LITERARY PRODUCTION, CURRENTS AND POLITICS BETWEEN 1960 AND 1980 IN TURKEY

HAKKI BAŞGÜNEY

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2013

LITERARY PRODUCTION, CURRENTS AND POLITICS BETWEEN 1960 AND 1980 IN TURKEY

by

Hakkı Başgüney

Submitted to the

Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosopy

Boğaziçi University

"Literary Production, Currents and Politics between 1960 and 1980 in Turkey," a dissertation prepared by Hakkı Başgüney in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University. This dissertation has been approved on June 27 by

Prof. Dr. Paul Dumont

(Dissertation Advisor)

Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak

(Dissertation Advisor)

Prof. Dr. Arzu Öztürkmen

Prof. Dr. Didier Francfort

Prof. Dr. Samim Akgönül

Doç. Dr. Ahmet Kuyaş

June 2013

An Abstract of the Dissertation of Hakkı Başgüney, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University to be taken

Title: Literary Prodution, Curents and Politics between 1960 and 1980 in Turkey

This dissertation examines the increasing visibility of literary activities as a part of other cultural activities between 1960 and 1980. During these two decades, there was an increasing influence of literary activities, literary production, literary world throughout large parts of the Turkish society. This may be also seen as a shaping, a reconstruction, or an expansion of a more effective literary world, literary public and literary market containing many different trends or currents.

This work also assesses the intricate relations between literary culture and politics. To put it in other words, the hypothesis is that a better understanding of the intellectual and political atmosphere of Turkey in the 1960s and in the early 1970s can be achieved through an examination of cultural and mainly literary life, the currents of that period, as these reflected, sustained and gave general expression to the prevalent intellectual and political tendencies of the period. It will be emphasized that the political identity which was adopted by the literary actors was generally one critical of the existing political and social system.

The intellectual climate will be examined via literature. I argue that the men of letters, literary actors played important roles along with academics and journalists through their public, intellectual identity in the social life from 1960 to the end of the 1970s.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlke ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Doktora derecesi için Hakkı Başgüney tarafından ….da teslim edilen tezin özeti

Başlık: Türkiye'de 1960 ile 1980 Yılları Arasında Yazınsal Üretim, Akımlar ve Politika

Bu çalışma 1960 ile 1980 yılları arasında kültürel etkinliklerin bir parçası olarak tarif edilen dönemin yazınsal faaliyetlerinin artan görünürlüğünü ortaya koymayı hedefliyor. Bu çalışmada bu iki on yıl boyunca yazınsal etkinliklerin, yazınsal üretimin, yazınsal dünyanın etkisinin Türkiye toplumunun geniş kesimlerine ulaştığı öne sürülecektir. Bu süreç kendi içinde çeşitli akımları, eğilimleri de içeren daha etkin bir yazınsal dünyanın, akımların, kamuoyunun, pazarın şekillenmesi, yeniden kuruluşu ve genişlemesi olarak da görülebilir.

Çalışma öte yandan bu dönemde yazınsal kültür ve politik pozisyonlar arasında da güçlü ve karmaşık bir ilişki olduğunu varsayıyor. Dönemin yazınsal etkinlikleri incelenerek de dönemin politik ve sosyal tarihine dair önemli bulgulara ulaşılabileceği, çünkü yazınsal etkinliklerin dönemin politik kültürüne dair oluşturucu, yansıtıcı ve genel fikir verici bir işlev kazandığı düşünülmektedir. Dönemin yazınsal aktörleri tarafından benimsenen politik kimliklerin varolmakta olan politik ve sosyal sisteme karşı muhallif ve eleştirel bir içeriğe sahip olduğu vurgulanmaktadır.

Ülkede hakim olan dönemin kamusal entelektüel kimliğinin de edebiyat üzerinden incelenebileceği düşünülmektedir. 1960'dan 1970'lerin sonuna dek edebiyatçıların gazetecilerle ve akademisyenlerle beraber ülkelerinin sosyal hayatında düşünsel ve kamusal kimlikleri aracılığıyla önemli roller oynadıkları iddia edilmektedir.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF THE AUTHOR: Hakkı Başgüney

PLACE OF BIRTH: Bolu, Turkey

DATE OF BIRTH: 9 February 1978

SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

Galatsaray Highschool 1989 1997

Boğaziçi University Philosphy 1997 2004

Boğaziçi University

Atatürk Institute Master

"Sinematek (Turkish Cinémathèque Association): Cinema and Political Debate in Turkey Between 1965-1980"

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Modern Turkish History, Intellectual History, History odf Cinema, Socıology of Literature

PUBLICATIONS:

TÜRK SİNEMATEK DERNEĞİ (1965-1980) Türkiye'de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma, İstanbul : Libra Yayınları, 2010.

"Börekçi": A Peculiar and Symbolic Place for B.U. Students
Journal of Historical Studies, Graduate Journal, Sayı 4, 2006
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, The Ataturk Institute for ModernTurkish History

SİNEMATEK (Türk Sinematek Derneği) : 1965-1980 Arasında Sinema ve Politik Tartışma Hakkı Başgüney, Serpil Kırel, Türkiye ve Dünya Sinemasında Sentezler, İstanbul : Parşömen Yayıncılık 2010.

CONFERENCES:

« Vers une culture nationale pluraliste. Les années 1960 dans la vie intellectuelle turque ».Conference: « Formation et transmission des héritages culturels dans le monde turc et les pays successeurs de l'Empire ottoman » 14 and 15 February 2008 Strasbourg, France.

« Regard social et regard culturel sur la question de la synthèse entre tradition et modernité en Turquie » Confererence: « La Turquie en Europe: Enjeux Politiques et Culturels » 5 February 2009, Strasbourg, France.

« The Ottoman Empire in Turkish cinema and the Role of the Turkish Cinema in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic".Conference: "Imperial Syncretism, Religious Nationalism and European Universalism in Central Europe, East Europe, Southeast Europe and Turkey" 12-13 February 2009, Freibourg, Germany.

« La société turque entre l'enclume et le marteau : "peuple" et "intellectuels" ».Conference: « Les mots ont un sens, Pérégrinations sémantiques à travers le lexique des recherches sur le monde turc » 21 january 2011, INALCO, Paris, France.

« Représentations du monde du travail dans le cinéma turc et dans la littérature turque des années 1960-1980 ». International Conference, « Histoire Culturelle du Travail» 3 and 5 July 2012, Lunéville, France.

PRESENTATION:

« Sanatın Politikleşmesi, Politikanın Sanata Artan İlgisi, 1970'ler Türkiyesi» [Politicization of Art, Increasing Political Interest in Art, 1970s Turkey]. « Duvar Resminden Korkuyorlar, Scared of Murals exhibition» Salt Cultural Center, 27 March 2013: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cz3KJ9g0W_Q

ORGANISATION:

Organisation of the « Days for documentaries about Turquie: Migration et Rencontre des cultures, Migration & Cultural Encounters » 26-27 April 2011, University of Strasbourg.

Organisation of the « Conférence and Projection of Turkish films. Vivre la ville dans le Cinéma Turc, (To live the city in Turkish Cinema) 4-5 March, 2010. University of Strasbourg : http://turcologie.u-strasbg.fr/dets/index.php

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my special thanks to my thesis advisors, Paul Dumont and Zafer Toprak, whose lessons in my first and second years developed my theoretical and analytical skills. I owe very special thanks for their help, guidance, patience, and unmentionably great contributions. There is no doubt that without their help, it would be impossible for me to achieve this degree. My sejour in France, at Strasbourg was very contributive, convivial and rich experience for my studies. I am very thankful to Paul Dumont for this opportunity. He shared with me his own literary archive which constitutes the core of this study. I am also thankful to Ahmet Kuyaş, whose interventions, especially in the field of Turkish cultural history made this thesis more complete than its first copy. I am also grateful to Sanmim Akgönül, Didier Franfort and Arzu Öztürkmen for their advises and always to the point questions in the building of a coherent study. They supported my dissertatıon by zrting very posivite thesis reports for my common defense with the University of Strasbourg. Kathryn Kranzler edited my writing and also encouraged me. This has been a very valuable exercise in learning how to write. He also has share in the correction and development of my writing. I am thankful for her sincerity.

To my friends, I am also indebted. First of all, I would like to express my special thank to my friend Coşkun for his unending support. I appreciate both intellectual, spiritual and technical supports of him who has never denied my demands in case of emergency. I also indebted to my old friend Burçak Gürsoy, who was shared her researches about the political and economic developments of the 1960s and 1970s. I owe also special thanks to Esin Ertürk who shared his unpublished work about the Turkish 1968 movements with me. Melih Yeşilbağ, Cemil Yıldızcan, Ali Gökçeli, Mehmet Emin Türkmen, Sinan Odabaşı, Işık Kırıbrahim, Özge Biner, Neslişah Başaran, Kaan Tuğrul Aksungur, Ozan Ekin Kurt, Merve Arkan, Barış Zeren were always with me during this study, with their constant support. I owe also special thanks to my friend Erkal Ünal, for his technical and spiritual support, for his companionship to listen to my straits all through the years. And from our institute, I acknowledge the candid help of many friends.

Ultimately, I owe special thanks for their constant support and patience to all my family. Emine and Fikret Başgüney, my parents were always with me during all my education, and all my life. My second mother Saadet Baykal and his husband Atilla Baykal were always with me during all the year. My brother Haluk Başgüney who was my good friend, my comrade owes special thanks for his patience, his existence, his amity.

Finally, I should thank my fiancée, who always gave me courage, power, inspiration and motivation to continue my studies and made my life richer and more beautiful. I thank her for being in my life.

CONTENTS

1. PREFACE……xxxiii

2. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION…… 1
Literature as an Institution and its Role in Human Communication……2
The Modern Background of Litreature and Novel……...8
Essential Theories……17
Historian, History and Literature……..24
Sociology of Literature……26
Marxism and Literature……32
What Are the Distinctive Measures of the Artists and Writers?.....41
Who is Intellectual?.....50
Intellectuals, Artists and Politics and their Role in the Public Sphere.....56
The End of Intellectuals Era.....62

3. CHAPTER TWO: THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT……..65
Leftist Movements of the Period: Turning Point: 1968 Student Movement –
Rise of a Leftist Popular Culture……..66
Counter Culture Movement……..72
International Mobility of Authors Competition of the Cold War……80
International Relationships of Turkey ……82

4. CHAPTER THREE: TURKEY BETWEEN 1960S AND 1970S……84
General Political Process……..84
Economic Developments (Import Substitution Industrialization 1960-1980)……..92
Ideological Framework and its Social Dimensions……..97
Nationalisms or the Solidarity of the Oppressed Nations……99
Foundation of the Left Politics and Ideas in Turkey……..104
Yön (Direction) Magazine and the Association of Socialist Culture……105
TLP (*Türkiye İşçi Partisi* - Turkish Labor Party)……..106
RPP's the "Left of Center" Discourse (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* CHP- Republican
People Party)……..108
The Significance of the 1968 in Turkey……110
Development of a Societal Culture in Turkey……113
Education……114
Popular Culture, New Life Styles, Artistic Production……...121
Other Artistic Realms: Cinema, Theatre…….....123
Transformation of the Turkish Language……...131

5. CHAPTER FOUR: HISTORY OF LITERATURE IN THE 1960S AND 1970S……..139
Intellectual and Literary History in Turkey before the 1960s - Literature Significance in the Formation of the Intellectual Culture…….....140
Literature Increasing Visibility and Its Main Political, Hegemonic Identity in the 1960s and 1970s.....156
The Development of Cultural Associations and Publishing Houses 156
Literature and Social Sciences.....161
Literature and Public Intellectuals.....163
Three Main Genres: Literary Production and Its Conditions……..170
Poetry……..171
Novel and Short Story……190
Critiques and Essays……...216

6. CHAPTER FIVE: LITERATURE AND POLITICS…….228

The Intricate Relationship between Authors, and Social Circumstances and Politics during these two Decades……...229
Evolution of the Relation between Artists and Politics……...230
Main Trends and Circles in the 1960s and 1970s……...255
Left Kemalist Writers…….....256
Marxist Affiliated Intellectuals, Social Realists…….262
"Sui Generis" Intellectuals Oğuz Atay, Kemal Tahir and Attilâ Ilhan, *Nevi Şahsına Münhasır*……...……..268
Modernists, Avant-garde Intellectuals……279
Nationalist, Conservative Intellectuals……..292

7. CHAPTER SIX: A SOCIOLOGICAL DEBATE……..……297

A Conceptualization of Intellectual, Literary and Theoretical Debates in the Literary. Reviews, and the Analysis of some Novels.....297
Populism Elitism Debate, Intellectuals between State and People…….300
Dualities in the Evolution of the Turkish Literature……..312
Different Social Classes, Inequalities and their Representations……..332
Historical Debates, Challenges to the Official History of Turkey…….340
The Relations of Artists with Social and Political Movements, Oppressions and Melancholy……344

8. CONCLUSION…….349

9. BIBLIOGRAPHY……..356

PREFACE

This dissertation examines the increasing visibility of literary activities as a part of general cultural activities between 1960 and 1980 in Turkey. It will be argued that during these two decades, there was an increasing visibility and influence of literary activities, literary production, and a growing literary world throughout Turkish society. This may be also seen as a reshaping, a reconstruction, or an expansion of a more effective literary world, literary public and literary market containing such different things as trends and currents.

