Rhetorical Contrast Between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire: 'Modern' Turkey Versus 'Unmodern' Ottoman Empire

Reyhan Kadriye Göksel

Department of Political Science and International Relations

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Abdullah Gül University, Turkey

E-mail: rgoksel@alumni.bilkent.edu.tr

Abstract

In its first decades, the Turkish Republic attempted to create a new national identity that differed from the identity of the Ottoman Empire in socio-cultural, bureaucratic, administrative and legal terms. This attempt led to the creation of a rhetoric of difference between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire. This article argues that the rhetorical rupture between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire was reflected in the Turkish press discourse of the early republican years. Applying the Vienna School of Discourse-Historical Approach (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Wodak 1990, 1994), this article will analyze the discursive and rhetorical strategies of the editorial published by M. Nermi in Cumhuriyet newspaper in 1931 to show that the editorialist M. Nermi strove to explain the administrative and perspective difference of Turkey from the Ottoman Empire. This article will show what kind of persuasive techniques the editorialist used to make the readers agree with his arguments (Note 1).

Keywords: Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), Topos of history-teaching lessons, Credibility enhancement moves

1. Introduction

From 1923 onwards, the Turkish state carried out numerous reforms to create a new collective national identity. These included the abolition of the caliphate in 1924, the replacement of Ottoman Islamic law with European legal systems in 1926 and the introduction of the Latin alphabet in 1928 (see: Ahmad 1993; Dumont 1984; Ergil 1975;

Findley 2010; Heper 1991; Inan 1981; Karpat 1967; Kazancıgil 1981; Keyder 1987; Mardin 2000; Parla & Davison 2004; Timur 1987; Zurcher 2007, 2010). In addition, women were granted the right to vote and stand for election in the 1930 local elections and the 1934 elections to the Turkish Grand National Assembly (Spencer 1958, p. 645). In the period between 1934 and 1936, surnames were introduced and in 1935, after the introduction of the Gregorian calendar, Sunday was officially recognised as a public holiday (ibid., p. 645). In this article, I argue that the press was one of the mouthpieces of the Turkish politicians in order to attune the public to the new collective national identity of the Turkish Republic. In my research on the Turkish press coverage of the early republican years, I have found that there is a close connection between the Turkish press and the Turkish politicians. In the first decades of the Turkish Republic, most of the editors of the Turkish press were also members of the Turkish parliament, such as Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Abidin Daver and Asım Us, to name a few. This has led me to believe that the Turkish press of the early republican years played a role in reproducing the opinions of the Turkish politicians of the 1930s.

In this article, I will use the Vienna School of Discourse-Historical approach to analyze the discursive strategies and rhetorical devices of a Turkish newspaper editorial published by M. Nermi in the Cumhuriyet newspaper on January 7, 1931. I will examine how the editorialist efforted for making the Turkish public embrace the norms and values of the Turkish Republic. In this article, I will examine the rhetoric of the Turkish press that distances Turkey from the Ottoman Empire. In this context, I will first explain my process of data selection and my method. Then I will provide a literature review of Turkey's early republican period. Because this literature review will show us to what extent and in what way Turkey distanced itself from the Ottoman Empire and familiarize us with the policies of the Turkish state and its standpoint on socio-cultural and administrative issues. I will then focus on the analysis of Turkish newspaper editorial, which I will conduct according to the five strategies of the Viennese Discourse-Historical Approach. Finally, I will draw a conclusion.

2. Data Selection Criteria

This article is the result of five months of archival research that I conducted in the microfilm archives of the Turkish Parliament as part of my doctoral thesis on the relationship between Turkish newspaper editorials and the formation process of Turkish national identity between 1929 and 1938. During my archival research, I collected more than a thousand newspaper sources, including editorials, columns and news reports related to Turkish national identity. Smith (1991, p. 15) points out that national identity has an economic, political, legal and territorial aspect. During my archival research, I came across a considerable number of editorials explaining the identity of the Turkish Republic on the basis of Turkey's separation from the Ottoman Empire in economic, administrative, political and socio-cultural terms. I was very interested in the Turkish press discourse that establishes a rhetorical break between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire in terms of socio-political, administrative, bureaucratic and foreign policy aspects. For this article, I have deliberately focused on M. Nermi's editorial published in the newspaper 'Cumhuriyet' in 1931 because it explicitly reflects how Turkey tried to create a rhetorical discourse on Turkey's dissociation from the Ottoman Empire in terms of its administrative aspects. For example, the Ottoman Empire had a feudal structure,

while Turkey adopted the concept of state-centrism. The editorial under study therefore reflects Turkey's new national identity, which is based on Western values in which the state is the main centralized power that has full control over the population, infrastructure and resources on the national territory. The editorial also emphasises Turkey's modernization in the areas of economy, army and education. This emphasis is also one of the important discursive dissociations between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire. Even though the process of modernization in the Ottoman Empire had already begun during the reign of Selim III and continued until its dissolution, the overall attempts at modernization in the areas of education, law and socio-cultural values started with the founding of the Turkish Republic.

In the next section, I will outline the theoretical relevance of the relationship between the press and national identity.

