

FROM RUSSIA TO TURKEY: AN INTELLECTUAL BIOGRAPHY OF
SADRİ MAKSUDÎ ARSAL (1878-1957)

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

ALMAZ MİFTAHOV

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of
MASTER OF ARTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2003

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of International Relations.

Associate Professor Dr. Hakan Kırımlı
Thesis Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of International Relations.

Assistant Professor Dr. Gönül Pultar

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of International Relations.

Assistant Professor Dr. Hasan Ünal

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan

ABSTRACT

The basic aim of this study is to present an intellectual biography of Sadri Maksudî Arsal (1878-1957). To accomplish this task the present study is divided into two main parts. The first part presents an essential biography, presented in chronological order. Its object is to illuminate the life of Sadri Maksudî, his intellectual development and his activities by revealing his time as well as the major developments within them. The second part analyzes Sadri Maksudî's views on a variety of matters and subjects, particularly nationalism, history, linguistics, and law, though he seems to also have come up with interesting ideas on other issues. Sadri Maksudî's beliefs about nationalism are explored both on their own and by taking into consideration historical and contemporary analyses on the issue. While his thoughts on linguistics are analyzed via the framework of the linguistic reformation in the Republic of Turkey, his perspectives about history and law are basically analyzed in terms of the major developments in these areas and the methodologies used by Sadri Maksudî.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı Sadri Maksudî Arsal (1878-1957)'in entelektüel biyografisini oluşturmaktır. Bunu başarabilmek için çalışma iki ana bölüme ayrılmıştır. Birinci bölüm Sadri Maksudî'nin kronolojik olarak düzenlenmiş olan hayatını takdim etmektedir. Buradaki maksat Sadri Maksudî'nin hayatını, onun entelektüel gelişmesini ve faaliyetlerini, onun tarafından yaşanmış olan dönemler ve önemli gelişmeler ile birlikte açıklığa kavuşturur. İkinci bölüm dört alt bölüme ayrılmış olup Sadri Maksudî'nin milliyetçilik, tarih, dil ve hukuk alanlarındaki fikirlerini tahlil etmektedir. Sadri Maksudî'nin milliyetçilik üzerine olan düşünceleri hem kendi başına hem tarihi ve günümüzdeki görüşlerle karşılaştırılarak incelenmiştir. Dil üzerine olan görüşleri Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ndeki dil inkılabı çerçevesinde incelenirken, tarih ve hukuk alanlarındaki kanaatleri bu alanlardaki inkılaplarla birlikte Sadri Maksudî'nin metodolojileri de göz önünde tutularak açıklığa kavuşturulmuştur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor Dr. Hakan Kırımlı, who guided, inspired and motivated me throughout my education at Bilkent University. Without his academic vision, comments and critique this thesis could have never been realized.

I want to thank Dr. Gönül Pultar and Dr. Hasan Ünal, who participated in my jury and made valuable comments on my thesis. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Sadri Maksudî's granddaughter Dr. Gönül Pultar, who encouraged me from the beginning, provided valuable insights, and presented me Sadri Maksudî Arsal's archival documents.

Special thanks are also due to Feride Gaffarova, member of a staff of the Institute of History of the Republic of Tatarstan, who endowed me with valuable information on the subject. In addition, Ali Akış, Enise Arat, and Selçuk Özçelik deserve exceptional recognition for their help in understanding Sadri Maksudî and his thoughts by means of interviews.

I express my sincere tanks to Songül Cici, who never begrudged her support and made it possible for the researcher to accomplish his objectives.

Last but not the least, I would like to express my special gratitude to my family for their tremendous help, patience and enormous support during my student life in Turkey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARIES

INTRODUCTION	1
--------------	---

PART ONE: THE LIFE OF SADRI MAKSUDÎ ARSAL

CHAPTER I: THE FORMATIVE YEARS, 1878-1906	5
--	---

1.1 Birth and Early Education of Sadri Maksudî	5
--	---

1.2 Muslim Modernism in the Volga-Ural Region	7
---	---

1.3 The Russian-Tatar Teachers' School Years	12
--	----

1.4 The Sorbonne and the Paris Years	16
--------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER II: THE CAREER IN RUSSIA, 1906-1923	23
--	----

2.1 "Political Spring" in the Russian Empire	23
--	----

2.2 The Third All-Russian Muslim Congress	26
---	----

2.3 Sadri Maksudî in the Second State Duma	27
--	----

2.4 Sadri Maksudî in the Third State Duma	28
---	----

2.4.1 Sadri Maksudî's Travels During the Third Duma	31
---	----

2.5 Sadri Maksudî and the Press	33
---------------------------------	----

2.6 Sadri Maksudî's Return to Kazan	34
-------------------------------------	----

2.7 The February Revolution and Sadri Maksudî	36
---	----

2.8 Establishment of the National Cultural Autonomy	39
---	----

2.9 Escape to Europe	42
----------------------	----

2.10 The Paris Peace Conference	43
---------------------------------	----

2.11 Sadri Maksudî at the Sorbonne	47
------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III: THE TURKEY YEARS, 1923-1957	49
---	----

3.1 Sadri Maksudî's First Visit to the Turkish Republic	49
---	----

3.2 Sadri Maksudî's Academic Career in Turkey	52
---	----

3.3 Formation of the Historical Studies and Sadri Maksudî	53
---	----

3.4 Sadri Maksudî's Studies on Language	56
3.5 Sadri Maksudî in Politics	57
3.5.1 At Home	57
3.5.2 Abroad	60
3.6 Last Years of Sadri Maksudî	61
PART TWO: SADRI MAKSUDÎ ARSAL'S VIEWS ON POLITICAL AND SOCIAL MATTERS	
CHAPTER IV: HIS VIEWS ON NATIONALISM	64
4.1 Nations and Nationalism	64
4.1.1 Historical Overview of the Approaches on Nationalism	65
4.1.2 Current Approaches on Nationalism	71
4.1.2.1 Primordialism	71
4.1.2.2 Modernism	73
4.1.2.3 Ethno-symbolic approach	76
4.2 The Nationalistic Doctrine of Sadri Maksudî	77
4.2.1 Sadri Maksudî on Formation of the Nations and Nationalism	78
4.2.2 Sadri Maksudî's Theory and the Others	81
CHAPTER V: HISTORY: CAUSES AND EVENTS	84
5.1 Introduction	84
5.2 Sadri Maksudî on the Factors of History	85
5.3 Sadri Maksudî and the "Turkish Historical Thesis"	87
CHAPTER VI: LANGUAGE AND REFORMS	90
6.1 Sadri Maksudî on the Turkish Language and the Linguistic Purification	91
6.2 Sadri Maksudî's Initial Defense and Criticism of the Linguistic Reforms	95
6.3 The "Denizbank Incident"	97
6.4 Sadri Maksudî and Constitutional Amendments	98

CHAPTER VII: SADRI MAKSUDĪ ON LAW	99
7.1 Sadri Maksudĭ as a Professor of Law: His Teachings and Contributions	99
7.2 Sadri Maksudĭ's Methodology	101
CONCLUSION	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY	110

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis has been to utilize all available sources in order to produce an intellectual biography of Sadri Maksudî Arsal (1878-1957). Sadri Maksudî, the Kazan Tatar, was born in the village of Taşsu at 30 kilometers' distance from city of Kazan. His birth coincides with major social and political developments of enlightenment and modernization among the Muslims of Russia, known as *Cedidçilik*. Sadri Maksudî's intellectual development was abundantly associated with this atmosphere in Russia. Besides, his readings of the literary classics, such as Lev Tolstoy, and of philosophers, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau stimulated his intellectual powers. Soon after, Sadri Maksudî headed towards France, and graduated from the Law School of the University of Paris in 1906. His arrival in Russia subsequent to the graduation matched with his deep involvement in politics until 1918. Initially, he participated in the Third All-Russian Muslim Congress, and was elected to the Second as well as to the Third State Duma on the ticket of the *Kadets*. He became one of the most prominent figures among the Turkic Muslims in the Russian Empire. Sadri Maksudî received an equal degree from the Moscow University in 1913, and was enrolled as an assistant of the Barrister I. I. Stepanov in Kazan. However, he never gave up his struggles on behalf of the Muslim peoples of Russia. Sadri Maksudî worked at the Turkestani Commission of the Provisional Government, and enjoyed the peak of his political career by becoming the Chairman of the National Administration of the Muslims of the Inner Russia and Siberia as well as the chairman of the National Assembly. After his escape to Finland, and further to Paris, Sadri Maksudî did not give up his struggle on behalf of the Muslim people. Afterwards, he was granted professorship at the Sorbonne. Later, Sadri Maksudî settled in Turkey and started his academic career at

the Ankara Law School and the Faculty of Law of the University of Istanbul. Sadri Maksudî actively participated in the early studies in history and was the vital figure during the early formation of the Turkish Historical Society. His works on the linguistic matters were appraised in Turkey as well. Besides, he was nominated for three terms at the Grand Turkish National Assembly and served as a deputy there. Sadri Maksudî participated in two assemblies of the League of Nations, as well as in two congresses of the European Union of the Parliaments. His last work on the national sentiment, written a year-and-half before his death, comprises genuine investigations of Sadri Maksudî starting from his European years of immigration and ending with his academic studies in Turkey.

Sadri Maksudî is a very remarkable and essential figure due to his activities and roles in various contexts. On the one hand, he was a leader of the Muslims of Russia, and, on the other, he became one of ideologues of the modern Republic of Turkey.

After Sadri Maksudî's death several articles on him written by his daughters, grandchildren, students and contemporaries appeared in the newspapers. Besides, Abdullah Battal-Taymas' book entitled "*İki Maksudîler*" (Two Maksudîs) and published in 1959 highlighted lives of Sadri and Ahmed Hâdi Maksudî. At the same time after the commemorative ceremony in 1977, the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Turkey published "*Ölümünün 20. Yılında Ord. Prof. Sadri Maksudî*" (20th Anniversary of Professor Emeritus Sadri Maksudî). Two books were published after the conferences held to commemorate birth anniversaries of Sadri Maksudî in Kazan in 1994 and 1998. The former one was entitled "Sadri Maksudî," and the latter one "Sadri Maksudî: History and the Present" (*Sadri Maksudî: Tarih hem*

Hezirgi Zaman). At the same time, the work of Feride Gaffarova entitled “Sadri Maksudî, (1906-1924)” provides an inquiry into Sadri Maksudî’s political affairs in Russia and Europe. In addition, Serdar Erkan’s thesis entitled “Sadri Maksudî Arsal” provides limited information on the life of Sadri Maksudî. However, the most comprehensive study on the life of Sadri Maksudî remains to be his daughter Âdile Ayda’s book entitled “Sadri Maksudî Arsal.” Even so, unfortunately, none of the materials written on Sadri Maksudî sufficiently dwell on the examination of his ideas, thoughts, and *Weltanschauung*, which was the basic incentive that led the present author to undertake this attempts.

Throughout this study all of the published books, unpublished notes, and articles in journals and newspapers of Sadri Maksudî were utilized. Besides, archival materials of Sadri Maksudî, Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan, Republican Archives of the Turkish Prime Ministry, Archives of the Grand Turkish National Assembly, Stenographic Records of the Turkish National Assembly and the Russian State Duma, secondary sources in terms of books and articles, personal interviews of the author were consulted as well.

To accomplish this task the present study is divided into two main parts. The first part presents an essential biography, presented in chronological order. The object of this part is to illuminate the life of Sadri Maksudî and his activities by revealing his *époque* as well as the major developments. Chapter I deals with the formative years of Sadri Maksudî, starting from his birth and ending with his graduation from the Sorbonne. Chapter II covers his years in politics at the State Duma and afterwards, and ends with his last attempts to revive the autonomy for Turko-Tatars in Russia. Chapter III looks at the period from 1923 to 1957. It deals

with his academic affairs at the Sorbonne and continues with Sadri Maksudî's years in the Republic of Turkey until his death. The second part analyses Sadri Maksudî's thoughts, arranged topically. While initial pages of Chapter IV present historical and contemporary analyses and considerations on nationalism, the later ones examine Sadri Maksudî's viewpoint on nationalism and make analyses by connecting his views to that expressed before. Sadri Maksudî's considerations on history, language, and law are explored in Chapter V, Chapter VI, and Chapter VII respectively.

All over this study, all of the Russian words were transcribed using the standard system of the Library of Congress. However, Tatar, Turkish and Islamic terminology and names were transcribed in accordance with the Turkish and Latin Tatar alphabet.

Throughout this study four different calendars had to be dealt: the Julian, the Gregorian, and two Islamic calendars: *Hicrî*, traditional lunar calendar dating from migration of the Prophet Muhammed from Mecca to Medina, and *Rumî/Malî*, based upon a fiscal reckoning beginning in 1840/1841. All dates from a purely Russian context are given in the Julian "style," while Gregorian dates are supplied in parentheses. However, those of an obvious Western nature are given according to the Gregorian. With regard to the Islamic calendars, equivalent Gregorian dates were given according to tables in Gâzî Ahmed Muhtar Paşa, *Takvimü's-Sinîn* (Ankara, Genelkurmay Basımevi, 1993).

PART ONE: THE LIFE OF SADRİ MAKSUDÎ ARSAL

CHAPTER I: THE FORMATIVE YEARS, 1878-1906

1.1 Birth and Early Education of Sadri Maksudî

Sadreddin (or Sadri, in the abbreviated form) Maksudî (or Maksudov, in the Russified form) was born on August 4 (July 23), 1878 in the Tatar village of Taşsu, located in the Kazanskii *Uyezd* (district) found within the Kazanskaia *Gubernia* (province) of the Russian Empire.¹ Sadri pursued his early education at the Taşsu Mektep. The *mekteps* were specific primary schools attached to the village mosque in general, and village mullahs were their initial tutors. Here, the pupils were commonly taught the Arabic alphabet (*elifba*), Koran reading and Islamic catechism. Sadri's father Nizameddin Maksudî (1846-1900) was the mullah of the Taşsu village. As it was common for every Muslim village, he was also holding the position of the village elder and was teaching at the Taşsu Mektep besides administrating the village mosque. Hence, Sadri Maksudî's initial tutor was his father, who was teaching his pupils using *elifba* published in Istanbul.²

¹ Sadri Maksudî's birthday remained a moot point for several reasons. Transformation of the Russian calendar from the Julian to the Gregorian "style" on the one hand, together with fault during conversion Sadri Maksudî's date of birth from the Gregorian to the Islamic calendar (traditional lunar calendar dating from migration of the Prophet Muhammed from Mecca to Medina) in the course of acquirement of the Turkish citizenship on the other generated different dates of birth. Consequently Sadri Maksudî's date of birth has experienced modifications from the Julian to the Gregorian, the Islamic, and back to the Gregorian "styles". Therefore, his date of birth is indicated as 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881 or 1882 in different sources. While in the Russian Empire Sadri Maksudî had two "dates of birth", in Turkey he is mentioned in three forms. Sadri Maksudî himself writes in his short biography supplied together with the official election reports of the fourth term 1931 elections to the Turkish Grand National Assembly (*Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi*) that he was born in 1881. Concise Biographical Document Peculiar to the Turkish Grand National Assembly, Term IV (*T. B. M. M. Âza-yi Kiramına Mahsus Muhtasar Tercümei Hal Varakası, Devre IV*), No: 56. The same date is also reiterated in the Biographical Sample of the Turkish Grand National Assembly Member (*T. B. M. M. Âzasının Tercümeihal Kağıdı Örneği*), No: 834. Nevertheless, Sadri Maksudî's birth certificate from the Register of Births (*Metricheskaia Kniga*) bears witness to the fact that Sadri Maksudî was born on July 23, 1878. See: *Tsentrálny Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan* [Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan], Fond 4, Opis' 177, Delo 159, List 160.

² *Ölümünün 20. Yılında Ord. Prof. Sadri Maksudî Arsal* (Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası, 1977), p. 3.

After graduating from the Taşsu Mektep in 1888, Sadri Maksudî was sent to the *medrese* of Qasimiye* in Kazan. The primary function of a *medrese* was teaching Islamic subjects as well as Arabic and Persian languages, logic, history and geography. It can be deduced that education at this *medrese* had become traditional for Sadri's family since his great-grandfather Maksud (1760-1865) as well as his father Nizameddin were educated there.³ Sadri's elder brother Ahmed Hâdi Maksudî (1868-1941) had also studied at the same *medrese* starting from 1881⁴ and by the time Sadri came to Kazan he had begun to work as an instructor there. Hâdi Maksudî taught such courses as Tatar and Arabic languages, Geography and History.⁵

Sadri Maksudî studied at the *medrese* of Qasimiye until 1895. During this period, besides progressing in the religious, Arabic and Persian language courses, Sadri Maksudî made up his mind to translate two of his favorite books from the Ottoman Turkish to Kazan Tatar. First of all he translated *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe. He managed to complete this task with his brother Hâdi's assistance and published his translation in one of the journals. The other book translated by Sadri Maksudî was *İlm-i Tabakat-ı Ârz* (Layers of the Earth). This time Sadri Maksudî completed his work without his brother's aid.⁶

* Qasimiye is also known as Allâmiye and Külbuyi Medresesi. The former name comes from its administrator Gabdülâllâm Salihoğlu and the last one is translated as "lakeside" that originates from the Medrese's geographical position.

³ For scrutiny of Maksudî's genealogical tree, see Gabelhak Zebirov, *Maksud Baba hem Maksudiler* (Kazan: Tatarstan Kitap Neşriyatı, 2000).

⁴ Abdullah Battal-Taymas, *İki Maksudiler* (Istanbul: Sıralar, 1959), p. 56.

⁵ Zebirov, *Maksud Baba ...*, p. 22.

⁶ The information on translations of Sadri Maksudî is given by his daughter Adile Ayda. Adile Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1991), pp. 14-15. However, in his catalogue of books published in the Arabic script, Seyfettin Özege mentions different publications of *Robinson Crusoe*. There are two appropriate publications of this book pertaining to the period before and during Sadri Maksudî's education at the Qasimiye Medrese. One of them, called *Robenson*, was written in a shortened form by Şemseddin Sâmi and was published in 1885 (1302) by Mihran printing house in Istanbul. The other one is *Robenson İssız Adada* (Robenson in the Uninhabited Island),

Sadri Maksudî's intellectual development was highly correlated with his brother Ahmed Hâdi's career and thoughts. It is possible to say that his brother's intellectual pattern was completely adopted and carried out by Sadri.

Ahmed Hâdi was one of the leading figures of the *Cedidçilik* movement among the Muslims of Russia. The usage of the words *Cedid* ("new") and *Cedidçilik* was borrowed from the educational reform program of İsmail Bey Gaspiralı (1851-1914), who named his program the "New Method" (*Usûl-ü Cedid*).⁷ In the context of the 19th century the word came to connote the reform and modernization movement among the Muslims of Russia.⁸

1.2 Muslim Modernism in the Volga-Ural Region

The modernization and enlightenment movement had spread among the Muslims of Russia in the early and mid-19th century. During the reign of the Empress Catherine II, between 1762 and 1796, Russian forcible assimilation policies were softened and Muslims were granted certain rights in this process. On 22 September 1788 the Orenburg "Muslim Spiritual Administration" (*Magometanskoe Dukhavnoe Sobranie*) was established in Orenburg by the imperial decree. The Spiritual Administration was in charge of religious activities of the East European and Siberian Muslims in command of *Müftü*, who was appointed by the Russian authorities. In this sense, the Muslims of Russia gained rights to launch mosques and

written in shortened form by Mehmed Ali, published in Istanbul by the Sühulet printing house. Nevertheless, the chance of the first book to be used by Sadri Maksudî is higher because publication date of the second one is unknown. See M. Seyfettin Özege, *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu* (Istanbul, 1977), vol. 4, p. 1485. For Sadri Maksudî's second translation, he evidently used *İlm-i Tabakat-ı Ârz*, translated by Ali Fethi and published by the Dar Üt-tıbaat ÜL-amire in Istanbul in 1853 (1269). Özege, *Eski Harflerle...*, vol. 2, p. 711.

⁷ Hakan Kırımlı, *National Movements and National Identity Among the Crimean Tatars, 1905-1916* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), p. 46.

⁸ For the detailed study on the Muslim modernism and *Cedid* movement in the Volga-Ural region, see İbrahim Maraş, *Türk Dünyasında Dinî Yenileşme (1850-1917)* (Istanbul: Ötüken, 2002), and Nadir Devlet, *Rusya Türklerinin Millî Mücadele Tarihi (1905-1917)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999).

medreses in some highly populated centers. With the Russian conquest of the Turkestan lands in the 19th century, Kazan Tatar merchants initiated commercial relations with people of Turkestan. In this respect, several wealthy Kazan Tatar families emerged. The policy of relative religious tolerance together with improvements in economic terms of some Muslim people brought out scientific advance by the way of tutorship of some pupils in such Turkestan centers as Bukhara and Semerkand and establishments of *medreses* in Russia. As a result, a new skilled and scholarly generation started to arrive on the scene. The modernization movements in the Ottoman Empire, Egypt and India had also penetrated in to the Muslims of Russia. Besides, the new generation had become acquainted with the “Western” ideas, and was eager to adopt and accommodate with the Western practices to a certain extent.⁹

During the second half of the 19th century the modernization drive took the shape of a national awakening movement among the Turks of the Russian Empire. The newly emerging Muslim intelligentsia was demanding the break of the grip of obscurantism on Islamic theology and introduction of secular subjects into the curriculum of the Muslim education institutions.¹⁰

Such intellectuals as Şihâbeddin Mercanî (1818-1889), Şemseddin Muhammed Kültêsî (1856-1930), Muhammed Necip Tünterî (1930), Ziyaeddin Kemâlî (1873-1942), Âlimcan Barudî (1857-1921), Musa Carullah Bigi (1875-1949), Rızaeddin Fahreddin (1858-1936), and Abdullah Bubî (1871-1922) were proponents of a novel Islamic comprehension. Among the leading figures of the educational reforms were Hüseyin Feyizhanî (1821-1866), Qayyum Nasırî (1825-

⁹ İbrahim Maraş, *Türk Dünyasında Dinî Yenileşme (1850-1917)* (Istanbul: Ötüken, 2002), pp. 64-71.

¹⁰ Edward J. Lazzerini, “Ġadidism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: a View from Within,” *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, Vol. XIV-2, p. 246.

1902), Zeynullah Rasulî (1833-1917), Abdürreşid İbrahim (1857-1944), Fatih Kerimî (1870-1937), and Zahir Bigi (1870-1902).

İsmail Bey Gaspıralı has a special place in national revival and modernization movement among the Muslims of Russia.¹¹ His compromising stance with the Russian administrative bodies facilitated achievement of successful outcomes, both in terms of publication of periodicals and in terms of introducing the new education method into Muslim schools. Within the framework of reformation he had become an ideologue vis-à-vis his educational reform program and publication of the *Tercüman/Perevodchik* (Interpreter) newspaper.

Gaspıralı's *Tercüman/Perevodchik* newspaper was established in 1883 and was printed up to 1917. At the beginning, Gaspıralı launched *Tercüman/Perevodchik* to advocate his educational reform program. Nevertheless, the publication of such a newspaper, read in every Muslim community of the Russian Empire, had turned out to be a big reform in itself.¹² Gaspıralı sought out to form a common literary language for all Turks in the Russian Empire and even beyond. Therefore, for the language of *Tercüman/Perevodchik* he used a simple Ottoman Turkish adding Crimean and other Turkic expressions into it.¹³

Gaspıralı's new method required the modification of the educational system on the subject of curriculum and system of education. With regard to the system of education, Gaspıralı had introduced the "phonetic method" (*usûl-ü savtiye*) in the *mektep* program. In this respect pupils were learning Arabic alphabet not at once,

¹¹ For the best literature on İsmail Bey Gaspıralı's life and his ideas, see Cafer Seydahmed [Kırımer], *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey* (Istanbul, 1934), Edward J. Lazzarini, "İsmail Bey Gasprinskii and Muslim Modernism in Russia, 1878-1914," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1973.

¹² Kırımlı, *National Movements ...*, p. 35.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

but by discovering five letters in the first course and one or two letters in the each following course.¹⁴ Concerning the curriculum, Gaspıralı encouraged the introduction of additional courses such as elementary arithmetic, concise general geography, general history, and an introduction to physical and life/biological sciences to the *mektep* curriculum.¹⁵ He introduced his educational program in Bahçesaray in 1884 and gained success from the very beginning. Soon, the new method educational program spread to the other Muslim centers, especially to the Volga basin, and became popular there as well.

Ahmed Hâdi Maksudî was one of the supporters of the educational reform initiated by Gaspıralı. Being a pedagogue himself, Hâdi Maksudî wrote several textbooks for pupils such as *Muallim-i Evvel* (The First Teacher), *Muallim-i Sâni* (The Second Teacher), designed for teaching Arabic alphabet according to the phonetic method of Gaspıralı. These books became successful and each new method *mektep* educated pupils using these books.¹⁶

Besides this movement, Ahmed Hâdi cherished a special feeling towards the Ottoman Empire, as it was common for many Muslims of the Volga-Ural region. Located at the seat of the Caliphate, the Porte borne spiritual authority and was widely considered a place of salvation for the Muslims of Russia. Especially during the period after the *Tanzimat* (the series of the governmental reforms from 1839 onwards), intellectual Muslims of Russia had supported this movement and had praised its leaders. Many Ottoman books, literary as well as textbooks, were distributed among Russia's Muslims; in addition, many youths had left Russia for

¹⁴ Edward J. Lazzerini, "İsmail Bey Gasprinskii and Muslim Modernism in Russia, 1878-1914," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1973, pp. 185-186.

¹⁵ Kırımlı, *National Movements...*, p. 47.

¹⁶ Battal-Taymas, *İki Maksudiler*, pp. 58-59.

Istanbul to study there. Sadri Maksudî himself remembers that every mullah and each family of moderate means possessed such books as *Muhammediye* and *Altı Parmak* written in Ottoman Turkish.¹⁷ Besides general religious books, many reformist and modernist books such as *Mecelle-yi Ahkâm-ı Adliyye* (The Collection of Judicial Texts) of Ahmed Cevdet Pasha (1922-1895), *Müdafaâ* (The Defence) of Ahmed Midhat Efendi (1844-1913) became quite fashionable among the *Cedids*. Furthermore, those books were not only read among the people, but some of them were also used in educating pupils. Apart from books, many newspapers such as *Tercüman-ı Ahvâl* of Ahmed Midhat Efendi¹⁸ and journals, like *Malûmat*, gained regard and attractiveness in the region.¹⁹

Hâdi Maksudî left Kazan for Istanbul to improve his Ottoman Turkish and to analyze the Ottoman system of education in 1894. This journey facilitated his close scrutiny of the educational institutions together with observations of the reform process in the Ottoman Empire. At the same time Hâdi Maksudî had a chance to meet significant figures among the Turks such as Ahmed Midhat Efendi²⁰ and Ahmed Cevdet Pasha in Istanbul, and to be enlightened by their thoughts and sights.²¹ İsmail Bey Gaspıralı had already invited Hâdi Maksudî to visit Bahçesaray and to teach at the Zincirli Medrese there. As for Hâdi Maksudî, he invited his younger brother Sadri, now a fresh graduate from the *medrese* of Qasımiye, to

¹⁷ Sadri Maksudî, *Türk Dili İçin* (Ankara: Türk Ocakları İlim ve Sanat Heyeti, 1930), p. 112. For a general review of the Ottoman books, which had gained popularity in the Volga-Ural region see, İbrahim Maraş, “İdil-Ural Bölgesi ve Osmanlı Fikrî Münasebetleri,” *Osmanlı*, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999), vol. 7, p. 503.

