamıştır.

Sonuç

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ile Pehlevi Iran devletlerinin miras aldıkları devlet gelenekleri modernleşme derecesi, gelişmiş bir bürokrasinin bulunması ve yönetimin merkeziliği bakımından farklılık gösterir. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Osmanlı İmparatorluğundan, Pehlevi İran'ın Kajar İmparatorluğundan aldığından daha gelişmiş bir devlet yapısı miras almıştır. Güçlü devlet geleneği devlet trafından temsil olunan politik bir grup olarak ulusa aidiyet fikrini güçlendirmiştir. Bu nedenle **Türkiye'de devlet İran'dakine göre ulusal kimlikte daha merkezi bir konuma sahiptir.**

Ondokuzuncu yüzyılda Kajar devleti Osmanlı devletinden kurumların modernleşmişliği ve bürokrasinin gelişmişliği itibariyle daha güçsüzdü. Bu nedenle İran toplumundaki sosyal güç odakları Türkiye toplumundakilerden daha güçlü kaldı. Ulema, bazaariler, aşiretler ve politik sol gruplar kitle protestoları örgütlemekte ve devletin uygulamalarına direnç göstermekte daha etkin oldu. Kitle katılımı ve hareketlerin politik etkileri gözönüne alındığında İran'da yaşanan Tütün Protestosu ve Anayasal Devrim gibi kitle hareketleri Türkiye'de gerçekleşmedi. Bunun da ötesinde İran toplumundaki kitlesel protesto geleneği 1945'lerdeki Azerbaycan ve Kürt Otonom Hükümetleriyle, 1950'nin ilk yıllarındaki Milli Cephe Hareketiyle, 1960'ların ilk yarısındaki kitlesel protestolarla ve 1970'lerin sonunda Pehlevi Rejiminin sonunu getiren kitle hareketleriyle

sürdürüldü. Türkiye'de bunlar gibi rejimi sarsan kitle hareketleri oluşmadı. **İran vatandaşlığı, devlete karşı tabandan gelen protesto geleneği anlamında, Türk vatandaşlığından daha aktif bir vatandaşlık oldu.**

Türkiye ve İran'daki vatandaşlık oluşumunun etnik boyutu Türk ve İranlı etnik kimliklerinin bu ülkelerdeki Kürt ve Azerbaycanlı azınlıklarla olan ilişkisi incelenerek anlaşılabilir. İki ülkede ulus devletin kurulması sonrasında Türkleştirme ve Farslaştırma politikaları uygulanmıştır. Türkiye'de önce Kürt kimliğinin politik olarak ifade edilmesi yasaklanmış, daha sonra Kürt kimlilğinin varlığı tamamen reddedilmiş, Kürtçe dili yasaklanmıştır. Kürtlerin Türk etnisitesine asimile olacağı düşünülmüştür. İran'da Pehlevi rejimi de etnik azınlıkları Fars kültürüne asimile etmeyi amaçlamış ama asimilasyon politikaları Türkiye'deki kadar baskıcı ve yaygın olmamıştır. İran Anayasası Azeri ve Kürt kimliklerini her zaman tanımıştır. Bunun da ötesinde Pehlevi Rejiminde uygulanmasa da, İran Anayasası yerel komisyonlar dolayımıyla etnik kimliklerin politik olarak ifade edilmesine izin vermiştir. **Türk vatandaşlığında Türk etnisitesi İran vatandaşlığında Fars etnisitesine göre daha güçlü empoze edilmiş ve daha merkezi bir konuma sahip olmuştur.**

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anadolu'nun gayri-Müslimlerden arındırılması şeklinde bir etnik temizlik üzerine kurulmuştur. Gayri-Müslimlerin sadakatinden her zaman şüphe edilmiştir. Yasal düzenlemelere ve uygulamalara bakıldığında Kürtler de devletin güvenliğiyle ilgili durumlarda dışlanmaya maruz kalmıştır. Yasal metinlerde Türk olmak ve Türk soyundan gelmek esas Türk vatandaşlığının koşulları olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Türkiye'de üç dereceli bir vatandaşlık modelinden sözedilebilir: en üstte esas Türk vatandaşı olarak algılanan etnik Türkler, ikinci seviyede potensiyel olarak asimile edilebilir olduğu düşünülen Kürtler, ve en alt seviyede Türk vatandaşlığının birçok hakkından dışlanan gayri-Müslimler vardır. İran'da İranlı kimliği etnik kimlikler üstünde şemsiye bir kimliktir. Bu anlayış Anayasal Devrim'le güçlenmiş, Rıza Şah'ın asimilasyoncu politikalarına rağmen varlığını sürdürmütür. İran'da Pejlevi Rejiminin asimilasyon politikası dışlayıcılığa dönüşmemiştir. Farsça dilini konuşan her hangi bir Azeri devletin ve askeri kadroların en üst kademelerine rahatlıkla gelebilmiştir. **Türk vatandaşlığında etnik köken anlayışı İran vatandaşlığına göre daha güçlüdür. Bu durum Türkiye'de dereceli bir vatandaşlık modelinin oluşmasına yolaçmıştır. İran'da İranlı üst kimliğinin asimilasyon gücü Türkiye'de Türk kimliğinin asimilasyon gücünden daha fazla olmuştur.**

Bir dışsal güç olarak "diğeri" anlayışı Türkiye ve İran ulusal kimliklerinde farklı şekilde kurulmuştur. Türkiye'de gayri-Müslim azınlıklar Batılı güçlerle işbirliği yapan ajanlar olarak algılanmıştır. **Türkiye'de devletin dış düşmanlarına karşı duyulan nefret yerel gayri-Müslimlere yöneltilmiştir.** Bu anlayış ve tutum yirminci yüzyılın başındaki iki katastrofik olaya, Ermeni Soykırımına ve Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesine, yolaçmıştır. İran'da dış güç olarak "diğeri" anlayışı direk olarak işgalci Batı güçlerine yöneltilmiştir. **İran'da ülkenin dış düşmanlarına duyulan nefret Batı devletlerine yöneltilmiştir.** Bu nefret Türkiye'deki gibi içsel

bir katliama ya da etnik temizliğe dönüşmemiş ama yabancı-düşmalığının İran kimliğinin güçlü bir parçası olması sonucunu doğurmuştur.