3. The Link Between the Press and the Formation of National Identities

The link between the press and the formation of national identities has attracted the interest of some theorists working on nation and nationalism. For instance, Anderson (2006), for example, argues that because the printed press was easily accessible to the people, it has been used by political powers since the sixteenth century to reinforce a collective sense of national belonging. According to Anderson (2006), newspapers give people the feeling of forming a community with people they have never met before. Newspapers inform people about what is happening around them, which strengthens their sense of collective belonging to the society in which they live (Anderson 2006). Anderson (2006, p. 62) explains this by saying that newspapers ''brought together on the same page this marriage with that ship, this price with that bishop, was the very structure of colonial administration and the market system itself'' and goes on to say that ''the newspaper of Caracas quite naturally and even politically created an imagined community among a specific assemblage of fellow readers to whom these ships, brides, bishops and prices belonged'' (ibid., p. 62). Furthermore, Hobsbawm (1992) pointed out that ''national identification'' in the post-World War I period was achieved through the ''modern mass media'', namely the ''press, cinema and radio'', and since they have the ability to disseminate certain ideas to a wider audience, it is generally assumed that they are exploited by ''states'' and ''private interests'' (Hobsbawm 1992, p. 141).

In the next section, I will explain the method and research questions.

4. Method and Research Questions

To analyze the data, this article uses the Viennese school of Discourse-Historical Approach, abbreviated DHA (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Wodak 1990, 1994). This approach is interested in how social problems, including anti-Semitism, discrimination and racism, as well as national identities, are constructed in political and press discourse (Reisigl 2017, p. 48). This approach attaches great importance to the historical and socio-political background of the discursive event (Wodak 2001, p. 65). In order to understand the historical and socio-political background of the discursive event, they researched various types of data, including all kinds of documents in the printed press, online and social media sources, parliamentary debates, archives, television series and radio programs (Wodak 2001, p. 70). In 1986, the DHA was

created by Ruth Wodak to analyze the anti-Semitic discourse that emerged during Kurt Waldheim's Austrian presidential campaign (Wodak 2011, p. 352; Wodak 2015a, p. 1). In the post-Cold War period, however, DHA scholars began to focus on how European identity was formulated in political discourse and in the press , and collectively found that European discourse was based on the 'we-group of Europeans' versus the 'they-group of non-Europeans, immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, Muslims' (see: Krzyzanowski 2009; Krzyzanowski 2016; Krzyzanowski & Ledin 2017; Krzyzanowski et al. 2018; Reisigl 2007, 2014; Richardson & Wodak 2009; Watson 2009; Wodak & Forchtner 2014, Wodak 2015b; Wodak & Krzyzanowski 2017; Wodak & Dijk 2000).

The DHA has developed five strategies, namely referential, predicational, argumentation, mitigation/intensification, perspectivization. Referential strategies define and categorize the actors (Reisigl &Wodak 2001, p. 45). For example, synecdoche and metonyms are part of referential strategies (ibid., p. 45). Predicational strategies attribute either negative or positive characteristics to actors and events (ibid., p. 45). The argumentation strategies refer to the question of how the authors/speakers develop their arguments. An argument consists of two premises and a conclusion. According to Toulmin (2003), the basic structure of an argument is as follows: "Socrates is a man; all men are mortal; So, Socrates is mortal" (Toulmin 2003, p. 100). The argumentation strategy deals with topos/fallacy. Topos is explained as "parts of argumentation that belong to the obligatory, either explicit or inferable, premises" (Reisigl & Wodak 2001, pp.74-75). If the argument is not based on true facts, it is referred to as a fallacy (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 35).

From my understanding from argumentation theory (Reed & Walton 2001; Reed et al. 2007; Toulmin 1964, 2003; Walton 1990, 1992, 1996, 2006, 2013, 2016; Walton et al. 2008; van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1992, 2004), the topos is an argumentation scheme based on a rule where premises either support or reject the conclusion. In addition to argumentation, the DHA also examines the style of the author or speaker by focusing on how they express and present their ideas. For example, the DHA examines whether or not the author or speaker pays attention to positive self-presentation. In this phase, intensification and mitigation strategies are important, which are realized by modifier particles and quantifiers (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 36). For example, passive voice or nominalizations can be used by the speaker or writer to obscure the responsible actors (ibid., p. 36). In the findings of Wodak et al. 2009 on the political discourse about the Nazi past of Austrians, Austrian politicians in the 1990s preferred to use the passive voice and avoided nominalizations when talking about the perpetrators of Austrian crimes during the Nazi period between 1938 and 1945 (ibid., p. 86).

For the research questions of this article, I have strictly followed the research questions highlighted in Reisigl &Wodak 2001. I applied the research questions from Reisigl &Wodak 2001 to my data. Below is the list of my research questions.

- How are the actors, namely the Ottoman Empire versus Turkey, the Ottoman feudal system versus Turkish state-centrism, named, defined, described?

- What kind of positive or negative characteristics are attributed to them?

- How does the author M. Nermi develop his arguments? What kind of topos/fallacies does he use in his editorial?

- In what style does M. Nermi express his point of view, his attitude and his opinion on the topic? (see: Reisigl & Wodak 2001., p. xiii).

In the next section, I will analyze early republican Turkish historiography in terms of continuity and change between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire.

5. Literature Review on Turkey's Early Republican Years

During my research on Turkish press coverage between 1929 and 1938, I found that the discourse of the Turkish press of the early republican years attempted to create a radical and sharp break between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire. The editorial that I will analyze in this article also strives for a rhetoric of clear distance between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire. However, this radical break between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire was perhaps not as sharp as the Turkish press portrayed it. In the literature on Turkey's early republican years, the continuity and change between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire have been discussed at length.