To explain this phenomenon, I would like to focus on the effects of the social and cultural atmosphere of the late 1960s and the early 1970s, on the objective conditions of the evolution and the development of the currents in the artistic but mainly literary world, and the subjective dimensions of the artistic, literary production, and its role in the shaping of the general social and intellectual atmosphere. My research is based on literature and art reviews, main literary works of the period and the activities of cultural associations.

Secondly, my work also aims at determining the intricate relations between literary culture and politics. I will also try to analyze the intellectual climate via literature, my hypothesis being that a better understanding of the intellectual and political atmosphere of Turkey in the 1960s and in early 1970s can be achieved through an examination of the cultural and mainly literary life, and the currents of that period as these were reflected, sustained and gave general expression to the prevalent intellectual and political tendencies of their period. It will be emphasized that the

political identity which was adopted by the literary actors was generally a dissident one critical of the political and social system of the time.

Third, my question is why literary actors played important roles with the academics and journalists through their public and intellectual identities in society from 1960 to 1980? Why were they accepted as the public intellectuals of the time, while today they are no longer as influential as academics and journalists? My thesis is a study of the conjunctural, structural and subjective reasons for the phenomenon mentioned above.

In this period, artists, journalists, and intellectuals were very active and productive. Within the limits of this research, I will focus on especially literary figures who had close relationships with other areas of the intellectual world. Literary figures, including Orhan Kemal, Onat Kutlar, Yaşar Kemal, Cemal Süreya, Fakir Baykurt, Yılmaz Güney, Oktay Akbal, Aziz Nesin, Melih Cevdet Anday, Necip Fazıl Kısakürek and many other intellectuals had a say in the existing problems of the country, today however when journalists and academics have a voice and mold the public opinion and writers they are not similarly influential. The case deserves an evaluation.

Considering these three elements, my objective can be defined as to highlight the process in which literature was oriented towards the social and political spheres within its authenticity while trying to reflect and to influence the social life. The aim of my dissertation can be defined as to determine whether the highlight will be on the period itself, or on the particular development of literature and its actors. I will have recourse to the theories of the sociology of literature. I consider this phenomenon as a

combination of subjective and objective factors, by including information of the era and the actors.

Considering the literary arguments of the era, it can be observed that the men of letters managed to move beyond literature and to create an intellectual climate through their discussions and their works, while also playing roles in the formation of the general intellectual climate, where avant-garde and populist (social realist) tendencies were intertwined.

Literature was focused on politics and society's problems since it was the *zeitgeist*, but there were multiple political, ideological spirits of the time. Nevertheless, it can be suggested that the tendency in literature was subject to limited economic and mainstream political influence, yet it often held its distance to the political power, and even was ideologically opposed to it. It is important to inquire why literature assumed a dissident and critical identity out of the system during this era. The said disposition is not something that was introduced during the era; however, it was expanded to a larger sector in this period, when the visibility and readability of literature and writers also increased.

I have to accredit literature and its agents with a certain authenticity. All in all, this authenticity can be considered as a challenge and even an attempt of ignorance of the intellectuals towards the conditions of the time and the cultural traits of their countries and, as well as a will to change it. Although these actors imagined a society which would be more appropriate to their political visions and where their subjectivity would gain importance, the oppression of the military coup of September 12, 1980 and the neo-liberal policies of the Turgut Özal government, which was a coalition of

the conservatives, nationalists and liberals, in its aftermath wiped them out, and thus they lost their ability to reflect on and contemplate society.

In that case, the role of the men of letters and writers can be defined as a subjective dissidence to the economic, social, and political structures of the country, which included certain potentials for change. Therefore, the development of literature was not completely independent from the social context; however, it had to return to its own field when it is engaged excessively in social issues, and subjective or collective attempts or challenges lost their importance gradually. Besides the changing content of literature, the actual change took place when the political sense of literary identity shrank, and the men of letters lost significantly their identity as public intellectuals.

This time period under consideration saw special conditions. I will start with the meaning of the beginning and end of the period on which I will focus. Specifically, it might be noted that the 1960s and 1970s were bracketed between two military coups, namely those of 27 May 1960 and 12 September 1980. The 1960 military coup and the constitution of 1961 were turning points, and thus the time in between constituted a transition period for cultural and political debates. The international mobility and the social movements and political diversity and plurality that increasingly sprang up in Turkey were the sources of this period of change. The 1960s were marked by the coup d'état of May 27 and its more liberal constitution that lay the basis for a "new period" that opened the way to new ideas for artists and intellectuals, who were impressed by the incredible influx of new political ideas and books, the translations, publication and reception had until then been very limited. This atmosphere of relative freedom did not continue too long, especially after the rise

of the conservative Justice Party government in 1965, state oppression via censure or other methods constituted a great obstacle to intellectuals and artists. Another turning point may be considered to have been the 12 March military intervention. I do not assert that the 1960s and 1970s were a period of total freedom, but in these years, more democratic and participatory organizations appeared and a struggle for a freer public life was started. However, at the end of the 1970s, a civil war atmosphere shadowed all cultural activities.

I consider this period of 1960-1980 as a new phase in the Turkish political life. The bipolarity of the previous decade was then succeeded by a more compounded political milieu in which the marginal currents of the right and the left both found opportunity for their representation by new political parties. These were years of compound violent socio-economic transformation, marked by military interventions and political oscillations and violence. Turkish Modernization gained acceleration in this period due the expansion of mass education, mass communication, popular and to some extent high culture; import substitution-based industrialization, urbanization, migration and immigration and the development of consumerism within an increasingly capitalist economy that slowly replaced the state-centered planned economy.

These developments gave rise to the deepening of class distinctions and class problems. Zafer Toprak writes that the 1960s and 1970s were the years when Turkish intellectuals discovered the class distinctions and class problems of their country. While the era of the foundation period of Turkey can be held to be characterized by a socio-political type of modernization, the era of the 1960s and 1970s witnessed a more

socio-economically based modernization, that is, more under the spell of capitalism.[1] However, the processes of modernization and westernization were far from complete, and some scholars began to seriously question these theories.

Globally, these years were the years of the Cold War. This should be taken this into account in our effort to comprehend the intricate political texture of the era. These decades generally are treated ones in which there was intense questioning of the legitimacy of the Cold War struggle between the USA and the USSR. During the Cold War period, many other centers of relative influence, as China, Yugoslavia, Albania, and the movement of Non-Aligned countries have to be noted. Moreover, the influential university movements of 1968 constitute the turning point of the period 1960-80. The 1968 movements were important for the literary and artistic realm because the youth who participated in these movements believed into the revolutionary potential of art. New artistic forms were proposed to produce a revolutionary art that would be emancipatory and transformative for the audiences. The revolutionary youth was also an important audience and consumer of the literary production of the age. At the end of the 1970s, nationalist and conservative writers, intellectuals and Islamist elites became more influential and some of these authors began to establish relations with Arab countries. During all of these two decades, political ties of the Turkish political elites with the US were also developed.

In this period, with the increasing complexity of the political scene, the cultural life itself, with its various components (literature, theatre, cinema, visual arts, thought), was inevitably prone to a significant degree of transformation. In my

[1]See Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London and New York: *I. B. Tauris and Co Ltd Publishers,* 1994), Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of the Modern Turkey* (New York: Routledge: 1993).

research, I focus mainly on literary production because I think that the literary production was also at the core of the intellectual debates and provided a relevant ground for these debates.

This transformation may be seen as a result of four key factors. First of all, in these years, an increasing number of institutions that brought together intellectuals and artists from various fields, allowing them to express their political views and cultural programs in the public sphere, were founded. Cultural associations like the Turkish Cinémathèque Association (Türk Sinematek Derneği) and Union of Turkish Writers (Türkiye P.E.N.Yazarlar Derneği) and the Syndicate of the Turkish Authors (Türk Yazarlar Sendikası - TYS) and political organizations, especially the TLP (Turkish Labor Party-*Türkiye İşçi Partisi*) in the 1960s and in many other small or middle political organizations in the 1970s, significantly contributed to the rise of a new generation of student and young intellectuals, men of letters who were closer to the left wing political organizations, and had access to a literary and political culture at the same time.[2] An atmosphere was taking shape in which the artists could express themselves more freely. And in this atmosphere, the economic and cultural problems of Turkey were fervently debated in many political, intellectual, and artistic circles.

Second, during these years, there were influential literary and political journals which functioned as a common ground for a literary and political world and public. These literary reviews were especially Memet Fuat's *Yeni Dergi* (New Review, 1965), Vedat Günyol's *Yeni Ufuklar* (New Horizons), Yaşar Nabi Nayır's *Varlık* (Being-Existence), and Hüsamettin Bozok's *Yeditepe* (Seven Hills). There were

[2]Emin Alper, "Student Movemet in Turkey form a Global Perspective, 1960-1971" (Ph.D. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2009), p. 49.

many other literary reviews, representing the artistic attitudes of many small circles, or single authors like *Şiir Sanatı* (Art of Poem) journal of Kemal Özer, and *Papirüs* (Papyrus) of Cemal Süreya and *Halkın Dostları* (Friends of People) review. The most significant political journals were edited by Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Yön* (Direction) and *Devrim* (Revolution) journals and Doğan Ergüden, *Ant* (Oath) review. These journals gave considerable place to cultural and literary events.

The cultural and intellectual enrichment of the country was also augmented by the establishment of the new publishing houses such as *Ant* (Oath), *Cem* (1964 Oğuz Akkan), *Ağaoğlu*, *De*, *Yön* (Direction), *Habora*, Muzaffer Erdost's *Sol* (Left), and *Bilgi* (Knowledge). *Varlık*, *Remzi*, and *Dost* (Friend) publishing houses which established before, were also productive during these decades.

This increasing number of publishing houses and formation of an autonomous literary world were important. Literature became part of a public culture in which visual and reading culture had an increasingly important role. This also was a result of the increasing rate of literacy of society and a political orientation that was diffused with the help of this reading activity. There was also an increase in the quantity of printed material. The social and technological transformations in the public communication and the development of a literary market were important factors that explain the development of the literature.

Thirdly, there was also a great international mobility in this period and especially leftist social and cultural movements followed one another throughout the world. This mobility and international movements affected the Turkish context. In this period, in the cultural and literary realm, diversified leftist tendencies were more dominant than other political ideologies, in Turkey. As a result of this international

and national factors, this period can be considered the only moment in the Turkish political life in which the radical, socialist left had a considerable power, mainly over intellectuals. These political ideologies were influential in the transformation of the literary realm.

Fourth, it was opened the way to new ideas for artists and intellectuals. They were impressed by the incredible influx of modernist, Marxist and alternative ideas by non fictive theory books and novels. Translations, and publications of books on theory and the novels had until then been very limited.

As a result of these factors, the young intellectuals of the period increasingly incorporated the intellectual tradition of the country. They were the audience for the literary and artistic production as well as the recipients of political thoughts. The cultural development of the country provided by new publishing houses, cultural centers and periodicals which entered in the cultural scene en masse, especially after 1965 contributed significantly to the education of a politically more libertarian and cultivated generation as an audience and future creators of art. Literature and literary journals which also published many other articles from different domains had a significant role in exposure of young people with leftist politics and different, alternative thoughts. This literature includes a wide variety of translations of the foreign works.

Thus, it is argued that during the interval 1960-1980, an artistic environment took shape in which a synthesis of cultural and political discussions was possible, and during this interval, modernist and realist artistic production held sway, although the influence of the anti-modernist tendencies that argued for the guidance of tradition in this era of cultural renovation, either religious or nationalistic in emphasis, was still

felt. One of my main objectives, in this study, is to map the prominent artistic and intellectual expressions that gave evidence of a political dimension. I am interested in particular in the most innovative and influential groups that participated in the effort to create a "progressive" cultural movement in which "leftist" and alternative visions were dominant.