¹⁸ Maraş, *Türk Dünyasında...*, pp. 68-71.

¹⁹ Muhammed Ayaz İshakî, “Abdülkayyum Nasırı Makalesinde Talebeliği,” in Ali Akış et al., eds., *Muhammed Ayaz İshakî: Hayatı ve Faaliyeti*, 100. *Doğum Yılı Dolayısıyla* (Ankara: Ayyıldız, 1979), p. 203.

²⁰ Ahmed Midhat Efendi bore special sympathy towards the Muslims of Russia. He received with open arms many of the Muslim students and travellers from Russia.

²¹ Akdes Nimet Kurat, “Kazan Türklerinin Medenî Uyanış Devri (1917 Yılına Kadar),” *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. XXIV, No. 3-4, p. 181.

Bahçesaray too. After his arrival, Hâdi Maksudî began tutoring in Arabic Literature, Logic, and *aqaid* (tenets of Islam) courses at the Zincirli Medrese in Bahçesaray. Besides this work, he was also attending Russian courses of İsmail Lömanov (1871-1942) at the same *medrese*. Sadri Maksudî, for one year during his stay at Bahçesaray, also began learning Russian there, most probably together with his brother, besides attending other courses, too.²² Nevertheless, the most important event he had come across in Bahçesaray was his meeting with İsmail Bey Gaspıralı. Gaspıralı, together with Hâdi Maksudî, instilled ideas of modernism in Sadri, and encouraged him to continue his education, learn Russian, adopt certain Western practices, etc. Sadri Maksudî always remembered İsmail Bey Gaspıralı as his “spiritual father” for his warmth and sympathy, as well as for his massive role in his intellectual development.²³

1.3 The Russian-Tatar Teachers’ School Years

Russian authorities had introduced Russian-Tatar Teachers’ School (*Russko-Tatarskaia Uchitel’skaia Shkola*) in order to train instructors of Russian language for Muslims. The Teachers’ School in Kazan was opened on September 12, 1876 in connection with the approval of the Regulations Concerning the Measures of the Education of non-Russians (*Pravila o Merakh k Obrazovaniiu Inorodtsev*)²⁴ These “regulations” were the official recognition of the program of Nikolai Ivanovich Il’minskii (1822-1891), a professor of Turkic languages at the Kazan University, who considered evolving schools to missionary institutions, and by the usage of teachers isolating people from native languages and bounding them to Russian as the

²² Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 20.

²³ Sadri Maksudî, “Emeller Üstadı,” *Yıldız*, 14 September 1914.

²⁴ Azade-Ayşe Rorlich, *The Volga Tatars: a Profile in National Resilience* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1986), p.45.

best assimilation process. However, even if the results were felt among quite many graduates, not all of the graduates of the Russo-Tatar Teachers' School had lost their national conceit. Vasilii Vasil'evich Radloff (1837-1918), a Russian official of German origin and a famed Orientalist scholar, was appointed as the director of this school. Two most significant figures of the reform movement, namely Şihabeddin Mercanî and Qayyum Nasırî taught in the school. Through Radloff's advice Şihabeddin Mercanî agreed to teach Islamic religion,²⁵ and Qayyum Nasırî consented to teach Tatar language courses there.²⁶ All at once, several graduates of this school such as Zâhir Bigi (1870-1902), Musa Carullah Bigi (1875-1949), Ayaz İshakî (1878-1954), Fuat Tuktarov (1880-1938), and Mir Said Sultangaliyev (1880-1939) became influential personalities in the political arena for the 20th century.

As for Sadri Maksudî, the Russian-Tatar Teachers' School enormously contributed to his intellectual development. During his student days there, Sadri read several literary classics, and, especially, those of Lev Tolstoy (1828-1910), with whom he would meet after graduation. In his third year at the Teachers' School, as Sadri Maksudî remembered, he was engaged in plenty of readings in different areas. The most attractive ones for him were mainly history and philosophy. Especially after reading Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) his interest in the French language increased deeply.²⁷ Readings in literary works developed Sadri Maksudî's passion to write his own work. The future author had two basic intentions in his mind: first of all to write a literary work by the usage of the pure Kazan Tatar dialect, and, secondly, to criticize the old-fashioned life style among the Muslims of Russia in addition to emphasizing the newly rising progressive thoughts among them. As

²⁵ Devlet, *Rusya Türklerinin...*, p. 13.

²⁶ Ahmed Kanlıdere, *Reform Within Islam: The Tajdid and Jadid Movement Among the Kazan Tatars (1809-1917): Conciliation or Conflict?* (Istanbul: Eren, 1997), p. 146.

²⁷ Sadreddin Maksudî, *Angliyağa Seyahat* (Kazan: Ümid, 1914), p. 91.

Sadri Maksudî summarized himself, its aim was to instill a national ideal in the reader.²⁸ In 1899 Sadri Maksudî had completed his work, which he entitled *Meğiyşet* (Livelihood) and published it in 1900.²⁹ In spite of the fact that the book was published in 3,000 copies, due to fire in 1902, 2,000 of them were burned. The book was re-published again in 1914.

Musa Akyiğitzade's (1865-1923) novel *Hüsameddin Mulla*, published in 1886, is regarded as the first novel written among the Muslims of Russia. Musa Akyiğitzade's language in this book cannot be considered as a pure Kazan dialect as the influences of the Ottoman Turkish were heavily felt there. Another novel in the Kazan dialect was published by Zahir Bigi (1870-1902) called *Ulûf Yeki Güzel Qız Hatice* (Thousands or the Beautiful Hatice) published in 1887. Musa Carullah refers to Zahir Bigi's book as the first novel written in Kazan Tatar.³⁰ On the other hand, Sadri Maksudî used the purest Kazan Tatar dialect in *Meğiyşet*.³¹ Sadri Maksudî claims that *Meğiyşet* was the first novel in authentic Kazan Tatar.³²

Besides philosophical literature Sadri Maksudî had a special interest in natural sciences and in the popular scientific-religious ideas at that time. In this sense, he read Professor Timiriyaev's work on Charles Darwin's theory on the origin of the species on the quiet in the bathroom at nights as reading such books was prohibited at the Teachers' School. Interestingly enough, Sadri Maksudî was also anxious that after reading it his Islamic belief might be weakened. Nevertheless,

²⁸ Sadri Maksudî, "Meğiyşet," *Kazan Utları*, No: 861 (July 1994), p. 80.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 79.

³⁰ Maraş, *Türk Dünyasında...*, p. 103.

³¹ Abdurrahman Sâdi, *Tatar Edebiyatı Tarihi* (Kazan, 1926), p. 121, quoted in Devlet, *Rusya Türklerinin...*, p. 165.

³² Maksudî, "Meğiyşet," p. 79.

after completing the book, he was relieved that he did not find anything contrary to his religious beliefs.³³

Unfortunately, no information is available about Sadri Maksudî's another book, published during his student years at the Teachers's School. At the end of one of his most significant essays called *Mebadi-yi Temeddün-i İslamiyân-ı Rus* (First Steps Toward Civilizing the Russian Muslims) published in 1901, İsmail Bey Gaspıralı gives titles of several books that comprise a part of *Cedid* literature. Under the heading of "Books Pertaining to Instructions" he mentions Sadri Maksudî's book called *Tercüman-ı Rusî* (The Translation of Russian) published in 1900 in Kazan at the typography of B. L. Dombrovskii. The book consisted of 60 pages and, as it is can be derived from the title, helps in translation from Russian.³⁴

After his graduation from the Russian-Tatar Teachers' School, Sadri Maksudî was determined to continue his education. Nevertheless, there was no chance of obtaining higher education in Russia for him. Therefore, on the advice of his brother Hâdi, Sadri Maksudî decided to study in Istanbul. However, he did not want to leave Russia without meeting his literary hero Lev Tolstoy. For this reason, Sadri Maksudî traveled to Yasnaia Poliana and visited Lev Tolstoy there in the summer of 1901. Two personalities, one being 73 and the other 23, talked for hours on different topics related with nature and mankind. Lev Tolstoy liked Sadri very much, and for several times patted on the back of Sadri by saying "intelligent young Tatar" (*umnyi tatarionok*).³⁵ After meeting with the popular philosopher and his admired character, Sadri Maksudî was enormously affected by him. He enthusiastically returned home and after getting permission to travel abroad from his

³³ Maksudî, *Angliyağa Seyahat*, pp. 90-91.

³⁴ Lazzerini, "Gadidism at the Turn..." p. 263.

³⁵ Ali Akış. January 24, 2003. Unstructured Interview with the Author. Aşağı Ayrancı, Ankara.

parents and his brother, Sadri left Kazan for Bahesaray. Sadri Maksudî was attached to İsmail Gaspıralı, with great respect, it would be unthinkable for him to go abroad without obtaining Gaspıralı’s consent and paying attention to his advice. İsmail Bey Gaspıralı recommended him to go to Paris rather than Istanbul, and to study there, rather than in Istanbul. He had promised to assist Sadri materially, and asked Sadri Maksudî to write articles for the *Tercüman/Perevodchik*. However, he also advised Sadri Maksudî to visit Istanbul. Sadri Maksudî left Crimea and traveled to Istanbul. There he met Ahmed Midhat Efendi, the famed Ottoman man of letters who enjoyed enormous respect among the Volga-Ural Tatar Intellectuals, who also recommended him to study in Paris.

1.4 The Sorbonne and the Paris Years

By November 1901, Sadri Maksudî left Istanbul for Paris.³⁶ In Paris, as he was already late to apply for admission to the university and due to his lack of French and Latin languages, he began learning these languages with the intention of joining the Law School of the University of Paris (Sorbonne).

Yusuf Akura (1876-1935) was among the first personalities Sadri Maksudî met in Paris. In the early days of 1902 Sadri Maksudî visited Yusuf Akura at the Hotel du Monde located in the Quartier Latin. Two fellow countrymen found a common language easily for three basic reasons. First of all, they were coming from the same geographical region of Russia. Even though Yusuf had to abandon Russia in 1883 and settle in Istanbul with his mother Bibi Fahri Banu, and in spite of the fact that Yusuf Akura was educated in the Ottoman schools (*mektep*, *rüştiye* (secondary school), and *harbiye* (military school)), he had visited his motherland

³⁶ Sadri Maksudî’s Remarks on His Biography. Ankara. Sadri Maksudî Arsal’s Archive.

several times and was always bound to there. Secondly, both figures were connected to İsmail Bey Gaspiralı and the Muslim modernism movement in Russia.³⁷ In this point, İsmail Bey, by means of marrying Zühre Akçura in 1881 became the bridegroom of the Akçura family. Lastly, Sadri Maksudî brought a letter from Yusuf Akçura's close friend Fatih Kerimî. As Sadri Maksudî called to mind their first meeting, Yusuf Akçura initially behaved coldly and only after reading the letter gave Sadri a hearty welcome.³⁸

During the period when Sadri Maksudî came to Paris there were plenty of worldwide students studying there. Among them Sadri Maksudî was especially intimate with students known as the Young Turks, coming from the Ottoman Empire. They had left their homeland with the purpose of surviving their state from despotism of Sultan Abdülhamid II and introducing *Kanûn-i Esasi* (constitution) and parliament once again in the Empire.³⁹

The seeds of the liberal movements in the Ottoman Empire originated from the reign of Sultan Selim III through reforms inaugurated by him.⁴⁰ In accordance with the promulgation of a liberal constitution by Sultan Abdülhamid II, in 1876, a parliament, consisting of two chambers, *Meclis-i Âyan* and *Meclis-i Mebûsan*, was assembled in the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, the Sultan prorogued the

³⁷ François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri: Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)* (Ankara: Yurt, 1986), pp. 24-27.

³⁸ Sadri Maksudî Arsal, "Dostum Yusuf Akçura", *Türk Kültürü*, No. 174, April 1977, p. 347.

³⁹ For more information on the Young Turk movement, see Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasî Fikirleri, 1895-1908* (Istanbul: İletişim, 1994), Ernest Edmondson Ramsaur, *Jön Türkler ve 1908 İhtilâli* (Istanbul: Sander, 1972), Cemal Kutay, *Prens Sabahattin Bey, Sultan II. Abdülhamit, İttihat ve Terakki* (Istanbul: Tarih Yayınları, 1964), İbrahim Temo, *İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetinin Teşekkülü ve Hizmeti Vatniye ve İnkılâbı Millîye Dair Hatıralarım* (Romania, Mecidiye, 1939).

⁴⁰ For more information on reformist movements in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, see Ahmed Bedevî Kuran, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılâp Hareketleri ve Millî Mücadele* (Istanbul: Baha, 1956), Berard Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).

parliament and shelved the constitution in 1878.⁴¹ In 1889 four students from the Military Medical Academy formed an organization called “the Ottoman Union” (*İttihad-ı Osmanî*). These people were İbrahim Ethem (Temo) (1865-1939), İshak Sükûtî (1868-1903), Mehmed Reşid (1872-1919), and Abdullah Cevdet (1869-1932). In a very short period the newly established organization found many new adherents of constitutionalism among the civil, military, naval, medical, and other schools of Istanbul, as well as in different settlements of the Empire.⁴² The Hamidian regime soon cracked down on the underground organization, which was propagating their ideas by the terms of foreign anti-Abdülhamidian publications, leaflets, and secret meetings. The *hafiyes*, the secret police, started watching and persecuting members of the organization. Therefore, many people, who were keen on changing the current political situation in the state started to move out of the Ottoman territories during the last decade of the 19th century. Many of them were located in Paris, Geneva, Cairo, and London. The first circle in Paris was founded under the leadership of Halil Ganem, who started publishing a newspaper called *La Jeune Turquie* in French. Ahmed Rıza (1859 – 1930) came to the Paris and joined the Young Turk circles in 1889. Very much under the influence of positivism and its protagonist August Comte (1798-1857), he wished to change the name of the organization from *İttihad-ı Osmanî* to *İntizam ve Terakki*, which was the direct translation of the “Ordre et Progrès” the motto of August Comte. Nevertheless, many of the Young Turks favored the term “union” instead of “order” for their organization. Therefore the name of the group was changed to *İttihad ve Terakki*

⁴¹ Feroz Ahmad, “The Young Turk Movement,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 3, no. 3 (July 1968), p. 20.

⁴² İbrahim Temo, *İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetinin Teşekkülü ve Hıdemat-ı Vatniye ve İnkılâbı Milliye Dair Hatıralarım* (Romania, 1939), pp. 16-18.

(Union and Progress). Here, Ahmed Rıza started off publishing his *Meşveret* journal in 1895.

In 1896, a number of Young Turks were arrested and banished to Tripoli and Fizan in the Ottoman North Africa. Three of them, namely Yusuf Akçura, Ahmed Ferit (Tek) (1877-1971), and Hüsni sneaked off from Tripoli and moved to Paris. In 1899, Mahmud Celâleddin Pasha (1853-1903), who was married to an Ottoman princess, together with his sons “Prince” Sabahattin (1877-1948) and “Prince” Lütfullah escaped from the Ottoman Empire.

By 1901, the Committee of Union and Progress under the presidency of Ahmed Rıza, remained to be the most influential group among the Young Turks. Ahmed Rıza was always in favor of centralism and Ottoman nationalism, opposing any foreign intervention. A newly emerged and numerous more influential group arose the Young Turks in Paris was thinking differently. During the First Young Turk Congress, held in Paris in February 1902, “Prince” Sabahattin, the leading figure of the new group, proposed to ask for foreign military support for the revolutionary aims. Given the fact that Ahmed Rıza was strictly against this, the Young Turk movement split into two groups during the congress. The group led by Ahmed Rıza was called *Osmanlı İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti* (Committee of the Ottoman Union and Progress), whose publication was *Meşveret*. The other group was led by “Prince” Sabahattin and was called *Teşebbüs-ü Şahsi ve Âdem-i Merkeziyet Cemiyeti* (Committee of Personal Undertaking and Decentralization), who published *Terakki*.

The time when Sadri Maksudî met Yusuf Akçura coincides with the First Congress of the Young Turks. Nevertheless, even though Yusuf Akçura was present

at the Congress, Sadri Maksudî did not seem to be among the members.⁴³ It might have something to do with the fact that Sadri Maksudî was a newcomer in Paris at that time. Even Yusuf Akçura was not officially involved in the Committee of Union and Progress, and was only publishing his articles in *Meşveret* and *Şura-yı Ümmet*. Apparently, Sadri Maksudî was not politically active at that time.⁴⁴ Sadri Maksudî was neither a member of the Committee of Union and Progress, nor was he writing in the Young Turk periodicals. On the other hand, Sadri Maksudî personally got acquainted with such Young Turks as Ahmed Rıza, the future renowned poet Yahya Kemal (Beyatlı) (1884-1958), Ahmed Ferit (Tek)⁴⁵ and Abdullah Cevdet during his years in Paris.⁴⁶ These figures became close friends of Sadri Maksudî, and he met with them several times at the Luxembourg Park, at the university, in libraries, and in restaurants.⁴⁷

In 1903, both Sadri Maksudî and Yusuf Akçura took a leading part in the organization of the 20th year-jubilee of the *Tercüman/Perevodchik* newspaper in Bahçesaray. They published and sent brochures and invitations to many Muslims in Russia supporting the modernist movement. Event though both of them could not personally participate in the jubilee, they worked hard to realize it as the first unofficial gathering of the Muslims of Russia at Bahçesaray.

In November 1902, Sadri Maksudî successfully passed his language examinations and was registered to the first class of the Law School of the

⁴³ Cemal Kutay, *Prens Sabahattin Bey, Sultan II. Abdülhamit, İttihat ve Terakki* (Istanbul: Tarih Yayınları, 1964), pp. 144-145.

⁴⁴ Muharrem Feyzi Togay, *Yusuf Akçura'nın Hayatı* (Istanbul: 1944), p. 41.

⁴⁵ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 29.

⁴⁶ Yahya Kemal, *Çocukluğum, Gençliğim, Siyasî ve Edebî Hâtıralarım* (Istanbul: Baha, 1973), pp. 111-112.

⁴⁷ Âdile Ayda, *Yahya Kemal: Kendi Ağzından Fikirleri ve Sanat Görüşleri* (Ankara: Ajans-Türk, 1962), p. 30.

Sorbonne.⁴⁸ Besides his own Law and Politics classes, the enthusiastic Sadri was curious about philosophy, history and especially sociology. According to his correspondence with Abdullah Battal-Taymas, Sadri Maksudî also attended classes at the *Collège de France*, and the Faculty of Letters of the University of Paris.⁴⁹ He was impatiently waiting with itch for each class of such well-known scholars as Gabriel Tarde, Émile Durkheim, Lévy-Brühl, Spinas, Haumant, Seignobos, and Le Roy-Beulieu, where he usually came across Yusuf Akçura.⁵⁰ Besides, Sadri Maksudî also remembered that together they attended lectures of Jules Halévy, which were associated with the ancient Turkic Orkhon inscriptions, at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales* (The School of Social Sciences).⁵¹

By the time Sadri came to Paris he faced serious financial difficulties and sometimes could not even appease his hunger for several days. His brother Ahmed Hâdi would send specific amounts of money within two or three month intervals. Nevertheless, that money was not enough even to allay his hunger.⁵² İsmail Bey Gaspıralı, during Sadri's visit to Bahçesaray in 1901, also promised financial aid to him, provided that Sadri Maksudî posted some articles for the *Tercüman/Perevodchik*. Initially, Sadri Maksudî could not send the articles for his lack of time. Nevertheless, İsmail Bey was very keen to assist Sadri.

Sadri Maksudî was grateful indeed for Gaspıralı's pecuniary aid. Taking into account this fact together with the role of Gaspıralı's newspaper *Tercüman/Perevodchik* among the Turks of Russia, Sadri started translating Edward Bellamy's (1850-1898) book *Looking Backward* from its French version to the

⁴⁸ Sadri Maksudî's Remarks on His Biography. Ankara. Sadri Maksudî Arsal's Archive.

⁴⁹ Battal-Taymas, *İki Maksudiler*, p. 22.

⁵⁰ Arsal, "Dostum Yusuf...", p. 347.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 28.

Kazan Tatar.* He named his translation *Yüz Sene Sonra Yahud 2000 Sene-yi Milâdiye* (One Hundred Years Later, or 2000) that was published in the *Tercüman/Perevodchik* starting from its 101st issue of 1905 and ending with 81st of 1906. Sadri Maksudî's translation was published in 30 issues of the newspaper at intervals, generally appearing on its first page. Nevertheless, the publication of the translation was not finished, because its last appearance in the newspaper carries a note of sequel, but none actually appeared in the further issues. This either due to possibility that that Sadri Maksudî did not finish the translation, or to the lack of space of the *Tercüman/Perevodchik* in view of the political developments among the Muslims of Russia. Some writers held that this translation belonged to İsmail Bey Gaspralı.⁵³ Nevertheless, given the fact that translation was signed "S. M.," and its drafts were found among Sadri Maksudî's own papers, leave no doubt that this translation belonged to Sadri Maksudî.⁵⁴

The Russian politics toward the Far East resulted in an increasingly tense situation with Japan. After the construction of the Trans-Siberian railway, the Russian Empire headed towards the northern territories of China for its extension. Futile Russian negotiations with Japan over the Far Eastern territories ended with the Japanese attack against the Russian fleet in the harbor of Port Arthur on February 8, 1904. Russian forces faced numerous defeats against the well-organized Japanese army. Moreover, the internal troubles in the early 1905 deepened the humiliating crisis that the Russia had faced. Russia had no other chance but to accept the defeat and to conclude a ceasefire with Japan. In August 1905 a peace conference was held

* There are two possible translations from English to French used by Sadri Maksudî. One of them was published in 1893, and was named *Enl'an 2000*; the other one was named *Seul de son sicle en l'an 2000*, published in 1893 in Paris as the primary one. Online Catalog of the Library of Congress viewed at www.loc.gov.

⁵³ İsmail Gaspralı, *Seçilmiş Eserleri* (Istanbul: Ötüken, 2003), vol. 1, p. 72.

⁵⁴ Sadri Maksudî's Remarks on His Written Works. Ankara. Sadri Maksudî Arsal's Archive.

in Portsmouth, New Hampshire in the United States and afterwards the Portsmouth Treaty was signed.

By the break of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904, which was one of the most significant developments in the international arena at that time, the French press was also very enthusiastic to comment on the war. Given that much information on this subject was made public by the Russian sources, French was in need of Russian speakers, who could make translations from Russian to French. Sadri Maksudî applied for several newspapers to translate articles on this subject. He took advantage of this situation and began to translate newspaper articles and started to earn his life by this way. In spite of the intense working conditions, he managed to fulfill his responsibilities concerning the university. All together, by this time he became an indispensable man for the French press. After his great strides in translations, Sadri Maksudî received the press card and was invited to the Paris balls many times.⁵⁵ Such a chance was really promising good future for Sadri, however, he had only one choice in his mind, which was returning home and serving his own people.

CHAPTER II: THE CAREER IN RUSSIA, 1906-1923

2.1 “Political Spring” in the Russian Empire

Sadri Maksudî graduated from the Faculty of Law and returned straight to Russia in 1906. During his studies in Paris, serious political changes had occurred in Russia. Starting with the industrial strike in St. Petersburg under the leadership of

⁵⁵ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, pp. 33-34.

Father Gapon on January 7-8, 1905 and the Bloody Sunday on January 9, a movement aiming at presenting a petition to the Tsar Nicholas II, which ended with a massacre consisting of 200 people killed and 800 injured,⁵⁶ the wave of major industrial strikes as well as the revolutionary fever spread over Russia. Thanks to the turmoil in the state together with the defeat by Japan, the Russian autocracy had no other solution but to accept to provide several concessions. At this conjuncture, the government promised the convocation of the Duma, the parliament, on January 18. After that, the Tsar signed the October Manifesto, granting the population inviolable foundations of civil liberty, convocation of the State Duma and its superiority in legislation on October 17 (October 30), 1905.⁵⁷

Parallel to the revolutionary movements, even the normally timid Muslims started to organize their own popular meetings, which were to be followed by the Muslim congresses. The First All-Russian Muslim Congress was convened in Nizhnii Novgorod on August 15, 1905. Even though it was planned to hold the meeting at the Hotel Germania, given the fact that the congress was an unofficial one and Muslim delegates could not get permission for it, it was convened at the steamer Gustav Struve under the guise of a riverboat trip on the Oka River. The basic resolution of the congress was political and social unification of all Muslims of Russia through the establishment of an alliance, demanding their rights and an equal footing with other subjects of the Russian Empire.⁵⁸

Following the October Manifesto, Ali Merdan Topçıbaşı, Ahmed Ağaoğlu and Abdürreşid İbrahim composed the regulations and program of the *İttifak* (the Union) alliance in St. Petersburg, and Muslims started to look for political parties

⁵⁶ Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution, 1899-1919* (London: Fontana, 1990), p. 25.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁵⁸ Devlet, *Rusya Türklerinin...*, p. 104.

they could collaborate with. The most likely party in terms of its program seemed to be the *Kadet* (Constitutional Democratic) Party, formed between October 12 and 18, 1905. At this point, the Kazan and Orenburg branches of *İttifak* selected the *Kadet* party and the *Kazan Muhbiri* newspaper published the translation into Tatar of its program. The leading figure among the Muslims, Abdürreşid İbrahim, started negotiations with the *Kadet* representatives.⁵⁹ Afterwards, members of the *İttifak* organized a meeting with a few prominent leaders of the *Kadet* party, and some representatives of the conservative parties in St. Petersburg on December 9, 1905. At the end of the meeting, the *Kadet* representatives proposed the election of Yusuf Akçura as a member to the Central Committee of the *Kadet* party.⁶⁰

The Second All-Russian Muslim Congress was arranged in St. Petersburg between January 13 and 23, 1906. Muslims were not able to obtain the official permission again. Yet the delegates managed to organize several meetings during dinners or in their private houses. During the congress, many of the Muslims gave priority to cooperation with the *Kadets* again, to strengthen in the forthcoming elections to the Duma. At this point, the *Kadets* agreed to adjust specific articles of the party's program to make it more acceptable to the Muslims before the elections.⁶¹

The First State Duma convened on April 27, 1906; however, it was quite short-lived and was dissolved on July 8. The *Kadets* gained absolute majority with regard to the other parties by winning 190 seats of 524 in total, among which the Muslims obtained 25. Following the opening of the Duma, the Muslim deputies formed the "Muslim Faction" (*Musul'manskaia fraktsiia*) and elected Ali Merdan

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 106.

⁶⁰ Rorlich, *The Volga Tatars...*, p. 113.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 113-114.

Topçibaşı (1862-1934) as chair. However, considering the brevity of the Duma, the deputies could not achieve any concrete results. In general, the First State Duma's facilities were restrained by primarily criticizing the state and members of state administration, drafting replies to the Tsar and selection of the commissions.

2.2 The Third All-Russian Muslim Congress

The most significant Muslim congress was the third one with participation of 800 delegates, held in Nizhnii Novgorod between August 16 and 21, 1906. Even though Seyid Gerey Alkin (1867-1919), the Muslim deputy to the First Duma, applied for authorization of the congress, his request was rejected. Later, under Abdürreşid İbrahim, Lütfullah İshakî and Âlim Maksudî's tactical letter to the Ministry of Interior, the Muslims obtained permission for organizing the congress. Hence, the third congress became the first meeting of the Muslims authorized by the government.