Scholars dealing with the early republican years of the Turkish Republic can be divided into two groups. The scholars of the first camp such as Ahmad 1993, 2008; Lewis 1968; Luke 1936; Shaw & Shaw 1977; Toynbee & Kirkwood 1926; Zurcher 2007, 2010 argue that the socio-political, cultural and bureaucratic developments in the last period of the Ottoman Empire from the Tanzimat reforms to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (1839-1922) inspired the Turkish Republic. They argue that the foundation of modern Turkey is the result of Westernization and modernization attempts that had already begun in the late Ottoman period. In their works, they reflected on the westernization of the Ottoman army under the rule of Selim III from 1789 to 1909, emphasized the importance of the Tanzimat reforms, including the 1839 Charter of the Rose Chamber and the Ottoman Reform Edict of 1856, which guaranteed the Ottoman Empire's equal treatment of its subjects regardless of their religious affiliation. These scholars also mentioned the turbulent war period, which included the First World War (1915-1918) and the Turkish War of Independence (1918-1922). These scholars argue that these historical episodes provide a crucial context that shows that 'modern Turkey' did not emerge abruptly but developed gradually from the experiences of the Ottoman Empire. This first camp highlighted the westernization and secularization movements of the Turkish Republic, including the abolition of the caliphate in 1924, the replacement of Ottoman Sharia with the Swiss Civil Code in 1926, the abolition of religious courts, the abolition of religious schools and religious foundations, and the introduction of the Latin alphabet (Ahmad 1993, 2003; Akşin 2007; Berkes 1998; Findley 2010; Inan 1981; Kadıoglu 1996; Karpat 1967; Lewis 1968; Luke 1936; Mardin 1981; Parla & Davison 2004; Shaw & Shaw 1977; Shaw 1985; Steinhaus 2002; Toynbee & Kirkwood 1926; Uzer 2016; Webster 1979; Wortham 1930. Zurcher 2007, 2010).

The continuity between the Committee for Union and Progress (1908-1918) and the subsequent republican period in its efforts towards westernization, nationalization and

secularization was analyzed by scholars of the first camp. The era of the Committee for Union and Progress (abbreviated as the CUP) also attracted the attention of the first camp scholars. During this decade, the CUP implemented major changes in the political, social and administrative framework of the Ottoman Empire in order to nationalize the Ottoman economy and secularize Ottoman law and education. In addition, some scholars in this camp stressed the efforts of the Committee of Union and Progress to nationalize the Ottoman economy by unilaterally abolishing capitulations in 1914 (Ergil 1975, pp. 137-138; Karpat 1967, p. 77; Keyder 1987, p. 75; Poulton 1997, p. 81; Zurcher 2010, p. 219). Scholars from the first group point to the link between the reforms of the Committee for Union and Progress and the subsequent reforms. For example, Dumont 1984; Özbudun 1984; Parla & Davison 2004; Zurcher 2007 argue that the reforms in Turkey's early republican years to secularize Turkish society and the bureaucracy were the intensified version of the reforms of the Committee of Union and Progress after the 1908 revolution. These scholars particularly highlight the initiatives of the Committee of Union and Progress to secularize Ottoman law and education. Mardin (2000), for example, points out that the roots of the Turkish secularization reforms can be traced back to the Ottoman Empire's secularization efforts between 1839 and 1867, which included the foundation of non-religious courts in 1847, the introduction of a commercial legal system inspired by European norms in 1850, and the transition to non-religious education between 1845 and 1868 (Mardin 2000, p. 163).

The second camp presents an alternative historical account of Turkey's emergence that focuses heavily on Ataturk's role in shaping Turkey (Armstrong 1961; Atay 1980; Benoist-Mechin 1954; Çeçen 1998; Glasneck 1976; Hanioğlu 2011; Kongar 2002; Mango 2008; Meydan 2014; Parusev 1981; Shah 1934; Sonyel 1989; Şapolyo 1958). This scholarship consists of biographies of Ataturk that focus on Ataturk's years of military service, his contribution to the national independence movement, and his achievements in the founding of the Turkish Republic (Glasneck 1976; Kinross 1981; Mango 1999; Shah 1934; Torumtay 2001). This camp views the founding of Turkey as a clear break with the Ottoman Empire. In this camp, certain publications present Ataturk as a role model for the Turkish people and associate him with every socio-cultural and political development in Turkey (Atay 1980; Çeçen 2003; İnan 1983, 1991; Sakaoglu 1990; Sonyel 1989). They emphasise Ataturk's influence on Turkey's republican ideals (Çeçen 2003), the Turkish education system (İnan 1983) and the progress of Turkish women in socio-bureaucratic terms (İnan 1991). For von Mikusch (1931), Ataturk is a reformer. In addition to the earlier biographical studies, Hanioğlu (2011, p. 6) argues that contemporary ideological movements, namely nationalism, westernisation and republicanism, inspired Ataturk (ibid., p. 6). Çeçen (2003) emphasises that the principles such as independence, democracy, civilization, secularisation and peace form a basis for Ataturk's conception of the Turkish Republic (Çeçen 2003, pp. 84-85).

Having set out the theoretical background to the Turkish early republican years in connection with its separation from the Ottoman Empire, I will turn in the next section to the argumentation analysis of the selected editorial.

6. Analysis

In this section, I will first provide the quotation from M. Nermi's editorial published in the newspaper Cumhuriyet on January 7, 1931, and then conduct my analysis based on the Viennese Discourse-Historical approach (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Wodak 1990, 1994). To clarify my analysis, I have numbered the paragraphs and sentences.

"1- 1It was the disorder in all social and political entity and the waste of power that dragged Turk from fall to fall and dissolved its unique power for centuries. 2.Tyrant, tithe, madrasa, liberal customs system of centuries, superstitious ideas, innumerable other things gnawed away all the power in our entire social structure without a slightest yield.