Therefore, it is necessary to think about the various dimensions and main characteristics of the literary world and its actors. First, it should be taken into account that, in Turkey, there was a long tradition of literature that had played a central role in transmitting political ideas and philosophical thoughts since the Tanzimat era by using literary works. I will discuss this literary tradition in this dissertation. During all of this period, philosophy, sociology and political thought also were replaced or conveyed to some extent by literature, but at least, all of these activities went hand in hand with literature. Journalists and some political faces of the period were also interested in literature. Men of letters wrote many articles about politics and art in journals and in political and art reviews. It may be added to these articles, the first publications of the novels of the authors in the newspapers, a tradition of *tefrika* (feuilleton). Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal and Kemal Tahir were among the authors whose works were published in newspapers.[3]

Thus, the most important phenomenon may be the intense relationship between authors and politics. In the literary reviews, articles about social sciences and politics

[3]Novels were first published in journals in a form of serials, in the most circulated journals of the period such as *Milliyet*, *Hürriyet* and *Cumhuriyet*. Yaşar Kemal's novel *İnce Memed II* (Memed my Hawk) was first published in *Hürriyet*, in 1968 in a form of serials, supported by an advertising campaign. Yaşar Kemal wrote articles about politics and art during 1952 and 1963 in *Cumhuriyet*. He was also one of the members and dominant leaders of the TLP for 8 years. He wrote articles in the periodical *Ant*, which was close to this party.

also were published. For instance, in *Yeni Ufuklar*, prominent thinkers like Afşar Timuçin, Nermi Uygur, Cengiz Gündoğdu; and in *Varlık*, Kemal Karpat, Cavit Orhan Tütengil, Bedrettin Cömert, Yaşar Nabi Nayır who contemplated about philosophy and the social sciences, wrote significant articles. *Yeni Dergi* and *Halkın Dostları* gave also place to articles about politics and society.

This political interest motivated the men of letters to be active participants or members of political parties and other associations. Political organizations, especially leftist organizations, developed a cultural agenda by opening up their journals to the artistic events, and by organizing cultural activities. Artists, especially musicians were an important part of the events organized by political organizations. Emblematic but deceased authors also were discovered. For instance, during these years, famous socialist writers, Sabahattin Ali and Nazım Hikmet, who have been under state's repression before because of their political views (their works could not be read by a larger public) came to the center and and was appreciated by a larger audience due to new publications in political periodicals like *Yön* and *Ant*.

Another important particularity of the period was the common ground which authors shared with other artists from different artistic fields. In this common space, men of letters existed with other artists from different realms like theatre, cinema and the visual arts. These common social spaces were cafés, pubs, journals, reviews and art institutions. Men of letters shared a common physical or intellectual ground in places like cafés, pubs and art associations with film directors, artists of visual artists, actors. A network was shaped in which many circles were interacted, and different artistic realms were interrelated. For instance, cinema was influenced by the literature;

many movies were adaptations of the novels of the period. Many plays were also produced during this time period.

In addition to this, during this period, there was still the European cultural influence, which was a greater importance than of the U.S. It has to be noted that the U.S. cultural influence also escalated during all these two decades; however, the leftist literary tradition was in a closer relationship with European countries leftist thoughts, mainly with France. Many of the authors on which I focus lived in France for several years, generally for their university educations, such as Attilâ Ilhan, Selahattin Hilâv, and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu. In addition to this, East European socialist countries and the USSR were also attractive to some of these intellectuals. But, the increasing fragmentation of the "real socialist" countries, and the formation of new centers like Yugoslavia, Albania, China also had reflections in the intellectual world of Turkey. Moreover, the 1968 events and its emancipatory and revolutionary power triggered new and creative debates for the leftist and revolutionary movements of the world, and accordingly for the Turkish writers.

Another important aspect of these writers, intellectuals is that most of them were prominent translators of literary works and works of the social and political sciences.

I think that men of letters, authors in these years, as a part of the artists of the period created a politically dissident and socially-oriented literary tradition. Every tradition was created by human actors by making some choices, by embracing or denying some actual writers and writers in the history of the literature. For instance, Melih Cevdet Anday states that literary tradition is always created by the artists of

society.[4] I consider this process to be a creation and a reconstruction of a literary tradition. İsmet Özel also argued that for the revolutionary man of letters of the 1970s: "we tried to transform the motto of elders, than ‘I am here’ to ‘I am here to adopt a new project.’”[5] Although many different circles were diversified between themselves. I argue that a plurality of literary attitudes established an increasingly political and socially oriented tradition of literature during the period under discussion; but it is necessary to note that the literature evolved during all that time.

The distinction between mainstream and radical currents may not be appropriate in the realm of literature, especially in some historical periods. As Bourdieu[6] shows in the nineteenth century French society and as Norbert Elias[7] argues, in eighteenth and nineteenth century German society, the radical trend was at the center of the artistic and intellectual millieus. Radical currents were dominant even if the governments were repressive and intolerant. Intellectuals and artists had the tendency to challenge the actual political powers and to be more independent and to adopt more radical thoughts. They had the desire to be more influential in the direction of their country, they were aware that they could loose their power in the public sphere and they wanted to have the ability to speak about their future. The members of this literary tradition can also be described as intellectuals.

---

[4]“*Edebiyatta geleneği toplumun sanatçıları kurarlar.*” Melih Cevdet Anday, “Sanatta Gelenekçiliğin Önemi,” *Yeni Ufuklar* no. 141 (February 1964), pp. 66 70, p. 70.

[5]“*Bizden öncekilerin 'ben buradayım' şeklindeki haykırışlarını, biz, 'ben kendimi yeni bir tasarıma fırlatmak üzere buradayım' şekline dönüştürme çabasındaydık.*” M. Bülent Kılıç. *Saklı Rönesans/Türkiye Sol Edebiyat Hareketleri İçin Bir Hatırlatma*, (Istanbul: Kült Sanat Yayıncılık, 2007).

[6]See Pierre Bourdieu, *Les Règles de l’Art, Genèse et Structure de l’Art Litéraire* (Paris: Seuil, 1992).

[7]See Norbert Elias, *La Civilisation des Moeurs* (Paris: Agora, 1969).

The dissident nature of the intellectual identity of the writers requires discussion. First of all, the literary actors in Turkey generally depicted social problems as a part of a general problem of the underdevelopment of the country, because the intellectual climate also was focused to the underdevelopment and possible solutions. It has to be noted that three books accompanied these literary works: *Tükiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi* (A History of Underdevelopment in Turkey)[8] in 1970, by İsmail Cem who later became a politician, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni*[9] (The Social Order of Turkey) by Doğan Avcıoğlu, in 1968 (Avcıoğlu will be discussed below as a notable intellectual fıgure) and *Düzenin Yabancılaşması* (Alienation of the Social Order)[10] by İdris Küçükömer which was an alternative study of Turkish political history. These books shaped the intellectual climate. This problem of underdevelopment and the underdeveloped conditions of Turkish society were also largely reflected in the novels and works of art of the period. This subject was the most popular topic written about. Many of the works of the social realist authors were dedicated to demonstrating and reflecting the underdeveloped conditions of the country.

In addition to this, topics like the miserable peasantry, social inequalities, the loneliness of intellectuals and educated parts of society or an excessive critique of petit-bourgeois intellectuals and the oppressions to which the revolutionary social movement was subjugated were frequent themes. Figures like Attilâ İlhan and Kemal Tahir defended in their works a modification of the offical version of Turkish history. For instance, in the novels, the *Asiatic Mode of Production*, which was proposed to

---

[8]İsmail Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi* (Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1970).

[9]Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968).

[10]İdris Küçükömer, *Düzenin Yabancılaşması* (Istanbul: Ant Yayınları, 1969).

understand the social system of the country in this epoch (Kemal Tahir, *Devlet Ana* - Mother State) or the role of the members of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) and indifference of the ordinary people toward the army in the Turkish War of Independence (Kemal Tahir, *Yorgun Savaşçı*- Weary Warrior), and the relations of the Turkish State officiers with the USSR (Samim Kocagöz's *Kalpaklılar* [1962]), *Doludizgin* (At Full Speed [1963]), and Hasan İzzettin Dinamo's *Kutsal İsyan* (Holy Rebelion [1966]) received focus.

A concern of native place-making was also developed by these authors as a reaction to the existing Universalist intentions of the authors, which can be seen as extremely Westernized. In the works of Oğuz Atay and Adalet Ağaoğlu, which were considered to be modernist masterpieces of Turkish literature, an implicit but influential satire of the Kemalist regime was visible. I argue that in the works and debates of the writers an anti-imperialist emphasis can be observed. For instance, *Amerikan Sargısı* (American Bandage of Fakir Baykurt in 1967 describes in a satiric way the project of the US to help the Turkish peasantry in the 1950s, which was not useful at all, and *Yaraya Tuz Basmak* (To Put Salt into wound) of Atillâ İlhan, was also written with a powerful anti-imperialist stance, about the sending of the Turkish troops to the Korean war to support american troops.

There were many novels that were produced to show the unequal and unjust social circumstances of Turkey. Poems were also interested in social and political problems. Poems appealing to the political struggle were written with increasing frequency; and in the realm of essays, there were many books of collected articles about social and political problems which reflected an intellectual attitude.

The tension between populist and elitist (avant-garde) tendencies may be one

of the tension of this intellectual culture will be discussed in this dissertation. The project of developing society's intellectual and cultural life through the development of an educated public may be defined as the main approach, but this approach was not totally elitist or populist. In this process of creating a more common level of cultural life in Turkey, it can be seen a synthesis of increasing populist motivations and the elitist tendencies of the early Republican period, which were questioned during these years. The main goal of the men of letters was to represent the reality in which society was living, to reach out to the people through works of art, to produce universal and significant works of art which would be part of an universal culture, to make Turkish art part of the universal or high culture, and to maintain a Turkish audience who would be capable of understanding high culture's works of art. All of these claims produced conflicts in populist motivations and elitist tendencies. Efforts to reflect society's reality or to reach out to people may be conflictual with the claims to produce universal works, to be part of the universal, international cultural world; and to support a minority who were able to understand the quality of the modernist works. These essential conflicts can be also observed in different artistic attitudes. The inner conflicts of this project are one of the main subjects of this research.

Other tendencies were to demonstrate the class distinctions in society and search for revolutionary art. In this period, Turkish writers focused on the nature of their society as formed by the different social classes. These classes were defined in the works of art and the lower classes were defended and appropriated against the upper classes. The working class, urban petit bourgeoisie and peasantry were all represented as a part of the entire structure of their society. A debate to produce a revolutionary art tht would focus on class conflicts emerge leading to the production

of a revolutionary art that underlined the conflicts and political problems. The oppression directed towards the leftist militants was also issued.

I argue that the public intellectuals of the period were writers who were also journalists or, in some cases, state officiers. These intellectuals were influential in the emerging public space, but they were aware that their power would not be permanent because of the fact that they were continuously excluded by the right-wing political powers. They contested the political power and social inequalities, and they sought a revolutionary transformation. They were part of social movements, hence they were not satisfied personally and politically by the current political system. In Turkey, writers as intellectuals, in this period, unlike the first generation of the Republic who supported the political regime (with several exceptions like Nazım Hikmet and Sabahatin Ali), were always critical, by justifying the description of the concept "critical intellectual", but on the other hand, they were in a very liminal situation. They were aware of their increasing influence in the public life, but they saw that if the political situation did not change, they could totaly lose their positions.

These writers and artists believed in a new social transformation project. Most of their works of art and their political activities grew out of the belief in a new social order. The works of literature were produced for the sake of intervening into the economic, social and cultural circumstances of the country. Three interrelated political discourses can be observed throughout these decades, but they mainly clustered in two periods, 1968 to 1969, and in the second half of the 1970s. These political intentions can be described as first a search for a new country (desire for a more equal, independent, and just society), and a definition of a revolutionary period, and finally a desire for the government of the left-wing political forces, especially in the 1977 and

in the 1978, as a result of the RPP's electoral success (whether the RPP represented a leftist political vision or not remains a matter of debate), but at the same time, as a reaction to the NF governments[11] during which time hostile practices were carried out against left-wing writers.

To be an intellectual had very negative connotations in the mainstream politicial millieus during these decades. Authors like Abdülhak Hamit Tarhan, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Ahmet Haşim and Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver who were criticized by Nazım Hikmet and his friends in *Putları Yıkıyoruz* (We Break the Idols) campaign[12] in *Resimli Ay* review lost their influence and the writers in the same political line of Nazım Hikmet came to the center among them Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Kemal Tahir, Çetin Altan, Aziz Nesin, Rıfat Ilgaz, Necati Cumalı, Oktay Rifat, Melih Cevdet Anday, Vedat Türkali, Attilâ Ilhan, Haldun Taner, Sevgi Soysal, and Adalet Ağaoğlu.

The power of this axis of left-wing intellectuals reached its apogee between 1965 and 1977. After 1977, even though they were very active in the political struggle, the conditions of the civil war and the assassination of the intellectuals like Bedrettin Cömert, Cavit Orhan Tütengil, and Abdi İpekçi led to minimize the effect of the intellectual realm. The politics of the streets, which disturbed the everyday life of

---

[11]At the end of the 1970s, the left-wing (RPP) and right wing governments (NF) were short lived and after the 1977 elections, there were several governments.