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde devlet gücünü kurulduğu andan yirmibirinci yüzyıla kadar korumuştur. Bu dönem içinde işgal ya da farklı bir nedenle devletin konrtolünde bir kesinti olmamıştır. Bu süreklilik kitlelerin devletin gücü ve başlatılan reform ve politikaların karalılıkla devam ettirileceği konusunda ikna olmasını kolaylaştırmıştır. Devletin sürekliliği kitlelerin devlete olan sadakatini artırmıştır. İran'da ise ülkenin Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nın öncesinde ve savaş sürecinde ve özellikle İkinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında işgal edilmesi dolayısıyla devlet yönetimi sekteye uğramıştır. Bütün bu işgaller kitlelerin İran devletine olan güvenini ve başlattığı programların sürekliliğine olan inancını olumsuz etkilemiş, İran'da kitlelerin devlete olan sadakatini azaltmıştır. Kitlelerin **devlete güveni ve sadakati Türkiye'de İran'a göre daha fazla olmuştur.** Bu durum Türkiye'deki modernleşmenin İran'dakine göre daha güçlü olmasına ve insanların yaşam tarzını Batı doğrultusunda daha çok değiştirmesine yolaçmıştır.

Türkiye ve İran devletleri arasındaki bir fark da şiddete başvurma dereceleri ve değişen soyo-politik koşullara adapte olabilme yetenekleri ile ilgilidir. Bu iki durum devletin kurumsal gücünün sürekliliği ile yakından ilişkilidir. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti devletin ve vatanın bölünmez bütünlüğü, laiklik ve Türk milliyetçiliği gibi temel ilkeleri sıkı sıkıya korumuş ve yaymıştır. Bu temel ilkeler devletin bekası gözetilerek ne pahasına olursa olsun, insani değerleri de gözardı edebilerek, korunmuştur. **Temel ilkeler üzerine kurulu resmi ideolojisi sayesinde Türk devleti İran devletine göre daha güçlü şekilde kitlelerin rızasını kazanmıştır.** Bu temel ilkeler dışında, Türk devleti değişen iç ve dış koşullara adapte olma yeteneği göstermiştir. Anayasa değiştirilmiş, ekonomik sistem koşullara göre tekrar düzenlenmiştir. İran devleti Türkiye'deki gibi ideolojisini temel ilkeler üzerine kurmamıştır. Bununla birlikte değişen koşullar ve kitlelerin talepleri karşısında katı bir tutum sergilemiştir. Adapte olarak değişmek yerine Türkiye'den daha fazla şiddete ve bastırmaya başvurmuştur. **Türkiye devleti, iç muhalefeti rejim içine çekmekte daha başarılı olmuştur; İran devleti, kitlesel direnci bastırmak için daha çok şiddete başvurmuştur.**

Türkiye ve İran'da vatandaşlık oluşumu ulus kimliği oluşturma sürecine eklemlenmiştir. **Kemalist Rejim ve Pehlevi Rejimi, vatandaşlığı modernleşme projesinin bir enstrümanı olarak görmüştür.** Bu nedenle Mann (1987)'ın yönetim stratejisi anlayışı Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıklarını anlamaya yardımcıdır. Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıkları İngiltere ve Birleşik Devletler'deki liberal vatandaşlık anlayışından çok uzaktadır. Marshall (1992)'ın modelindeki gibi tutarlı ve sıralı bir haklar genişlemesi Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıklarında gözlemlenmez. Türk ve İran devletlerinin gözettiği vatandaşlık topluma nasıl iyi vatandaş olunacağını öğretmeye çalışır. Vatandaşlık hakları insanları devletin şiddetinden korumak amaçlı değildir. **Devletler tarafından empoze edilen şekliyle Türkiye ve İran vatandaşlıkları görevlerle yüklü vatandaşlıklardır.** Bireylere iyi vatandaş olmaları için yerine getirmeleri gereken görevler bildirilir.

İranlı terimi hemen hemen her zaman İran'da yaşayan bütün insanları ifade edecek şekilde kullanılmıştır. Farsça dili yüksek bir asimilasyon gücüne sahip olmuş etnik azınlıkların entellektüellerine çekici gelmiştir. Türkiye'de ise gayri-Müslimler ve Kürtler has Türk vatandaşı olarak görülmemiştir. Bu nedenle, **Türk vatandaşlığına kıyasla İran vatandaşlığı toprak temelli asimilasyoncu Fransız vatandaşlığına daha yakındır.** İran vatandaşlığı Fars etnisitesi ile Türk vatandaşlığının Türk etnisitesi ile olduğundan daha az ilişkilidir. **Türk vatandaşlığı İran vatandaşlığına göre dışlayıcı Alman modeline daha yakındır.** Vatandaşlık statüsü bakımından etnik Türkler diğer etnik gruplardan ve gayri-Müslimlerden daha üstün görülmüştür.