2- 1. No matter how new the expression is, the necessities that create the modern state are the idea of rationalization; namely the idea of obtaining maximum efficiency by exerting minimum effort. 2.Modern army, modern defence, modern education, modern economy, in brief everything is this. 3.The secret of power that created a bright and effective politics on the ruins of a state which gave the flag of victory to a dissolved army, did what a period that borrowed millions of money almost each year could not have done in a couple of years with inconsistency, and whose policy could not be effective even in its provinces is here.

3- 1. Today, we are powerful. 2.Tomorrow we will be much more powerful.3. Rationalizing national power is not a minor and simple thing. 4. Turkey is becoming a bigger power with each passing day. 5. In order to understand this, it is necessary to consider the major and significant role of our political entity in the world politics. 6. The new Turkish state is the most powerful occurrence of the entire Turkish history. 7. We need to know it as is.

4- 1. We now comprehensively understand the reasons that dissolved our power, weakened us in all areas. 2. The former feudal Ottoman empire did not collapse for nothing. 3. It did not collapse for a luxury. 4. It did collapse for a principle, for an inevitable necessity. 5. There was no other way to not waste the public power and to give it a creative power. 6. After all the required collapses, the Turkish nation reached a historical youth. 7. What created this is, above all, the rationalization of its self-power. 8. We all can remember the last days of the palace. 9. It is not a period that is too far to us. 10. It is so easy to compare its horrible weakness and the will of the young Republic, the power of creation.

5- 1. The creative power of the new period which evolved out of the dulling snore of the Ottoman empire of centuries is a phenomenon itself in the history of humanity. 2. Turkishness serves as the most honorable model of our period in order to understand the major and shocking-difference between the dispersed national power and the rationalized national power". M. Nermi, 7 January 1931, Cumhuriyet.

In the editorial, M. Nermi discusses the socio-political structure of the Ottoman Empire (education, economy, faith and feudalism) and argues that this structure destroyed the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, he emphasises Turkey's struggle to improve itself by freeing itself from the socio-economic and administrative institutions of the Ottoman system. The editorial contains the negative portrayal of the Ottoman Empire as a country whose social and

bureaucratic system prevents people from self-development, in contrast to the positive portrayal of Turkey as a country that wants to create a modern and powerful country.

Nermi begins the first paragraph by blaming 'the disorder in all social and political entity' and 'the waste of power' for the weakness of Turks. In the first sentence, Turkish power is described as 'unique', which contributes to a positive portrayal of the Turks as a sui generis nation. But the author does not explain why Turkish power is unique. In the second sentence of the first paragraph, he wants to make it clearer what he means by 'disorder in all social and political entity and the waste of power'. Therefore, he explicitly refers to 'tyrant', 'tithe', 'madrasa', 'liberal customs system', 'superstitious ideas' and blames them for the collapse of the Turks. Madrasa refers to the Ottoman education system, liberal customs system refers to the capitulations, the privileges granted by the Ottoman sultans to the European countries for tax exemption. The title refers to the feudal system and the tyrant to the feudal lords. With the metaphorical use of the verb 'gnawed away', he increases the degree of their negative portrayal. I think that their negative representation is equal to the negative representation of the Ottoman Empire, as they belong to the Ottoman Empire.

In the first sentence of the second paragraph, he argues that rationalization creates modern states. This paragraph is reminiscent of Weber's theory of rationalization, which emphasizes the necessity of rationality for the modernization and secularization of a society and defends rational bureaucracy against traditions, superstitions, religious beliefs, feelings and emotions in administration. Collins (1986, p. 62) notes that Weber describes bureaucracy as 'rational-legal' and regards it as the driving force behind the development of Western societies. Furthermore, according to Holton & Turner (1989, p. 68), 'secularization', 'intellectualization' and 'the systematization of the everyday world' are some of the processes of rationalization. He further points out that rationalization provides the ground for ''a stable administrative system the conditions, a systematic framework of legal relations, the dominance of natural science within the intellectual understanding of reality, and the spread of a variety of systems of human control and regularization'' (ibid., p. 68). Taking Weber's theory of rationalization into account, Turkey's commitment to rationalization can be interpreted as its commitment to socio-bureaucratic secularization by reducing the influence of religious traditions and superstition on society and bureaucracy.

The second sentence of the second paragraph claims that 'modern army', 'modern defence', 'modern education', 'modern economy' emerges from rationalization. Through the excessive use of the term 'modern', he implies how important modernization is for Turkey. Here, the contrastive comparison between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire is essentialized as follows: While the Ottoman Empire is predicated as 'dissolved army', a 'period in which it borrowed millions of money almost each year and could not use it consistently' and a lack of political influence in its provinces, Turkey is described as having 'smart and effective policies' that led to the victory of the Turkish army, which enabled Turkey to use its money efficiently and have full control over all its provinces. This success of Turkey is attributed to rationalization. The purpose of the second paragraph is to emphasize that Turkey was founded on the basis of a modern nation-state in which feudalism was abolished. In modern nation states, the state is

the most important central power that has full control over the lands within its jurisdiction (Gellner 1983, p. 4; Hobsbawm 1992, p. 4).

In the first sentence of the third paragraph, 'Today we are powerful', the temporal adverb 'today' signifies the change from the past, indicating that the Ottoman Empire was not powerful, but Turkey is powerful. The temporal adverb 'tomorrow' in the second sentence shows Turkey's determination and commitment to be powerful in the future. The deictic 'we' in the first and second sentences is a 'national we' referring to Turkey and intends to strengthen group consciousness by uniting all Turkish citizens under Turkey. In the example of Wodak et al. (2009), the ''national we'' serves to strengthen and foreground ''national pride'' and ''national despair'' (p. 156). I take the following quote from Wodak et al. (2009, p. 156) to make the 'national we' clearer.