[12]Mehmet Fatih Uslu, "Resimli Ay Magazine (1929-1931) The Emergence of an Oppositional Focus Between Socialism and Avant-Gardism," (Master Thesis, Bogaziçi University, 2004), p. 101, Uslu writes that: "In June 1929, *Resimli Ay* review began a campaign which harshly criticized the legendary figures of recent Turkish literature. The campaign lasted only two months, but its influence was great, so that a heated discussion was set off among the important figures of the time. The name of the campaign *Putları Yıkıyoruz* (We Break the Idols), in fact, tells a lot in terms of the aim of the campaign. The very exalted figures of recent literature were analyzed to reveal how they were worshipped in an exaggerated way."

the ordinary people, were more powerful than the intellectual realm. It should be noted that despite the fact that left-wing politics were on the rise, the ruling governments were generally right-wing, such as AP (JP - Justice Party) and the MC (NF - National Front), with authoritarian, repressive practices; however, this was reflected in literature to only a limited extent. The literary domain was dominated by left modernist and left Kemalist tendencies, which can be regarded as a relative autonomy, and even as an anomaly.

The right-wing political powers, which were not influential in the intellectual realm against left-wing political powers, led them to the streets. There was also institutionalized state pressure mainly after the coup d'état of 1971. During the coup d'état of 12 March 1971, intellectuals like Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Azra Erhat, Sevgi Soysal and Vedat Günyol were arrested and detained for several months, and in 1978 and in 1979, Cavit Orhan Tütengil and Bedrettin Cömert were killed by right-wing militants. Another example is the banning of the literary works of Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, and Bekir Yıldız in the libraries of the high schools during the government of the National Front parties in the 1978. After the coup d'état of the 12 September 1980, these intellectual circles lost their influences, many of the left wing authors, like Yaşar Kemal, Nedim Gürsel and Ataol Behramoğlu had to leave Turkey and some of them were imprisoned. In this political landscape, the weakness of the right-wing political actors in the cultural and intellectual realms deserves to be analyzed.

This relative backwardness and ineffectiveness of the conservative and nationalist writers was an important debate. It may be argued that the conservative and nationalist axis was also active mainly in the oral literary tradition. The *Kubbealtı*

Cemiyeti (Kubbealtı Association) can be considered as one of the bases of this literary culture. Many literary figures followed the legacy of the *Dergâh* review's tradition. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Yahya Kemal Beyatlı were appreciated and followed by many young writers. Peyami Safa may be seen as a rediscovered literary figure and his works were republished by the ultra-nationalist political line, especially in the late 1970s. A nationalist and conservative review edited by Nurettin Topçu called *Hareket* (Action) may be also cited. Necip Fazıl Kısakürek's *Büyük Doğu* (Great Eastern) review was a representative of the Islamist circles. These two journals defended a synthesis of Islamist and ultra-nationalist worldviews. This may be a representation of the over polarization of the artistic realm. This politically-oriented literary tradition criticized the leftist one as being foreigner, extremist and not being native. Many differences between ultra-nationalist, Islamist and conservative traditions also may be identified; however a close relationship between these axes during this period was also evident. The politically oriented right-wing literary culture was not completely divided. The Islamist and nationalist lines were in a close relationship against the leftist literary tradition.

In my research, while presenting an account of the value of the literary works and their writers of the time as a whole, what they stood for and what they defended, I also will examine this on the basis of the topics and reasons for their discussions, motives, and objectives. While the value of these works and writers cannot be denied, and even when we emphasize their artistic value, the writers also influenced the public opinion, and their political claims had a value that extended beyond the content of their works. Some of them wrote articles in the newspapers and others were members of political parties and unions of authors. This does not mean that their works of

literature do not reflect their political positions, but their political activities could not be limited to their works of art. Without these works of art, their political efforts would not make much sense.

In conclusion, I will bring about my disciplinary position. In my research, I apply a sociological perspective, looking at literature as a complex structure created by a number of social and historical factors. Therefore, I discuss the social history of writers and literary circles from a sociological approach and with the help of the literary theories, but I am also an historian, and this research can be considered as an historical work.

First chapter of the dissertation discusses from within a theoretical framework, different perspectives of literary criticism and the sociology of literature, to clarify my own approach. In addition to this, a definition of artist and intellectual, and their intricate relations with politics will be provided. Finally, I will introduce a theoretical framework about the formation of an intellectual public sphere, discussing some approaches to the formation of a public space in which intellectuals can express more freely their political ideas during the period under discussion.

In the second and third chapters, I will examine the political, ideological, social, and economic conditions of the 1960s and 1970s, taking an international and national context into account. The conditions in which literature was produced will be defined. A selective approach toward the socio-political events that were more related to the literature will be applied.

For the fourth and main chapter of this work, I collected a large amount of literary material. A chronological and intertwined history of Turkish writers and intellectuals will be narrated as an introduction of the chapter. During these two

decades, 1960s and 1970s, the enlargement of the literary world and its increasing influence on the public life will be discussed in depth. This chapter is a large presentation of the progress in the realm of novel, poetry, and essays.

In the fifth chapter, the influences of political process on literary events of these two decades will be presented in a chronological plan. The four main politically oriented literary comportments of the period and three sui generis men of letters will be identified.

In the sixth chapter, I will depict the main debates between different authors and circles in a sociological framework, and the main topic of their works to provide a relevant sociological debate of the literature of the period.

As a conclusion, this dissertation presents a landscape of the poetry, novel and essays, main works of art, main literary and intellectual debates, and topics. I will classify the main political attitudes, and approaches of the artists, and their positions toward the social problems, and their political and intellectual projects. I also will show the main differences and similarities between these different literary circles. Another dimension of my work will be to discuss about the relationship between these artists and the state institutions and, artists and their reading public. Finally, as I conceived to be an important point, the relationship between artists and the larger segments of society, such as different classes, urban and rural populations.

In this dissertation, I sought to learn about and represent who were the writers of the period, their political identities, their motivations to produce works of art, the reasons why they adopted political missions, and what they wanted to do by writing and participating in the different political activities. I argue that the social history of the period from the axes of these people deserves to be elaborated, and it is plausible

to debate the products and debates of these artists which can reflect or represent the social realities of different classes and groups of society and especially their conceptualizations of realities.

I believe that literature by itself cannot reflect the social, economic and cultural environment of the time completely; and it does not completely reflect the political approaches of the time, mainly the approaches of the mainstream political forces, nevertheless, it played a special role in the modernization history of Turkey during a time when it most closely interacted with society, and the objectives, successes and failures of these men of letters can contribute greatly to enriching the academic literature of the social history of the country.

As stated by Kemal Karpat, "the most important source from which to write the history of Turkey will be undoubtely literature."[13] I agree with this approach to some extent, but, this social history will be from the axis and perception of these intellectuals then for the reason that is necessary to understand these artists and intellectuals; and what these artists reflected, represented, and debated. What they chose as the subject of their work was the result of their political dipositions and social status; this could not be the "real" social, cultural history of Turkey, but, conceptualization and expression of the social and historical realities of Turkey by an important segment of society, the writers deserves to be taken seriously.

In this sense, this dissertation represents the combination of rich material by explaining the exclusive development of literature, and to offer a contribution to the

[13]Kemal Karpat, *Türk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1962), p. 10.

studies in the history of literature as a work of sociology of literature, to fill a gap in the literary, cultural, and intellectual history of Turkey through the axis of literature.

My methodology will be to analyze the main literary reviews and political periodical literary pages. In these reviews, I will benefit from many articles, and debates. I also will analyze many of the leading and trivial literary works of the period which were most interesting for my research to focus on the relationship between politics and art.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Main Theories of Literature and Identification of Writers and Artists as Intellectuals

In this chapter, a theoretical approach will be developed. I will focus on the pertinent points in the literature of literary criticism and the sociology of literature, which demonstrate the methods and theories that this research claims to follow.

First of all, it is necessary to explain the disciplinary positioning of my study. As I have already mentioned, I will examine the significant role played by Turkish writers as part of the Turkish intelligentsia, by also embracing their close relationships with other parts of the intellectual world during the 1960s and 1970s. This study will give a sociological perspective which will be demonstrated in the following sections. The various theories of literary criticism also will be discussed to understand the perspective that I will adopt by the sake of defining the functions identified to the literature. This study will cover various social, intercontextual relations between literature, writers, society and history.

Then, as an historian, I also will narrate the history of these decades, focusing on the intricate relationship between an historian and works of literature as assumed different from the other ordinary sources of an historian. I argue that it is possible to think that historians can consider literature and the literary domain as a subject of study, not only a source. I see literature not only as a source for history writing but especially, I will attempt to narrate the intellectual and social history of the 1960s and

1970s by focusing on the literary world, then its actors. Their products were not only sources for me, but also components of a whole system which I will try to describe.

Moreover, this chapter will also discuss the relationship of intellectuals, artists with politics and their role in the public sphere. In this part, theoretical and methodological approaches to this phenomenon are delineated. I will refer briefly to pertinent points in the literature of intellectual history that are useful to my research. This chapter also addresses literature significance in the formation of intellectual culture.

Literature As an Insitution and Its Role in Human Communication

Literature has two components: form and content or in other words, ideas and sounds. Literature transmits ideas on a semantical plane and sounds on a phonetic plane. This dualistic structure is the main axe of the demarcation between different theories of literature that will be explained below. The form and content duality is the main axe according to which literary theories developed their main thesis. But literature is always more than the work of literature. Literature always existes as an institution and as a social formation.

Clark writes that literary system consistes of four dimension: creation, production, diffusion and reception. The diffusion and reception of literature are important because they complete the literary circuit, making the connection between writer and reader.[14] Diffusion is more than transmitting literary works. Criticism and

[14] Priscilla B. P. Clark "Literature and Sociology," in *Interrelations of Littérature*, Jean Pierre Barricelli and Joseph Gibaldi (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1982), p. 116.

promotion campaigns of literary works are also part of literary activities. Social significance and the interpretation of literature are essential as its creation, because, the process of creation is determined to some extent by the production, diffusion, and reception in the existing and permanently changing market conditions.

Then, literature can be defined both as a social institution including a market and as a multitude of many works of art created by human beings. (the individual or collective character of this process will be discussed below.) As argued by Clark,

> As a social institution, literature is a combination of all the practices and customs determining the circulation of writings in a given society: the social status of the writer, his ideology, the forms of diffusion, the conditions of production and consumption and critics directed by the audience and literary critics.[15]

Thus, literature has to be considered as an institution, as a system including a market and many human literary actors and a reading public that is always one of the permanent subjects of the social sciences. In its historical evolution, a market system was formed at the center of this literary world in which the artist produces work of art for the publication by integrating into capitalist relations. This was considered like a formation of a literary structure as a part of the capitalist social formation. In this formation which is a product or a sub-formation of the social system, the role of an emergent literary market is important for the definition, and the freedom of the artist and the work of art. This dependence of the artist on the market can be seen as an obstacle to individual creativity. It is also argued, however that the emergent market of literature could not exclude works of art that even questioned the modern bourgeois state. Burns and Burns state that,

[15] Ibid.

> The bourgeois apparatus of production and publication is capable of assimilating, indeed of propogating an asthonishing amount of revolutionary themes without ever seriously putting into question its own continued existence or that of the class which owns it.[16]

Another important determinant in the formation of the literature as an institution was the role of the state. In a national context, the role of the state was significant. It could try to control the production, diffusion and reception process of the literature. The freedom and social status of an author may be strictly dependent on the initiative of the state institutions and to the ideology which was produced by them. This influence of the state institutions in the early period of the modern states however was increasingly transcended and the rule of free markets and the desire of the intellectuals and writers to be independent limited the role of state institutions.

However, in general works of art were produced like many other works that were produced in a social system in the determinative conditions of this social system. (including a market system and state institutions in a capitalist social formation). But the creative and innovative dimensions of artistic activities were challenges to the determinations of this system. For instance, Janet Wolff, in her book, *The Social Production of Art* writes that, "it is not useful to think of artistic work as essentially different from other kinds of work, and that the issue of practical activity, including creative or innovative activity, of any agent arises in the same way in all areas of social and personal life."[17] This approach assumes that the work of art necessitates a creative and innovative activity which is shared by other human activities I completely

---

[16]Quoted in Elizabeth and Tom Burns, *Sociology of Literature – Drama* (London: Penguin Books, 1973), Benjamin Wirly, p. 25.

[17]Janet Wolff, *The Social Production of Art* (New York: New York University Press, 1984), p. 2.

agree with this, but a work of literature may be distinguished from other works by its capacity to provide written and verbal communication between human beings.

As a work of art, literature shares all the essential characteristics of written and verbal communication tools. Literature should be defined mainly as an act of communication. It was perhaps one of the most important act of communications during the eighteenth and ninetheenth century. As said by Calinescu,

> Reading, in fact, is largely an extension of live dialogue and is meant to fulfill all the basic functions that live dialogue can have... Literature is one of the few activities in which the principle of persuasiveness is still alive.[18]

There are certainly other institutions or areas that makes communication posssible. Therefore, a literary work of art includes elements of communication which are not unique to literature.[19] Other artistic forms, journals or public spaces like art associations or cafés were spaces in where communication is always proliferated.