Sadri Maksudî got to the congress in time during his way home from Paris. Here he met his friends as well as his brother Hâdi Maksudî and İsmail Bey Gaspıralı. Here, Sadri Maksudî was elected to the commission, consisting of 15 members, to analyze items of the program of the newly formed political party *İttifak el-Müslimin* (The Muslim Union).⁶² In this sense, Sadri Maksudî participated in several discussions. One of them was pertaining to the Article 9 of the program and the unfit between *Şeriat* (Muslim canonical laws) and official Russian legislature in the commercial transactions.⁶³ Sadri Maksudî's second point was expressed during questioning Article 18 that was associated with the parliamentary system

⁶² Musa Carullah Bigi, *Umum Rusya Müslümanlarının Üçüncü Resmi Nedveleri, 1906 sene Avgust 16'dan 20'ye Kadar Beş Kôn Devam Etmîş Meclisler "Protokolü" Zabıt Ceridesi* (Kazan: Kerimiye, 1906), pp. 58-59.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.

consisting of the unique chamber in Russia. Sadri Maksudî defended advantage of two chambers by strengthening his argument with examples of French and Swiss practices. Sadri Maksudî's assertion notwithstanding, his proposal was rejected.⁶⁴

Finally, on the last day of the congress, the delegates elected the Presidium (*İdare-yi Merkeziye*) of the *İttifak*, consisting of 15 members, among whom Sadri Maksudî was elected with 178 votes.⁶⁵

2.3 Sadri Maksudî in the Second State Duma

In the late 1906, elections for the Second State Duma were held in Russia. Sadri Maksudî was nominated from the Kazan *Gubernia* on the *Kadet* ticket and was elected on October 14 1907, becoming one of the 36 Muslim deputies.⁶⁶ The 29 Muslim deputies formed the Muslim Faction and elected Kutluq Muhammed Tevkilev (born in 1850), deputy from the Ufa *Gubernia*, as their chairman. Sadri Maksudî was elected to the secretary post of the faction in addition to the assistant position of the Secretary of the State Duma (*Zamestitel' Sekretaria Gosudarstvennoi Dumy*) among five other assistants.⁶⁷

The Second Duma was also quite short. After its convocation on February 20, 1907, it was dissolved on June 3. The Muslim deputies due to their number and the nature of the Duma itself could hardly play an effective role in the Duma. Sadri Maksudî worked in two commissions during the Second Duma: Financial

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 115-118.

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 168-169.

⁶⁶ "Sadri Maksudî: Pokorneishe Proshu Osvobodit' Menia ot Shtrafa," *Gasırlar Avazı/Ekho Vekov*, no. 3/4, 1998, p. 237.

⁶⁷ Dilâra Usmanova, *Musul'manskaia Fraksiia i Problemy "Svobody Sovesti" v Gosudarstvennoi Dume Rossii (1906-1917)* (Kazan: Master Line, 1999), p. 133, 141. Dilâra Usmanova, "The Activity of the Muslim Faction of the State Duma and Its Significance in the Formation of a Political Climate Among the Muslim Peoples of Russia (1906-1917)," in A. Kûgelgen et al. eds., *Muslim Cultures in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, (Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1988), p. 422.

Commission (*Finansovaia komissii*) and Commission for Scrutiny of the Bills Assigned for Implementing Freedom of Conscience (*Komissii dlia rassmotreniia zakonoproektov, napravlennyh k osushchestvleniiu svobody sovesti*). During the gatherings, he delivered one speech consisting of his critics of the Russian educational system and proposal for education in native languages in official educational institutions. In his speech, Sadri Maksudî pointed out that Muslims were loyal subjects of the Russian Empire and had all rights to receive education in their own languages.⁶⁸

2.4 Sadri Maksudî in the Third State Duma

During the Third State Duma (November 1, 1907-June 9, 1912) the most vocal and active member among the 10 Muslim deputies was Sadri Maksudî. He delivered 17 speeches, whereas all of them were related with the Muslim issues. His primary target in his speeches was acquiring rights for the Muslims and gaining their equity with the Russians. Sadri Maksudî claimed that the Muslim deputies represented twenty million Russian Muslims, who were ready to guard their religion and culture by all possible means.⁶⁹ He continuously pronounced that state has the role of *modus vivendi*,⁷⁰ and each and every citizen had his or her own rights in this context. Moreover, Sadri Maksudî emphasized the unique fact that the Muslim people were not separatists and were destined to live within the state. He accentuated rapprochement with the Russian people and the Russian culture, pointing out that the Muslims did not reject living together with the Russian culture, while wished preserving their own values, traditions, way-of-life.

⁶⁸ "Sadri Maksudî Notığı," *Yıldız*, May 23, 1907.

⁶⁹ Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 118.

⁷⁰ Larisa A. Yamayeva, *Musul'manskie deputaty Gosudarstvennoi dumy Rossii, 1906-1917* (Ufa: Kitap, 1998), p. 138.

In his speeches, Sadri Maksudî criticized low financial expenditures of the budget earmarked for the Muslims.⁷¹ He proposed Friday be the official holiday for Muslims,⁷² as well as the prohibition of selling alcoholic drinks in Muslim districts.⁷³ He criticized the political situation in terms of the fact that there were no Muslim representatives at the *Gosudarstvennyi sovet* (State Council) among its 200 members.⁷⁴ Moreover, Sadri Maksudî felt very uncomfortable about the accusations of “Pan Islamism” on the part of certain Russian official bodies and raids against Muslims with arrests conducted by the former.⁷⁵ Evidently, he accomplished the lifting of the military obligation for the Muslim clergy, as it had been the case for other religious clericals, hitherto excluding the Muslims.⁷⁶ Sadri Maksudî emphasized educational matters several times at the Duma and criticized missionary activities in the Muslim schools. Sadri Maksudî felt uncomfortable about the occupation of the Turkestani lands and particularly the method of occupations, that is the pillage and settlement of the Russians there.⁷⁷ Besides, Sadri Maksudî also proposed rapprochement with the Ottoman Empire and Russia’s establishing friendly relations with the Porte.⁷⁸ Finally, on March 13 1912, three months before the completion of the Third State Duma’s period, Sadri Maksudî made the famous speech that condemned the chasing of the Muslims by the Russian officials and

⁷¹ *Gosudarstvennaia дума. Tretii sozyv. Stenograficheskiĭ Otchet. 1908 god. Sessia pervaiā*, vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1908), column 2643.

⁷² “Sadri Maksudî’nin Duma’da 1 Mayda Yal İtü Köniniñ Müsülmanlar Öçin Cumga Kön Bulun Talep İtip Söylegen Nutıq,” *Yulduz*, May 9, 1910.

⁷³ Yamayeva, *Musul’manskie ...*, pp. 167-170.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 153-160.

⁷⁶ “Biznin Ruhaniler Gasker Bulmylar,” *Yulduz*, December 29, 1915.

⁷⁷ “Sadri Efedî Maksudî Notıgı,” *Yulduz*, May 20, 1910.

⁷⁸ “Sadri Efedî Maksudî Notıgı,” *Yulduz*, May 21, 1910; May 26, 1910.

turned down the Pan-Islamic accusations toward the Muslim people, especially after the Missionary Congress held in Kazan in 1910.⁷⁹

The Muslims constituted a weak minority (10 seats) in the Third Duma, as were the *Kadets*, who possessed 57 seats, and upon whose support they relied. Critical of the situation, Sadri Maksudî suggested the creation of a purely political platform to combine liberals. However, such a union never happened.⁸⁰ During the whole period of the Third Duma, the Muslim deputies were not able to develop their own political machine. Moreover, their affiliation with the *Kadets* made it impossible to pursue an independent political action at the national level. Individually, Sadri Maksudî selected keeping the middle course and highly bound to the *Kadets*.⁸¹ Nonetheless, Sadri Maksudî, after his ardent speeches from the Duma podium, became one of the strongest and essential figures within the national awakening movement of the Muslims of the Russian Empire.⁸²

Sadri Maksudî worked in three commissions in the Third Duma. These were the Financial Commission (*Finansovaia komissii*), where he worked from the 3rd to the 5th sessions; Commission for Assignment of Draft Bills (*Komissii po napravleniiu zakonodatel'nyh predpolozhenii*), from 1st to 5 sessions; and Commission for Scrutiny of the Personal Immunity Bill (*Komissii dlia rassmotreniia zakonoproekta o neprikosnovennosti lichnosti*), from 1st to 2nd sessions.⁸³

⁷⁹ Yamayeva, *Musul'manskie ...*, pp. 178-194.

⁸⁰ "Deputat Maksutov of tret'ei Dume," *Kazanskii Vecher*, December 31, 1907. Cited in Rorlich, *The Volga Tatars ...*, p. 120.

⁸¹ Kurat, "Kazan Türklerinin..." , p. 186.

⁸² Feride Gaffarova, *Sadri Maksudî* (Kazan: DAS, 2001), p. 152.

⁸³ Usmanova, *Musul'manskaia Fraktsiia ...*, p. 145.

2.4.1 Sadri Maksudî's Travels During the Third Duma

The convocation of the First Duma initiated warm relations between Russia and England. The first Russian delegation consisting of the Duma and the State Soviet representatives made their visit to England in 1906 to join the Congress of the International Union of Parliamentarians.⁸⁴ The same union organized the next visit in June 1909. A delegation of 15 Duma deputies and 5 members of the State Council were selected for this journey under the head of Nikolai Alekseevich Khomiakov (1850-1925), chairman of the Third Duma. Kutluq Muhammed Tevkilev, chair of the Muslim faction, was chosen as a member of the delegation from the Muslims. However, he could not take part in the travel, and Sadri Maksudî was chosen to replace him.⁸⁵ Sadri Maksudî accepted the travel basically to explain the situation of the Muslims of Russia there. During the visit to England, Sadri Maksudî made three speeches: the first was delivered during the gathering in honor of Professor Bernard Pares (1867-1949) in London, the second one at the gathering of merchants at the Adelphi Hotel in Liverpool, and the last speech was delivered at the Foreign Press Committee's meeting in Edinburgh. Sadri Maksudî was especially pleased with his speech in Liverpool, where he exposed the demands of the Muslims of Russia to a wide audience.⁸⁶ The travel left pleasant impressions on Sadri Maksudî, proceeding from which Sadri Maksudî delivered a speech at the Cuba audience chamber during the English delegations visit to St. Petersburg in 1912, along with recalling their visit, and its uses in the Russian practices.⁸⁷ After his return, Sadri Maksudî published his travel notes in *Yulduz*, as well as his travel book, which he entitled as

⁸⁴ Paul Miliukov, *Political Memoirs, 1905-1917* (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1967), p. 185.

⁸⁵ Maksudî, *Angliyağa Seyahat*, pp. 6-8.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 119-122.

⁸⁷ *Yulduz*, January 22, 1912.

Angliyağa Seyahat (The Travel to England), published in 1914. The travel was a valuable one, however, upon the delegation's return, it faced strong criticism and protest from the leftist press.⁸⁸

In 1910, Sadri Maksudî travelled to Turkestan and Baku⁸⁹ and visited the Muslim population of the Volga basin, the Urals, and the Kazak steppes on his way.⁹⁰ He arrived in Khokand on September 15, where a big crowd welcomed him at the railway station. The main purpose of Sadri Maksudî's visit was to undertake analyses of the compulsory primary education code of March 31, 1907, as well as propagating the *İttifak*'s program and gaining the support of the Turkestani people for *İttifak*.⁹¹ Besides, he also provided certain assistance for the "Frinduki" Tatar school in Ashkabat.⁹² Sadri Maksudî participated in the Orenburg Congress, probably on his way back from Turkestan, officially held in Orenburg on October 1, 1910 with the presence of 3,000 participants. The only topic discussed during the one-day congress was identification of primary educational matters and language issues for the Muslims of Orenburg.⁹³ At the end of his surveys and investigations, as well as his meeting with the Emir of Bukhara,⁹⁴ Sadri Maksudî gained support from the Muslims and was ready to introduce the following issues related with education to the Duma sessions: education in native languages, inclusion of the religious courses to the curriculum, and the Russian authorities' negotiations with the spiritual administrations of Muslims for reckoning the courses. However,

⁸⁸ Miliukov, *Political Memoirs ...*, pp. 187-188.

⁸⁹ Indus Tahirov, "Parijda Ukığan Sadri," in *Yörte Bizni Yazmışlar*, ed. Ahmet Sahapov (Kazan: Tatarstan Kitap Neşriyatı, 1992), p. 150.

⁹⁰ Akdes Nimet Kurat mentions that Sadri Maksudî travelled in summer 1912. Kurat, "Kazan Türklerinin ...," p. 150.

⁹¹ "S. Maksudî Türkistanda," *Yıldız*, September 29, 1910.

⁹² Tahirov, "Parijda Ukığan Sadri," p. 150.

⁹³ Necip Hablemitoğlu, *Çarlık Rusyası'nda Türk Kongreleri, (1905-1917)* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1997), pp. 85-86.

⁹⁴ Yusuf Akçura, "Sadri Maksudî," *Türk Kültürü*, no. 168 (June 1977), p. 41.

inspirations and demands of Muslims for the educational reform turned out to be unsuccessful with the onset of the World War I and the February Revolution.

2.5 Sadri Maksudî and the Press

While he was a Duma deputy, Sadri Maksudî had not isolated himself from the public. Sadri's brother Ahmed Hâdi published *Yıldız* (Star) newspaper in Kazan from 1906. Sadri Maksudî utilized such an opportunity to communicate with the Muslims by publishing articles on the *Yıldız* pages. Even though the Second Duma had subsisted for a short period of something more than three months, Sadri Maksudî felt himself compelled to inform his electors about their activity in the Duma and published a series of articles called *Sadri Efendi Maksudîniñ Kazan Guberniyası Müsülman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi* (Account of Sadri Maksudî to the Muslim Electors from the Kazanskaia Guberniia) in six issues of the *Yıldız*.⁹⁵ During the Third Duma Sadri Maksudî maintained the same tactic as well.⁹⁶ Furthermore, he published numerous articles associated with financial, political, educational and national issues in order to inform and clarify the Muslim population with the most essential matters. Sadri Maksudî's articles on finance were published under the title of *İlmî Sohbetler* (Scientific Talks), political issues were entitled as *Siyasî Sohbetler* (Political Talks), national questions as *Millî Sohbetler* (National Talks), and educational with the other topics were called *Sohbetler* (Talks).

Besides the "talks," the *Yıldız* newspaper also published Sadri Maksudî's speeches delivered from the Duma podium. Among 18 speeches delivered by Sadri

⁹⁵ "Sadri Efendi Maksudî'nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi," *Yıldız*, July 15, 1907; July 18, 1907; July 20, 1907; July 25, 1907; July 27, 1907; July 29, 1907.

⁹⁶ "Müslüman Fraksiyası Ahvalinden," *Yıldız*, February 29, 1908; "Fraksiya Ahvalinden," *Yıldız*, December 2, 1908; "Müslüman Fraksiyasının," *Yıldız*, May 22, 1911.

Maksudî at the State Duma for almost five years of his parliamentary experience, 12 of them appeared on the pages of the *Yıldız*.

Sadri Maksudî's political activities at the State Duma made him almost a celebrity among the Muslims of Russia. Some of the Muslims were directly calling him in his house in St. Petersburg located in his flat, in the Gogol' street, No. 9, 9. The others expressed their support, critics and proposals in terms of exchange of letters.⁹⁷ The eminent Tatar poet Gabdulla Tukay (1886-1913) depicted the following critical suggestion for the solution of an unexpected situation in his poem called *Piçen Bazarı, yahud Yaña Kisekbaş*, written in 1908:

Qaysı eyte: "Sadri Maksudî barır, Some say: "Let Sadri Maksudî go,
Mes'eleni, belki mecliske salır. He would bring the issue to the assembly
Biz anıñ öçin küp tırıştıq şar salıp, We have tried a lot for him,
*Ahırında Dumağa da sayladıq."*⁹⁸ And elected him to the Duma."

2.6 Sadri Maksudî's Return to Kazan

Sadri Maksudî was not reelected to the Fourth Duma, although he had put his candidacy.⁹⁹ In fact, only seven Muslim deputies were elected there. Sadri Maksudî had one option in his mind for the future: continuing his career in line with his own profession as a lawyer. He started preparing for the examinations that were vital to pass in order to receive an equal degree from the Russian institutions. In the spring of 1913 Sadri Maksudî went in for 9 examinations, namely criminal law, criminal process, civil law, civil process, Roman law, international law, commercial law, financial law, and administrative law at the Moscow University and passes eight of

⁹⁷ Sadri Maksudî, "Beznen Ruhaniler Gasker Bulınıylar," *Yıldız*, December 29, 1915.

⁹⁸ Gabdulla Tukay, *Şiğirler, Ekiyetler, Poemalar* (Kazan: Tatarstan Kitap Neşriyatı, 1990), p. 229.

⁹⁹ Feride Gaffarova, "Rusiya Deület Dumasındağı İşçenligi," in Yahya G. Abdullin et al., eds., *Sadri Maksudî (1879-1957)* (Kazan, 1996), p. 53

them with “highly satisfactory” and one with “satisfactory” grades.¹⁰⁰ Additionally, being a compulsory part for the equivalent degree, Sadri Maksudî prepared his thesis entitled Comparative Study on Property Rights’ Bases of the Roman and Islamic Laws.¹⁰¹ In the end, he successfully accomplished all of the tasks and was granted the diploma on June 1, 1913.¹⁰²

Sadri Maksudî determined to go back to Kazan, to settle and start working there. His wealthy brother Selâhattin Maksudî (1869-1949) had already bought a house for Sadri Maksudî and his family at the Voznesenskaia Street.¹⁰³ After coming to Kazan Sadri Maksudî was elected as a member of the Kazan City Duma (the municipal administration). He applied to the barrister Izmail İzmailovich Stepanov to patronize him for his probationary five-year period and to be enrolled as his assistant on October 27, 1913.¹⁰⁴ Chairman of the Kazan Circuit Court A. Z. Popov, member of the same court N. A. Novikov and Honorary Justice Vasilii Demytyevich Boronin wrote their recommendations for Sadri Maksudî to the Barrister Council of the Kazan Judicial Chamber and the chamber took on Sadri Maksudî as Stepanov’s assistant on November 9, 1913.¹⁰⁵

Sadri Maksudî contributed to the Fourth All-Russian Muslim Congress held in St. Petersburg that started on June 15, 1914 and lasted for 11 days. The congress was held after a long period of time from 1906 owing to the Russian official restrictions. Only 40 delegates were present at the congress. As a matter of fact, it

¹⁰⁰ Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan (*Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan*), Fond 52, Opis’ 1, Delo 230, List 23.

¹⁰¹ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 77.

¹⁰² Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan (*Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan*), Fond 52, Opis’ 1, Delo 230, List 23.

¹⁰³ This street is called the Street of Ostrovskii nowadays.

¹⁰⁴ Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan (*Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan*), Fond 52, Opis’ 1, Delo 230, List 3.

¹⁰⁵ Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan (*Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan*), Fond 52, Opis’ 1, Delo 230, List 10.

was not formally named the “fourth” one for the very same limitations. Furthermore, none of the journalists were allowed to participate in the congress, and the keeping of the records was restricted. As a consequence of the same restrictions, the unique theme raised and analyzed during the Congress was religious administration and religious topics. Individually, Sadri Maksudî made a speech on the Muslim schools and conditions of the Muslim clergy.¹⁰⁶ The congress resolutions were published, but they remained ineffective: they were neither raised at the Duma assemblies, nor regarded by the addressed ministries.

2.7 The February Revolution and Sadri Maksudî

In the course of the fateful days of violent demonstrations and riots in February 1917, the provisional Government (*Vremennoe Provitel'stvo*) was formed under the chairmanship of Prince Georgii Evgen'evich L'vov (1861-1925) on March 2. On the same day Tsar Nicholas II abdicated in favor of his brother Grand Duke Michael, who rejected the throne a day later.

Parallel to these developments, *Millî Şura* (the national soviet) was created in Kazan on March 7, 1917, and Sadri Maksudî was elected there.¹⁰⁷ Afterwards, the Muslim deputies to the Fourth Duma called for a conference of Muslim leaders to be held in Petrograd between March 15 and 17. The main achievements of the meeting were the formation of the Provisional Central Bureau of the Muslims of Russia (*Vremennoe Tsentral'noe Biuro Rossiiskih Musul'man*) and decision to arrange the All-Russian Muslim congress not later than May 14, 1917.

¹⁰⁶ Hablemitoğlu, *Çarlık Rusyası'nda ...*, p. 87.

¹⁰⁷ Nadir Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali ve Türk-Tatar Millet Meclisi: (İç Rusya ve Sibirya Müslüman Türk-Tatarlarının Millet Meclisi 1917-1919)* (Istanbul: Ötüken, 1998), pp. 73-74.

Simultaneously, the Seventh Congress of the *Kadet* Party was held in Petrograd between March 25 and March 28, 1917. Sadri Maksudî, being a member of the *Kadet* Party, also joined the congress and expressed his opinion after Fiodor Izmailovich Rodichev's (1853, or 1856-1932) zealous speech rooting for take over Istanbul and occupation of the Straits, that also contained insults on the Ottoman Sultan. Sadri Maksudî made a contrary speech, which found place in several Russian and Muslim newspapers, on behalf of the Ottoman Empire and the Straits.¹⁰⁸ To enforce his arguments, Sadri Maksudî mentioned that the Muslim population would never remain impartial about the caliphate, and the fact that they had always supported and will be eager to maintain their support for the *Kadets*. His speech caused strong objections from the *Kadet* side, as well as from the Muslims, for speaking on behalf of everyone. Sadri Maksudî expressed his protest to the *Kadets* by not taking part in the poll and resigned from the *Kadet* Party.¹⁰⁹ Still, many Muslims expressed their support for Sadri Maksudî for his brave conduct of two aspects put forward: republican status for Russia based on self-determination and her decentralization, which would enable to launch the federal democracy.¹¹⁰

In the same period, the Provisional Government suggested Sadri Maksudî take part in the Turkestani Committee, established to work together with Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet there. Sadri Maksudî accepted the offer and moved to Tashkent. The Committee was established under the chairmanship of Nikolai Nikolaevich Shchepkin (1854-1919) and consisted of the following members: Preobrazhenskii, Lipovskii, Yel'patevskii, Shkapskii, General Abdülaziz Devletşin, Muhammed Tınışbay, Alihan Bökeyhan (1870, or 1866-1937) and Sadri Maksudî.

¹⁰⁸ Efimii Malov, *O Tatarah, Evreiah i Drugih İnorodstah v Rossiiskoi Imperii* (Kazan: 1999), pp. 64-65.

¹⁰⁹ Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali ...*, p. 80.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 78.

The Provisional Government organized two gatherings through mediation of the committee, one being the general assembly held between April 16 and 23 in Tashkent, and another meeting in Bukhara, on April 17, 1917.¹¹¹ However, upon the ineffectiveness of the committee and impossibility to work with the Soviet, Shchepkin left Turkestan in the late May 1917. Preobrazhenskii, Devletşin and Maksudî also abandoned Turkestan soon after Shchepkin.¹¹² According to Mustafa Çokayoğlu (1890-1941), Sadri Maksudî was the most skillful and effective member of the committee, but his principal lack was his links with the *Kadets*, which thwarted his facilities there.¹¹³

During Sadri Maksudî's stay in Turkestan, the First All-Russian Muslim Congress was held in Moscow between May 1 and May 11, 1917. The main issues discussed all through the congress were state organization, the local administrations, elections to the Constituent Assembly, education, religion, armed forces, land, labor, and women. The most important matter discussed and resolved at the congress, whereas the congress reached the climax, was that of the future state building. Two main trends were present on this question. There were "centralists" supporting the extraterritorial cultural autonomy for Muslims, who opposed to "federalists", who defended territorial autonomies. At the end of voting, the last group prevailed by 446 votes against 271.¹¹⁴ Simultaneously, the Soviet of the Muslims of Russia (*Rusya Müslümanlarının Şurası*) was formed instead of *Millî Şura* during the congress, while Sadri Maksudî was elected as a member among other 9 ones, who were responsible for the Muslims of the Inner Russian and Siberia. Although Sadri Maksudî's candidacy also nominated for the *Müftü* position, Âlimean Barudî (1857-

¹¹¹ Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali ...*, pp. 82-83.

¹¹² Abdullah Battal Taymas, *Rus İhtilali'nden Hatıralar I* (Istanbul: Turan Kültür Vakfı, 2000), p. 46.

¹¹³ Mustafa Çokay, *1917 Yılı Hatıra Parçaları* (Ankara, 1988), pp. 31-32

¹¹⁴ İhsan Ilgar, *Rusya'da Birinci Müslüman Kongresi* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990), pp. 299-300.

1921) won the elections. In addition, the congress resolved to organize the second meeting in Kazan, and later gatherings in Tashkent and Baku.

Sadri Maksudî's return from Turkestan was followed by his deep involvement in politics. At the beginning, Sadri Maksudî, Ayaz İshakî, and İslam Şahahmed succeeded in getting an access to the Winter Palace and meeting with Prince L'vov on July 4 or 5, 1917, the time of riots and armed conflicts in Petrograd. Their intention was gaining 2 ministerial and 3 deputy ministerial posts for Muslims after the prospective fall of the shaky Provisional Government. Afterwards, the three Kazan Tatars went to the Tavrida Palace, where they met with Nikolai Semionovich Chkheidze (1864-1926), chairman of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and Viktor Mikhailovich Chernov (1873-1952), Minister of Agriculture. However, their endeavors proved to be in vain. After resignation of L'vov, the Muslims could not acquire any official posts in the government formed by Aleksander Fiodorovich Kerenskiy (1881-1970) as well.

2.8 Establishment of the National Cultural Autonomy

The Second All-Russian Muslim Congress convened in Kazan between July 21 and 31, 1917. Besides this one, two other assemblies took place simultaneously there: the General Assembly of the Muslim Soldiers (*Müsülman gaskerleri kurultayı*) and the All-Russian Muslims' Clergy Congress (*Bütünrusiya Müsülmannarı Gulema Nedvesi*).¹¹⁵ On July 22, 1917 all three congresses held a shared meeting and arrived at a decision of establishing a national cultural autonomy for Turko-Tatars settled in the Inner Russia and the Siberia. Following the resolution, Sadri Maksudî penned and developed the Principles of the National Cultural Autonomy (*Millî Medenî*

¹¹⁵ Tamurbek Devletşin, *Sovyet Tataristan'ı* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1981), pp. 173-179.

Mohtariyat Esaslari)*, which were approved on July 31. The principles included regulations related to the national, educational, religious, cultural, and administrative aspects.¹¹⁶ Additionally, Sadri Maksudî designed the political organization of the autonomy. In this context, the National Assembly (*Millet Meclisi*) undertook legislative and administrative functions, as well as three ministries, namely Ministry of Religious Affairs, Ministry of Education, and Ministry of Finance, were to form the National Administration (*Millî İdare*), the executive body of the autonomy. In addition to that, the Provincial Assemblies (*Vilâyet Meclisi*) together with the Provincial National Administrations (*Vilâyet Millî İdaresi*) acting in 34 provinces¹¹⁷ would be established to conduct local policies of the national cultural autonomy.

Sadri Maksudî was elected as the Chairman of the National Cultural Autonomy Board (*Millî Medenî Mohtariyet Heyeti*) on July 31, 1917. After elections for the First National Assembly deputies started to come to Ufa, which was resolved to become the center of the autonomy during the congress. As a result of deficiency of the funds, the board decided to establish the National Fund (*Millî Fon*), under chairmanship of Sadri Maksudî to facilitate the collection of money from the population.