''Well at an international soccer match as long as the game's going on I think to myself, now we're going to win or, it looks like we're losing but / as soon as the game's over then I really don't care anymore / I mean like in sports'' (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 156).

In M. Nermi's editorial, I think that owing to this deictic 'we', the portrayal of Turkey as powerful will be convincing to readers because readers will be proud of themselves as members of powerful Turkey.

In the following paragraphs of the third paragraph, Nermi attempts to reinforce the powerful depiction of the Turkish Republic. For example, by saying that 'the rationalization of national power is not a small and simple thing' and 'Turkey is becoming a bigger power with each passing day', he constructs the image of a Turkey that is overcoming the challenges. Here he assumes that Turkey has succeeded, even though the rationalization of national power is something difficult. In the fifth sentence, the image of 'powerful' Turkey becomes international by emphasizing Turkey's influence as a political player in world politics. In this sentence, the possessive pronoun 'our', which refers to Turkey as a political entity, has two strategic implications. Firstly, it shows how much the author, Nermi, owned Turkey, and second, the possessive pronoun constructs a strong 'we' group of Turkey. In the sixth sentence, he claims that Turkey is the most powerful Turkish country in history, implying a comparison with other Turkish countries in history. In the sixth sentence, the use of the term 'new Turkish state' clarifies the difference between Turkey as a 'new' country and other Turkish countries as 'previous' and 'past'. In this way, he distinguishes Turkey not only from its recent past (Ottoman Empire), but also from all previous Turkish states in history. In the last sentence of the third paragraph, he patronizingly appeals to his readers and wants them to agree with his argument that Turkey is the most powerful Turkish state among all other Turkish states. This patronizing tone is achieved through the deontic modal 'must'. According to Suikkanen (2018, p. 354), modal verbs such as 'should', 'must', 'have to' indicate necessity and obligation. Here, M. Nermi forces readers to assume that Turkey is the strongest country.

The first sentence of the fourth paragraph also contains the pronouns 'we', 'our' and 'us', which are used strategically to emphasize the solidarity and consciousness of the 'we-group of Turks', just as in the third paragraph. These pronouns can be interpreted as a historically

expanding 'we'. The "historically expanding we" includes the speaker, the addressee and the people who are no longer alive. This is because this kind of "we" refers not only to the present, but also to the past (Wodak et al. 2009, pp. 45, 46). Therefore, these pronouns in this paragraph also emphasize all Turks in other Turkish countries that were founded and collapsed in history.

In the fourth paragraph, M. Nermi invokes the topos of history teaching lessons. The topos of history teaching lessons is emphasized in Wodak et al. (2009). The topos of history teaching lessons is an argumentation scheme that emphasizes the lessons learned from the mistakes of the past and stresses that the mistakes and errors of the past will not be repeated because lessons have been learned from the mistakes of the past. Wodak et al. (2009) give many examples of topos of history teaching that reflect the lessons learned from Austrian politics during the Second World War. In this editorial, the argumentation scheme for the topos of history teaching lessons is as follows:

Premise: Turkey has learned not only from the unmodern, feudal and religious structure of the Ottoman Empire, but also from the Ottoman Empire's economic system based on capitulations.

Conclusion: Turkey will not repeat them by modernizing its education system, bureaucracy and military.

This topos, as part of the strategy of transformation (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 85), involves the discontinuation between past and present. This topos is found in the second, third, fourth and fifth sentences of the paragraph, in which the editorialist argues that the Ottoman Empire collapsed because it failed to learn lessons from its past mistakes, e.g. feudalism, which caused it to collapse. In this respect, this topos serves to raise Turkey's positive profile by implying that Turkey will not make the same mistakes and thus protect its existence. I criticize the topos of history education in general for its negative approach to the past. In this editorial, even though it seems that the editorialist is using this topos to distinguish Turkey from the Ottoman Empire, it is biased towards the past, the Ottoman Empire.

The use of 'inevitable necessity' in the fourth sentence and the use of 'required collapse' in the sixth sentence allows him to argue that the collapse of the Ottoman Empire was necessary. In the sixth sentence, he emphasizes that its collapse was something positive for the Turkish nation because after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish nation was able to reach its highest level. In the sixth sentence, the metaphor 'historical youth', even though it refers to the success, achievements and bright future of the Turkish people, is used as a strategy of vagueness in which the author draws on the knowledge of his readers. Here, the author thinks that the readers will understand what he means by 'historical youth'. In the eighth, ninth and tenth sentences of the fourth paragraph, he explicitly appeals to the readers to remember the last period of the Ottoman Empire. He is very sure that his readers have bad memories of the last years of the Ottoman Empire. Here he appeals to a certain group of Turks who lived through the last period of the empire. The use of 'we all' in the eighth sentence and the use of 'us' in the ninth sentence constructs a 'we group' who are not only Turkish citizens now, but

were also once the Ottoman subjects who experienced the socio-cultural, administrative and political problems in the last decade of the Ottoman Empire.