During the twentieth century, thanks to technological innovations, other artistic forms, or instruments of communication, became relevant to transmitting similar messages to the public. For instance, the 1960s was a decisive moment in the development of modern mass communications. The major mass medium of the decade was the cinema. The interrelation between literature and cinema and other instruments will be discussed in my study.

The communicative functions of literature were always distinguished from other forms of communications for diverse reasons. Literature has the capacity to

---

[18]Matei Calinescu, "Literature and Politics," in *Interrelations of Littérature*, Jean Pierre Barricelli and Joseph Gibaldi (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1982), p. 141.

[19]Pierre Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production* (New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 191.

transmitting various thoughts to its public in a form in which its public became active reproducer of meaning. This may be an important factor for this distinction.

Literature developed as a part of a mutual relationship in a social system. As explained by Pierre Macherey:

> The literary work never arrives unaccompanied; it is always determined by the existence of other works, which can belong to different areas of production. There is no first book, independent and absolutely innocent: novelty and originality, in literature as in other fields, are always defined by relationships. Thus the book is always the site of exchange: its autonomy and its coherence are brought at the price of that otherness, which can also be, on occasion, an alteration.[20]

Works of art and books took on a new meaning during their consumption by their reading public. However, the collective and public character of the work of literature is generally denied by an approach that reduces the work of art to individual's self capacity, and creativity. I will focus on the collective and individual dimensions of the producers of the works of art in the section in which I will show the characteristics of the artists and writers.

Another specificity of the literary domain is defined by Terry Eagleton who comments that literature is an historical invention the ideological tyranny of which is more supple and deep-seated for us than any other art form. The art gallery, concert hall, and opera house are absolutely privileged spaces which established themselves as well as the demarcation between initiate and ignorant is precisely determined. This is not the same for literature, for two reasons:

> First, the character of literary production in advanced social formations is such that it ceaseless surpasses such cloistered, isolable spheres: literature is multiple and polycentric, saturating the very textures of our social life, pervasively present as consolidation, information, persuasion, infatuation.

[20]Ibid., p. 113.

> Second, an advanced social formation demands that literacy should be widely diffused, so that today is relatively marked absence in such conditions is inevitably scandalous, signifying a loss of full humanity.[21]

These two dimensions of literature provide an important possibility to writers to reach to a larger public as they will transmit their ideas. Therefore literature is the main popular instrument to address the larger publics. Literature may be a more democratic way of social interaction, unlike other artistic forms, which are generally used to specify the distinctions between classes and status. As Eagleton writes:

> Reading: is at once the most natural and esoteric of acts, spontaneous and sacred, public facility and privileged cult. Its naturalness is thus enforced by its very naturalness, whih is not the case with opera houses and concert halls. Literature is always that which can be reached for an ordinary phenomenon which is always alien.[22]

The leader of the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin, argued that cinema was the most revolutionary of all artistic forms because of its capacity to communicate with a larger public; according to me, before cinema, in the nineteenth century, the novel was the most popular and revolutionary artistic form, because, to persuade or to motivate people to adopt political views created the intricate relation between literature, politics and the political projects of social change.

Literature as a social insitution has a special relationship with the social and historical. As stated by Kahraman, literature with all its aspects is more than itself. It always transcends its author with this quality, because, contrary to this impossibility,

---

[21]Terry Eagleton, *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (New York: Verso, 2006), p. 164.

[22]Ibid., p. 165.

it includes more than itself. This excess reflects a relationship founded with the social and historical.[23]

The special relationship of literature with the social and historical and its power of communication makes it an important research field for sociology and history. In the following sections, I will argue that literature can be understand adequately from a sociological and historical perspective that I implement.

The Historical Evolution of Modern Literature

The very concept of modern literature is defined as a product of late eighteenth century Europe. Modern literature's most important novelty was the formation of a new genre, the novel, which became the core element of modern literature since its formation. The history of modern literature also can be seen as the history of the novel. This concept of novel and its French equivalent *roman* were used in different ways. "Novel" can be seen as a product of modernity, unlike "roman" which reaches back to the Middle Ages. Other main genres like poetry and essay also were transformed at the same time as the novel, but the novel may be seen the main ground for the definition of modern literature.

Before the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, playwrights written by Sheakspeare and Molière (his masterpiece, *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*) were significant literary events, even if they

[23] "*Edebiyat her haliyle kendisinden daha fazla birşeydir. Bu niteliğiyle yazarını daima aşar ve ondan bağımsızlaşır. Çünkü bu imkansızlığa rağmen edebiyat daha fazlasını içerir. Bu fazlalık toplumsal ve tarihsel ile kurulan ilişkidir ve bir imkansızlığı yansıtır.*" Hasan Bulent Kahraman, *Post Entelektüel Dönem ve Edebiyat* (Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2004), p. x.

were not diffused to larger parts of the societies although as was the case after the nineteenth century.

The history of literature begins in Antique times, a slow evolution of literature and novels that can be extended before the eighteenth century may be discussed. In this study, however, I would like to focus on the period as it can be considered a turning point on the diffusion of this literary genre to a larger population. For instance, in the eighteenth century England to get drunk with a bottle of gin was more cheaper to buy a newspaper or a book.[24] Literary works did not reach most of the people before the late eighteenth century. The formation of a larger reading public triggered a massive production of the literay genres, especially the novel.

Moreover, Middle Eastern and Far Eastern countries in the production of literature should be considered; but the European continent's pioneer role has to be underlined in many respects, thanks to many relevant circumstances, which will be discussed below. For instance, the modern English novel, which was developed in the eighteenth century may be defined like a product of many complex social factors, as argued by Clark:

> The economic prosperity and consequent leisure of an emergent middle class, and especially of women; urbanization, which encouraged geographical and social mobility and transformed traditional social hierarchies; secularization which turned writers and readers alike from religious works toward the more worldly novels.[25]

Moreover, the invention of print and innovations in print technology and increasing literacy may have been the necessary causes for the formation of modern

[24]Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novels* (London: Penguin Books, 1966), p. 48.

[25]Clark, p. 113.

literature. These social factors were defined as necessary for the formation of the novel as a revolutionary medium in the human communication.

As Clark states, the novel in eighteenth century England developed as a result of the economic capacity of the new middle class reading public but it was not strictly speaking a popular literary form. In the country, many small farmers, their families and the majority of labourers were remained illiterate. The expansion of the novel was strictly related to the expansion of middle class culture.

Technological advances in publishing permitted expanded production, innovations in the marketing of books and the rise of journalism helped to the commercialization of literature. The new publics, literate but lacking classical educations turned to novel for a good, easy read.[26] The middle classes and especially women public were important in the evolution of literature during all of the nineteenth century:

> By the nineteenth century in Europe, literary activities acquired a measure of autonomy and the institutions to maintain it. The increase in the numbers and kinds of readers, writers and works, the development of the market, technological advances (roller presses, cheap paper, etc.) diferent from to endow literary activities with an independent momentum very different from the economic, social, and cultural dependence characteristic of the literary system supported by the aristocratic or royal patronage.[27]

As a result of these developments, first in England and throughout the industrialized capitalist countries literature, the literary imagination became ideologically central in the social life, replacing premodern cultural institutions. For many of authors, literature was destined to replace religion, or redifine the religion

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid., p. 118.

like Tolstoy and to save people.[28] England, France, and Russia were the core countries where literature played an important role in social life and social changes in the nineteenth century.

From its beginning, literature was designed as a communication tool to represent social reality and to propose new social models. This approach was certainly questioned by many writers, starting by Arthur Rimbaud, but a realist perspective which had been influential before, should not be ignored. In the eighteenth and especially in the nineteenth century, the novel was nearly, totally based on a realist approach. For instance, in this period English and French novels became increasingly preoccupied with social change.[29]

Realist writers defined man as the product of heredity and social circumstances, even if they differed in the degree to which they followed the logic of this concept. This realism may be the product of rapid social change in all the industrialized countries, for instance in England when Charles Dickens was born in 1812, the majority of the population was involved in agriculture, but in 1870, only one person over seven was living dependent on the agricultural production.[30] However, the realist novel reached the peak of its achievement outside Britain and in particular in mid-nineteenth century France and Russia.[31] The realist novel of the nineteenth

---

[28]Francis Barker, *1936:The Sociology of Literature-Practice of Literature and Politics* (Essex: University of Essex, 1979), p. 4.

[29]Maurice Larkin, *Man and Society in the Nineteenth Century Realism, Determinism and Literature* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977), p. 5. This motif of change would be also relevant for the significant part of the Turkish novel of the 1960s and 1970s Turkey.

[30]This may be compared to the changing rate of the population living dependent to the agricultural production in Turkey between 1960 and 1980 from seventy five percent to fewer than fifty percent.

century was identified itself with a political commitment in the twentieth century. This realist tradition was criticized and transformed by a modernist one during the twentieth century, but the relation of the novel with reality and history has always been debated and this relation is important to understand the Turkish novel of the 1960s.

The novel played a role in social change. The most important example is the role that literature played in the French Revolution. The social, political and economic dislocations of the French revolution were mostly mediated by the institutions of the literary system.[32] The Republic of Letters may be a good example to analyze and to understand the roles of intellectuals, and writers in the preparation of the revolution. The Parisian salons, press, and literary journals and other institutions of sociability, communication and interaction were at the core of this Republic.

For instance, literary journals more than doubled between 1740 and 1780, from 64 to 150, in Paris.[33] Casanova writes that "political liberty, elegance and intellectuality constituted a unique configuration, both historical and mythical, that made it actually possible to invent and to perpetuate the liberty of art and of artists."[34] This combination of literary and intellectual dispositions may be defined as a product of the project of the Enlightenment :

> The Republic of Letters rose with the moden political state out of the religious wars of the sixteenth century, out of the articulation of public and private

---

[31]Dennis Walder, "Reading Fathers and Sons," in *The Realist Novel*, ed. Denis Walder (New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 167.

[32]Clark, p. 118.

[33]Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 65.

[34]Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 2004), p. 24.

> spheres, citizen and state, agent and critic...The transformative impulse, the desire to change the world to conform the Republic of Letters, its values and practices, is the constructive result of this critical position. It is the project of Enlightenment.[35]

Therefore, literature's function can be defined as to support or to contribute to the creation of a bourgeois revolution. This process gave rise to the formation of a public sphere in which the middle classes, an emergent bourgeois class and an educated public, were more active and visible. In this process, the universal and international dimensions of the literature were constructed. In Paris, in the nineteenth century, artistic internationalism was founded and the concept of universalism was defended in the hegemony of the international intelligentsia of Paris. This notion of universalism became the basis of the claim of legitimacy by literature to assume to represent all humans.[36]

At the same time, with Herder's effect,[37] the role of literature in the consolidation of national states also discovered and Herder attempted to consolidate national unity as an undeniable condition of the nationalization and the modernization process via literature. Casanova writes that:

> Herder, in calling for a return to "popular languages", devised a wholly new novel and genuinely revolutionary strategy for acumulating literary capital that was enable Germany to overcome its "backwardness" and join lastly in international literary competition. By granting each country and each people

---

[35] Goodman, p. 2.

[36]This notion of Universalism was also one of the main themes Turkish writers attempted to attain that will be discussed below. To what degree they achieved this goal will also be discussed.

[37]Johann Gottfried von Herder (25 August 1744 – 18 December 1803) was a German philosopher, theologian, poet, and literary critic. He is associated with the periods of Enlightenment, Sturm und Drang, and Weimar Classicism. Along with Wilhelm von Humboldt, Herder was one of the first to argue that language determines thought, a theme that two centuries later would be central to the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis. Herder's focus upon language and cultural traditions as the ties that create a "nation" extended to include folklore, dance, music and art, and inspired Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm in their collection of German folk tales. Wikipedia, available on 16.04.2013.

> the right to an existence and a dignity equal in principle to those of others, in the name of popular traditions from which sprang a country's entire cultural and historical development, and by locating the source of artist fertility in the soul of peoples.[38]

The avant-garde role of Germany in the foundation of national literatures deserves to be mentioned. During the nineteenth century, an emphasis on the national dimensions of literature went hand in hand with its Universal claims. This tendency can be called theoretically nativity or native place making.[39] This nativist approach had an important influence on the literary realm as argued:

> This alternative notion of literary legitimacy, at once national and popular permitted the accumulation of another type of resource, unknown until then in the literary world, that was to link literature more closely with politics. Henceforth, all the little nations in Europe and elsewhere were able, to claim an independent existence that was inseperably political and literary.[40]

Literature's development as an institution also was tied to a modern, national culture which sought to show its superiority over other nations; nevertheless, a literature from its beginning, as a part of the universal culture was produced by the collective efforts of international actors. While the founders of these two traditions (Nationalists and Universalists) tried to define the limits of this domain, national, and international tendencies existed at the same time. In this context, thanks to its promotion of the law of universality in the world of letters against the ordinary political laws of nations, France became an alternative model for writers from every

---

[38]Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 2004), p. 76, 77.