The National Assembly convened on November 20, 1917 for the first time. Sadri Maksudî delivered the opening speech, which was followed by Âlimcan Barudî's reading of the Koran and official proclamation of the National Cultural Autonomy of the Muslims of Inner Russia and Siberia (*İç Rusiya hem Sibirya Müslümanlarının Millî Medenî Mohtariyeti*). Three days later Sadri Maksudî was

* For the full text of the principles, see Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali ...*, pp. 127-136.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 191-195.

¹¹⁷ Aydar Habutdinov, “‘Millî İdare’ Kak Pervoe Tatarskoe Pravitel’stvo,” in *Aktual’nye Problemy Istorii Gosudarstvennosti Tatarskogo Naroda*, ed. A. A. Arslanova (Kazan: Matbugat Yorti, 2000), p. 110.

elected the Chairman of the National Assembly. Consequently, he became the chair of National Administration as well.¹¹⁸

Following the debates between the factions of “Turkists” (*Törkiçi*), who argued for religious and cultural sovereignty, and the “territorialists” (*tuфраqçı*), who conceived of sovereignty based on a specific bounded territory, at the National Assembly, it was determined to form a territorially defined republic called “İdil-Ural”, based on national sovereignty.¹¹⁹ The İdil-Ural Republic was announced on January 6, 1918 and its constitution (*İç Rusiya ve Sibirya Müslüman Türk-Tatarlarının Millî Muhtariyet Esasları*), prepared by Sadri Maksudî, was adopted on January 16. The constitution was not different from the national cultural autonomy’s principles, assuming changes made from the extra-territorial to the territorial autonomy and definition of the people from Muslims to the Turko-Tatars. In the course of time, Sadri Maksudî was elected the chair to the National Administration by gaining 28 votes of 77 on January 7, 1918.¹²⁰

On January 11, 1918, the National Assembly went into recess until May 1, 1918. However, before its assembly the National Administration was raided on April 13. On April 8, the Muslim Commissariat (*Müslüman Komissariati*) under the leadership of Mullanur Vahitov (1885-1918) took decision to get hold of the National Assembly. Without undue delay, Mullanur Vahitov himself and Iosip Stalin (1878, or 1879-1953), the Commissar of the National Affairs signed the resolution about liquidating the Assembly. During the incursion only Sadri Maksudî was present there. Members of the National Assembly were rounded up within an

¹¹⁸ Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali* ..., pp. 181-188.

¹¹⁹ Taymas, *Rus İhtilâli'nden* ..., p. 87.

¹²⁰ Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali* ..., pp. 209-214.

hour-and-half, they were forced to resign and the Bolsheviks occupied the assembly building.¹²¹

2.9 Escape to Europe

Sadri Maksudî left Ufa for Kazan after the National Assembly was dispersed red-handed by the Bolsheviks. He stayed here for a while and together with Ayaz İshakî planned to travel to Moscow and protest the abolishment of the National Assembly there.¹²² Not long after, however, Sadri Maksudî and Ayaz İshakî realized it would be utterly useless to apply for Moscow for that matter, and, in any case, the turmoil in Russia would hamper their journey. While Ayaz İshakî thought of cooperation with the White movement, Sadri Maksudî made his mind up to move to Petrograd from one village to another and thereafter flee to Finland.

In Petrograd Sadri Maksudî was met by his fellow Tatars, and his old acquaintance Musa Carullah Bigi assisted him to cross the Russo-Finnish border through the good offices of the smugglers. His countrymen met Sadri Maksudî in Finland and put him up there. Sadri Maksudî was also met with the great hospitality and assistance of some Finnish politicians, such as the Minister of Interior,¹²³ and a number of academicians. While he was a Duma deputy, Sadri Maksudî had defended the autonomy rights of the Finns on several occasions on the Duma podium, and had raised the issue in the press as well.¹²⁴ The Finnish bureaucrats had not forgotten his sympathy for the Finnish cause and Sadri Maksudî was welcome in

¹²¹ Ibid., pp. 284-289.

¹²² Battal-Taymas, *İki Maksudîler*, p. 33.

¹²³ Kadircan Kafılı, "Sadri Maksudî Arsal'ı Anarken", *Tercüman*, February 20, 1958.

¹²⁴ Yrjö Raevuori, *Sadri Maksudî ve Türk-Fin Münasebetleri* (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1965), pp. 26-27. Sadri Maksudî, "Finladiya Mes'elesi Niden Gıybaret?", *Yıldız*, June 6, 1910; June 8, 1906.

Finland as an official guest.¹²⁵ During his 9-10 months residence there the Finnish authorities organized a soiree in honor of Sadri Maksudî, where he delivered a speech on Finland.¹²⁶ Sadri Maksudî did not waste his time in Finland, and read translations of Finnish newspapers and studied in the libraries, which were quite wealthy in terms of their holdings of Russian language books.¹²⁷

2.10 The Paris Peace Conference

After it was decided to hold the peace conference, the National Assembly held a meeting and elected the Peace Delegation (*Sulh Heyeti*) composed of three members, namely Ahmet Tsalikov [Salikati] (1882-1928), Ayaz İshakî and Fatih Kerimî (1870-1937) on January 8, 1918. The National Administration required that these three representatives met in Moscow on January 20, before they would proceed to the conference. However chaos in the state hindered this course of action.¹²⁸

Following the announcement that the Peace Conference would gather on January 18, 1919 in Paris, Sadri Maksudî immediately decided to move to France. By April, the Swedish Embassy offered him a visa, by means of which Sadri Maksudî left Finland and entered Sweden. At the end of April Sadri Maksudî obtained the German transit and French entrance visas and reached Paris in the late May 1919.¹²⁹

Sadri Maksudî's preliminary endeavors were comprised of meetings with representatives of the Entente. Though he initially tried to meet the American

¹²⁵ Kafı, "Sadri Maksudî Arsal'ı Anarken."

¹²⁶ Raevuori, *Sadri Maksudî...*, pp. 28-32.

¹²⁷ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 119.

¹²⁸ Devlet, *1917 Ekim İhtilali ...*, pp. 238-230.

¹²⁹ Battal-Taymas, *İki Maksudîler*, p. 39.

delegation, his efforts proved to be in vain. Sadri Maksudî submitted a Memorandum to the Peace Conference in a written form as the Chairman of the Peace Delegation of the National Cultural Autonomy of Tatars of the Inner Russia and Siberia in the late June or early July 1919. The Memorandum reflected the national aspirations of the Tatar people, encompassing national, religious, cultural and educational rights designed in parallel to the national cultural autonomy justification of the Tatar people. That is, the Memorandum and its demands were aimed at acquiring national sovereignty for the Tatar people without obtaining a territorial autonomy.¹³⁰

Sadri Maksudî was in good terms with the French press probably due to his connections going back to his student years. Not long after his arrival in Paris, writings on Sadri Maksudî began to appear on the pages of the French press. One such piece was published on May 28 in the *Paris-midi*, as well as another article on his activities in *Éclair* on May 30, 1919. As the time passed on, Sadri Maksudî commenced working in the *Le Temps* from June 1919, and thus Sadri Maksudî earned his living in the extremely expensive Paris.¹³¹ Simultaneously he continued to visit and study at the Parisian libraries. Sadri Maksudî also became a member of the *Société Asiatique* (the Asiatic Society) here, and frequently attended its meetings and conferences.

The Ottoman Empire signed the Mondros Armistice on October 18, 1918 at the English battleship *Agamemnon*. The armistice, a *de facto* collapse of the empire, resulted in the Ottoman lost of the territories in the Arabian Peninsula, Syria, and Mesopotamia, her withdrawal from the Caucasus and Iran, the occupation of the

¹³⁰ For the whole text of the Memorandum, see Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Aarsal*, pp. 267-272.

¹³¹ E. J. Dillon, *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference* (New York: Harper & Brother, 1920), pp. 25-44.

Straits by the Entente, and the enforced disarmament of the army. Even though the Ottoman delegation under the presidency of Grand Vizier (*Sadrazam*) Damad Ferid Pasha took part at the Peace Conference in Paris, it was sent back on June 28, 1919 for its demands were deemed unacceptable to the victors.

Sadri Maksudî, as the President of the National Assembly of the Muslims of the Inner Russia and Siberia, submitted his Application to the Peace Conference (*Appel a la Conference de a Paix*) in French and English languages on January 10, 1920.¹³² An eight-page text from the Kazan Tatars, as Sadri Maksudî himself admitted the point, was unlikely to be appreciated and considered to be of importance.¹³³ Even so, Sadri Maksudî was convinced that it was obligatory for him on behalf of his people to make its voice heard for the future acquisition of national rights. Moreover, he thought it would also help to perform a gesture in support of the Ottoman Sultan, and the fair treatment of the Ottoman Empire.¹³⁴

Ayaz İshakî and Fuat Tuktarov, the other two members of the delegation, could not arrive in the right time in Paris either. Following their unsuccessful attempts to combine forces with the White movement, they had to leave Russia for Japan. Here they got in touch with Sadri Maksudî via the Russian embassy, and Sadri Maksudî assisted in transmitting their French visas on August 3, 1919.¹³⁵ However, they had already moved to Harbin and could not get them. İshakî and Tuktarov reached Prague in early 1920. Sadri Maksudî, learned their arrival from the press, and sent a letter to Ayaz İshakî, which was received by him on January 12.¹³⁶

¹³² Musa Gürbüz, "Paris Barış Konferansı ve Sadri Maksudî'nin Türkiye'yi Savunma Mücadelesine Bir Örnek", *Atatürk Yolu*, vol. 5, no. 17 (January 1996), p. 51.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

¹³⁵ Ali Akış et al., eds., *Muhammed Ayaz İshakî...*, p. 282.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

Thanks to the visas, transmittance of which was again assisted by Sadri Maksudî, Ayaz İshakî and Fuat Tuktarov arrived in Paris in March 1920.

The activities and role of the delegates of Muslims of the Russian Empire in Paris was ineffective and very limited during the Peace Conference. Nevertheless, the three delegates did everything they could. They met with the chief of the Russian Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on April 1, 1920, and with the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of France Alexandre Millerand on April 6, 1920. Demands of the delegation expressed during their meetings were not different from the demands enclosed in the Memorandum, which had been submitted to the Peace Conference by Sadri Maksudî in advance. Both officials expressed that their opinions were identical with those of the delegates on the subject of future of Russia, and guaranteed their further official support throughout their meetings.¹³⁷ Besides their demand on sovereignty and justice for the Tatar people of the Inner Russia and Siberia, the delegation also expressed their support for the Ottoman Empire and depicted the necessity of keeping the Caliphate alive.

During their stay in Paris, the members of the delegation saw a good deal of Ahmed Rıza Bey, the senior leader of the former Young Turks and old acquaintance of Sadri Maksudî from his student days, and Ali Merdan Topçubaşı, the chairman of the Azerbaijani delegation at the Peace Conference. According to Topçubaşı, Sadri Maksudî also frequently appeared among the anti-Bolshevik Russian celebrities in Paris, such as Vasilii Alekseevich Maklakov (1869-1957), Prince Georgii Evgenevich L'vov (1861-1925), Boris Victorovich Savinkov (1879-1957), and Sergei Dmitrievich Sazonov (1860-1927).¹³⁸ In fact, the Tatar delegation was a

¹³⁷ Ibid., pp. 218-225.

¹³⁸ Ali Merdanbek Topçubaşev, *Pis'ma iz Parizha* (Bakü: Azərneşr, 1998), p. 86.

proponent of new Russia on democratic bases. Explicitly, the delegation's claim was existence within a democratic Russia rather than gaining an independent territorial sovereignty.¹³⁹

After the terrible famine in the Volga basin started in 1921, Sadri Maksudî, Ayaz İshakî and Fuat Tuktarov tried to do their best for the suffering indigenous people. In this sense, they sent summons in English and French languages to the Muslim states, as well as they applied to the American Relief Administration's representations in various countries for aid.

During his departure from Russia Sadri Maksudî had left his family, his wife Kâmile and his daughter Âdile and Naile, there in 1918. All endeavors of Sadri Maksudî to get in touch with his family were futile. Ahmet Rıza advised Sadri Maksudî to deliver his letters to his family through Ali Fuat [Cebesoy] Pasha, the Turkish ambassador in Moscow. Sadri Maksudî's letters, one being to Ali Fuat Pasha and the other to Kâmile Maksudî, were delivered to the ambassador via Ankara. Afterwards, Ali Fuat Cebesoy lent his hand and facilitated the escape of Kâmile Maksudî and her daughters to Finland in 1922. Sadri Maksudî and his family resided for a short period in Finland and moved to Berlin by the end of July 1922. Sadri Maksudî did not relinquish his academic studies here as well – he regularly worked at the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin.¹⁴⁰

2.11 Sadri Maksudî at the Sorbonne

Sadri Maksudî together with his family moved to Paris in August 1923. Sadri Maksudî was offered to teach Russian language here. Nevertheless, he was not eager

¹³⁹ Abdulvahap Kara, *Türkistan Ateşi: Mustafa Çokay'ın Hayatı ve Mücadelesi* (Istanbul: Da, 2002), pp. 195-197.

¹⁴⁰ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, pp. 132-138.

to teach Russian and denied the offer on the grounds that he strived for an academic career.¹⁴¹ Meanwhile, Sadri Maksudî visited Professor Emile Haumant, the chairman of the Slavonic Institute of the University of Paris and applied for a teaching position there. On the account of the influential recommendation letters from the members of the Asiatic Society, Sadri Maksudî was shortly nominated for lecturing on the “History of the Turks” there.¹⁴² His initial lecture took place on December 4, 1923 with the presence of Professor Haumant, Hüseyin Ragıp, Turkish ambassador to France, Ali Merdan Topçibaşı, and Mustafa Çokayoğlu. The possession of the first professorial status at Sorbonne among the Turko-Tatars made Sadri Maksudî a renowned figure in the Turkish press as well. Turkish journalist Alâeddin Cemil, attended every lecture of Sadri Maksudî, and published a series of articles called “History of the Turks at Sorbonne” (*Sorbonne’da Türk Akvâmı Tarihi*) on the pages of the *Vakit* newspaper.¹⁴³

During his academic career at the Sorbonne, Sadri Maksudî delivered a speech on his personal discoveries at the Asiatic Society on February 13, 1924,¹⁴⁴ which was later published as an article in the *Journal Asiatique* in French in the January-March issue of 1924, as well as in *Türk Yurdu* (Turkic Homeland) in Turkish in April 1925. The article was entitled “The Identity of the Oghuz, Who Were Mentioned in the Orkhon Inscriptions, and the Houei-Hou Uygurs called as such by the Chinese and Mongolians” (*Çinliler ve Moğolların Houei-Hou Uygurlarıyla Orhun Türk Kitabelerindeki Oğuzların Ayniyeti*).¹⁴⁵ As the title speaks for itself, the main argument of the article was that the Uygur people and the Oghuz

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 139.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 141.

¹⁴³ Alâeddin Cemil, “Sorbonne’da Türk Akvâmı Tarihi”, *Vakit*, December 16, 1923; Mart 13, 1924; July 26, 1924.

¹⁴⁴ Zeki Velidî Togan, *Hatıralar* (Istanbul, 1969), pp. 544-545.

¹⁴⁵ Sadri Maksudî, “Çinliler ve Moğolların Houei-Hou Uygurlarıyla Orhun Türk Kitabelerindeki Oğuzların Ayniyeti,” *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 16, no. 1 (April 1925 (1341)), pp. 24-28.

were, in fact, one and the same people. Fuad Köprülü criticized the article in the *Türkiyat Mecmuası* (Turkic Review) for Sadri Maksudî's insufficiency in utilizing the source material, as well as for his reiteration of the known facts on the issue. Sadri Maksudî published his reply, which was deplete the same people with strong arguments against Fuad Köprülü in *Türk Yurdu* in November 1925¹⁴⁶.

CHAPTER III: THE TURKEY YEARS, 1923-1957

3.1 Sadri Maksudî's First Visit to the Turkish Republic

In early 1924, Sadri Maksudî came across the news announcing convocation of the First Congress of the *Türk Ocakları* (the Turkic Hearth) in Ankara on April 23. This celebrated society was formed *de facto* on June 20, 1911, and formal foundation happened on March 25, 1912 (March 12, 1328) with the intention to launch a social and cultural institution that would be above the daily politics and would function for all of the Turks in the world.¹⁴⁷ The establishment of the Republic of Turkey on October 29, 1923 paved the way for rapprochement of the association with the government. Now, under the new circumstances, the society restricted its functions within the boundaries of the young Turkish Republic. As a matter of fact, the *Türk Ocakları* had supported the Turkish War of Liberation, and adopted principles and bases of the newly formed state.

Even though he was already late to join the congress, Sadri Maksudî wrote a letter to the executive committee of the *Türk Ocakları* and solicited the association

¹⁴⁶ Sadri Maksudî, "Çinlilerin Hoei Hou Dedikleri Halkın Orhun Kitabeleri'ndeki Dokuz Oğuzların Aynı Olduğuna Dair İzahat : Köprülüzâde Mehmed Mehmed Fuad Beyin Tenkitlerine Cevap," *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 17, no. 1 (November 1925), pp. 106-111.

¹⁴⁷ Yusuf Sarımay, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları, 1912-1931* (Istanbul: Ötüken, 1994), pp. 121-136.

to deliver several speeches in Turkey. Sadri Maksudî was replied that he was welcome to offer his lectures at the Ankara and Istanbul branches of the *Türk Ocakları* in November 1924.

Sadri Maksudî received a warm welcome after his arrival and spent a hectic schedule in Turkey. Yusuf Akçura organized a banquet in honor of his old friend at the *Millet Bahçesi* (Nation's Park) café on November 13, 1924. The next day, Sadri Maksudî made a speech on the "Instruction of the Turkish History" (*Türk Tarihinin Telkinati*) at the Ankara branch of the *Türk Ocakları*. He delivered another speech on "The Role of Nation, Hero and Dynasty in the History of Turks" (*Türk Tarihinde Halk, Kahraman ve Hânedan Rolü*) on November 17. On November 19, Sadri Maksudî contributed to a discussion and replied the questions here. He delivered his last speech at the Ankara branch of the *Türk Ocakları* on November 21, which was entitled "The Union of Turks" (*Türk Birliği*).¹⁴⁸ As soon as Sadri Maksudî arrived in Ankara, he got an appointment with the President Gazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha [Atatürk] for November 24. Sadri Maksudî visited him on the designed date and accepted Mustafa Kemal's invitation to settle in Turkey.

Sadri Maksudî soon moved to Istanbul and gave three lectures there as well. One of his lectures was delivered at the University (*Darülfünun*) of Istanbul on December 15, which was called "A General Overview of the Turkdom" (*Türklüğe Umûmî Bir Nazar*). The second one was "The Union of Turks", and the last one was "The Role of the Academies in the Discovery and Evolution of the Languages" (*Lisanların İnkişâf ve Tekamülünde Akademilerin Rolü*) delivered at the Istanbul

¹⁴⁸ Hüseyin Tuncer, Yücel Hacıoğlu, and Ragıp Memişoğlu, *Türk Ocakları Tarihi (Açıklamalı Kronoloji)* (Ankara, 1998), vol. 1, pp. 125-126.

branch of the *Türk Ocakları*.¹⁴⁹ Sadri Maksudî enjoyed a large attention in Turkey. All his lectures attracted a large audience, which were also publicized on the pages of *Türk Yurdu* except for one of them.

During his stay in Turkey, Sadri Maksudî presented two of his manuscripts to the Ministry of Education.¹⁵⁰ According to Sadri Maksudî's correspondence with Hamdullah Suphi [Tanrıöver], the president of the *Türk Ocakları* with whom Sadri Maksudî was in close relations, and Âdile Ayda's comments on these books, Sadri Maksudî brought a manuscript called "The Past, Present, and Future of Turkism" (*Türkçülüğün Geçmişi, Bugünü ve Geleceği*).¹⁵¹ The other manuscript, probably entitled "Turkism" (*Turquisme*) was written in French. Actually the latter was brought to Turkey with the intention of introducing it to Mustafa Kemal Pasha.¹⁵² The Ministry of Education, under its minister Hamdullah Suphi, purchased both manuscripts by paying 500 Turkish liras for each. However, both of the manuscripts were never published.

During his stay in Ankara, the Ministry of Education nominated Sadri Maksudî to a post within the Compilation and Translation Committee (*Te'lif ve Tercüme Encümeni*) on November 30, 1924. Approved by the President Mustafa Kemal and by the Council of Ministers, the assignment was sent back to the Ministry of Education on December 6.¹⁵³ On the other hand, having reviewed the

¹⁴⁹ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 152.

¹⁵⁰ A letter from Hamdullah Suphi [Tanrıöver] to Sadri Maksudî. April 15, 1925. Ankara. Sadri Maksudî Arsal's Archive.

¹⁵¹ This book was also mentioned by Baron Carra de Vaux in his book after conducting an interview with Sadri Maksudî. Baron Carra de Vaux, *Les Penseurs de L'Islam* (Paris : Libraire Paul Geuthner, 1926), vol. 5, p. 407.

¹⁵² Ali Vahit Turhan and Füsün Üstel, "Sadri Maksudî'nin Yayınlanmamış Bir Eseri: Turquisme," in *Sadri Maksudî : Tarih hem Hezîrgi Zaman*, ed. R. F. Mõhemmetdinov (Kazan: Master Line, 1999), p. 137.

¹⁵³ *T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi* (Republican Archives of the Turkish Prime Ministry) - Ankara, 030.11.1/ 8.31.19.

memorandum of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Mart 15, 1925, the Council of Ministers' meeting resolved to grant Sadri Maksudî the Turkish citizenship exceptionally, i.e. without fulfilling the residence conditions in view of his "affection to the Turks, academic studies, competence and virtue" on the same day.¹⁵⁴ The acquisition of the Turkish citizenship enabled Sadri Maksudî to work in the Compilation and Translation Committee officially, and he started to receive his salary while he was in Paris.¹⁵⁵

3.2 Sadri Maksudî's Academic Career in Turkey

Even though he planned to arrive in Turkey in May, Sadri Maksudî was able to come to Istanbul only at the end of June 1925. Shortly, he was appointed to the Ankara Law School (*Ankara Hukuk Mektebi*) to lecture on the "History of the Turkish Law" (*Türk Hukuku Tarihi*) and on the "General History of Law" (*Umûmi Hukuk Tarihi*). Later he also lectured the Roman law from 1926 to 1930. Sadri Maksudî brought an innovation by launching the course on the "History of the Turkish Law" for the first time in Turkey and in the world. The main feature of this course was its appraisal of Turkish history from the pre-Islamic period until the present time, rather than the hitherto usual practice starting every historical approach with the emergence of Islam.¹⁵⁶

Sadri Maksudî was also appointed to instruct the History of the Turks and History of the Turkish Law courses at the Faculty of Letters and the Faculty of Law at the Istanbul University in the 1934-1935 academic year. Thus, Sadri Maksudî was

¹⁵⁴ T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi - Ankara, 030.18.01/013.16.10.

¹⁵⁵ A letter from the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Turkey to Sadri Maksudî. April 29, 1925. Ankara. Sadri Maksudî Arsal's Archive.

¹⁵⁶ Ertuğrul Bolaç et al., eds., *Türkiye'deki Türk Dünyası* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998), p. 73.

simultaneously employed at two universities and traveled to Istanbul every month.¹⁵⁷ In 1940, Sadri Maksudî added another course to his curriculum, namely the “Philosophy of Law” and was granted the degree of Professor Emeritus (*Ordinaryüs Profesör*) by the Ankara Law School in the same year.

In the summer of 1943, Sadri Maksudî applied to the Ministry of Education for a single teaching position at the Law School of the Istanbul University rather than a joint one with the Ankara University due to his health problems. Sadri Maksudî was appointed there in the 1943-1944 academic year, where he started lecturing on the “Introduction to Law” and “General History of Law”. Two years later, in 1945, Sadri Maksudî retired from the university. However, since there was no instructor to lecture on the “General History of Law” at the Istanbul University, Sadri Maksudî started lectured on the “General History of Law” from late 1946 to early 1950.

3.3 Formation of the Historical Studies and Sadri Maksudî

Sadri Maksudî harbored affection for the *Türk Ocakları* from its early formation. Sadri Maksudî became a member of this organization during his first visit to Turkey in 1924-1925. Meanwhile, he was elected to the Culture Commission (*Hars Heyeti*)¹⁵⁸ of the *Türk Ocakları* in the course of the Third Congress held on April 23, 1927.¹⁵⁹

Sadri Maksudî played a principal role during formation of the historical studies in the Republic of Turkey. He had relentlessly proposed the necessity of

¹⁵⁷ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 195.

¹⁵⁸ During the Fourth Congress of the *Türk Ocakları*, held on April 23, 1928, this commission was renamed as the Science and Art Commission (*İlim ve Sanat Heyeti*).

¹⁵⁹ *Türk Ocakları 1926 Senesi Kurultay Zabıtları. Üçüncü Kurultay* (Istanbul: Kader, 1927), pp. 73-75.

launching an academy that would deal with history.¹⁶⁰ During the Sixth Congress of *Türk Ocakları*, which was convened on April 23, 1930, Sadri Maksudî, together with Afet İnan and Reşit Galip made a speech on the necessity of creating a special organization that would conduct scientific research on the history of Turks.¹⁶¹ On the same day the Committee of the Research of the Turkish History within the Turkish Hearth Society (*Türk Ocağı Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti*) was established and Sadri Maksudî was elected to the committee as a member.¹⁶² During the extraordinary *Türk Ocakları* congress on April 10, 1931, the association was dissolved and the committee evolved into the Society of Research of the Turkish History (*Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti*) on April 15, 1931. In 1935 the name of the committee was changed to the Turkish Historical Society (*Türk Tarih Kurumu*) and continues to exist to the present day as the most respected institution of historical research in Turkey.

After its foundation, the Research of the Turkish History within the Turkish Hearth Society set off preparations of a book to be entitled “Outlines of the Turkish History” (*Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları*), which was to be the first publication announcing the so-called “Turkish historical thesis”. The basic argument of this “thesis”, announced from above, was that huge waves of migration from the Central Asia towards the south, west and east had taken place from the time immemorial as a result of climatic and economic reasons. The migrants from Central Asia spoke the Turkic language and carried their culture wherever they settled. Thereby, becoming

¹⁶⁰ Maksudî, *Türk Dili İçin...*, p. 450.

¹⁶¹ Adile Ayda, “Sadri Maksudî’nin Türk Tarih Kurumu’nun Kuruluşundaki Rolü,” *Türk Kültürü*, no. 53 (March 1967), pp. 324-325.