In the ninth sentence, the Ottoman period 'is not too far from us', he implies that he and his readers will remember the time of the Ottoman Empire. This can be seen as a move to increase credibility, as he believes that his generation in Turkey will agree with his arguments about the weakness of the empire. By doing so, he implies that he and his generation have similar negative views about the last decades of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the metonym "the palace" in the eighth sentence refers to the Ottoman dynasty. This metonym serves to reproduce the negative portrayal of the empire. It could be aimed at reviving any bad memories the reader may have. Mardin (1971, p. 199) defines the palace as a 'Sultan's staff' and shows its contagiousness at the beginning of the twentieth century by referring to Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's memoirs about the Ottoman palace. He points out that in Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's memoirs, the palace is portrayed as an institution shaped by the personalities of the Ottoman padishahs. For example, he mentions in the memoirs that during the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II in 1909, the palace was transformed into an 'ghost', mythical institution that was at the heart of Sultan Abdulhamid's administration. In the time of Sultan Vahdeddin, the palace became an institution detached from politics (ibid., p. 9). In this respect, it seems that the editor M. Nermi assumes that the inefficiency of the Ottoman palace will be ingrained in the collective memory of his readers who witnessed the period of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. In the last sentence of the paragraph, he continues with the negative portrayal of the Ottoman Empire versus the positive portrayal of Turkey by portraying Turkey as a 'power of creation' versus Ottoman Empire as a 'horrible weaknesses'. In the last sentence, he again appeals to his readers by asking them to make a comparison between the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic.

In the last paragraph, the dichotomy between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire is again made clear by referring to Turkey's 'creative power' in contrast to the 'dull snoring' of the Ottoman Empire. By assessing Turkey's power as a 'phenomenon' in human history, the editorialist constructs Turkey as a role model for humanity. This serves not only to portray Turkey in a positive light, but also to singularize Turkey so that humanity can draw inspiration from Turkey's founding. From the third to the fifth paragraph, the term 'power' and the adjective 'powerful' are used to refer to Turkey, but the author is not clear about the ways in which Turkey is powerful. Finally, in the last sentence of the editorial, he explains how Turkey is strong by emphasizing that the Turkish Republic attaches importance to the Turkish people and Turkish national identity. The distinction between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire is emphasized again in the last sentence by referring to Turkey as a country that attaches importance to Turkishness, while the Ottoman Empire was a country where Turkish identity was not important. By predicating Turkishness 'the most honourable model of our period' in the last sentence, he shows how valuable Turkishness is for the Turkish Republic. By referring to Turkey, the author uses 'our period', which not only shows how much he owns Turkey and is proud of it. It is interesting that in the last paragraph, the author emphasises Turkey as a nation-state based on Turkishness, but does not explain who is a Turk and what Turkishness is. In the early republican years of Turkey, the question of who is a Turk was

debated. The 1924 Constitution does not define Turkishness according to religion, ethnicity or language. The definition of the Turkish nation in the Turkish constitution is a civic-territorial definition in which all Turkish citizens are equal before the law and their lives, honour and property are under the guarantee of the Turkish state. On the other hand, in the parliamentary debates on the Turkish Constitution of 1924, it was agreed that a distinction should be made between the concept of belonging to the Turkish nation and Turkish citizenship (Cagaptay 2006).

In the next section, I will draw a conclusion by giving a general overview of my findings and how this article has contributed to existing scholarship.

7. Conclusion and Further Research

This article examines the rhetorical strategies of M. Nermi's editorial in the reproduction of Turkish political discourse on Turkey's dissociation from the Ottoman Empire in relation to administrative issues. This article has shown that in M. Nermi's article, the negative representation of the Ottoman Empire against the positive representation of Turkey was often achieved through predications that construct Turkey as "powerful", "modern" and "rational" against the Empire as "weak", "unfashionable" and "irrational". In the editorial, Turkey's identity is based on the Western type of modern nation-state in which the state is the main central power and has full control over the territories under its jurisdiction. In this regard, M. Nermi's editorial emphasized the non-existence of feudalism and the priority of Turks in Turkey in order to construct Turkey as a modern type of nation-state. This article contributes to scholarship in two ways. First, the DHA is interested in a European discourse by investigating the ways in which othering, racism, anti-Semitism, and European collective national identity have been shaped. However, in this article, by focusing on the rhetoric of Turkish press discourse on Turkish national identity, I have shown that this approach can also be applied to a non-European discourse and context. Second, this article contributed to research on the early republican years in Turkey in that I focused specifically on the press discourse in Turkey's early republican years by examining what role it played in relation to the reinterpretation of Turkish national identity.

During my archival research on Turkish national identity in the Turkish press of the early republican years, I came across not only newspaper editorials on the socio-cultural, economic and administrative differentiation between Turkey and the Ottoman Empire, but also many editorials on Turkish nationalism and Turkish ethnicity. In my future research articles, I would like to focus on the editorials of Turkish newspapers that deal with Turkish identity and ethnicity. During my archival research in the Turkish press in 2014, I collected a large number of editorials dealing with the question of who the Turks are and discussing the conditions of belonging to the Turkish nation. My aim is to analyze these editorials by using the method of the Viennese School of Discourse-Historical Approach.

References

Ahmad, F. (1993). *The Making of Modern Turkey*. London, New York: Routledge.

Ahmad, F. (2008). Politics and Political Parties in Republican Turkey. In R. Kasaba (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Volume 4: Turkey in the Modern World* (pp. 226-265). Cambridge University Press.

Akşin, S. (2007). *Turkey: From Empire to Revolutionary Republic: The Emergence of the Turkish Nation from 1789 to the present*. New York: New York University Press.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London and New York: Verso.

Armstrong, H. C. (1961). *Gray Wolf: The Life of Kemal Ataturk.* New York: Capricorn Books.

Atay, F. R. (1966). *Babanız Ataturk.* İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Matbaacılık.

Benoist-Mechin, J. (1954). *Le loup et le leopard Mustapha Kemal ou la mort d'un empire*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Berkes, N. (1998). *The Development of Secularism in Turkey.* New York: Routledge.

Cagaptay, S. (2006). *Islam, Secularism and Nationalism in modern Turkey: Who is a Turk.* London, NewYork: Routledge.

Çeçen, A. (1998). *Kemalizm.* Istanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.

Çeçen, A. (2003). *Atatürk ve Cumhuriyet.* Ankara: İmge Yayınları.