[39]Jennifer Robertson, "It Takes a Village, Internationalization and Nostalgia in Postwar Japan," in *Mirror of Modernity, Invented Traditions of Modern Japan*, ed. Stephen Vlastos (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), p. 110. This concept of nativism was also relevant to discuss one of the tendencies of the 1960s and 1970s Turkish literature.

[40]Casanova, p .76.

part of the literary world who aspired to autonomy.[41] But a nationalist model of literature was also defended and developed throughout the world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

An important novelty of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was the modernist authors who attempted to show the culture of decadence of the epoch. The inner conflicts of human being became the unchangeable part of the Universal literary canon, and thanks to these authors, a more inclusive literary identity which transcended national borders was developed.[42] As Zeraffa notes,

> The greatest Western novelists felt less the right or authority to speak on behalf of the society, and they have almost exclusively valorized first the person's inner life then its "look."[43]

Literature was as a realm of confrontation and struggle for Nationalist and Universalist tendencies at the end of the nineteenth century, as in the case of Franz Kafka, but especially during the rise of the ultra-nationalist, fascist regimes of the twentieth century. Many authors of Jewish origin, Central European or German authors were excluded from the canons of their countries and had to leave their countries such as Stefan Zweig and Thomas Mann. After the Second World War, literature's universal and international dimensions were more freely developed and appreciated by larger publics thanks to the increasing influence of the humanist,

---

[41]Ibid., p. 87.

[42]Many examples of this modernist tradition were also existent in the Turkish context of the 1960s.

[43]*"Les plus grands romanciers occidentaux se soient de moins en moins senti le droit ou le pouvoir de parler au nom de la société, et qu'ils aient valorizé presque eclusivement la personne par sa vie intérieure d'abord, puis par son "regard."* Michel Zeraffa, *Roman et Société* (Paris: Press Universitaire de France, 1970), p. 46.

modernist and international socialist cultures. State sponsored ultra national and discriminative approaches lost ground in the literary domain.

Another novelty at the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century, after the foundation of literary centers in Europe, was the formation of Latin America, Africa and Asia literature in such places. These regions were also part of a debate in which literature may be seen as a realm of struggle for independent artist, as defenders of universal artistic authority, and state sponsored writers, defenders of a national literature. This was however a complex process in which there were national states which were more modernized and intellectual elites were defenders of universal artistic authority and some artists were defenders of the creation of a "real" and "independent" national culture.

The post colonial era and struggles against Western colonialism must be taken into account as important factors in the analysis of the evolution of these literatures. As argued, this process creates different temporalities:

> The relative backwardness and poverty of such regions are not permanent conditions: not all writers on the periphery are inevitably "condemned" to backwardness; any more than writers form the center are necessarily modern. To the contrary, very different literary temporalities (and therefore aesthetic and theories) may be found in a given national space, with the result that not infrequently one finds writers who are nearer to ones quite distant in geographical terms than to writers of their generation and nationality who share the same culture and the same language.[44]

Finally, in this process, literary culture produced its own hierarchy and in the production and reception of literature, it diversed into popular literature and high

[44]Casanova, p. 101.

literature.[45] Other developments may be seen as the basis of a creation of a literature as an institution.[46]

The fragmentation in the realm of literature may be seen as a product of modern canonization and institutionalization. Other distinctions may be defined such as avant garde as opposed to popular, or traditional as opposed to new and restricted as opposed to mass reception.[47]

All of these classifications and definitions are meanigful for my study of the Turkish literary context and its intellectual dimensions. Turkish literature can be considered as a part of the Universal literary culture with all of its geographic and historical particularities and by reflecting many of the dualities discussed below.

Different Literary Theories to Identify Literature's Role and Functions

Natalie Heinich, in her book, *La Sociologie de l'Art*[48] argues that there are various tendencies in the sociological theory of art and specifically of literature, but the main tendencies can be summarized like the reductionism of the art to the individuals, to its own historical evolution, and to the society and the period.

The first two types of reductionism underline the autonomous dimension of literature. The third one uses heterenomous factors to explain the functions and transformations of art by the context and the moment in which it is produced. The

---

[45] Barker, p. 8.

[46] Ibid. p. 14.

[47] See Janet Wolff, *The Social Production of Art* (New York: New York University Press, 1984).

[48] See Natalie Heinich, *La Sociologie de l'Art* (Paris: La Découverte, 2004).

related problem to this scheme may be the autonomy or the dependency of art, like a mirror or the reflector or independent, self referential, autonomous structure. This duality grew out of the conflicting dimensions of a work of art, an aesthetic creation as well as the reflection or representation of the social circumstances of the historical moment in which it is produced.

This duality can be defined also by the distinction of "art for art's sake" and realism. A philosophical background is necessary to analyze this distinction. Three main school of literary aesthetics may be defined in relation with this problem: Immanuel Kant, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, and Friedrich Nietzsche [49]

Three main philosophical approaches have been adopted by literary critics: Firstly, the Kantian aesthetic approach is "the beautiful, the work of art could not be defined by concepts."[50] Kant affirms that in the literary domain, aesthetic judgement can not be founded on conceptual and logical, and consequently the beautiful likes "without concept."[51] "Disinterested pleasure, efficacity without goal" is the motto of the Kantian aesthetic and the literary theory.

Anglo-American New Criticism, Russian Formalism, Czechian Structuralism are similar to the Neo Kantian approaches. All of these theories can be envisaged like the Kantian aesthetic in the way that they underline the automomous character and non referential structure of the work of art and they oppose all efforts to reduce the

[49]See Peter V. Zima, *Critique Littéraire et Esthetique, Les Fondements Esthetique des Theories de le Litterarure* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2003).

[50]Ibid., p. 15.

[51]Ibid., p. 13.

work of art to heterenomous elements, like to the biography of the author, to the social context, on to the reactions of the reader.[52]

On the other hand, the Hegelian and Marxist approaches argue that "works of art are accessible to the conceptual analysis." Hegel significatively defies Kantian dualism and at the same time, neglects in an implicit manner and sometimes explicitly the autonomy of the plan of expression in the literary domain to use and to subjugate it to the political, economic and didactic preferences. The Hegelian aesthetic says "the Artist is the conveyor of a particular, historical consciousness, the spirit of his age." Three essential ideas of Hegel are first an historical perspective, second an orientation towards an historical perspective, and sensuous presentation of an idea.[53]

As will be discussed at lenght at the following sections, George Lukacs and Lucien Goldman, disciples of Hegel and Marx in their theories, consider works of art as significant totalities related genetically to the interest of classes, ideologies or different worldviews.

Finally, deconstructive theories, espousing the Nietzschean approach, ignore the research on the content of truth in works of art.

From philosophy to literary criticism, we are faced with different approaches which are the products of these philosophical theories.

First of all, Berna Moran's siginificant work on literary theories will be our main source. He argues that until the end of the eighteenth century, the essence of literature was the reflection.[54] He writes that,"Marxism and the sociology of literature

---

[52]Ibid., p. 23.

[53]Ibid., p. 37.

also assumes that the theory of reflection, in other words, the relation of the work of art with the social has a central importance to comprehend its function."[55] In this theory there is a possibility to reflect the reality by the intermediacy of the work of art.

Reality is not only constructed by "real things." There are also imaginary and symbolic representations in the reality, thus literature consists of imaginations and symbols that can represent or reflect the reality. The Reflection Theory provides the possibility of a sociological approach to apply to the works of art. Fredric Jameson's approach about the reflection theory is very original. He does not consider works of art as a mere or disconcerted mirror of history, but rather as an expression of the conflicts and disharmonies of the period in which it is produced.[56]

As argued by Marxist literary theoretician, Pierre Macherey, "Literature can be called a mirror: in displacing objects, it retains their reflection. It projects its thin surface on to the world and history. It passes through them and breaks them. In its thin surface arise the images."[57] He writes that,

> Disconcerting mirror of ideologies, literature offers the most incisive, although the most discrete and often also the most ironic critique of ideology. That is why literaure is not a mere divertissement, as would be the case some consummer product offered to the faculty of taste and its vain judgements. Literature, in its special dimension, is one of the forces for the transformation of the world.[58]

---

[54]Berna Moran, *Edebiyat Kuramları ve Eleştiri* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999), p. 132.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Fredric Jameson, *L'Inconscient Politique. Le Récit Comme Acte Socialement Symbolique* (Paris: Questions Théoriques, 2012), p. 117.

[57]Pierre Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production* (New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 151.

[58]Ibid., p. 364.

.

To reflect does not exclude to imagine or to motivate people for the transformation of the world. There are also different theories like the Emotional Influence Theory and Expressionalism. Expressionalism which analyses works of art putting priority of the feelings of its producer. The Emotional Influence Theory focuses on the sentiments and the psychology of the reader and argues that an object can be defined like a work of art on the condition that it provokes pleasure or an aesthetic feeling in the reader."[59]

Reflection theory, Emotional Influence Theory and Expressionalism argue that the essence of a work of art is to be found in relation with another thing, with reality or in relationship with the reader's reactions or the reasons which motivate authors to produce. Criticism of literature grew out of biography, history, sociology, psychology or psychoanalysis. These theories have also been useful for different branches of the social sciences.

Moreover, in the historical evolution of literature, literature's potential to represent reality (the characteristic which certainly was attributed to history as a discipline) was seriously contested. Literature certainly includes fictive, mythical and aesthetic dimensions which have to be seen outside of temporality. Literature is defined as a distinct discipline which have to be its own characteristics. As I have already mentioned, this approach aims to analyze literature as an autonomous realm with its own rules.

For instance, Formalism and Sructuralism argues that a work of art's own structure or the various forms of a literary product are underestimated by these theories and what is the most important is the work of art's own existence. As argued

[59]Moran, p. 133.

by Moran, "Formalist argue that without separating wok of art and the reality, it is not possible to comprehend the work of art."[60] The distinctive feature of works of art is to transform conventions. According to them, the mission of the work of art is not to reflect the reality but to help perceive it in a different way.[61]

According to many theorists of aesthetics, the work of art's essential function is to create an aesthetic sensibility in the reader: Works of art can give us information, or provoke religious agitation or political sentiments,[62] but this may be only a result, not a goal.

Art for art's sake, and realism duality present one of the main dualities of the twentieth century, as a product of these different literary approaches. For instance, it is argued that the whole Anglo-American school of the criticism can be seen partly, even largely, as a response and counter attack to the Marxist undermining of the autonomy of literature and beyond that of the hierarchical ordering of culture and society.[63] According to the Marxists as will be stated below, the duty of the literary historian is to explain literary history as a reflection of changing economic and material realities. Rita Felski discusses the two different approaches as:

> The tendency of artists, and of those who have a lively interest in art, towards art for art's sake, arises when they are in hopeless disaacord with the social environment in which they live...(art for art sake approach) On the other hand, the so called utilitarian view of art, that is to say, the inclination to attribute to works of art the significance of judgement on the phenomena of life, and its constant accompaniment of glad readiness to participate in social struggles, arises and becomes stronger whenever a mutual sympathy exits between the

---

[60]Ibid., p. 153.

[61]Ibid., p. 169 -170.

[62]Ibid., p. 230.

[63]Burns, p. 13.

> individuals more or less actively interested in artistic creation and some considerable part of society. (Realist approach)[64]

This approach can be applied to the art for art's sake's approach of the 1950s which was powerful in Turkey as artists were in political disaccord with the existing government. The realist and political approaches were influential in the 1960s and 1970s, where a mutual sympathy can be observed between the artists and a considerable part of society.

There are still many critics who dislike the notion that literature could have or should have any direct connection with politics and the reflection of the social:

> From their point of view, whether the literary work is seen as a pure aesthetic construct, or as an embodiement of literariness, or as a skillful use of devices for purpose of aesthetic surprise, or more fashionably as the realization of a deconstructive project, the experience of art not only is autonomous but somehow enjoys a primacy over other type of experiences.[65]

This kind of theory of literature has been always criticized by the sociological approach which is generally Marxist oriented. The aesthetic dimensions of work of art were not always neglected by these scholars, but the work of art was always considered in terms of more than an aesthetic construction, as a product of a social system. They also argue that a work of art has a relationship with the reality. (capacity to represent, to reflect, to identify). I completely agree with this approach. I also think that works of art are appropriate tools to think about the social and historical conditions in which they are produced.

---

[64]Rita Felski, *Uses of Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 2008), p. 37.

[65]Calinescu, p. 123.

History, the Historian and, Literature

A complex relation exist between an historian and literature. Judith Lyon-Caen and Dinah Ribard, in their works *L'historien et la Littérature* (the Historian and Literature) argue that there is a very complicated relationship between historians and literature.[66] Two main criticisms of the relationship between the historian and literature, an historian's approach to consider literature by abstracting it from the mythical, aesthetic values as other historical sources and second, literary critic's approach to consider literature as outside of every temporality are two extremes.

Therefore, the relation of these two domains, history and literay criticism, are separated in some cases and, in others, literary sources are inappropriately reduced to the same status as other historical sources, which literary critics severely criticized.