¹⁶² Uluğ İğdemir, *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk Tarih Kurumu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973), pp. 73-76.

the fountainheads of several ancient civilizations there.¹⁶³ Even though the “outlines” was published in 100 copies in 1930, its introductory part called “Introduction to the Outlines of Turkish History” (*Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları Methal Kısmı*) was published in 30,000 copies in 1931 and was supplied to the secondary educational institutions. An official textbook entitled “History” (*Tarih*) in four volumes appeared in the same year. As a member of the committee, Sadri Maksudî highly contributed to preparation and publication of these publications. Mustafa Kemal Pasha assigned the Society of Research of the Turkish History revise and update of the “Outlines of the Turkish History” by taking into considerations the latest researches and documents on February 14, 1932. This time Sadri Maksudî penned two manuscripts entitled “1-Scythians, 2-Asian Huns, 3-Yuechis, 4-European Huns” (*1-İskitler-Sakalar, 2-Asiya Hunları, 3-Yüeciler, 4-Avrupa Hunları*) and “Turkic States of the Central Asia” (*Orta Asiya Türk Devletleri*).¹⁶⁴

The First Turkish Historical Congress was organized basically for the history teachers between July 2 and 11, 1932, but played a critical role in publicizing the “Turkish historical thesis”. Sadri Maksudî delivered a speech on “The Factors of History” (*Tarihin Amilleri*) at the congress.¹⁶⁵ He also participated in the Second Turkish Historical Congress held in Istanbul between September 20 and 25, 1937. His speech was entitled “The Role of Turks in the Development of the Concepts and Institutions of State and Law in the history of the Mankind” (*Beşeriyet Tarihinde Devlet ve Hukuk Mefhumu ve Müesseselerinin İnkişâfında Türk Irkının Rolü*).¹⁶⁶ However, for some reason, Sadri Maksudî did not present it orally, but submitted in

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁶⁴ Sadri Maksudî, “1-İskitler-Sakalar, 2-Asiya Hunları, 3- Yüeciler, 4-Avrupa Hunları,” *“Türk Tarihi Ana Hatları” Eserinin Müsveddeleri* (Ankara: 1932), no. 5, pp. 1-62. Sadri Maksudî, “Orta Asiya Türk Devletleri,” *“Türk Tarihi Ana Hatları” Eserinin Müsveddeleri* (Ankara: 1932), pp. 1-50.

¹⁶⁵ *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Konferanslar, Müzakere Zabıtları* (Istanbul, 1932), pp. 339-364.

¹⁶⁶ *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Kongrenin Çalışmaları, Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler* (Istanbul: Kenan, 1943), pp. 1062-1093.

a written form.¹⁶⁷ Sadri Maksudî also contributed to the Third Turkish Historical Congress between November 15 and 20, 1943, and to the Fourth one between November 10 and 14, 1948. During the former he presented a paper on “The Role of Farabi in the History of Culture” (*Farabî'nin Kültür Tarihindeki Rolü*).¹⁶⁸ At the last historical congress he participated, Sadri Maksudî presented a paper on “The Identity of the Bases of ‘Soy-Oymak’ Organization of the Ancient Turks with Genos-Fratria Organization of the Ancient Greeks and Gens-Curia Organization of the Romans” (*Eski Türklerdeki Soy-Oymak Teşkilâtının İstinat Ettiği Esaslarla Kadim Yunanlıların Genos-Fratria Teşkilâtında ve Kadim Romalıların Gens-Curia Teşkilâtında Hâkim Olan Esasların Ayniyetine Dair*).¹⁶⁹

3.4 Sadri Maksudî’s Studies on Language

The Latin script was officially adopted instead of the previously used Arabic one in the Republic of Turkey on November 1, 1928. Sadri Maksudî published a series of articles based on his researches in Europe, and entitled them “The Issue of the Language Reform” (*Lisan Islahı Meselesi*) in *Milliyet*.¹⁷⁰

Being influenced by Sadri Maksudî’s publications, The Prime Minister İsmet Pasha [İnönü] invited him to join the Language Commission (*Dil Heyeti*). However, according to Sadri Maksudî, the Language Commission undertook a fruitless mission, and he was not eager to take part in there.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. XLII.

¹⁶⁸ III. *Türk Tarih Kongresi. Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1948), pp. 352-367.

¹⁶⁹ IV. *Türk Tarih Kongresi. Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1952), pp. 109-124.

¹⁷⁰ Sadri Maksudî, “Lisan Islahı Meselesi,” *Milliyet*, September 28; September 29; September 30; October 2; October 3; October 4; October 5; October 6; October 7; October 9; October 11; October 13; October 14; 1928.

¹⁷¹ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 182.

In 1930 Sadri Maksudî published his masterpiece on the language reform: “For the Turkish Language” (*Türk Dili İçin*). Albeit he had begun its preparations in Berlin in 1922 and 1923,¹⁷² the book was revised and published eight years later. It is most likely that Sadri Maksudî hanged on before the Latin alphabet resolution had passed so that the necessary amendments would be done for the Turkish language. The main aim of this book was to prove the inevitability of creating a modern literary and academic Turkish. The book was well equipped by giving examples of practices of linguistic modernization in other countries, as well as with detailed analyses of the necessary steps to reform Turkish. As a final point, Sadri Maksudî proposed the creation of a Language Academy for Turkey, which would undertake the linguistic reforms in Turkey.¹⁷³ The Committee of Research of the Turkish Language (*Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti*), which evolved into the Turkish Linguistic Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu*), was formed in 1932. However, Sadri Maksudî was not included in its activities, and participated to the Turkish linguistic congresses merely as an auditor.

3.5 Sadri Maksudî in Politics

3.5.1 At Home

After publishing his articles on the language reform in *Milliyet*, President Mustafa Kemal Pasha drew Sadri Maksudî closer to politics. In this sense, Sadri Maksudî spent the summer at Yalova in 1930 regularly attending the “dinners” of Mustafa Kemal, during which many political and social issues were discussed in the presence of academics, state officials, and men of letters, and which constituted the most important “unofficial” platform of the Kemalist Turkey. In this sense,

¹⁷² Battal-Taymas, *İki Maksudîler*, pp. 42-43.

¹⁷³ Maksudî, *Türk Dili İçin*, pp. 443-450.

according to the official records, Sadri Maksudî was invited to the “dinners” or met with Mustafa Kemal 106 times from 1931 to 1938.¹⁷⁴

In 1931, Mustafa Kemal Pasha nominated Sadri Maksudî for the parliament and Sadri Maksudî was elected to the Turkish Grand National Assembly (*Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi*) from the Şebın Karahisar (Karahisar-ı Şarkî) province on the People’s Republican Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*) ticket.¹⁷⁵ In February 1935 Sadri Maksudî was elected for the next term to the National Assembly from Giresun, as Şebın Karahisar had become a part of the province of Giresun in 1933.¹⁷⁶

In aftermath of the World War II, and during the foundation of the Democratic Party (*Demokrat Parti*) in Turkey on January 7, 1946, Sadri Maksudî began writing articles to the *Tasvir* (Description) daily, which were published under the “Scientific Talks” (*İlmî Sohbetler*) title. His articles focused on two issues. On the one hand, he propagated the necessity to grant autonomy for the universities, and, on the other, he promulgated the democratic bases. Both issues were mainly stemmed from the threat of communism after the Soviet victory against the Nazi Germany, and proliferation of the communistic ideas in Turkey. In this sense, with regard to the latter issue Sadri Maksudî published his article on “Two Worldviews are Against Each Other” (*Dünyada İki Türlü Hayat Telâkkisi Karşı Karşıya*) by stating the superiority of liberalism against Marxism.¹⁷⁷ His following articles, which exalted democracy were “Democracy and Law” (*Demokrasi ve Hukuk*)¹⁷⁸,

¹⁷⁴ For detailed chronological information on Sadri Maksudî’s meetings with Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, see Özel Şahingiray, *Atatürk’ün Nöbet Defteri: 1931-1938* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1955).

¹⁷⁵ Inspection Commission of the Election Commission of Karahisar of the Şebın Karahisar Province (*Şebın Karahisar Vilâyeti Karahisar Dairei İntihabiyesi Heyeti Teftişiyesi*).

¹⁷⁶ Inspection Commission of the Election Commission of Giresun of the Giresun Province (*Gireson Vilâyeti Gireson Dairei İntihabiyesi Heyeti Teftişiyesi*).

¹⁷⁷ Sadri Maksudî, “Dünyada İki Türlü Hayat Telâkkisi Karşı Karşıya,” *Tasvir*, October 21, 1945.

¹⁷⁸ Sadri Maksudî, “Demokrasi ve Hukuk,” *Tasvir*, November 29, 1945.

“Ideologies of the Political Parties” (*Siyasî Partilerin İdeolojileri*)¹⁷⁹, “Scientific and Psychological Bases of Democracy” (*Demokrasinin İlmî ve Ruhî Esasları*)¹⁸⁰, “Scientific and Philosophical Bases Relied upon by Democracy” (*Demokrasinin İstinat Ettiği İlmî ve Felsefî Esaslar*)¹⁸¹, “Democracy and the Principle of Equity” (*Demokrasi ve Müsavat Esası*)¹⁸², “Democracy and Liberty” (*Demokrasi ve Hürriyet*)¹⁸³. With regard to the universities and their autonomy, Sadri Maksudî penned “Science and Liberty” (*İlim ve Hürriyet*)¹⁸⁴, “Scientific Liberty in the Ancient Greece” (*Kadim Yunan’da İlmî Muhtariyet*)¹⁸⁵, “Liberty of the Universities” (*Üniversite Muhtariyeti*)¹⁸⁶, “Reasons for Liberty of the Universities” (*Üniversite Muhtariyetini Zarurî Kılan Sebepler*)¹⁸⁷.

Two founders of the Democratic Party, namely Adnan Menderes, the future Prime Minister, and Refik Koraltan, the future Chairman of the Turkish parliament, were old acquaintances of Sadri Maksudî. While Adnan Menderes was his brilliant student from the Ankara Law School between 1931-1935, who graduated with an honor degree,¹⁸⁸ Refik Koraltan was his close friend from the parliament’s 1935-1939 term. Sadri Maksudî was nominated from the Ankara province,¹⁸⁹ and he was elected to the National Assembly for his third term on May 14, 1950. After the elections, while the newspapers were exploring who would be the President and the Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey, *Son Saat*, as well as other dailies gave the name of Sadri Maksudî among those who were pronounced for the aforesaid

¹⁷⁹ Sadri Maksudî, “Siyasî Partilerin İdeolojileri,” *Tasvir*, December 6, 1945.

¹⁸⁰ Sadri Maksudî, “Demokrasinin İlmî ve Ruhî Esasları,” *Tasvir*, December 10, 1945.

¹⁸¹ Sadri Maksudî, “Demokrasinin İstinat Ettiği İlmî ve Felsefî Esaslar,” *Tasvir*, December 23, 1945.

¹⁸² Sadri Maksudî, “Demokrasi ve Müsavat Esası,” *Tasvir*, December 30, 1945.

¹⁸³ Sadri Maksudî, “Demokrasi ve Hürriyet,” *Tasvir*, January 6, 1946.

¹⁸⁴ Sadri Maksudî, “İlim ve Hürriyet,” *Tasvir*, February 17, 1946.

¹⁸⁵ Sadri Maksudî, “Kadim Yunan’da İlmî Muhtariyet,” *Tasvir*, February 24, 1946.

¹⁸⁶ Sadri Maksudî, “Üniversite Muhtariyeti,” *Tasvir*, March 3, 1946.

¹⁸⁷ Sadri Maksudî, “Üniversite Muhtariyetini Zarurî Kılan Sebepler,” *Tasvir*, March 10, 1946.

¹⁸⁸ Enise Arat. January 20, 2003. Unstructured Interview with the Author. Aşağı Ayrancı, Ankara.

¹⁸⁹ “Demokrat Partinin Aday Listesi Dün İlân Edildi,” *Cumhuriyet*, April 25, 1950.

positions.¹⁹⁰ Sadri Maksudî neither became the President, nor the Prime Minister, however, he actively worked at the parliament. Though Sadri Maksudî also had put his candidacy for the Chairmanship of the Turkish National Assembly, but did not win the elections.¹⁹¹ At the same time he vigorously participated in the activities of the Commission of Foreign Affairs (*Dışışleri Komisyonu*), and in some other temporary commissions' functions. Analyzing all speeches of Sadri Maksudî at the Turkish National Assembly, one can clearly observe that Sadri Maksudî defended two main issues to a greater extent. The first one was the problems of the Turkish language, and the necessity of preserving the language reform process in Turkey. The other issue was concerned with improvement of the educational system in Turkey, especially at the universities.

3.5.2 Abroad

Sadri Maksudî was nominated a member of the Turkish delegation to the League of Nations' assembly held in London in 1936,¹⁹² as well as to the Breslau assembly of the league in 1937,¹⁹³ where the Turkish delegation actively participated at the discussions and negotiations.¹⁹⁴

The European Union of Parliaments called representatives for its Fourth Congress that was to be held in Constance in September 1950. The Turkish committee to the union was elected on July 7, 1950, while Sadri Maksudî became the chairman of the committee.¹⁹⁵ Sadri Maksudî proposed three points in his address to the congress, which were adopted here. The points concerned the system

¹⁹⁰ "Kimin Cumhurbaşkanı Olacağı Henüz Belli Değil," *Son Saat*, May 18, 1950.

¹⁹¹ Cansever Tanyeri, "Sadri Maksudi Arsal'ın Türkiye'deki Siyasi Hayatı," in Yahya G. Abdullin et al., eds., *Sadri Maksudî (1879-1957)* (Kazan, 1996), p. 60.

¹⁹² *T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi* - Ankara, 030.18.01/02.64.36.16.

¹⁹³ *T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi* - Ankara, 030.18.01/02.75.50.5.

¹⁹⁴ Âdile Ayda, *Bir Demet Edebiyat* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1998), p. 73.

¹⁹⁵ "Parlamentolar Birliği Tük Grubu," *Vatan*, July 14, 1950.

of elections to the Constituent Assembly, the qualifications of the executive and legislative bodies, and the preservation of the national sovereignty of the future member states after the integration. Sadri Maksudî was also elected to the Constituent Assembly during the congress. One of the most important achievements of the congress was resolution to enlarge the Atlantic Pact's sphere of influence towards the Mediterranean.¹⁹⁶ During the next congress of the union in Strasbourg between May 4 and 7, 1951, Sadri Maksudî raised two issues: one was the national sovereignty term once again and the other was equity of the seats at the European Council for each member. Both proposals were accepted by a majority vote.¹⁹⁷

3.6 Last Years of Sadri Maksudî

Sadri Maksudî had an accident in 1953. In the evening of April 2, a car struck Sadri Maksudî while he was crossing the street in Ankara. The injured Sadri Maksudî was put in the Nümûne Hospital immediately.¹⁹⁸ The Ankara Governorship reported the accident to the Ministry of Interior, and the report was transmitted to the Prime Ministry and to the Turkish National Assembly from there.¹⁹⁹ Thank God, Sadri Maksudî was not wounded that much. However, he decided to end his political career subsequent to the end of the National Assembly's term and settle in Istanbul eventually.

The last work of Sadri Maksudî was a book entitled "The Sociological Bases of the National Sentiment" (*Milliyet Duygusunun Sosyolojik Esasları*). Even though it was prepared in a short period from autumn 1954 to summer 1955, this work of

¹⁹⁶ "Parlamentolar Birliđi Kongresi," *Cumhuriyet*, September 22, 1950. "Parlamentolar Birliđi Kongresinde Türk Heyetinin Oynadıđı Büyük Rol," *Vatan*, September 22, 1950.

¹⁹⁷ "Avrupa Federasyonuna Dair Tekliflerimiz," *Cumhuriyet*, May 12, 1951.

¹⁹⁸ "S. Maksudî Kaza Atlattı," *Zafer*, April 4, 1953.

¹⁹⁹ T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi - Ankara, 030.10/77.514.32.

Sadri Maksudî revealed the basic principles of his studies starting from his migration years in Europe and ending with his academic studies in Turkey. As soon as he finished penning the book, Sadri Maksudî made its presentation at the Konak Hotel to the press and renowned writers on June 16, 1955,²⁰⁰ and had it published in the same year. Once he finished the work, Sadri Maksudî began translating it to French and succeeded to do so in five months. Although he yearned for to have the translation published in France, no publishing house accepted the offer.²⁰¹

Sadri Maksudî got sick in early 1956, and the illness became serious in early 1957. On the doctors' advice, Sadri Maksudî was hospitalized to the Gureba Hospital²⁰² in Istanbul in late January 1957. Sadri Maksudî went into a coma on February 17,²⁰³ and passed away on February 20, 1957. The funeral service was performed at the Beyazıt Mosque from where the deceased was taken to the Istanbul University for a ceremony, and was taken to the Zincirlikuyu Cemetary for his eternal rest on February 22.²⁰⁴

Throughout his academic and political activities Sadri Maksudî was a prominent figure and performed his best in Turkey.²⁰⁵ Evidently, he always regarded all of the Turks as a single group either in Russia or in Turkey. Subsequent to his death, commemorative ceremonies of Sadri Maksudî were organized by the Ankara Law School in 1959, as well as by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Turkey

²⁰⁰ Peyami Safa, "Milliyetçilik Üzerine Bir Eser," *Milliyet*, June 17, 1955.

²⁰¹ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, pp. 239-240.

²⁰² Nowadays known as the Çapa Hospital.

²⁰³ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 242.

²⁰⁴ "Ord. Prof. Sadri Maksudî Toprağa Verildi," *Cumhuriyet*, February 23, 1957.

²⁰⁵ Gönül Pultar, "Sadri Maksudî Arsal'ın Türkiye'deki Politik Faaliyetleri," in Yahya G. Abdullin et al., eds., *Sadri Maksudî (1879-1957)* (Kazan, 1996), p. 38.

in 1977.²⁰⁶ Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, international scientific conferences on Sadri Maksudî were organized in Kazan, in 1994 and 1998.

²⁰⁶ Invitation Cards to the Commemorative Ceremonies of Sadri Maksudî. Ankara. Sadri Maksudî Arsal's Archive.

PART TWO: SADRI MAKSUDĪ ARSAL’S VIEWS ON POLITICAL AND SOCIAL MATTERS

CHAPTER IV: HIS VIEWS ON NATIONALISM

In order to analyze Sadri Maksudĭ’s considerations on the formation of the nations and nationalism, it is better to pick up earlier and present approaches on the issue. Therefore, initially the present author presents historical overview on nations and nationalism together with the current approaches, and makes a general analyses together with Sadri Maksudĭ’s thoughts on the issue.

4.1 Nations and Nationalism

Nation, derived from the Latin word *natio*, was originally used to define a group of people belonging to a specific community with respect to their similarities of birth. In this sense, the term was used in medieval times to distinguish different groups of people. It acquired its modern meaning following the French Revolution, during which its ideologues stated that the principle of revolution resided essentially in the nation. According to them, the nation became a group of “associates living under one common law and represented by the same legislature”.²⁰⁷

However, it currently seems very difficult to find a specific and universally accepted definition of a “nation.” Various scholars have formulated different definitions for the “nation” through their academic studies and endeavors. Ernest Renan formulated one of the first definitions of a nation, whereby he stated that a nation was comprised of “a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in

²⁰⁷ Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1961), pp. 13-15.

the future”.²⁰⁸ Max Weber examined the nation as a “prestige community” endowed with a sense of cultural mission. In this sense, he affiliated nations to ethnic communities whereas populations were unified by a myth of common descent.²⁰⁹ On the other side, Elie Kedourie argued that a nation is “a body of associates living under one common law and represented by the same legislature”,²¹⁰ while Karl Deutsch maintained that a nation was “an alignment of large numbers of individuals from the middle or lower classes linked to regional centers and leading social groups by channel of social communication and economic intercourse, both indirectly from link to link and directly with the center.”²¹¹

The term “nationalism” was apparently coined in German by Johann Gottfried Herder and in French by Abbe Barruel somewhat less than 200 years ago.²¹² Nationalism is generally used to describe two phenomena. On the one hand, it means the attitude that the members of a nation hold when they care about their national identity, while on the other hand it represents the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve or sustain some form of political sovereignty. The first and the theoretical definition of nationalism raises questions about the concept of a nation (or national identity). The second meaning raises questions about whether sovereignty must be understood as the acquisition of full statehood with complete authority for domestic and international affairs, or whether something less than statehood is required.

4.1.1 Historical Overview of the Approaches on Nationalism

²⁰⁸ Ernest Renan, “What is a Nation?”, in Homi K. Bhabha, ed., *Nation and Narration*, (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 19.

²⁰⁹ John Hutchinson et al., eds., *Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 15.

²¹⁰ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, pp. 13-15.

²¹¹ Hutchinson, *Nationalism*, p. 28.

²¹² Craig Calhoun, “Nationalism and Ethnicity”, *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 19 (1993), p. 213.

Nationalism, as an ideology and a social movement, has been very much in evidence since the end of the 18th century. The origins of the nationalist doctrine can be traced back to the German Romantic thought. Though Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was not a nationalist, he defined the freedom of an individual in terms of his/her respect for the laws of morality, something everyone was to find within their own character. This was actually the revolutionary definition of freedom that paved the way for nationalism.²¹³

Kant's disciple Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) indicated language as the most imperative factor for the nation's maintenance of its identity. He advanced that language mirrored the national soul, and that the protection of the language from the invasion of impurities emanating from other languages was similar to defending the national soul against subversion by foreign values. For Fichte, this implicitly indicated that only people who spoke their original languages could be connoted as nations. According to him, the geographical borders of the state should coincide with the frontiers of people who speak the same language. The state, which was ought to bear the highest rank of culture, was also supposed to create freedom in the internal and the spiritual sense for its population. Freedom, then, was realized only by absorption within the state as only through the state could the individual attain coherence and acquire reality in this mystic unity.²¹⁴

According to Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), the diversity of nations was characterized by traditions such as language, religion, art, literature, education, customs, and political institutions. The peculiar combination of these elements separated one nation from the other and gave each of them a unique character. For

²¹³ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, p. 16.

²¹⁴ Umut Özkırımlı, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction* (New York: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 17-18.

him, nationalism was neither a political, nor a biological concept; it was rather spiritual and moral. Herder argued that language had the chief importance for formulation of the nation. Language was the manifestation of unique values and ideals, and it possesses synonymous character with thoughts so that each community has its own mode of thinking.²¹⁵ In addition, language was the most distinctive expression of a spirit or essence of a nation and the only way in which that spirit could manifest itself. Nation and language could not be discriminated from each other as language was also considered an expression of the identity of a nation.²¹⁶

Language was the most important component of a nation in nationalist discourse from Herder to Fichte. In their doctrines each nation has a spirit, individuality or soul as well as its essence, and this essence can be transported only via language. For them, the purity of language reflected the authenticity of national culture or tradition.

One of the most influential figures in the formulation of the political approach was the French political thinker Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), who prepared the modern bases of identification of nation and state. However, he also made it possible for the close integration of cultural and emotional principles with political life. Rousseau introduced the idea of “national character” and the “spirit of nation” to control the political life of communities, and sought to translate them into a practical program of national preservation and restoration. He attached importance to the national individuality and its maintenance through preservation of the nation’s manners and customs. He claimed that the nation was not made of people and walls; according to him, traditions, government, constitution, and the manner of existence

²¹⁵ Özkırımlı, *Theories of Nationalism...*, p. 17.

²¹⁶ Hans Kohn, *Nationalism: Its Meaning History* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1965), pp. 21-22.

that emerged from the people was to be given priority.²¹⁷ Rousseau placed sovereignty within the framework of the population, which was to express its will for sovereignty. According to him, the true political community was to be based only on the virtue of its citizens and their love for the fatherland.²¹⁸

Ernest Renan (1823-1892) described nation as a moral conscience. For him, nations were something fairly new in history, since even though classical antiquity had empires, republics, and municipal kingdoms, it could hardly be said that the nations in the modern understanding of the term existed then.²¹⁹ He insisted that neither religion, nor language supplied an adequate basis for the constitution of a modern nationality.²²⁰ Geography or natural frontiers played a considerable part in the division of nations.²²¹

Renan claimed that every individual was neither a slave of his language, nor his religion. A large gathering of men created a kind of moral conscience that is called nation. For him, nations could be understood by disregarding such differences as race and language. Renan defined nation as a soul and a spiritual principle stemming from the past to the present. The former lies in the past, which is the possession of a rich legacy of common memories, while the other lies in the present, and encompasses the desire to live together. A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past,

²¹⁷ Josep R. Llobera, *The God of Modernity: The Development of Nationalism in Western Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 1996), pp. 154-157.

²¹⁸ Kohn, *Nationalism...*, p. 31.

²¹⁹ Renan, "What is a Nation?", p. 9.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

and of those that one is prepared to make in the future, which expresses desire to continue a common life.²²²

Otto Bauer (1881-1938) and Karl Renner (1870-1950), who wrote under the pseudonym of Rudolf Springer, systematically developed the idea of non-territorial cultural autonomy. Being members of the Austrian Social Democratic Party, they tried to solve problems confronted by their party. At the same time their doctrine aimed at finding a solution to the serious problem of ethnic and linguistic antagonism in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Both defined the nation as a union of similarly speaking and similarly thinking people. They argued that the state should adopt federalism in its internal organization. The economic and social issues should be delegated by the state, and national functions should be restricted to education and culture. Federalism would consist of non-territorial autonomies, where a particular (ethnic) group is granted autonomy rights benefiting all its members, and must fulfill the respective obligations that simultaneously come with them, regardless of their residence on the territory of the host state.²²³

Émile Durkheim (1858-1917) sought to formulate a positive science of “social facts”. He issued a declaration of independence of sociology from philosophy, biology and psychology. Durkheim always insisted that “social facts” must be considered as “things”, that is, since they are too diverse and complex, they have to be explained by the complex as well. These social facts were governed by laws of their own, which could be measured and compared.

²²² Ibid., p. 19.

²²³ Rainer Bauböck, *Multinational Federalism: Territorial or Cultural Autonomy* (Malmö: IMER, 2001), pp. 4-5, 29-36.

Durkheim began with the premise that in order to know man, one must know his social environment. He called the whole group of individuals “society”, whereby he was not speaking about a great universal entity, but of any well-defined group. Durkheim believed that society was within as well as outside of the individual. In this sense, he placed the whole emphasis upon collective life, distinct and superior from that of its members. He regarded these “societies” as the most powerful combination of physical and moral forces, and endowed them with a personality, morality, and manner of thinking and feeling of their own.

Durkheim listed certain “social facts” such as fixed emotions and intense feelings of a patriotism under the label of “collective conscience” (*conscience collective*), which imposed itself upon the individual. If “social conscience” as well as “social facts” such as traditions and aspirations of the group were destroyed, Durkheim assured that society would collapse.²²⁴

Durkheim was a strong advocate of the properties of moral discipline. He felt that men needed the aspiration of a new ideal of moral solidarity, which would in turn arouse the spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion.

Durkheim defined the nation as follows:

A nationality is a group of human beings, who for ethnical or perhaps merely for historical reasons desire to live under the same law, and to form a single state; and it is now a recognized principle among civilized peoples that when this common desire has been persistently affirmed it commands respect, and is indeed the only solid basis of a state.²²⁵

He used such terms as “people”, “nation”, “state”, “society” synonymously to denote a “collective being” distinct and superior than individuals. The constituent

²²⁴ M. Marion Mitchell, “Emile Durkheim and the Philosophy of Nationalism,” *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 1 (March 1931), pp. 89-91.

²²⁵ Emile Durkheim, *Germany Above All*, translated by J. S. (N.P., 1915). Quoted in Mitchell, “Emile Durkheim...,” p. 96.

elements of his national society were cultural, and his nation was largely the product of the “social facts”, such as customs, traditions and beliefs derived from a common historic past. At the same time, in each nation law, economic organization, literature, language, monuments, and moral philosophy were consistent with the character of its constituents. This character was not subject to daily change.²²⁶

Durkheim, through his pamphlets, wished to make France a strongly integrated national unit. However, he neither sought to restore the excessive integration of primitive society, nor did he seek to attain his aims through increased centralization.

4.1.2 Current Approaches on Nationalism

Nowadays there is still no consensus on the definition of nationalism. Therefore, in order to clarify different approaches, it is better to classify them according to their attitudes as is generally accepted. There are mainly two approaches on the nature of nation and nationalism, which are primordialism and modernism. Primordialists hold that ethnic identities are primordial, and human beings belong to fixed ethnic communities as well as to their families “by nature”. On the other hand, the modernist scholars maintain that since nationalism emerged in the last two centuries, nations and nationalism have to be regarded as inherently modern and inevitable components of the rise of modern states. At the same time there is the ethno-symbolic approach, proposing something of a “middle ground” between primordialism and modernism.