Collins, R. (1986). *Weberian Sociological Theory.* Cambridge University Press.

Dumont, P. (1984). The Origins of Kemalist Ideology. In J. M. Landau (Ed.), *Ataturk and the modernization of Turkey* (pp. 25-45). Boulder / Colorado: Westview Press.

Ergil, D. (1975). A Reassessment: The Young Turks, their Politics and anti-colonial struggle. *Balkan Studies, 16*(2), 26-72.

Findley, C. V. (2010). *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism and Modernity A History, 1789- 2007*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Basil Blackwell.

Glasneck, J. (1976). *Kemal Ataturk and Çağdaş Türkiye.* Translated by Gelen, A. Ankara: Onur Yayınevi.

Hanioğlu, Ş. (2011). *Atatürk: An Intellectual Bibliography.* Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Heper, M. (1979). Patrimonialism in the Turkish Public Bureaucracy. *Asian and African Studies, 13*(1), 3-21.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992). *Nations and Nationalism since 1870: Programme, myth, reality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Holton, R. J. and Turner B. S. (1989). *Max Weber on Economy and Society.* Routledge.

Inan, A. (1981). *A History of the Turkish Revolution and the Turkish Republic*. Ankara. Pars Matbaası.

İnan, M. R. (1983). *Atatürk'ün evrenselliği, önder kişiliği, eğitimci kişiliği ve amaçları.* Ankara: UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu.

İnan, M. R. (1991). *Ataturk ve Türk Kadını: Tarihte Türk Kadını.* İstanbul: Arkın Yayınları.

Kadıoglu, A. (1996). The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity. *Middle Eastern Studies, 32*(2), 177-194. Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved 3 July 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4283799

Karpat, K. (1967). *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi: Sosyal, Ekonomik, Kültürel Değerler.* İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası.

Kazancıgil, A. (1981). The Ottoman Turkish State and Kemalism. In A. Kazancıgil, & W. Özbudun (Eds.), *Ataturk and Founder of a Modern State* (pp. 37-56). London: C. Hurst & Company.

Keyder, Ç. (1987). *State and Class in Turkey: A study in Capitalist Development.* London and New York: VERSO.

Keyder, Ç. (1997). Wither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in 1990s. In S. Bozdoğan (Ed.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey* (pp. 37-51). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Kinross, P. B. (1981). *Ataturk: The Rebirth of a Nation*. Nicosia: Rustem and Brother in association with Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Kinross, P. B. (1981). *Ataturk: The Rebirth of a Nation.* Nicosia: Rustem and Brother in association with Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Kongar, E. (2002). *Devrim tarihi ve toplumbilim açısından Atatürk*. İstanbul: Remzi Yayınevi.

Krzyzanowski, M. (2009). Europe in crisis: Discourses on crisis-events in the European press 1956-2006. *Journalism Studies, 10*, 18-35.

Krzyzanowski, M. (2016). Recontextualization of neoliberalism and the increasingly conceptual nature of discourse. *Discourse and Society, 27*(3), 308-321.

Krzyzanowski, M., & Ledin, P. (2017). Uncivility on the Web: Populism in/and the borderline discourses of exclusion. *Journal of Language and Politics, 16*(4), 566- 581.

Krzyzanowski, M., Triandafyllidou, A., & Wodak, R. (2018). The Mediatization and the Politicization of the "Refugee Crisis" in Europe. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 16*(1-2), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1353189

Lewis, B. (1968). *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Luke, H. (1936). *The Making of Modern Turkey: From Byzantium to Angora*. London: Macmillan.

Mango, A. (1999). *Atatürk. Translated by Doruker, F. Yeni Binyıl Sabah Kitapları.* Sabah Kitapçılık San. ve Tic. A.Ş.

Mango, A. (2008). Atatürk. In R. Kasaba (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Volume 4: Turkey in the Modern World* (pp. 147-172). Cambridge University Press.

Mardin, Ş. A. (1971). Ideology and Religion in the Turkish Revolution. *International Journal of Middle East Studies, 2*(3), 197-211. Retrieved 12 September 2017, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/162194

Mardin, Ş. A. (2000). *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*. Syracuse University Press.

Meydan, S. (2014). *İşte Türkiye'nin kurtuluş reçetesi Akl-ı Kemal: Atatürk'ün akıllı projeleri*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitapevi.

Nermi, M. (1931). *7 January 1931*. Cumhuriyet.

Okyar, O. (1984). Ataturk's Quest for Modernism. In J. M. Landau (Ed.), *Ataturk and the modernization of Turkey* (pp. 45-53). Boulder / Colorado: Westview Press.

Özbudun, E. (1984). Antecedents of Kemalist Secularism: Some Thoughts on the Young Turk Period. In A. Evin (Ed.), *Modern Turkey: Continuity and Change* (pp. 25-44). Opladen: Leske & Budrich.

Parla, T., & Davison, A. (2004). *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey Progress or Order*. Syracuse / N.Y: Syracuse University Press.

Parusev, P. (1981). *Atatürk*. Cem Yayınevi.

Poulton, H. (1997). *The top hat, the grey wolf and the crescent: Turkish nationalism and the Turkish Republic*. London: Hurst.

Reed, C., & Walton, D. (2001). *Applications of argument schemes*. OSSA Conference Archive.

Reed, C., Walton, D., & Macagno, F. (2007). Argument diagramming in logic, law and artificial intelligence. *The Knowledge Engineering Review. 22*(1), 87-109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269888907001051

Reisigl, M. (2007). The dynamics of right-wing populist argumentation in Austria. In H. F. van Eemeren, A. J. Blair, A. C. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the international society for the study of argumentation* (pp. 1127-1134). Amsterdam: Sic Sat 2007/International Centre for the Study of Argumentation.