The main problematic between historian and literature is the search for a truth in the content of the writings. The aesthetic or fictive dimensions of the works of art are seen obstacles for the research of the truth of the historians. However, historians and writers share a similar instrument in expressing their ideas, which is writing, and, it was argued by Hayden White at the end of 1970s that, "the techniques or strategies that (historians and imaginative writers) use in the composition of their discourses can be shown to be substantially the same, however different they may appear on a purely surface, or fictional level."[67] White's approach, which relativizes the meaning of the truth, also was criticized.

---

[66]Dinah Ribard and Judith Lyon-Caen, *L'historien et la Littérature* (Paris: La Découverte « Repères », 2010), p.10.

[67]Hayden White, *Topics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 1978), p. 121.

In my study, I do not underestimate the aesthetic dimensions of the literary works, however, I think that literary work are related to reality (represent, reflect, and imitate) and they are good instruments for realizing communication between different parts of society.

This potential of representation and communication justifies an historical approach which attempts to study works of art and even the entire literary landscape. I think that especially the novel, but other literary genres may be important tools to transmit cultural and historical knowledge or consciousness to an important part of society. This instrument, which is capable of transmitting historical knowledge to people, deserves to be analyzed by historians.

In addition to this, as argued by Zeraffa, the novel's emergence as an art form affirms essentially that there has been no society without history, no history without society. The novel is the first art to represent man explicitly as defined historically and socially. With the novel, society enters into history and history enters into society.[68] I share this approach in defining literature as a more humanistic way of representing human reality than the previous history tradition of the century, which consists of the mainstream events of social organizations, like politics and wars. Therefore, it can be argued that literature even affects the history writing process. This fact has to be taken into account. In the nineteenth century, a common evolution of history writing and a realist tradition of literature can be observed.

In the historical evolution of literature, realist, romanticist, and modernist traditions have changed the content of the truth of the works of art by changing

---

[68]Michel Zeraffa, "The Novel as Literary Form and Social Institution" (1972), in Elizabeth and Tom Burns, *Sociology of Literature – Drama* (London: Penguin Books, 1973).

degrees. But during all of this history, literary works also have been used to maintain historical and sociological data about the period in which they were produced.

As discussed, I prefer to use an historical and reflective approach. I certainly think that literature is the complex construction of a number of historical factors. I argue that the Turkish literary context that will be discussed is appropriate for analyzing the intercontextual relations between the works and the period in which they were produced. Moreover, in the critiques of the period, an historical approach was more visible than a literary approach trying to establish the independent rules of a literary discipline. Another characteristic of the period was the history novels tradition. These novels were considered as alternative histories to the official history of the period.

Sociology of Literature

The sociology of literature has three seperate but complementary dimensions. The first is the social history of literature. The social history of literature considers literature as a social institution affected and transformed by social and economic changes. One of the tasks of this kind of sociology of literature is to make researches about the social and demographic origins of authors.

Second, it is the sociology of the habitus and *champ* (domain). These two kinds of sociology of literature most often designate the study of literary institutions and the social organization of literary life: discusssions of publishers, publics, critics, writer’s circles and journalists will be discussed below.

Third is a sociology that contemplates social contextual actions and interactions. As a product of this sociological approach, the social context which is the condition of the production of a literary text is also, in turn, influenced by the effects of literary work.[69] The sociology of literature nonetheless recognizes the significance – the literary significance- of the social contexts that define literature, contexts which literature in turn defines them.[70] For instance, Oscar Wilde argues that "Life imitates art far more than art imitates life."

According to Selahattin Hilav, André Bazin, the art historian says that literature is an human activity as well as philosophy, science, technology, created by human beings and, on the other hand, a praxis, an effort and an activitiy which creates and realizes in turn human beings.[71] The third approach which seeks for this dual effect, the interrrelation of social reality and literature is the main concern of the sociology of literature. This will be discussed below.

An important conflict between literary studies and sociology of literature is that literary studies seek what is singular about a text or an author, and sociology looks beyond the individual for the patterns that order social life.[72] But a literary critic who has the tendency to interpret works of literature as the reflection of the social context in which they were produced has to take into account the analyses of the sociology of literature.

---

[69]Heinich, p. 78.

[70]Clark, p. 107.

[71]Quoted in Selahattin Hilav, "Sanat bir Değisme ve Oluştur," in *Entelektüeller ve Eylem: Düşünceler-Tartışmalar-Söyleşiler* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2008), p. 33.

[72]Clark, p. 108.

The principle contribution of a sociological perspective to the literature is explained by Clark:

> This is the sense that literature is more than works and their authors. It is a system of relations, of individuals and institutions, of functions and roles, which join to define literature and to give it social presence. What we call "literature" covers all those creations and products, individuals and institutions defined by their relations to those works designated by society as literary.[73]

Literature also was defined as an institution. In this definition, aesthetic criterion may be secondary for the significance or value of the works of art for the sociological analysis. Clark writes that "a negative connection between aesthetic quality and sociological significance is most evident in the deliberate selection of minor works, of popular or what Germans calls 'trivial' literature."[74]

This negative connection may be important for my work in considering "trivial works," which have the ability to go beyond their aesthetic quality and render meaningful data for the period; but to make the content analysis and to interprete the aesthetic quality of the every literary works that I will mention in this study will not be possible. But, in analyzing some of the works of the authors of the period, I will collect meaningful data for the position of the writers as intellectuals to reflect the social life as well as to reflect their ideas in their work for the sake of defending their visions of societies. In this respect, both of works which have higher and lower aesthetic qualities will be used.

The debates based on works with aesthetic qualities that are polemical give me an important aspiration to develop my thesis on the tension between populism and elitism, which was one of the more important debates of the period. For instance,

[73]Ibid., p. 113.

[74]Ibid.

populist tendencies which define literature to transmit consciousness to the people were ciriticized for producing works of lower quality. The politically oriented literary tradition of this period was criticized for undermining the aesthetic quality of the works of art.

Literary institutions is one of the research subjects of the sociology of literature. Gisèle Sapiro, in *La guerre des ecrivains 1940 1953*, explains the important social history and conflictual existence of four literary institutions of France; *L'academie Française* (French Academy), *L'academie Goncourt* (Academy Goncourt) *La Nouvelle Revue Française* (the New French Review), and *Le Comité National des Ecrivains* (The National Committee of Writers - CNE). These four instutions were analyzed during the struggle of the Second World War period.

The relations of these institutions between themselves and their influences on the society are important guides for me to analyze my own research subject. For my research, the most exciting one among these associations is the role played by the CNE. Sapiro writes that"The formation of the CNE based on the alliances between the French Communist Party and avant-gardes authors, illustrates the implementation of a political logic which defines literature as an action"[75] This formation is similar to that for the literary circles of the 1960s in Turkey.

On the other hand, in the French case, a state founded institution was the supporter of the hegemonic values of the dominant class. However, in the 1960s and 1980s, no such foundation existed in Turkey. Sapiro argues that,

---

[75]"*La formation du CNE, fondé sur l'alliance entre avant gardes et les forces d'opposition en l'occurence le parti communiste illustre la mise en oeuvre d'une logique politique qui conçoit la litérature comme action."*Gisèle Sapiro, *La Guerre des Ecrivains 1940 1953* (Paris: Fayard, 1999), p. 246.

> In the process of the autonomization of the literary field, the Academy was represented since the nineteenth century, rather as a source of heteronomy, carrying within it the extra literary interests ranging from preservation of the moral order to the defense of the social order when this order was threatened.[76]

The Academy tried to determine the dominant values of its period. But, as demonstrated by Sapiro, alternative and challenging approaches to this dominant approach were always existed, and as in the case of Louis Aragon and other writers who participated in the resistance movement, became dominant after the victory of the resistence against the Nazi forces and their collaborators. This association may be seen as an important example in the debate on the intricate relation of literature and politics which is one of the important factors permanentely shaping the former one.

One of the main research fields of the sociology of literature focuses on the social and demographic origins of authors.

> In which countries, in which period and from which social classes, authors were mostly originated? Which cities had specific characteristics for the formation of authors? The balance between the writers who was born in Paris, and the writers who were born in the rest of country was in favor of Paris in the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century writers who was born in the rest of the country increased and after the revolution, with some exceptions, the all regions of the country were producers and the determinant is the population rate of the cities.[77]

---

[76] *"Si sa fondation a participé à l'origine, du processus d'autonomisation du champ litéraire, l'Academie y represente, à partir du XIXeme siecle, plutot une source d'hétéronomie, véhiculant en son sein des intérets extra litteraires qui vont de la preservation de l'ordre moral à la defense de l'ordre social quand il est menacé."* Ibid. p. 250.

[77] *"Yazarlar hangi ülkelerde, hangi çağlarda, en çok hangi sınıflardan çıkmıştır? Hangi özellikteki şehirler en çok yazar yetiştirmiştir? Fransa'da taşrada doğmuş yazarlarla Paris'te doğmuş yazarlar arasındaki denge onyedinci yüzyılda Paris'in lehinedir. Onsekizinci yüzyılda taşralılar ağır basmakta ve bu taşralılaşmakta hızlanmaktadır. Devrimden sonra az istisnalar dışında bütün ülke üreticidir, nüfus sıklığı en fazla bölgeler en çok yazar çıkaran bölgelerdir."* Robert Escarpit, *Edebiyat Sosyolojisi* (Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1968), p. 47.

This meaningful research can be also done for the social origins of Turkish authors and changes in the historical evolution. In this dissertation, however, I will not be able to show this with qualitative datas, but even so I will try to share some commonly accepted informations about the demographic or class origins of some of these authors and circles. Social origins of the authors will be examined below.

A brief study about this subject has been done by Özdemir who writes:

> In the Tanzimat era, 79.5 percent of the authors and poets was born in Istanbul and only 7.1 percent of them was born in Anatolia. In the era of Tanzimat, the percent of the writer who was born in Istanbul was 73 and 11.7 in Anatolia; After the foundation of the Republic, there was a big change in these rates, and writers born in Istanbul were 29 percent and born in Anatolia were 67 percent.[78]

According to these data, it can be said that many of the Turkish writers of the 1960s had been born in Anatolia.

I will apply a sociological perspective in my work. The relation between the social context and the characteristics of the literary works reflecting and producing this context will be the main concern of my work, from the tradition that accepts that art is a social product and arguing that the arts and literature can be understood adequately only from a sociological perspective.[79] For this sociological research, it is necessary to discuss the Marxist dominance in this field and also in the field of literary theory.

---

[78]"*Tanzimat döneminde yazar ve ozanlarımızın yüzde 79.5'u İstanbul'da, yüzde 7.1'i Anadolu'da doğmuştur. Serveti Funun döneminde ise İstanbul doğumluların oranı yüzde 73, Anadolu duğunluların oranı ise yüzde 11.7'dir. Cumhuriyetten yani 1923'ten sonra ise bu oranlarda büyük bir değişim ortaya çıkmış, İstanbul doğumluların oranı yüzde 29, Anadolu doğumluların oranı ise yüzde 67 olmuştur*." Emin Özdemir, *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı, Kavramlar, Dönemler, Yönelim*ler (Ankara: Bilgi Yayinevi, 1999), p. 171.

[79]Wolff, p. 1.

Marxism and Literature

Marxist literary theories and the sociology of literature are useful in the examination of the period about which I conducted research, as most of the artists of the period were Marxist oriented. It is argued that Marxism had a significant impact on both of these domains, (literary theory and the sociology of literature), to analyze the relationship of the reality and its representations by the works of art. Thus, It may be argued that the Marxist literary critic prefers to situate a definition of literary in its historical, cultural and social locations, functions and effects, rather than in terms of its aesthetic essence.[80]

Therefore, many scholars argue that the Marxist critique insists on the cognitive and communicative function of literature and neglects its poetic and fictional dimension. According to them, it functions like an economic and social barometer. Literature is not perceived as an object of permenant reinterpretation. In my research, the external social factors affecting the literature and their social dimension will be more important and primary, then Marxist literary and sociological theories will be more appropriate for my research. Ahmad's argument, "Marxism's statement success is to connect the cultural productions of a period with other kinds of productions and political processes"[81] will be my guideline.

---

[80]Peter Widdowson, *What is Litterature* (New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 117.

[81]Aijaz Ahmad, *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures* (New York: Verso, 1992), p. 5.

As mentioned above, Marxism insists on this dual nature of literature, which registers the effects of social forces and redefines them at the same time.[82] According to Clark:

> Marx's influence on literary criticism rests wholly on the theory of knowledge that insists on the interdependence of ideas and the organization of the society. Because knowledge is ultimately conditioned by economic structures, literature can be said to reflect or hold a mirror to the society, however the Marxian theory of knowledge does more than specify the social and especially economic locus of literature; it insists on the vital role these ideas play in creating society.[83]

This role of ideas in the creation of social structures has also been underlined by Marxist theoretians like Lukacs and Goldmann, who will be considered as among the most important producers of the Marxist literary tradition.