4.1.2.1 Primordialism

²²⁶ Mitchell, “Emile Durkheim...,” pp. 96-97.

Primordialism comes from the adjective “primordial”, which is defined in three ways: first in the order of time, original, elemental; first in order of appearance in the growth of the development of an organism; and the elementary principle, first, primeval, transcending. Primordialism is not a theory, but rather an approach including scholars who regard nationalism as a natural part of human beings, and defend their point that nations have existed since time immemorial. According to this approach, every person carries connections (or attachments, the widely used term by primordialist scholars) derived from his/her place of birth, kinship relations, religion, language, and social practices that are natural to him/her from the beginning of his/her life. These primordial ties have naturally divided human beings into the culture-communities as basic organizing principles, in the same way they differ sexually or are geographically located in different parts of the world.²²⁷

In this sense, Clifford Geertz, a primordialist scholar, generalizes and gives the best explanation for primordialism:

By a primordial attachment is meant one that stems from the “givens” – or, more precisely, as culture is inevitably involved in such matters, the assumed “givens” – of social existence: immediate contiguity and kin connection mainly, but beyond them the givenness that stems from being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices. These congruities of blood, speech, custom, and so on, are seen to have an ineffable, and at times overpowering, coerciveness in and themselves.²²⁸

Edward Shils argues that the strength of these attachments does not come from interaction, but from “a certain ineffable significance ... attributed to the tie of blood.”²²⁹ For him these attachments can be described only as primordial. Therefore,

²²⁷ Anthony D. Smith, “The Problem of National Identity: Ancient, Medieval and Modern?” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3 (1994), pp. 376-367.

²²⁸ Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (London: Fontana, 1993), 2nd ed., p. 259.

²²⁹ Edward Shils, “Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties,” *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1957), p. 142.

primordialist scholars claim that primordial entities are given, or a priori; and primordial attachments are natural and spiritual rather than sociological. Thus, if any individual is a part of a certain group, he comes to possess certain attachments to that group and its practices, such as culture, lifestyle, traditions, language, etc.

4.1.2.2 Modernism

In contrast to primordialists, modernist scholars argue that nation and nationalism are outcomes of modernity and its narrative conditions such as capitalism, industrialism, urbanism, bureaucracy, mass communication, etc.²³⁰ In general, such modernist scholars as Tom Nairn, Michael Hechter, Elie Kedourie, Ernest Gellner, John Breuilly, Benedict Anderson, and Eric J. Hobsbawm maintain that nation and nationalism are totally modern phenomena, which emerged as a result of the revolutionary transformations through history. Therefore, nations are products of the invention, creation and the construction of the nationalist ideology.²³¹

Anthony D. Smith criticizes modernists on the grounds that they adopt merely the Western conception as a norm, and disregard the rest. He indicates that the Western conception includes strong emphasis on birth and residence of citizens within the specific territory, their belief in the nation as a political community, importance placed upon citizenship, and the need for a public culture and civic religion.²³² Apparently, all of the modernist scholars agree that nation is defined through five factors that are observed only in the modern conditions. These factors are a common territory, a legal community, the legitimatization of nationalist

²³⁰ Anthony D. Smith, "When is a Nation?", *Geopolitics*, vol. 7, no. 2 (Autumn 2002), p. 6.

²³¹ Smith, "When is a Nation?", p. 6.

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

ideology, an international element in the global system of nation-states, and mass community, that is to say a complete consciousness of belonging to the nation and the resulting participation in national life.²³³

The modernist scholars use a different methodology in their approaches towards nationalism. For instance, the neo-Marxists, namely Nairn, and Hechter stress the importance of economic factors, while Breuilly, and Hobsbawm emphasize the role of politics and power struggles between contending elites. On the other hand, Gellner, and Anderson give priority to cultural factors. The last two perspectives, namely political and cultural approaches, have gained strength among the modernist scholars.

One of the differences that separate political nationalism from cultural nationalism in terms of their understanding of state is the subject matter, concerning whether the priority should be given to the state or to individuals, especially on the matter of which comes first. Yet, the dimensions attributed by some scholars to political nationalism may also be attributed to cultural nationalism and vice versa.

Hobsbawm developed the radical political doctrine by defining nationalism as a product of the quest for territorial state, and arguing that the origins of nationalism should be sought at the point of intersection of politics, technology and social transformation. In other words, nationalism comes into being in the context of particular stages of technological and economic developments. According to Hobsbawm, both nation and nationalism are products of the so-called “social engineering” factor, that is, the nation and its associated phenomena are the most

²³³ Ibid., p. 7.

pervasive factors of traditions invented by the state authorities.²³⁴ For instance, Hobsbawm states that national languages cannot emerge before necessary inventions to print and spread literacy within the society.²³⁵ He maintains that the years between 1870 and 1914 have to be considered as the zenith of invented traditions, the period in which the ruling elites introduced three major inventions, namely those of primary education, invention of public ceremonies, and mass production of public monuments.²³⁶

For cultural modernists nation is created, kept together and kept alive by powerful cultural assets that can be listed as a standard language, a common history, a common literature, a common religion, customs, traditions, and geography. The diversity of the nation is characterized by these common elements and their peculiar combination separates one nation from the other and makes it a unique society.

According to Gellner, one of the representatives of cultural modernism, nationalism is a product of industrial social organizations; that is nations emerge “when general social conditions made for standardized, homogeneous, centrally sustained high cultures, pervading entire populations and not just elite minorities.”²³⁷ Gellner puts forward three stages in human history: the hunter-gatherer, the agro-literate, and the industrial. Here, nationalism becomes important during the third stage, whereas such characteristics as the nationalities of the rulers of the previous two stages were not important for the ruled people in the pre-modern times. Relationship between culture and power is the main factor to expose nationalism in

²³⁴ Eric J. Hobsbawm and et al., eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 1.

²³⁵ Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 10.

²³⁶ Hobsbawm, *The Invention...*, p. 270.

²³⁷ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), p. 55.

industrial societies. However, culture plays a more active role in industrial societies that are characterized by high levels of social mobility than the others.²³⁸

Anderson suggests that people regard nationalism as a distinct mode of understanding and as constituting the phenomenon of belonging together. Therefore, according to Anderson nation is an “imagined political community”. He explains his formulation as follows:

It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion... The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations... It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm... Finally, it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.²³⁹

He is totally convinced that nationalism has to be understood not with political ideologies, but with cultural systems, which preceded it, and by means of which it took form. As a part of cultural systems, Anderson takes the notion of language, “print-capitalism”, or the capitalist cultural production in terms of novels and newspapers, and graphic and synoptic expression in the proliferation of maps as the essential cultural condition of nationhood.

4.1.2.3 Ethno-symbolic approach

In the recent years the modernist arguments have been challenged by a number of scholars who focused on the role of pre-existing ethnic ties in the formation of modern nations. These scholars argue that modernists overlooked the

²³⁸ Ibid., pp. 9-20.

²³⁹ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991), 2nd ed., pp. 6-7.

persistence of earlier myths, symbols, values and memories in many parts of the world and their continuing significance for large numbers of people.²⁴⁰ Ethno-symbolist scholars such as John Armstrong, Anthony D. Smith, and John Hutchinson propose a “midway” for the primordialists’ vs. modernists’ debate. In this sense, they form a more homogeneous category than the primordialists and the modernists, through emphasizing the need to examine the emergence of modern nations from the early past by highlighting the ethnicity factor in a larger scale. However, they reject the strict continuity of the primordialists due to transformations brought by modernity.²⁴¹ According to the ethno-symbolist scholars’ nationalist doctrine, the history plays a legitimately constructive role as the evidence of a nation. In their conception of nationalism, history has gained a privileged position to verify the uniqueness of institutions, customs, language, by tracing back their roots to the old ages of the nation. Anthony D. Smith maintains that nationalism is historical in character since it sees the world as a product of the interplay of various communities and each community possesses a unique character and history, and they are the result of specific origins and developments.²⁴²

4.2 The Nationalistic Doctrine of Sadri Maksudî

“The Sociological Bases of the National Sentiment” remains to be the unique piece of Sadri Maksudî on nationalism. However, the fundamental ideas expressed here are not different from those articulated in his earlier studies in such fields as history, law, and linguistics, and in his articles. Yet, this last piece assembled Sadri Maksudî’s basic views around the issues of formation of the nations and

²⁴⁰ Anthony D. Smith, “Opening Statement: Nations and Their Pasts,” *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1996), p. 361.

²⁴¹ Özkırmılı, *Theories of Nationalism...*, pp. 167-169.

²⁴² Anthony D. Smith, “Nationalism and Historians,” in *Ethnicity and Nationalism*, ed. A. D. Smith (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), p. 58.

nationalism. The readily understood language of the book together with rich examples, arguments and suggestions deserves to be regarded as a masterpiece on nationalism, and especially on the sociological bases of the doctrine.

As it can be deduced from the book, the influence of Rousseau on Sadri Maksudî's years at the teachers' school, as well as inspirations from Durkheim, his professor at the Sorbonne are highlighted to a large extent. This can be derived also from the two personalities' role in the intellectual development of Sadri Maksudî. However, Sadri Maksudî developed his own peculiar perspective on nationalism and expressed it in his book.

4.2.1 Sadri Maksudî on Formation of Nations and Nationalism

According to Sadri Maksudî the basic factor that initiated the formation of the nations were races. However, he did not define races in anthropological terms, or through division of individuals into groups by means of their somatic peculiarities. According to him the ethnologic factors bore a more important role than physical ones, and nations came into being from ethnologically defined races. Sadri Maksudî maintained the importance of the ethnological factors by reason of his notion that races, even after the collapse of their states, do not lose their language, traditions, customs, and affiliations to their past.²⁴³

Sadri Maksudî argued that after originating from the ethnologically defined races, nations develop on the biological and sociological grounds respectively. Whether nations emerged from one predecessor (monogeneses) or from more predecessors (polygeneses), all people subsisted within patriarchal families, which later evolved into ethnic groups. Due to the biological law of struggle, these ethnic

²⁴³ Sadri Maksudî Aarsal, *Milliyet Duygusunun Sosyolojik Esasları* (Istanbul: Çeltüt, 1955), p. 16.

groups combined into the clans, and by the same reason into the tribes, then into the ethnic nations by forming the state authority in the final phase.²⁴⁴ Sadri Maksudî maintained that either together with, or after these developments sociological factors started to function and develop the nations as well. Initially, loyalty of members as well as their devotion to their nation, their solidarity, and necessity to keep themselves alive developed as time passed. Later on these feelings were substituted by the national consciousness and nationalism.

Sadri Maksudî, after generalizing the process of the nations evolvment*, indicated nine causes and conditions that influenced their developments. These causes were the unification of groups by and large belonging to a unique race under one state authority; a crowded population; a common geographical location; the sovereignty of that state for a long period of time; common language; common customs and traditions; common religion; unique national character; and common roots in terms of race.²⁴⁵ Besides these points, Sadri Maksudî pointed out that national heroes and the law of imitation* were pretty influential for the formations of the nations.

Sadri Maksudî objected to the supremacy of some nations over others, especially to a notion proposed by de Gobineau. According to Sadri Maksudî no nation was superior to other, and the prevalent leadership of the western world in the 20th century did not entail its inherent superiority over the others. Sadri Maksudî emphasized the fact that cultural centers or preponderances had always changed over

²⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 44-48.

* Sadri Maksudî analyzed tribal nations, in other words not the nations which carried their *sui generis* properties from the beginning, which were actually too few. His orientation was on the nations developed by means of combinations of tribes and clans.

²⁴⁵ Aarsal, *Milliyet Duygusunun...*, pp. 58-68.

* Imitation of traditions, language, psychological factors, and national character within the nations, mostly from top to bottom of the social structure, or from superior to the others.

time, thus no nation could be considered second-rate.²⁴⁶ In 1946 Sadri Maksudî responded to the premises that the European culture would die in the aftermath of the World War II. He stated that cultures did not collapse, but the cultural centers were changing.²⁴⁷

Sadri Maksudî asserted that together with the formation of the nations two important elements emerged. One was the “national sentiment”, or nationalism; and the other was the “national character”. The “national sentiment” had two properties. On the one hand, it involved individuals’ psychological devotion and respect for the past of their nation, including their achievements and triumphs, as well as misfortunes and debacles. These devotions were clarified by the nationalities’ affection for national cultures, their language, “nationalized” religious faith, national traditions, and recognized predecessors. On the other hand, the “national sentiment” included the national ideals, aims and thoughts for the future. Therefore, the “national sentiment” involved dynamic progress, evolution, and aspirations for the future.²⁴⁸ Sadri Maksudî stated that the “national sentiment”, or nationalism, emerged together with formation of the nations, irrespective of time. In addition to the “national sentiment”, people also gained the “national character” after their nations were formed. Though Sadri Maksudî admitted that nations did not possess totally polarized characters, however, according to him there were specific inclinations that each nation had, and by means of which nations were distinguished from the others. The “national character” comprised the respect of the population for their nation, and people did their utmost to preserve it forever. At this point, Sadri

²⁴⁶ Arsal, *Milliyet Duygusunun...*, p. 41.

²⁴⁷ Sadri Maksudî, “Medeniyet Mahsulleri ve Kültür Kıymetleri Zail Olmaz,” *Tasvir*, April 28, 1946.

²⁴⁸ Arsal, *Milliyet Duygusunun...*, p. 73-76.

Maksudî proceeded from Durkheim's inspirations that the "national character" is gained slowly in a long course of time, however, it is also lost at a snail's pace.²⁴⁹

Throughout his studies on nationalism, Sadri Maksudî totally rejected cosmopolitanism, which overlooked and reduced to insignificance the national principles, along with chauvinism and imperialism, which symbolized extreme nationalism. Sadri Maksudî strived to find a method as a result of which people would live in peace and considered that the formation of federal states would be the best structure to end wars and oppression. Evidently, his proposed federal administration had to function rationally together with providing national sovereignty, liberty, and autonomy to its members. In concluding his work, Sadri Maksudî made a general analysis and maintained that nationalism should have the following properties: rationality, sociological and psychological bases, liberalness, egalitarianism, democracy, pacifistic character and federalism, idealistic and optimistic features.²⁵⁰

4.2.2 Sadri Maksudî's Theory and the Others

As Sadri Maksudî himself noted, his justifications of nationalism were not totally novel. His views more or less composed the general standpoints of the previous historians of law and sociologists. However, according to him, any scholar who stressed nationalism proposed some certain issues, while at the same time neglected the others. Accordingly, Sadri Maksudî mentioned that when taking singularly Füstel de Coulanges's religious faith, Mommsen's language, Ratzel's geographical location, the role of the races of Gustave Le Bon, and the economic

²⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 78-85.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 220-224.

factors of Otto Bauer were unsatisfactory to analyze the emergence of the nations.²⁵¹ Thus, Sadri Maksudî derived his own *sui generis* theory by means of analyzing and combining other approaches and retaining his analyses on the socio-biological grounds.

Even though Sadri Maksudî's theoretical doctrine does not exactly match any other, it is pretty noticeable that he followed the track of Rousseau and Durkheim, the former being his admired philosopher and the latter his professor at the Sorbonne. Rousseau was a politically oriented scholar. Yet, he proposed the amalgamation of politics with the cultural factors, and launched the "national character" issue, the role of which was underlined by Sadri Maksudî after the formation process of the nations. However, Durkheim's sociological viewpoint was felt more extensively in Sadri Maksudî's analyses. Indeed, the "social facts" of Durkheim as well as his assertions on the longings of the nations to live under state authority are considered as the basic factors for the formation of the nations.²⁵² Among the "social facts", Durkheim's assertions on the national ideals and aspirations constituted the backbone for the formation of the nations for Sadri Maksudî. In this respect, in 1911, shortly after *Türk Yurdu* had started to be published, he sent an article on "The Great National Ideals" (*Büyük Millî Emeller*) to the journal with the pseudonym "Can Bek". In the article, Sadri Maksudî emphasized the utmost role of the ideals for individuals as well as for the nations concerning their future.²⁵³ In this sense, Sadri Maksudî compared a nation without an ideal to a soulless corpse.²⁵⁴ In 1946, Sadri Maksudî touched on the national

²⁵¹ Ibid., p. 70.

²⁵² Hamit Zübeyir Koşay, "Sadri Maksudî Arsal'ın Hizmetleri ve Millet Anlayışı," *Türk Kültürü*, no. 53 (March 1967), p. 318.

²⁵³ Sadri Maksudî, "Büyük Millî Emeller", *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 1, no. 1 (November 30, 1911), pp. 14-15.

²⁵⁴ Sadri Maksudî, "Büyük Millî Emeller", *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 1, no. 2 (December 24, 1911), p. 29.

ideals again. He stated that spiritual, or the purposeful life was the real life,²⁵⁵ as great personalities create these ideals for the nations.²⁵⁶

Sadri Maksudî stood completely against the standpoint of Ernest Renan considering the importance of the physical circumstances in the process of the formation of the nation, rather than religion and language. However, Sadri Maksudî attached importance to the geographical dynamics as well, and the “national soul” of Renan was extant and constituted a notable part in Sadri Maksudî’s analyses.²⁵⁷ Besides Renan, the linguistic arguments of Fichte and Herder, as well as the biological evolution of Herbert Spencer were also present among Sadri Maksudî’s list of imperative dynamics.²⁵⁸

It is uneasy to tackle Sadri Maksudî’s line within the current approaches and theories. First of all, it is quite obvious that Sadri Maksudî cannot be considered a primordialist due to the fact that primordialist scholars consider “attachments” as natural and inherent spiritual factors, rather than those which were formed through biological and sociological process. Moreover, none of the “attachments” were subject to modifications in the flow of time for primordialists. However, Sadri Maksudî’s view was that all “attachments” developed on the socio-biological bases and may be modified, albeit too slowly. Sadri Maksudî gave priority to the political and cultural factors during the formation of nations. However, unlike the modernist scholars, Sadri Maksudî held a totally contrary position with reference to the modernity of the nations and effects of the political factors starting from the French Revolution. He regarded the French Revolution as an important development for

²⁵⁵ Sadri Maksudî, “İnsanların Manevî Hayatında Gaye ve İdeallerin Rolü,” *Tasvir*, April 7, 1946.

²⁵⁶ Sadri Maksudî, “Milletlerin Hayatında Büyük Fikir ve İdeallerin Rolü,” *Tasvir*, April 14, 1946.

²⁵⁷ Koşay, “Sadri Maksudî Arsal’ın . . .,” p. 317.

²⁵⁸ Arsal, *Milliyet Duygusunun...*, pp. 44-48.

nations and nationalism, but rejected the fact that the revolution brought out the “national sentiment”. According to Sadri Maksudî nationalism was on the same age with the nation.²⁵⁹ In this sense, neither the political modernism of Hobsbawm, nor the cultural modernism of Gellner and Anderson suit Sadri Maksudî. It seems that Sadri Maksudî’s viewpoint is quite similar to that of the ethno-symbolists more than any of the others. Sadri Maksudî’s historical methodology is analogous with the ethno-symbolists’ approach, which underscores ethnicities as well as stressing their traditions, religion and language from the past, and esteems the role of political developments.

CHAPTER V: HISTORY: CAUSES AND EVENTS

5.1 Introduction

Sadri Maksudî attributed particular importance to history. According to him, history was not simply a chronological study of a nation, but it was especially an inspiration for that nation’s character, its inclinations, nature, spiritual life and future.²⁶⁰ Sadri Maksudî regarded the historical sense and anxiety about the future like two sides of the same coin. For him, whenever nations would like to predict their future they had to rely on their past. He mentioned that every nation had a desire for living with its ideals for the future. On the other hand, in order to predict the future, it is compulsory to pay attention to every lesson from the past. The importance of history according to Sadri Maksudî originated from its sociological dynamic nature. As he pointed out himself: “There would be limited results and

²⁵⁹ Ahmet Bican Ercilasun, “Sadri Maksudî’nin Milliyetçiliği,” *Türk Kültürü*, no. 301 (May 1988), p. 307.

²⁶⁰ Sadri Maksudî, “Türk Tarihinin Telkinatı”, *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 15, no. 4 (January, 1925), p. 143.

benefit from learning history if history and historiography would be comprised only of chronicles and annals.”²⁶¹

Sadri Maksudî’s studies in history started from his student years in Paris. Due to his political activities in Russia, he was not involved in historical studies earlier, except for his attendance in Radloff’s lectures in St. Petersburg. After abandoning Russia in 1919, Sadri Maksudî undertook detailed studies on Turkic history and language in various European libraries.

In late 1924, Sadri Maksudî visited Turkey in order to give speeches in the conferences organized by *Türk Ocakları*. There, he delivered several speeches on Turks and the Turkish language. By far the most important among them was on the “Instruction of the Turkish History” (*Türk Tarihinin Telkinâtı*). Throughout his speech, which was later published in *Türk Yurdu* in January and February 1925, Sadri Maksudî depicted certain personal observations of the Turks and their history. He stated that all of the Turks had common features like the vigor and strength, the inclination to expansion, the preservation of their political sovereignty, giving birth to the heroes and leaders, and the concern for law and order. In addition, even though the Turkic leaders attached extra importance to the political and administrative issues, the Turkic people themselves generated their own culture in the historical process. Moreover, the Turks took notice of science and knowledge, as well as they were liberal about religious affairs of their people.²⁶²

5.2 Sadri Maksudî on the Factors of History

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Ibid., pp. 144-146.

During the First Turkish Historical Congress, Sadri Maksudî delivered a speech on “The Factors of History.” This speech bore parallels with his socio-biological approach on nationalism, since Sadri Maksudî’s nationalism was also defined in historical terms. According to him, during each period of history historians were focused on two different areas. On the one hand, they tried to define the developments and occurrences, on the other hand, they were concerned with the factors that shaped these developments. As a historian, Sadri Maksudî tried to shed light not only on the historical events and the final outcomes, but also took upon himself the task of clarifying the foremost causes and factors that shaped the history. After his broad examinations, Sadri Maksudî derived nine main factors that influenced historical moments and the social life of humanity. For him, historical factors could be summarized as follows: physical and geographical factors, psychological factors, great ideals, race, conquests and migrations, evolutionism, economic factors, nation, and great personalities.

With regard to the physical and geographical factors, Sadri Maksudî accentuated the point that in the early formation of the nations they played the most significant role. He gave the example of the migrations of Turks from Central Asia as it was stated within the “historical thesis”.²⁶³ On the issue of the psychological factors, he particularly mentioned inventions together with imitations due to psychological reasons. Here Sadri Maksudî stated that legal institutions spread from one center to other locations, as it was with the adoption of the British parliamentary system by other countries.²⁶⁴ Within the context of the ideals, Sadri Maksudî listed nationalism and political sovereignty as the most important ideals, which changed

²⁶³ *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*, p. 344.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 346.

the historical process, where he provided the French Revolution as an example.²⁶⁵ In his explanations for the role of race, Sadri Maksudî pointed out the Turks and their role in the cultural developments of humanity. Here, he maintained his approach for the so-called “historical thesis” by means of underlying the migrations of Turks and their originality in terms of their Brachycephalian type of skull. Nevertheless, he did not connote the inequality between the races by attaching importance to the Turks.²⁶⁶ In addition to the race, conquests, migrations and great personalities are especially involved within the Turks’ role in history. He stated that great personalities such as Alparslan, Melik Shah and Gazi Mustafa Kemal have originated from the nation itself. For the theory of evolution and the economic factors, Sadri Maksudî argued that these elements had contributed to the historical developments as well, but in a lesser degree compared to the other aforementioned factors.

5.3 Sadri Maksudî and the “Turkish Historical Thesis”

As it can be observed from his studies on history, Sadri Maksudî was an advocate and follower of the so-called “Turkish historical thesis”. However, he also questioned and opposed some aspects of the thesis. In this sense, after some exaggerations and amplifications on the thesis*, Sadri Maksudî wrote a letter to Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the end of 1931. There, Sadri Maksudî wrote that it would be difficult for European scholars to accept the thesis, yet they could not reject the primary assertions of the Turkish historians. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the secondary statements together with the subjective accounts in the thesis would cause troubles. Therefore, Sadri Maksudî suggested that it would be better if the secondary

²⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 347-348.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 350.

* Like regarding Achaeans as Turks by Yusuf Ziya, Professor from the Ankara University, Faculty of Law and Eskişehir deputy to the Grand National Assembly.

statements would rely on European sources as much as possible. In his letter, Sadri Maksudî also tried to persuade Mustafa Kemal Pasha to avoid hypotheses developed through linguistic resemblance as much as possible.²⁶⁷

During the First Turkish Historical Congress a significant discussion occurred between Sadri Maksudî and Zeki Velidî [Togan] concerning the thesis. On July 25, 1931 and May 29, 1932 Zeki Velidî wrote his opinions about the Outlines of Turkish History and History books respectively.²⁶⁸ He expressed his own criticisms about both books and pointed out that the already existent 17 towns located in Central Asia* were incorrectly mentioned as buried deep into the sand. Actually the fact about the buried towns was more or less connected with the historical thesis, whereby emphasizing the buried towns would be more persuasive to explain migration of the Turks from Central Asia. According to Zeki Velidî's argument, none of the towns were buried under the sand, and in fact some were even inhabited at that time.²⁶⁹ On the second day of the First Turkish Historical Congress after Reşit Galip's question concerning the subject of drought in Central Asia that caused migration of the Turks to the west, Zeki Velidî replied that he believed in the drought, which occurred merely in the pre-historic times and not later.²⁷⁰ The other discussion with the presence of Zeki Velidî occurred on July 7. This time Sadri Maksudî opposed to his views regarding the towns. In fact, this issue became a matter of pride for Sadri Maksudî. For this reason he continued to strengthen his formulation through academic sources written by such authors as P. Lerch, Bretschneider, Barthold, Howorth, Petrovskii, and E. Chavannes. Zeki Velidî took

²⁶⁷ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Aarsal*, pp. 171-173.

²⁶⁸ Ahmet-Zeki Valîdi, *On Yedi Kumaltı Şehri ve Sadri Maksudî Bey* (Istanbul: Bûrhaneddin, 1934), p. 4.

* Namely Otrar, Cent, Yangıkent, Sağnak, Atlak, Atbaş, Almalık, Balasagun, Talas, Kulan, Barshan, Sus, Suyap, Nüzket, Şelci, İlibalık, and Sütken.

²⁶⁹ Valîdi, *On Yedi Kumaltı Şehri...*, p. 54.

²⁷⁰ *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*, p. 168.

the matter personally as well. During his residence in Vienna, he wrote the book entitled “Seventeen Buried Towns and Sadri Maksudî Bey” (*On Yedi Kumaltı Şehri ve Sadri Maksudî Bey*). There, he sought to explain his hostility with Sadri Maksudî and to prove his assertion about the above-mentioned Central Asian towns.