Reisigl, M. (2014). Argumentation Analysis and the Discourse-Historical Approach: A Methodological Framework. In C. Hart, & P. Cap (Eds.), *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 67-97).

Reisigl, M. (2017). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In J. Flowerdew, & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 44-59). Routledge.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Richardson, J. E., & Wodak, R. (2009). The impact of visual racism: Visual arguments in political leaflets of Austrian and British far-right parties. *Controversia, 6*(2), 45-77.

Sakaoglu, S. (1990). *Atatürk, gençlik ve kültür*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi.

Şapolyo, E. B. (1958). *Kemal Atatürk ve Milli Mücadele Tarihi*. İstanbul: Rafet Zaimler.

Shah, I. A. (1934). *Kamal: Maker of modern Turkey*. London: Herbert Joseph.

Shaw, S. J. (1985). *Historical Foundations: Turkey from the Young Turk Revolution until World War II. Reprint from Südosteuropa-Handbuch Band IV.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Shaw, S. J., & Shaw, E. K. (1977). *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey: Volume II: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975*. Cambridge University Press.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.

Sonyel, S. R. (1989). *Ataturk, The Founder of Modern Turkey*. Ankara: Turkish Historical Society.

Spencer, R. F. (1958). Culture Process and Intellectual Current: Durkheim and Atatürk. *American Anthropologist, 60*(4), 640-657. Retrieved 22 August 2017 from, http://www.jstor.org/stable/665671

Steinhaus, K. (2002). *Türk Devrim Tarihi (The history of the Turkish Revolution)*. İstanbul: Örgün Yayınevi.

Suikkanen, J. (2018). Deontic Modality. *Analysis. 78*(2), 354-363. https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/any015

Timur, T. (1987). The Ottoman Heritage. In I. C. Schick, & E. A. Tonak (Eds.), *Turkey in Transition: New Perspectives* (pp. 3-26). New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Torumtay, N. (2001). *Atatürk: Çağdaş Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devleti'nin kurucusu lider Atatürk*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık.

Toulmin, S. (1964). *The Place of Reason in Ethics: an examination.* Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. (2003). *The Uses of Argument.* Cambridge University Press.

Toynbee, J. A., & Kirkwood, K. P. (1926). *Turkey.* London: E. Benn.

Uzer, U. (2016). *An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism: Between Turkish Ethnicity and Islamic Ethnicity.* Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.

Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, Communication and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective.* Routledge.

Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic Theory of Argumentation. The Pragma-dialectical Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Von Mikusch, D. (1931). *Ghazi Mustapha Kemal: La Résurrection d'un peuple.* Paris: Librairies Gallimard.

Walton, D. (1990). *Practical Reasoning: Goal-Driven, Knowledge-Based, ActionGuiding Argumentation*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Walton, D. (1992). *The Place of Emotion in Argument.* Pennsylvania State University Press.

Walton, D. (1996). *Argumentation Schemes for Presumptive Reasoning*. Psychology Press.

Walton, D. (2006). *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge University Press.

Walton, D. (2013). *Methods of Argumentation.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Walton, D. (2016). *Argument Evaluation and Evidence*. Cham: Springer.

Walton, D., Reed, C., & Macagno, F. (2008). *Argumentation Schemes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, S. D. (2009). *The securitization of humanitarian migration: Digging moats and sinking boats*. London / UK: Routledge.

Webster, D. E. (1939). *The Turkey of Atatürk: Social Process in the Turkish Reformation. Philadelphia*. The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Wodak R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Washington, D.C: SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R. (1990). The Waldheim Affair and Antisemitic Prejudice in Austrian Public Discourse. *Patterns of Prejudice, 24*(2-4), 18-33.

Wodak, R. (1994). The Development and forms of racist discourse in Austria since 1989. In G. Graddol, & S. Thomas (Eds.), *Language in a Changing Europe* (pp. 1-15). Multilingual Matters.

Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer, (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 65-93). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Washington, D.C: SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R. (2011). Suppressions of the Nazi Past, Coded Languages, and Discourses of Silence: Applying the Discourse-Historical Approach to Post-War Antisemitism in Austria. In W. Steinmetz (Ed.), *Political Languages in the age of Extremes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2015a). Critical discourse analysis, discourse-historical approach. In K. Tracy, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction*. John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463/wbielsi116

Wodak, R. (2015b). *The politics of fear: What right-wing discourses mean*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Forchtner, B. (2014). Embattled Vienna 1683/2010: Right-wing populism, collective memory and the fictionalisation of politics. *Visual Communication, 13*(2), 231-255.

Wodak, R., & Krzyzanowski, M. (Eds.) (2017). Right-wing populism in Europe and USA: Contesting politics and discourse beyond "Orbanism" and "Trumpism" [Special Issue]. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *16*(4), 1-14.

Wodak, R., & Van Dijk, T. (Eds.). (2000). *Racism at the Top Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic issues in Six European States.* Klagenfurt / Celovec: Drava.

Wodak, R., De Cilia, R., Martin, R., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity* (2nd ed.). Translated by Hirsch, A., Mitten, R., & Unger, J. W. Edinburgh Press.

Wortham, H. E. (1930). *Mustapha Kemal of Turkey.* New York: William Edwin Rudge.

Zurcher, E. J. (2007) *Turkey: A Modern History.* London: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd.

Zurcher, E. J. (2010). *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Ataturk's Turkey*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris.

Note

Note 1. Some parts of this article was produced from my PhD Thesis.

Copyrights