Besides, Sadri Maksudî brought up another issue about the Turkic origin of the Sumers with regard to the “historical thesis”. In his paper on “The Role of Turks in the Development of the Concepts and Institutions of State and Law in the History of the Mankind” during the Second Turkish Historical Congress, whilst giving examples to the ability to form states among Turks, Sadri Maksudî mentioned that “The Sumers, who had found the first state in Mesopotamia were certainly Turks.”²⁷¹ While explaining legal structures among the Turks, Sadri Maksudî mentioned the written tablets of Sumers containing commercial and legal documents, epics, poems, etc. Additionally, he referred to the pieces of the law journal belonging to the Sumers.²⁷² Further on, he referred to Babylon, and Hammurabi’s legal codes. Sadri Maksudî mentioned that the Babylon, as well as Assyrians, was an extension of the Sumer civilization, implying that they were of Turkic origin as well.²⁷³

As time passed Sadri Maksudî’s concerns about the historical thesis changed. For instance in his masterpiece on law called “Turkish History and Law” (*Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk*), Sadri Maksudî analyzed the Turkish history in terms of law by dividing his analysis into four periods, namely Central Asia, Islamization, Seljuks, and the Ottoman Empire, leaving out the pre-historic times.²⁷⁴ On the other hand, Sadri Maksudî chose the Orkhon inscriptions, the Uygur literature, Turkish epics,

²⁷¹ *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*, p. 1071.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 1082-1083.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 1084.

²⁷⁴ Sadri Maksudî Arsal, *Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk* (Istanbul : İsmail Akgün, 1947), p. 68.

verbal folk literature, and customs together with materials on customary law of the Turks who lived in the North and Central Asia as the basic sources on the subject.²⁷⁵

CHAPTER VI: LANGUAGE AND REFORMS

Sadri Maksudî was always filled with admiration and affection for the Turkish language. Most probably his interest in this area developed with İsmail Bey Gaspiralı's ideals to form a unique literary language among the Turkic groups. In the course of his student days Sadri Maksudî willingly participated in Professor Halévy's courses devoted to the Orkhon inscriptions at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes. According to Sadri Maksudî, by the end of each lecture, professor praised the Turks to him and Yusuf Akçura. He kept in mind the following words of Halévy:

By the time when Orkhon inscriptions were written none of the present European languages had come onto the scene. Your ancestors had a developed literary language able to explain everything even then. Your culture is much older than cultures of the nations today, you can be proud of this.²⁷⁶

During his deputy years in St. Petersburg, Sadri Maksudî intensely attended at the private meetings of the famous Russian Turcologist of German origin Radloff. Radloff devoted himself to his researches in the daytime, and to discussions with his friends and students in the evenings. Sadri Maksudî regularly attended Radloff's discussions for approximately four years. Thereupon, on Radloff's advice, Sadri Maksudî started reading the indispensable literature concerning the dialects, grammar and phonetics of the Turkic language.²⁷⁷

6.1 Sadri Maksudî on the Turkish Language and Linguistic Purification

²⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 69.

²⁷⁶ Arsal, "Dostum Yusuf...", pp. 347-348.

²⁷⁷ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 53.

Sadri Maksudî expressed his view on linguistics and the Turkish language for the first time when he came to Turkey in late 1924. Sadri Maksudî talked about the unity of Turks by describing the subject matter in terms of language and culture in Ankara on November 21 1924.²⁷⁸ Soon after, he addressed the same question in Istanbul. Above and beyond this, Sadri Maksudî dealt with another topic at the University (*Darülfünun*) of Istanbul entitled “The Role of Academies in the Discovery and Evolution of the Languages” (*Lisanların İnkışâf ve Tekâmülünde Akademilerin Rolü*).²⁷⁹

Both speeches constituted the complementary parts of the language issue. Throughout his conference on “The Unity of Turks” Sadri Maksudî talked about the uniqueness of the Turkic language and culture in the pre-Islamic era, by concentrating on the language question to a higher extent. Specifically, by providing examples from the Orkhon and the Kirghiz Barlık inscriptions, the author defended that the Turkic people residing in different geographical areas spoke the same language.²⁸⁰ In the end, Sadri Maksudî derived the conclusion that during the 6th, 7th and 8th centuries the Turks stretched in the vast area between the Mongolian lands and the Dnepr River, even up to the Danube River, were all speaking a single Turkic language.²⁸¹ In addition, Sadri Maksudî pointed out to the demise of the united Turkish language after the invasion of the Arabic words and the conquests of Genghis Khan. He mentioned that after the Arabic missions and Islamization, the Turks widely adopted Arabic and Persian words. Alternatively, after the Genghis

²⁷⁸ Tuncer, et al., *Türk Ocakları Tarihi...*, p. 125.

²⁷⁹ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, p. 152.

²⁸⁰ Sadri Maksudî, “Türk Birliği”, *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 16, no. 5 (August 1925), pp. 214-216.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

campaigns, even though Turks were united for a specific time, they lost their consciousness of being the Turks and later their unity also disappeared.²⁸²

Sadri Maksudî's speech on the role of academies responded to the "What is to be done?" question. According to Sadri Maksudî languages were created unconsciously at first. However, in order to create modern languages, Sadri Maksudî maintained that they had to be processed and worked upon. He argued that the academic and literary, i.e. modern languages are fashioned by means of wise and relevant people in history.²⁸³ Sadri Maksudî defended his line of reasoning by stating that every modern language such as the Arabic, Russian, German, Italian, Czech, and Finnish passed through such a process.²⁸⁴ Additionally, he emphasized the effective role of the linguistic academies functioning under the patronage of the Turkish government. Sadri Maksudî reiterated the fact that the Turkish language had been very much affected from Arabic and Persian, and that hitherto for 500 years nothing has been done officially to modernize it.²⁸⁵ He described the modernization process of the Turkish language in terms of the abandonment of the foreign, i.e. Arabic and Persian words and their modification by "genuine" Turkish ones used in the pre-Islamic period. He pointed out that one of the basic objectives of the Republic of Turkey is Turkism (*Türkçülük*) as the President, Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha [Atatürk] and the prime minister, İsmet Pasha [İnönü] had emphasized from its formation. Hence, given the fact that "The most natural and sacred appearance of

²⁸² Ibid., pp. 216-217

²⁸³ Sadri Maksudî, "Lisanların İnkişâf ve Tekamülünde Akademilerin Rolü", *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 16, no. 6 (September 1925), p. 271.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 272.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 275.

Turkism no doubt is Turkism on language,” Sadri Maksudî was totally convinced that the linguistic academy would emerge during the republican period.²⁸⁶

Sadri Maksudî’s articles on the linguistic reform in *Milliyet*, as well as his book “*Türk Dili İçin*” were penned with the purpose of proving the inevitability of the creation of a literary and academic Turkish, or its modernization. In fact, his articles in *Milliyet* included the same points stated in his book. Therefore, the book “*Türk Dili İçin*” should be analyzed in terms of its integrity on the ideas of Sadri Maksudî. In his book, Sadri Maksudî defined the language reform as follows:

Gathering and arranging words, which were used in one nation’s colloquial language and folk literature, but which for some reasons lost, and making place for these words in the literary and academic languages, that is creating new literary and academic terms fitting according to grammatical rules, and putting these terms instead of the words acquired from foreign languages.²⁸⁷

Sadri Maksudî divided his book into three main parts. In the first part he examined the linguistic reform processes of several nations. Later, he praised the Turkish language, its position among other languages and the relations between the Turkic dialects or languages. Simultaneously, Sadri Maksudî placed emphasis on the transformation of Turkish by time and attempts to reform it in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Subsequently in the third part, the author argued about the indispensability of the modifications in the language and dwelled upon the role of the Turkish government for the enactment of the reforms.

Sadri Maksudî mentioned that 75-80% of the words in Turkish are of foreign origin (more than 50,000²⁸⁸), and that as far as the academic technical jargon is

²⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 276.

²⁸⁷ Maksudî, *Türk Dili İçin*, p. 18.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 316.

concerned this ratio reached even 99%.²⁸⁹ He entirely stood against the further usage of the Ottoman language. Sadri Maksudî considered the Ottoman as an artificial language, which was remote from the nation's verbal communications, moreover, obstructive to the advancement of education and culture. At the same time, Sadri Maksudî argued that the maintenance of the Ottoman language would be a felony for the genuine Turkish language.²⁹⁰

The complex process of the linguistic reform, according to Sadri Maksudî, had to pass through numerous stages. He claimed that first of all the appropriate orthography had to be established along with a suitable alphabet for Turkish language. The creation of the list of words suitable to the alphabet would come next. Likewise, the grammar rules should be determined.²⁹¹ Sadri Maksudî underlined that modern Turkic academic terms should be organized by means of the word roots from the language of a common folk, old dialects, and Turkic dialects and languages spoken outside of Turkey, thereby creating them by means of prepositions, suffixes, affixes, prefixes, infixes. He analyzed every step of the linguistic reformation in details through several practices that strengthened his arguments.²⁹²

As a final point, Sadri Maksudî proposed the creation of the linguistic academy for Turkey, which would undertake linguistic reforms. He compared the situation of the Turkish language then to a city without any authorized municipality. For that reason, he stressed the necessity for the linguistic academy to destroy the anarchy that was present in the Turkish.²⁹³ As long as the new Latin alphabet was already adopted in Turkey, Sadri Maksudî called attention to recreating the

²⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 372.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 294-295.

²⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 25-26.

²⁹² Ibid., pp. 216-402.

²⁹³ Ibid., pp. 447-450.

vocabulary, determination of the grammar rules, and organization of the new terms for Turkish. He confidently attached importance to the role of the linguistic academy to cope with these practices. In addition, Sadri Maksudî highlighted necessity to scrutinize the Orkhon and Uygur inscriptions, and collection of the folk literature among the functions of the linguistic academy.²⁹⁴

In addition to forming the modern Turkish, Sadri Maksudî proposed the creation of a single Turkish for all of the Turks. According to him, the best way was to combine all dialects around the western or the Turkish dialect spoken in Anatolia.²⁹⁵ Sadri Maksudî was entirely convinced that all Turks should use one common alphabet as well. The usage of a common script would pave the way for modernization of the Turkish world and diffusion of the common culture between the Turks soon.²⁹⁶ According to him, even though the Turks preserved their identity and language within other states like Russia, Iran, or China, the creation of a united Turkish was critical at that time. The critique of Cafer Seydahmet [Kırırmer] in *Milliyet* on the book handled this issue, whereas he mentioned that Sadri Maksudî's aspirations were far from reality at that period regarding the Turkic people residing in the Soviet Union.²⁹⁷

6.2 Sadri Maksudî's Initial Defense and Criticism of the Linguistic Reforms

In 1948, Sadri Maksudî raised the language issue on the pages of *Cumhuriyet* once again. His approach was not different from his ideas reflected in "*Türk Dili İçin*". Sadri Maksudî wrote that academic languages were not created unconsciously,

²⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 443-446.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 455.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 251-457.

²⁹⁷ Cafer Seydahmet [Kırırmer], "Türk Dili İçin," *Milliyet*, April 24, 1931; April, 26, 1931.

but had to pass through amendments and supplements.²⁹⁸ However, this time, besides expressing his own ideas on the linguistic reforms, Sadri Maksudî also responded to the main arguments against them and criticized the activities of the Turkish Linguistic Society. He ignored the criticisms, which reasoned that the Ottoman Turkish had already become the spoken Turkish among the people, and that the languages are modernized by means of the men of letters.²⁹⁹ At the same time, he also concurred that the Linguistic Society made many mistakes with regard to the language, but according to Sadri Maksudî there was worthy potential within the Turkish republic to handle the linguistics.³⁰⁰

Sadri Maksudî contributed to the Linguistic Congress of the Union of Instructors (*Muallimler Birliđi Dil Kongresi*) held on October 24, 1948. The congress was conducted against the linguistic reforms, and Sadri Maksudî's assertions on the language were applauded by merely a small group of the auditors there. In order to recover the Turkish from its grave situation, Sadri Maksudî, together with such figures as Halil Nimetullah Öztürk and Tahir Nejat, formed the Society for the Improvement of the Turkish Language (*Türk Dilini Geliştirme Derneđi*) on March 10, 1949.³⁰¹

During his years at the Turkish National Assembly, Sadri Maksudî attached importance to the wrong usage of some words from the podium for several times. His objections were on behalf of using the words purified from the Ottoman Turkish and against mistaken words proposed by the Linguistic Society. In this sense, Sadri

²⁹⁸ Sadri Maksudî, "Medenî Milletlerde İlim Dili Yaratma Tarihine Bakış," *Cumhuriyet*, October 5, 1948.

²⁹⁹ Sadri Maksudî, "İlmî Usûllerle Yaratılmış Türkçe ve Müstakil Bir İlim Dili Lâzımdır," *Cumhuriyet*, October, 19, 1948.

³⁰⁰ Sadri Maksudî, "Dil Islahı ve Dil Kurumu," *Cumhuriyet*, October 23, 1948.

³⁰¹ *Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi 1923-2000* (Istanbul: YKY, 2002), vol. 2, p. 158.

Maksudî proposed to use the word “bakış” (glance) instead of “bakım” on May 5, 1934³⁰²; to use the word “ekim” (culture) instead of “kültür”, and “göçer” or “göçkün” (immigrant) instead of “sığınak” on June 7, 1934³⁰³; “doğması” (rise, birth) instead of “doğuşu” or “doğumu” on February 25, 1952³⁰⁴; “kapalı” (closed) instead of “musakkaf” on April 10, 1953.³⁰⁵ Even though Sadri Maksudî was successful in the adoption of these words, sometimes the parliamentary sessions turned out to the debates on linguistic matters. Therefore, he proposed the creation of the Linguistic Commission within the National Assembly in 1933, in order to work out the linguistic problems for the National Assembly.³⁰⁶ Sadri Maksudî insisted on the creation of such a commission in 1952 as well. However, both of his proposals of him were rejected.³⁰⁷

Sadri Maksudî defended his concerns at all times. With regard to the linguistics, he experienced two major clashes in his life. One of them was the so-called “Denizbank incident” in late 1937, and the other one was his stance against the modification of the Constitution in late 1952.

6.3 The “Denizbank Incident”

In the course of the discussions on the subject of the formation of the Maritime Bank (*Denizbank*) on December 24, 1937 at the Turkish National Assembly, Sadri Maksudî made a motion to change its name to *Deniz Bankası*, on the grounds that the former label was inconsistent with the grammar rules of the

³⁰² *T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi* (Assembly 57, May 26, 1934), term 4, vol. 22, session 1, pp. 275-276.

³⁰³ *T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi* (Assembly 65, June 7, 1934), term 4, vol. 23, session 1, pp. 71-75.

³⁰⁴ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 47, February 25, 1952), term 9, vol. 13, session 2, pp. 766-767.

³⁰⁵ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 66, April 10, 1953), term 9, vol. 21, session 1, p. 346.

³⁰⁶ *T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi* (Assembly 16, December 13, 1934), term 4, vol. 25, session 1, p. 140.

³⁰⁷ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 32, January 28, 1952), term 9, vol. 12, session 1, pp. 361-362.

Turkish language. The motion was accepted by the majority of the deputies on the same date.³⁰⁸ The problem was that, however, the President Mustafa Kemal Atatürk had named this institution as *Denizbank* himself. After Atatürk became aware of the event at the National Assembly, he ordered eight people to reply to Sadri Maksudî that *Denizbank* was not contrary to the grammar rules of the Turkish as a term. On December 27, Atatürk's line was publicized via radio. However the reply turned out to be an exaggerated attack on Sadri Maksudî, which included plenty of insults and rudeness directed against him.³⁰⁹ On the same day, the issue was brought back to the parliament again, whereas Sadri Maksudî was not present there. Here as well as in some interviews to the press, the deputies attacked on Sadri Maksudî and accused him of ignorance.³¹⁰ The name of the bank was restored to *Denizbank* on the same day.

Sadri Maksudî defended his argument during discussions over bill on the "Offenses Against Atatürk" in 1951, pointing out that Atatürk was in poor health at that time, and the incident was caused by plotters around him and their slanders.³¹¹ In fact, after a short period Celâl Bayar, the Prime Minister of Turkey during the incident, received Sadri Maksudî in his office and conveyed Atatürk's respects and kind thoughts for Sadri Maksudî.³¹² As a matter of fact, Atatürk was not pleased with the excessively insulting speeches against Sadri Maksudî on the radio and scolded the speakers later.

6.4 Sadri Maksudî and the Constitutional Amendments

³⁰⁸ *T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi* (Assembly 20, December 24, 1937), term 5, vol. 21, session 1, pp. 98-99.

³⁰⁹ "'Denizbank' Kelimesi Öz Türkçedir," *Ulus*, December 28, 1937.

³¹⁰ "S. Maksudî Her Sahada Cehaletle İtham Ediliyor," *Tan*, December 28, 1937. Orhan Seyfi, "Bay Sadri Maksudî'ye," *Akbaba*, vol. 9, no. 210 (January 13, 1938), p. 3.

³¹¹ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 104, July 25, 1951), term 9, vol. 9, session 1, p. 307.

³¹² *Ibid.*

Sadri Maksudî's second important discussion occurred in 1952. Fuad Köprülü and 203 deputies made a motion to modify the "reformed" language of the Constitution of 1945, and adopt the language of the Constitution of 1924 instead on November 28, 1952. In the course of the parliamentary session on December 8, Sadri Maksudî opposed to the modification and regarded the motion as ignorance against the revolutionary linguistic developments of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. He stated that even though the linguistic reforms were not extremely fruitful, it would be totally nonsensical to give up the achievements.³¹³ According to him, the linguistic reform was the major revolutionary achievement of Atatürk.³¹⁴ Discussions continued on December 17 on the same issue in the parliament. Sadri Maksudî made a motion to reject the motion of Fuad Köprülü and 203 deputies, and authorize the Linguistic Academy, which would be established near in a recent time, to deal with the language. However, the motion was not accepted by majority.³¹⁵ On December 24, the motion on behalf of the modification of the Constitution was put to the vote and was accepted. Nevertheless, Sadri Maksudî was not present at the Turkish National Assembly during the voting.³¹⁶

CHAPTER VII: SADRI MAKSUDÎ ON LAW

7.1 Sadri Maksudî as a Professor of Law: His Teachings and Contribution

³¹³ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 14, December 8, 1952), term 9, vol. 18, session 1, p. 133.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134. "Anayasa'nın Dilini Değiştirecek Yerde D. P. Hükümet ve Parti Olarak Her Şeyden Evvel Anayasa Tâdili vaadini Yerine Getirmeli," *Ulus*, December 9, 1952.

³¹⁵ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 18, December 17, 1952), term 9, vol. 18, session 2, p. 304.

³¹⁶ *T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi* (Assembly 18, December 24, 1952), term 9, vol. 18, session 1, pp. 424-426.

Most of the works written by Sadri Maksudî were related to jurisprudence. During the almost 25 years of his academic life, Sadri Maksudî penned several books and articles on law. In addition, some of his manuscripts were published solely for students in the form of course notes. During his professorial career at the University of Ankara and Istanbul, Sadri Maksudî primarily taught three courses: “History of Turkish Law”, “General History of Law”, and “Philosophy of Law”. Thus, his main works were related with these courses.

Sadri Maksudî published his first book called “ Lectures on History of Law Courses for the Second Year Law Students” (*İkinci Sene Hukuk Tarihi Dersleri*) as a textbook for his General History of Law classes.³¹⁷ The same book was revised, extended, and republished in 1928 and was called “Lectures of History of Law” (*Hukuk Tarihi Dersleri*).³¹⁸ It was republished again in 1941. Sadri Maksudî renamed it “General History of Law: Legal Institutions of Ancient India, Iran, Athens, and Sparta. Political and Legal Organization of Rome, Its Social and Economic Structure” (*Umumî Hukuk Tarihi: Eski Hind, İran, Atina ve İsparta'nın Hukukî Müesseseleri. Roma'nın Siyasî ve Hukukî Teşkilâtı, İçtimaî ve İktisadî Bünyesi*), which appeared in 1944 and 1948 as well.

With regard to his “Philosophy of Law” lectures, Sadri Maksudî prepared his book on “General Principles of Law: The Positive Philosophy of Law” (*Hukukun Umumî Esasları: Hukukun Pozitif Felsefesi*), which was printed in 1937. Emanating from the same course, Sadri Maksudî’s book called “History of the Philosophy of Law” (*Hukuk Felsefesi Tarihi*) was published in 1946. All at once, Kemal Gözler maintains that Sadri Maksudî was the first person in Turkey who talked about and

³¹⁷ Sadri Maksudî, *İkinci Sene Hukuk Tarihi Dersleri* (Istanbul: Kader, 1926-1927).

³¹⁸ Sadri Maksudî, *Hukuk Tarihi Dersleri* (Ankara: Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 1928).

analyzed the “General Theory of Law”. Apparently, Sadri Maksudî did not exactly use this term, but named it the “General Principles of Law”.³¹⁹

Even though the course notes called “History of the Turkish Law” (*Türk Hukuku Tarihi*) were printed as a reading source for the students of the Ankara Law School earlier, the book on this subject appeared in 1947, which was entitled the “Turkish History and Law” (*Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk*). Sadri Maksudî’s intensive studies on this subject were stemming from his academic researches in Europe. He introduced this subject in the Ankara Law School originally in 1925, and continued to instruct on it at the Ankara University, as well as at the Istanbul University. He was the only professor to offer this course up to 1940s. Therefore, this book proved to be unique piece in the area. Sadri Maksudî conducted his analyses quite successfully, as it was reflected in his book. He not only covered the secondary sources, but he also genuinely scrutinized the customs, traditions, languages, inscriptions, documents, literature, and folklore additionally. The book roused several appreciations in the press.³²⁰

Sadri Maksudî was among the leading figures in Turkey, who instilled the modern comprehension of law to his students and thereby gave shape to the intellectual structure of the young republic.³²¹ Sadri Maksudî’s advices to his students after the end of each academic year were always remembered by his students.

7.2 Sadri Maksudî’s Methodology

³¹⁹ Kemal Gözler, *Hukukun Genel Teorisine Giriş: Hukuk Normlarının Geçerliliği ve Yorumu Sorunu* (Ankara: US-A, 1998), pp. 1-10.

³²⁰ Kemal Salih Sel, “İlk Türklerde Hukuk,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 21, 1948. Bahadır Dülger, “Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk,” *Tasvir*, March 1, 1948.

³²¹ Serdar Erkan, “Sadri Maksudî Arsal,” Unpublished Master’s Thesis, Dicle University, 2001.

The lectures of Sadri Maksudî in the academia, as well as his writings indicate that Sadri Maksudî was a historian of law. His methodology on law was not different from his approaches on nationalism or his studies in history.

Sadri Maksudî paid attention to the historical and sociologic dimensions of jurisprudence. According to him, every nation had its own historical and sociological structure developed through social and economic relations in time. In this sense law and legislature was the historical factor, which had developed over centuries. At the same time this factor became specified with a certain nation. That is to say, each nation maintained its own legal symbols for eternity. Therefore, any nation's legislature had to be appropriate with its historical and social structure. According to Sadri Maksudî, in order to understand the present social situation of any nation it is necessary to begin with an understanding of its past. Hence, given that the legal historical developments and their reasons are analyzed, then the present legal and social structures can be understood properly.

Sadri Maksudî defended the modernizing effects of law in historical procedure. He maintained that each modern nation has developed through its legal structures. Nevertheless, the more modern any nation became, the more its dependency on the legal bases increased.

Sadri Maksudî did not deny the universal principles and philosophical and ethical values specific to every nation. Nevertheless, he argued that that these factors ensue only the general foundations, but not provide the final form. Sadri Maksudî maintained that the setting up of the social order and prosperity was highly correlated with forming the legal basis. In this sense the most important factor here

was establishment of the “national” law appropriate with the social, economic and historical structures of every nation.³²²

With regard to the natural law, which deals with the general principles that form the legal institutions by means of rejecting the historical view, Sadri Maksudî gave priority to the moral values and universal principles that have constructed the necessary general basis in law. Nevertheless, according to Sadri Maksudî, those principles were sufficient neither for analyzing law, nor for legislation. He pointed out that legal systems developed and matured through “social facts” and their conditions first. These conditions were comprised of several aspects such as natural, historical, economic, religious and philosophical issues. Therefore, according to Sadri Maksudî the legal systems had to be analyzed in a sociological pattern.³²³ Sadri Maksudî emphasized the role of sociology in law, and underlined the importance of considering the natural, political and economic factors together with the spiritual and moral dynamics. Apart from this, Sadri Maksudî also put moral values forward:

In the fields where natural and economic factors assure our animal life, moral factors are effective as well. We, as the human beings, are not living in physiological and material life as other animals... There is an inclination and capability of human beings to go beyond the material life and spiritualize. For this reason throughout cultural developments and people’s spiritual evolution moral factors’ influence in human life gradually increases. Influence of these moral factors in social life immediately appears in the legal framework too. (My translation.)³²⁴

Although Sadri Maksudî exalted such factors as justice and equity, he did not approve the presence of the universal system of law in the world.³²⁵ According to

³²² Sadri Maksudî Aarsal, *Hukuk Felsefesi Tarihi* (Istanbul: İsmail Akgün Matbaası, 1945), pp. 300-311.

³²³ Sadri Maksudî Aarsal, *Umumî Hukuk Tarihi* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi, 1948), p. 25.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

him law altered through time, space and according to each nation. He admitted that values and the structure of the nations underwent continuous changes and that every society has a changing structure with regard to its historical experiences and social relations. Expectedly, rules and rights would also change in accordance with changing social relations and, therefore, become its product.³²⁶

³²⁶ Ibid., p. 18.

CONCLUSION

Sadri Maksudî's life was connected to a diverse group of people, societies, and states. Disappointed or enthusiastic, Sadri Maksudî emigrated from one state to the other for numerous times. He was very eager to visit the Ottoman Empire, to study in France, to go to see the Muslim communities all over the Russian Empire, and to travel to England. However, he was quite broken when he was forced to leave Russia in 1918 with the hope to come back and restore the autonomy for the Tatar people. Similarly, Sadri Maksudî was frustrated both in the aftermath of the Paris Peace Conference, and the World War II. Nevertheless, Sadri Maksudî in no way lost his ideals for the future, the role of which he had emphasized incessantly. That is why he achieved success and fruitful outcomes throughout his life.

The basic objective of this study was to produce an intellectual biography of Sadri Maksudî. On the one hand, it aimed at scrutinizing his life by attaching importance to the main internal and external circumstances. At this point, the *époque* and the main factors that affected his intellectual development, as well as his own activities and endeavors were analyzed. On the other hand, this study strived for highlighting Sadri Maksudî's thoughts and considerations, as well as their roots in four different areas, namely nationalism, history, linguistics and law, which he was involved in throughout his life.

First of all, Sadri Maksudî's birth in a conservative Tatar family, whose members as well as ancestors strived for education, determined his future route. The atmosphere of the Muslim modernism and enlightenment, whose ideas were instilled to Sadri Maksudî via his brother Ahmed Hâdi Maksudî and İsmail Bey Gaspıralı, developed his affection for the *Cedidçilik*. Sadri Maksudî's vast interest in the

literary works of the classics, as well as his readings of several works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau brought out his interest for literature. Over and above, his meetings with celebrated men of letters, namely with Lev Tolstoy in Russia and with Ahmed Midhat Efendi in Istanbul, as well as his studies in Paris, meetings with Yusuf Akçura and his collaboration with the *Kadet* party in Russia elaborated Sadri Maksudî's liberal, democratic, and intellectual stance oriented on modernization and reformation of the Muslim people of Russia. Sadri Maksudî either from the Duma podium, or during the all-Russian Muslim congresses permanently emphasized that the Muslim people had all bases to share the same rights with the Russians. Later on, he proceeded on underlining assertions for the Muslims of the Inner Russia and Siberia in the role of the Chairman of the National Administration and the National Assembly on top. However, the aspirations of Sadri Maksudî fell short, which can be explained by the world historical events, which shook the entire Russian Empire in 1917-1918. Later, he presented the Ultimatum to the Peace Conference in 1919, but his attempts were in vain.

Sadri Maksudî constituted an intellectual bridge between the Muslims of Russia and the young Turkish republic. His affection for the Ottoman Turks had been present from his childhood. His friendship with the Ottoman students in Paris, speeches at the Duma, Application to the Peace Conference on behalf of the Ottoman Empire, and, primarily his lecture on the history of Turks with his speeches in Ankara in Istanbul in 1924 and 1925 ended with Sadri Maksudî's eventual settlement in Turkey. Sadri Maksudî was involved in politics for a lengthy time here. However, the most noticeable occupation was Sadri Maksudî's academic studies, starting with law and continuing with history, language, and nationalism. Sadri Maksudî's scholarly inquiry started from the Law School of the University of

Paris as well as his voluntary attendance to the classes of the *Collège de France*, and the Faculty of Letters.

The nationalistic doctrine of Sadri Maksudî was based on the socio-biological grounds with regard to the formation of the nations and the “national sentiment,” or nationalism as he defined it. His analyses concerning births of the nations, their development and emergence of nationalism are very familiar with the ethno-symbolist scholars’ standpoints, rather than that of the primordialists or modernists. Indeed, Sadri Maksudî and ethno-symbolist scholars argue that the nations have to be examined from the early past by highlighting the ethnicity factor in a larger scale. Apparently, Sadri Maksudî argued that nations and nationalism were products of the ethnologically defined races, which developed through several phases and by means of numerous certain factors. His thoughts on the formation of the nations were *sui generis*, albeit encompassing arguments of different scholars and ideologues on the subject. At this point, the ideas of Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Johann Gottfried Herder, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Ernest Renan, Otto Bauer, Émile Durkheim, and Gustave Le Bon are discovered in Sadri Maksudî’s analyses.

Sadri Maksudî formulated his historical approach by two means. That is to say, he studied the past by focusing on the factors that shaped it. He generalized these factors during the First Turkish Historical Congress and stated that both material and moral dynamics are present in history. However, according to him, the spiritual dynamics were superior. Sadri Maksudî played one of the most essential roles during the formation of the historical studies in the Republic of Turkey. Actually, it was him, who reiterated the necessity to create the historical institution in Turkey, and who was one of the founders of the Committee of the Research of the

Turkish History within the Turkish Hearth Society, which later evolved into the Turkish Historical Society, the most respected institution of scholarly historical research in Turkey. Sadri Maksudî was a follower of the so-called “Turkish Historical Thesis.” However, he did not refrain himself from rejecting to exaggerated arguments of the Turkish scholars, whereas he even applied to the President Mustafa Kemal Pasha in order to avoid them.³²⁷ His stance, actually, led to his escape from such sources, as it was clearly expressed within his book entitled “Turkish History and Law.”

Sadri Maksudî attributed particular importance to the linguistic issues as well. Actually, he possessed special affection for the Turkish language from his early formative years. Together with the linguistic reforms in Turkey, Sadri Maksudî penned a series of articles as well as his *magnum opus* on the linguistic reform. Throughout these works and in his speeches at the conferences or at the Turkish National Assembly, he proposed the creation of a modern literary and academic Turkish language. According to him, the modern academic terms should be created by relying on the common spoken Turkish, as well as on the mature Turkic dialects and the dialects spoken outside of Turkey. He did not keep him back from arguing about wrong usage of the Turkish words, as it was with *Denizbank* in 1937, or during the modification of the language used in the Constitution in 1952. Academics in Turkey did not get much use from Sadri Maksudî’s endeavors to create the modern Turkish, yet his offers were utilized in a certain degree.

Sadri Maksudî was the pioneering scholar in Turkey who launched the “History of the Turkish Law” lectures, as well as the one who analyzed the General Theory of Law. His main attempts were to analyze the history of law. At this point,

³²⁷ Ayda, *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*, pp.171-173

Sadri Maksudî paid attention to the juridical structures by proposing that any nation's legislature had to be suitable with regard to them. He attached importance to the Roman law, legal structures of the ancient Greece, India, Iran and Sparta. However, he bore special sympathy for the Turkish historical juridical institutions, customs and traditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Unpublished Documents and Materials

A. Official Documents

Gireson Vilâyeti Gireson Dairei İntihabiyesi Heyeti Teftişiyesi [Inspection Commission of the Election Commission of Giresun of the Giresun Province]. Archives of the Grand Turkish National Assembly.

Şebın Karahisar Vilâyeti Karahisar Dairei İntihabiyesi Heyeti Teftişiyesi [Inspection Commission of the Election Commission of Karahisar of the Şebın Karahisar Province]. Archives of the Grand Turkish National Assembly.

T. B. M. M. Âzasının Tercümeihal Kağıdı Örneği [Biographical Sample of the Turkish Grand National Assembly Member]. No: 834.

T. B. M. M. Âza-yi Kiramına Mahsus Muhtasar Tercümei Hal Varakası, Devre IV [Concise Biographical Document Peculiar to the Turkish Grand National Assembly]. Term IV. No: 56.

T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi [Republican Archives of the Turkish Prime Ministry]. Ankara. 030.11.1/ 8.31.19.

T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi. Ankara, 030.18.01/02.75.50.5.

T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi. Ankara. 030.10/77.514.32.

T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi. Ankara. 030.18.01/013.16.10.

T. C. Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi. Ankara. 030.18.01/02.64.36.16.

Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan [Central State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan]. Fond 4, Opis' 177, Delo 159, List 160.

Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan. Fond 52, Opis' 1, Delo 230, List 23.

Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan. Fond 52, Opis' 1, Delo 230, List 3.

Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan. Fond 52, Opis' 1, Delo 230, List 10.

B. Sadri Maksudî Aرسال's Archive

A letter from Hamdullah Suphi [Tanrıöver] to Sadri Maksudî. April 15, 1925. Ankara.

A letter from the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Turkey to Sadri Maksudî. April 29, 1925. Ankara.

Invitation Cards to the Commemorative Ceremonies of Sadri Maksudî. Ankara.

Sadri Maksudî's Remarks on His Biography. Ankara.

Sadri Maksudî's Remarks on His Written Works. Ankara.

C. Interviews

Ali Akış. January 24, 2003. Unstructured Interview with the Author. Aşağı Ayrancı, Ankara.

Enise Arat. January 20, 2003. Unstructured Interview with the Author. Aşağı Ayrancı, Ankara.

D. Theses and Dissertations

Erkan, Serdar. "Sadri Maksudî Aarsal." Dicle University, 2001.

Lazzerini, Edward J. "Ismail Bey Gasprinskii and Muslim Modernism in Russia, 1878-1914." University of Washington, 1973.

II. Published Documents and Materials

III. Türk Tarih Kongresi. Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1948.

IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi. Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1952.

Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Konferanslar, Müzakere Zabıtları. Istanbul, 1932.

Gosudarstvennaia дума. Tretii sozyv. Stenograficheskie Otchet. 1908 god. Sessia pervaiia, vol. II. St. Petersburg, 1908.

İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Kongrenin Çalışmaları, Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler. Istanbul: Kenan, 1943.

"Sadri Maksudî: Pokorneishe Proshu Osvobodit' Menia ot Shtrafa." *Gasırlar Avazı/Ekho Vekov*, no. 3/4, 1998.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 104, July 25, 1951), term 9, vol. 9, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 14, December 8, 1952), term 9, vol. 18, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 18, December 17, 1952), term 9, vol. 18, session 2.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 18, December 24, 1952), term 9, vol. 18, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 32, January 28, 1952), term 9, vol. 12, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 47, February 25, 1952), term 9, vol. 13, session 2.

T. B. M. M. Tutanak Dergisi (Assembly 66, April 10, 1953), term 9, vol. 21, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi (Assembly 16, December 13, 1934), term 4, vol. 25, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi (Assembly 20, December 24, 1937), term 5, vol. 21, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi (Assembly 57, May 26, 1934), term 4, vol. 22, session 1.

T. B. M. M. Zabıt Ceridesi (Assembly 65, June 7, 1934), term 4, vol. 23, session 1.

Türk Ocakları 1926 Senesi Kurultay Zabıtları. Üçüncü Kurultay. Istanbul: Kader, 1927.

III. Published Materials of Sadri Maksudî

A. Articles

Arsal, Sadri Maksudî. "Dostum Yusuf Akçura." *Türk Kültürü*, No. 174, April 1977.

Maksudî, Sadri. "1-İskitler-Sakalar, 2-Asiya Hunları, 3- Yüceçiler, 4-Avrupa Hunları." In "*Türk Tarihi Ana Hatları*" *Eserinin Müsveddeleri*. no. 5. Ankara: 1932.

_____. "Beznen Ruhaniler Gasker Bulmuşlar." *Yıldız*, December 29, 1915.

_____. "Büyük Millî Emeller." *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 1, no. 1 (November 30, 1911).

_____. "Büyük Millî Emeller." *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 1, no. 2 (December 24, 1911).

_____. "Çinliler ve Moğolların Houei-Hou Uygurlarıyla Orhun Türk Kitabelerindeki Oğuzların Ayniyeti." *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 16, no. 1 (April 1925 (1341)).

_____. "Çinlilerin Hoei Hou Dedikleri Halkın Orhun Kitabeleri'ndeki Dokuz Oğuzların Aynı Olduğuna Dair İzahat : Köprülüzâde Mehmed Mehmed Fuad Beyin Tenkitlerine Cevap." *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 17, no. 1 (November 1925).

_____. "Demokrasi ve Hukuk." *Tasvir*, November 29, 1945.

_____. "Demokrasi ve Hürriyet." *Tasvir*, January 6, 1946.

_____. "Demokrasi ve Müsavat Esası." *Tasvir*, December 30, 1945.

_____. "Demokrasinin İlmî ve Ruhî Esasları." *Tasvir*, December 10, 1945.

- _____. “Demokrasinin İstinat Ettiği İlmî ve Felsefî Esaslar.” *Tasvir*, December 23, 1945.
- _____. “Dil Islahı ve Dil Kurumu.” *Cumhuriyet*, October 23, 1948.
- _____. “Dünyada İki Türü Hayat Telâkkisi Karşı Karşıya.” *Tasvir*, October 21, 1945.
- _____. “Emeller Üstadı.” *Yıldız*, 14 September 1914.
- _____. “Finladiya Mes’alesi Niden Gıybaret?” *Yıldız*, June 6, 1910.
- _____. “Finladiya Mes’alesi Niden Gıybaret?” *Yıldız*, June 8, 1906.
- _____. “Fraktsiya Ahvalinden.” *Yıldız*, December 2, 1908.
- _____. “İlim ve Hürriyet.” *Tasvir*, February 17, 1946.
- _____. “İlmî Usûllerle Yaratılmış Türkçe ve Müstakil Bir İlim Dili Lâzımdır.” *Cumhuriyet*, October, 19, 1948.
- _____. “İnsanların Manevî Hayatında Gaye ve İdeallerin Rolü.” *Tasvir*, April 7, 1946.
- _____. “Kadim Yunan’da İlmî Muhtariyet.” *Tasvir*, February 24, 1946.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 11, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 13, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 14, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 2, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 3, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 4, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 5, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 6, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 7, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, October 9, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, September 28, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, September 29, 1928.
- _____. “Lisan Islahı Meselesi.” *Milliyet*, September 30, 1928.

_____. “Lisanların İnkişâf ve Tekamülünde Akademilerin Rolü.” *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 16, no. 6 (September 1925).

_____. “Medenî Milletlerde İlim Dili Yaratma Tarihine Bakış.” *Cumhuriyet*, October 5, 1948.

_____. “Medeniyet Mahsulleri ve Kültür Kıymetleri Zail Olmaz.” *Tasvir*, April 28, 1946.

_____. “Milletlerin Hayatında Büyük Fikir ve İdeallerin Rolü.” *Tasvir*, April 14, 1946.

_____. “Müslüman Fraksiyası Ahvalinden.” *Yıldız*, February 29, 1908.

_____. “Müslüman Fraksiyasının.” *Yıldız*, May 22, 1911.

_____. “Orta Asiya Türk Devletleri.” In “*Türk Tarihi Ana Hatları*” *Eserinin Müsveddeleri*. Ankara: 1932.

_____. “Sadri Efendi Maksudî’nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi.” *Yıldız*, July 15, 1907.

_____. “Sadri Efendi Maksudî’nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi.” *Yıldız*, July 18, 1907.

_____. “Sadri Efendi Maksudî’nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi.” *Yıldız*, July 20, 1907.

_____. “Sadri Efendi Maksudî’nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi.” *Yıldız*, July 25, 1907.

_____. “Sadri Efendi Maksudî’nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi.” *Yıldız*, July 27, 1907.

_____. “Sadri Efendi Maksudî’nin Kazan Guberniyası Müslüman Saylauçlarına Hisapnamesi.” *Yıldız*, July 29, 1907.

_____. “Siyasî Partilerin İdeolojileri.” *Tasvir*, December 6, 1945.

_____. “Türk Birliği.” *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 16, no. 5 (August 1925).

_____. “Türk Tarihinin Telkinatı.” *Türk Yurdu*, vol. 15, no. 4 (January, 1925).

_____. “Üniversite Muhtariyeti.” *Tasvir*, March 3, 1946.

_____. “Üniversite Muhtariyetini Zarurî Kılan Sebepler.” *Tasvir*, March 10, 1946.

B. Books

Arsal, Sadri Maksudî. *Hukuk Felsefesi Tarihi*. Istanbul: İsmail Akgün, 1945.

_____. *Milliyet Duygusunun Sosyolojik Esasları*. İstanbul: Çeltüt, 1955.

_____. *Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk*. İstanbul : İsmail Akgün, 1947.

_____. *Umumî Hukuk Tarihi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi, 1948.

Maksudî, Sadreddin. *Angliyağa Seyahat*. Kazan: Ümid, 1914.

Maksudî, Sadri. “Megiyşet.” *Kazan Utları*, No: 861 (July 1994).

_____. *Hukuk Tarihi Dersleri*. Ankara: Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 1928.

_____. *İkinci Sene Hukuk Tarihi Dersleri*. İstanbul: Kader, 1926-1927.

_____. *Türk Dili İçin*. Ankara: Türk Ocakları İlim ve Sanat Heyeti, 1930.

IV. Books and Articles

Ahmad, Feroz. “The Young Turk Movement”. *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 3, no. 3 (July 1968).

Akış, Ali et al., eds. *Muhammed Ayaz İshakî: Hayatı ve Faaliyeti, 100. Doğum Yılı Dolayısıyla*. Ankara: Ayyıldız, 1979.

Akçura, Yusuf. “Sadri Maksudî.” *Türk Kültürü*, no. 168 (June 1977).

“Anayasa’nın Dilini Değiştirecek Yerde D. P. Hükümet ve Parti Olarak Her Şeyden Evvel Anayasa Tâdili vaadini Yerine Getirmeli.” *Ulus*, December 9, 1952.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. (2nd ed.) London: Verso, 1991.

“Avrupa Federasyonuna Dair Tekliflerimiz.” *Cumhuriyet*, May 12, 1951.

Ayda, Âdile. “Sadri Maksudî’nin Türk Tarih Kurmu’nun Kuruluşundaki Rolü.” *Türk Kültürü*, no. 53 (March 1967).

_____. *Bir Demet Edebiyat*. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1998.

_____. *Sadri Maksudî Arsal*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1991.

_____. *Yahya Kemal: Kendi Ağzından Fikirleri ve Sanat Görüşleri*. Ankara: Ajans-Türk, 1962.

Bauböck, Rainer. *Multinational Federalism: Territorial or Cultural Autonomy*. Malmö: IMER, 2001.

Bigi, Musa Carullah. *Umum Rusya Müslümanlarının Üçüncü Resmi Nedveleri, 1906 sene Avgust 16’dan 20’ye Kadar Beş Kön Devam Etmiş Meclisler “Protokolü” Zabıt Ceridesi*. Kazan: Kerimiye, 1906.

- “Biznin Ruhaneler Gasker Bulmıylar.” *Yıldız*, December 29, 1915.
- Bolaç, Ertuğrul and et al., eds. *Türkiye’deki Türk Dünyası*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998.
- Calhoun, Craig. “Nationalism and Ethnicity.” *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 19 (1993).
- Cemil, Alâeddin. “Sorbonne’da Türk Akvâmı Tarihi.” *Vakit*, December 16, 1923.
- _____ . “Sorbonne’da Türk Akvâmı Tarihi.” *Vakit*, July 26, 1924.
- _____ . “Sorbonne’da Türk Akvâmı Tarihi.” *Vakit*, Mart 13, 1924.
- Çokay, Mustafa. *1917 Yılı Hatıra Parçaları*. Ankara, 1988.
- Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi 1923-2000*. Vol. 2. Istanbul: YKY, 2002.
- De Vaux, Baron Carra. *Les Penseurs de L’Islam*. Vol. 5. Paris : Libraire Paul Geuthner, 1926.
- “Demokrat Partinin Aday Listesi Dün İlân Edildi.” *Cumhuriyet*, April 25, 1950.
- “Denizbank’ Kelimesi Öz Türkçedir.” *Ulus*, December 28, 1937.
- Devlet, Nadir. *1917 Ekim İhtilali ve Türk-Tatar Millet Meclisi: (İç Rusya ve Sibirya Müslüman Türk-Tatarlarının Millet Meclisi 1917-1919)*. Istanbul: Ötüken, 1998.
- _____ . *Rusya Türklerinin Millî Mücadele Tarihi (1905-1917)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.
- Devletşin, Tamurbek. *Sovyet Tataristan’ı*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1981.
- Dillon, E. J. *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference*. New York: Harper & Brother, 1920.
- Dülger, Bahadır. “Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk.” *Tasvir*, March 1, 1948.
- Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican. “Sadri Maksudî’nin Milliyetçiliği.” *Türk Kültürü*, no. 301 (May 1988).
- Gaffarova, Feride. “Rusya Devlet Dumasındağı İşçenligi.” in Yahya G. Abdullin, and et al., eds. *Sadri Maksudî (1879-1957)*. Kazan, 1996.
- _____ . *Sadri Maksudî*. Kazan: DAS, 2001.
- Geerts, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. (2nd ed.) London: Fontana, 1993.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Georgeon, François. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri: Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*. Ankara: Yurt, 1986.

Gözler, Kemal. *Hukukun Genel Teorisine Giriş: Hukuk Normlarının Geçerliliği ve Yorumu Sorunu*. Ankara: US-A, 1998.

Gürbüz, Musa. “Paris Barış Konferansı ve Sadri Maksudî’nin Türkiye’yi Savunma Mücadelesine Bir Örnek.” *Atatürk Yolu*, vol. 5, no. 17 (January 1996).

Hablemitoğlu, Necip. *Çarlık Rusyası’nda Türk Kongreleri, (1905-1917)*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1997.

Habutdinov, Aydar. “‘Millî İdare’ Kak Pervoe Tatarskoe Pravitel’sstvo.” In A. A. Arslanova, ed. *Aktual’nye Problemy Istorii Gosudarstvennosti Tatarskogo Naroda*. Kazan: Matbugat Yortı, 2000.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. and et al., eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

_____. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hutchinson, John, and et al. eds. *Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

İğdemir, Uluğ. *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk Tarih Kurumu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973.

İlgar, İhsan. *Rusya’da Birinci Müslüman Kongresi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990.

İsmail Gaspıralı, Seçilmiş Eserleri. Vol. 1. İstanbul: Ötüken, 2003.

Kaflı, Kadircan. “Sadri Maksudî Arsal’ı Anarken.” *Tercüman*, February 20, 1958.

Kanlıdere, Ahmed. *Reform Within Islam: The Tajdid and Jadid Movement Among the Kazan Tatars (1809-1917): Conciliation or Conflict?* İstanbul: Eren, 1997.

Kara, Abdolvahap. *Türkistan Ateşi: Mustafa Çokay’ın Hayatı ve Mücadelesi*. İstanbul: Da, 2002.

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1961.

Kemal, Yahya. *Çocukluğum, Gençliğim, Siyasî ve Edebî Hâtıralarım*. İstanbul: Baha, 1973.

Kırımlı, Hakan. *National Movements and National Identity Among the Crimean Tatars, 1905-1916*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

“Kimin Cumhurbaşkanı Olacağı Henüz Belli Değil.” *Son Saat*, May 18, 1950.

Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism: Its Meaning History*. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1965.

Koşay, Hamit Zübeyir. “Sadri Maksudî Arsal’ın Hizmetleri ve Millet Anlayışı.” *Türk Kültürü*, no. 53 (March 1967).

Kurat, Akdes Nimet. "Kazan Türklerinin "Medenî Uyanış" Devri (1917 Yılına Kadar)." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. XXIV, No. 3-4 (July-December 1966).

Kutay, Cemal. *Prens Sabahattin Bey, Sultan II. Abdülhamit, İttihat ve Terakki*. İstanbul: Tarih Yayınları, 1964.

Lazzerini, Edward J. "Ġadidism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: a View from Within." *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, vol. XIV-2.

Llobera, Josep R. *The God of Modernity: The Development of Nationalism in Western Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 1996.

Malov, Efimii. *O Tatarah, Evreiah i Drugih İnorodstah v Rossiiskoi Imperii*. Kazan: 1999.

Maraş, İbrahim. "İdil-Ural Bölgesi ve Osmanlı Fikrî Münasebetleri." *Osmanlı*. Vol. 7. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999.

_____. *Türk Dünyasında Dinî Yenileşme (1850-1917)*. İstanbul: Ötüken, 2002.

Miliukov, Paul. *Political Memoirs, 1905-1917*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1967.

Mitchell, M. Marion. "Emile Durkheim and the Philosophy of Nationalism." *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 1 (March 1931).

"Ord. Prof. Sadri Maksudî Toprağa Verildi." *Cumhuriyet*, February 23, 1957.

"Ord. Prof. Sadri Maksudî Toprağa Verildi." *Cumhuriyet*. February 23, 1957.

Ölümünün 20. Yılında Ord. Prof. Sadri Maksudî Arsal. Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası, 1977.

Özege, M. Seyfettin. *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu*. İstanbul, 1977.

Özkırımlı, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.

"Parlamentolar Birliği Kongresi." *Cumhuriyet*, September 22, 1950.

"Parlamentolar Birliği Kongresinde Türk Heyetinin Oynadığı Büyük Rol." *Vatan*, September 22, 1950.

"Parlamentolar Birliği Tük Grubu." *Vatan*, July 14, 1950.

Pipes, Richard. *The Russian Revolution, 1899-1919*. London: Fontana, 1990.

Pultar, Gönül. "Sadri Maksudî Arsal'ın Türkiye'deki Politik Faaliyetleri." In Yahya. G. Abdullin, and et al., eds. *Sadri Maksudî (1879-1957)*. Kazan, 1996.

Raevuori, Yrjö. *Sadri Maksudî ve Türk-Fin Münasebetleri*. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1965.

Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" In Bhabha, Homi K., ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Rorlich, Azade-Ayşe. *The Volga Tatars: a Profile in National Resilience*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1986.

"S. Maksudî Her Sahada Cehaletle İtham Ediliyor." *Tan*, December 28, 1937.

"S. Maksudî Kaza Atlattı." *Zafer*, April 4, 1953.

"S. Maksudî Türkistanda." *Yıldız*, September 29, 1910.

"Sadri Efedî Maksudî Notuğu." *Yıldız*, May 20, 1910.

"Sadri Efendi Maksudî Notuğu." *Yıldız*, May 21, 1910.

"Sadri Efendi Maksudî Notuğu." *Yıldız*, May 26, 1910.

"Sadri Maksudî Notuğu." *Yıldız*, May 23, 1907.

"Sadri Maksudî'nin Duma'da 1 Mayda Yal İtü Köniniñ Müslümanlar Öçin Cumga Kön Bulun Talep İtip Söylegen Nutıq." *Yıldız*, May 9, 1910.

Safa, Peyami. "Milliyetçilik Üzerine Bir Eser." *Milliyet*, June 17, 1955.

Şahingiray, Özel. *Atatürk'ün Nöbet Defteri: 1931-1938*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1955.

Sarımay, Yusuf. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihî Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları, 1912-1931*. İstanbul: Ötüken, 1994.

Sel, Kemal Salih. "İlk Türklerde Hukuk." *Cumhuriyet*, February 21, 1948.

Seydahmet, Cafer [Kırımer]. "Türk Dili İçin." *Milliyet*, April 24, 1931

_____. "Türk Dili İçin." *Milliyet*, April, 26, 1931.

Seyfi, Orhan. "Bay Sadri Maksudî'ye." *Akbaba*, vol. 9, no. 210 (January 13, 1938).

Shils, Edward. "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties." *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1957).

Smith, Anthony D. "Nationalism and Historians." In Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

_____. "Opening Statement: Nations and Their Pasts." *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1996).

_____. "The Problem of National Identity: Ancient, Medieval and Modern?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3 (1994).

_____. “When is a Nation?” *Geopolitics*, vol. 7, no. 2 (Autumn 2002).

Tahirov, Indus. “Parizhda Ukığan Sadri.” in Ahmet Sahapov ed. *Yörte Bizni Yazmıřlar*. Kazan: Tatarstan Kitap Neřriyatı, 1992.

Tanyeri, Cansever. “Sadri Maksudi Arsal’ın Türkiye’deki Siyasi Hayatı.” in Yahya G. Abdullin, and et al., eds. *Sadri Maksudî (1879-1957)*. Kazan, 1996.

Taymas, Abdullah Battal. *Rus İhtilâli’nden Hatıralar 1*. Istanbul: Turan Kültür Vakfı, 2000.

_____. [Battal-Taymas, Abdullah]. *İki Maksudîler*. Istanbul: Sıralar, 1959.

Temo, İbrahim. *İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyetinin Teşekkülü ve Hıdemat-ı Vatniye ve İnkılâbı Milliye Dair Hatıralarım*. Romania, 1939.

Togan, Zeki Velidî. *Hatıralar*. Istanbul, 1969.

_____. [Ahmet-Zeki Valîdi]. *On Yedi Kumaltı Şehri ve Sadri Maksudî Bey*. Istanbul: Bürhaneddin, 1934.

Togay, Muharrem Feyzi. *Yusuf Akçura’nın Hayatı*. Istanbul: 1944.

Topçibaşev, Ali Merdanbek. *Pis’ma iz Parizha*. Bakü: Azərneşr, 1998.

Tukay, Gabdulla. *Şiğirler, Ekiyetler, Poemalar*. Kazan: Tatarstan Kitap Neřriyatı, 1990.

Tuncer, Hüseyin et al., eds. *Türk Ocakları Tarihi (Açıklamalı Kronoloji)*. Vol. 1. Ankara, 1998.

Turhan, Ali Vahit and Üstel, Füsün. “Sadri Maksudî’nin Yayınlanmamış Bir Eseri: Turquisme,” in R. F. Möhemmetdinov, ed. *Sadri Maksudî: Tarih hem Hezirgi Zaman*, Kazan: Master Line, 1999.

Usmanova, Dilâra. “The Activity of the Muslim Faction of the State Duma and Its Significance in the Formation of a Political Climate Among the Muslim Peoples of Russia (1906-1917).” in A. Kügelgen et al., ed. *Muslim Cultures in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*. Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1988.

Usmanova, Dilâra. *Musul’manskaia Fraktsiia i Problemy “Svobody Sovesti” v Gosudarstvennoi Dume Rossii (1906-1917)*. Kazan: Master Line, 1999.

Yamayeva, Larisa A. *Musul’manskie deputaty Gosudarstvennoi dumı Rossii, 1906-1917*. Ufa: Kitap, 1998.

Yıldız, January 22, 1912.

Zebirov, Gabelhak. *Maksud Baba hem Maksudîler*. Kazan: Tatarstan Kitap Neřriyatı, 2000.

Zenkovsky, Serge A. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967.