Lukacs and Goldmann were literary critics whose works have been more translated in Turkish than those of others since the 1960s and critics like Fethi Naci and Selahattin Hilâv referred to the works of these authors in their articles.[84] Lukacs' theory of Realism and Goldmann's theory of Genetic Sturucturalism, which accepts the role of social structures which determine literary production as well as providing a freeedom of action for human subjects, and give for authors a possible role to transform and influence public opinion. Burns writes that: "Lukacs and Goldman for whom literature provides an objective demonstration of the articulation of traditional values and of emergent values which in turn reflect the power structure of society and

---

[82]Clark p. 109.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Selahattin Hilav knew Lucien Goldman very well from France when he lived there for his university education. Fethi Naci in his book, *Türkiye'de Roman ve Toplumsal Değişme* refers to Goldmann and Lukacs many times. The work of Lukacs, *European Realism* was translated by Mehmet H. Doğan.

the challenges to it."[85] Then authors, writers can be defined as active producers or bearers of the values of the dominant power structures and challenges to them.

Lukacs and his theory of realism grew out of the idea that all the great and progressive literature shows the essence or the reality of a social, historical situation by presenting personalities, actions, and typical situations by offering to the reader the *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of the age. Realism is not a substitute for political action: it is the structure of the consciousness that accompanies it. This constitutes the strenght of Lukacs's position.[86] He argues that individual literary actors are the bearers of the structural forms, but some of these individual actors are able to bring about the spirit of these structural forms and their changes more effectively than others. Lukacs' theory of realism is generally criticized of its overestimation of some authors in what seems to be an arbitrary way and the exclusion of the modernist, individualist literary tradition.

Goldmann, like Lukacs, also attempted to propose a resolution to the intricate relationship between structures and human agency. According to Goldmann's theory,

> The genetic structuralism is a response for the most important discussions in the human sciences is that of knowing whether men or structures generate historical transformations...; genetic structuralism asserts that structures, being a universal aspect of all human thought, sensibility or behavior, could in no instance replace man as an historical subject.[87]

---

[85]Burns, p. 11.

[86]Georg Lukacs, *Essays on Realism* (Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press, 1981), p. 21.

[87]Lucien Goldmann, "Structuralism Génétique et Analyse Stylistique," In *Method in the Sociology of Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), pp. 143- 161.

This approach can be defined as a response to the approach that criticizes Marxism for its underestimation of the role of the human subjects in the evolution of societies.

According to Goldmann's concept of genetic structuralism and totality, history is a unified, knowable and social process which is comprehensible; this comprehensiveness which allows people to carry out both a positive (descriptive) and a critical (interpretive) analysis.[88] The role of the artist to comprehend and to analyze this totality is described by Goldmann as:

> The artist can begin to imagine a vision of society only from within the totality. Thus he is determined as well as he determines and reveals his epoch in the very act of transcending the immediacy around him. The flight of the artist's vision is defined by the objective possibility of his position within a given culture.[89]

The capacity to describe and to interpret social events in their works makes authors important social actors as they understand and reflect the totality in a comprehensible way. They share a common ground with social scientists.

According to Goldmann,

> The more the work is the expression of a thinker or a writer of genius, the more it can be understood by itself, without the need of the historian to have recourse to biography or the intentions of the creator. The strongest personality is that which best identifies with the life of the spirit, i.e., with the essential forces of social consciousness in its active and creative aspects.[90]

This approach of the strongest personality was an appropriation of the Lukacsian theory of Realism. On the other hand, Goldmann argues that: "If one does

---

[88]Ibid., p. 43.

[89]Ibid., p. 26.

[90]Lucien Goldmann, *Method in the Sociology of Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), p. 334.

not relate historical facts and major cultural creations which are also historical facts to a collective society, it is impossible for him to comprehend or to study their meanigfulness."[91] He also describes literature as a product of a collective process, not only a product of its producer. He attempts to show the collective process of the production of literature in addition to his definition of the strongest personality that is also part of a cohesive social group, but this strongest writer carried perfectly this collective spirit.

Structuralism is one of the main literary studies also inspired by the approaches of Marxist theory,[92] but Goldmann's position, Genetic Structuralism can be considered as a critique of this theory and in his book, *The Language of Criticism*, after making a long critic of non genetic structuralism, Goldmann argues that:

> Above all, we must refuse such principles as the elimination of the subject or the object, every attempt finally, to eliminate one of this basic aspect of reality. We must study reality as a process made by man, created by them, and having a human meaning."[93]

As a result, it can be said that the sociology of literature of Lukacs and Goldmann does not reduce individuals to the passive bearers of the mentality of some

---

[91]Introduction by William Q. Boelhower, In Lucien Goldmann, *Method in the Sociology of Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), p. 21.

[92]Goldmann and Lukacs were also important for the evolution of the Structuralist theory.The structuralism of Roland Barthes who is one of the founders of this theory and who had an intricate relationship with Marxist theory, who criticizes the possibility of transmitting meaning and significance by the works of literature. In his essay "The Death of the Author" (1968), he argues that the whole notion of the 'knowable text' acts as little more than another delusion of Western bourgeois culture. Indeed the idea of giving a book or poem an ultimate end coincides with the notion of making it consumable, something that can be used up and replaced in a capitalist market. "The Death of the Author" is sometimes considered to be a post-structuralist work, since it moves past the conventions of trying to quantify literature, but others see it as more of a transitional phase for Barthes in his continuing effort to find significance in culture outside of the bourgeois norms. Structuralism and post structuralism literary theories can be defined like the Nieztchean approach which ignores the research of the content of truth in the work of art.

[93]Goldmann, p. 53.

classes or other groups. There is room for a hierarchy of mediations, even where the emphasis has been out on social rather than biographical issues.[94]

Another important position in Marxist literary theory is Ernst Fischer's theory which considers work of art to be a product of labor, not a mere reflection or a totality as in the Lukacsian sense, but a creation which can help to protest or to go beyond human alienation.[95] In this approach, the function of art is defined as a medium not to moderate but to disturb. This approach depends on the Marxists view that the role of art and literature were essential in human emancipation. For instance,

> Human self realization means much more to Marx than the return of man out of his alienated labour... The ending of economic alienation will mean the end of the state, the family, law, morality etc, as subordinate space of alienation. What will remain is the life of art and science in a special and vastly enlarged sense of these two terms. Marx's conception of ultimate communism is fundamentally aesthetic in character. The acquisitive and therefore alienated man of history is to be succeeded by the post historical aesthetic man. The alienated world will give way to the aesthetic world. Accordingly Marx's discussion in the manuscript on communism is largely taken up with aesthetic questions. [96]

Burns also says that, "There is visible evidence in the diffusion and the development of the Marxist vision of the litterature, as ideology, something of the nature of self fulfilling prophecy."[97] It is an important device for human self realization. The hope that art can somehow break through the limitations of actual consciousness and overcome human alienaton for a moment.

---

[94]Wolff, p. 69.

[95]Quoted in Selahattin Hilâv, Roger Garaudy, *Yön*, no 100 (20 February1965), in *Entellektüeller ve Eylem* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2008), p. 20, 21.

[96]Robert C. Tucker, *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972), p. 16.

[97]Burns, p. 11.

An important distinction between the Lukacsian aesthetic and Ernst Ficher is the perception of modernist art. According to Lukacs, Kafka is the symbol of the art of decadence, but Ficher argues that Kafka's art was also a contestation against human alienation even this art does not show the way for the realization of a human totality to transcend the alienation caused by capitalist society.[98]

According to Georg Steiner, Marxism has made four main contributions to literary theory. Firstly, Marxism argues that writer may not be aware of the worth of its work. It may be a conflict between his ideas and his works. As argued by Goldmann, literary history is full of examples of writers whose ideas completely contradicted.[99] The history of literature, remarks Lucien Goldmann, is full of writers whose thought was rigorously contrary to the sense and structure of their work (among many examples given are Balzac and Goethe.)[100]

According to Marxists, authors who are not Marxist oriented may more succesfully reflect the social reality. In addition to this, Marx considers writers who directly express class interests in their works as mediocre artists, for the immediate transposition of economic and political interests in literature transforms it into ideology and thus bad art.[101]

Engels says that "the more the opinions of the author remains hidden, the better for the work of art" may be a good critique for literary criticism which states

---

[98]Selahattin Hilâv, *Yön*, no 101 (5 March 1961), in *Entellektueller ve Eylem*, in *Entellektüeller ve Eylem* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2008), p. 23.

[99]Lucien Goldman "The Fictive and the Social World," in Lucien Goldmann, *Method in the Sociology of Literature*, Introduction by William Q. Boelhower (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), p. 317.

[100]Georg Steiner, "Marxism and Literary Critic," in *Sociology of Literature, Drama* ed. Elizabeth and Tom Burns (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973), p. 172.

[101]Ian H. Birchall "Practices of Literature and Politics, The Novel and the Party," in *Sociology of Literature, Drama* ed. Elizabeth and Tom Burns, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973), p. 169.

that Marxism reduces literature to political ideas. However, in analyzing the literary debates of the period in my research, I saw that in the criticism there was a negative connection between aesthetic quality and the direct reflections of the political claims of the writer who is generally Marxist or socialist oriented. Some Marxist-oriented authors produced works with much lower aesthetic qualities to defend their political visions, as it was the case in Turkey, but Marxist critics were sensitive about criticizing this mentality with reference to Marx's own position and Lukacs' distinction between naturalist and realist literature.

It may be concluded that the analysis of a work of art and the study of its author's ideas belong to two different but related domains. In my research, I reveal these contradictions in my analysis of the ideas and the works of the authors of the period.

However, in the 1960s and 1970s, discussions turned to the problematic of the reflection of political ideas in the works of art by shadowing the aesthetic values of the works. A writer who desires to put his political ideas to his own work may not be succesful, and some authors independent of their political ideas may reflect the social context more succesfully than others. In this dissertation, I will use some political and literary visions to categorize some tendencies; but these political and literary categories will be defined outside of the aesthetic quality of the works of art. My subjectivity will inform my choices, but I generally consider the works and their authors in order to their significance (influence, sales, respectability from an audience, whether they are part of the Turkish literary canon.) in the literary landscape in which they were produced. This does not mean that many of the works that I will mention do not have an aesthetic value.

Second, Marxist literary ciritics, mainly Lukacs, proposed an important distinction between realism and naturalism. This distinction may be one of the most important of the Marxist literary debates.

Third, Marxism has sharpened the critic's sense of time and place. According to Steiner, the Marxist sensibility has contributed to a sociological awareness of the best of modern criticism. Concepts like "spirit of the age," "studies of the audience" were developed by Marxist critics.

Fourth, for Marxist thought and politics, literature has always been very important as well as a literary form and a social institution. For instance, in a communist society, the poet is regarded as a central figure for the health of the political body. The health of language is essential to the preservation of a living society. It is in litterature that language is most truely challenged and guarded.

In addition to these four points, the most important success of the Marxist critique is to change the perception of "*ce n'est que de la littérature.*" (this is only literature)[102] This is argued not only by Marxists, but the French poet Paul Valéry also argued that "All artists are creators of their works of art and many other things at the same time."[103] Literature's significance is always a debated subject on the one hand, as a most important part of the nation's cultural heritage and on the other hand, an imaginative world of bohemian, dreamer writers that may be dangerous for the unity of the society .

---

[102]Steiner, p 175 - 177.

[103]Quoted in Terry Eagleon, *Criticism and Ideology : A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (New York: Verso, 2006), p. 55.

Insufficiency in the realm of poetry may be an important critique of the Marxist literary theory. As argued by Eagleton, a Marxist who makes generally conceptualizations and generalizations has difficulties in the poetry. He says, "for instance, for Lukacs, literature is limited to the novel, Williams also limited his researches to novel and the theatre, beceause there are social productions in which the relation between history and aesthetics is more clear."[104]

As a result, even today after the loss of authority of Marxism in the social sciences, the literary Marxist tradition remains influential by the works of Terry Eagleton, Frederic Jameson and Aijaz Ahmad. Pierre Bourdieu and his colleagues who adopt a sociological and Marxian approach are also influential in the field of the sociology of literature. Pascale Casanova, Dena Goodman and Gisèle Sapiro produce significant works by representing and writing the social history of nineteenth and twentieth century European and French literature. These authors are among my sources.

What Are the Distinctive Measures of the Artists and Writers?

According to the literary theories we discussed above, writers and their approaches to the literature vary. Literary theories defend or identify different types of writers asserting different worldviews. The concepts of novel and novelist compose very different styles, attitudes, works and authors.[105] This is similar for poetry and other genres of literature. But, as above mentioned, theories on the realm of literature

[104]Ibid., p. 45.

[105]Clark, p. 118.

are generally centered on the novel. There are many different approaches to define a novelist, a man of letters.

In the production of art, social institutions affect, among other things, who becomes an artist, how they become an artist, how they are then able to practise their art, and how they can ensure that their work is produced, performed and made available to the public. The technological and institutional conditions of the production are crucially important. These conditions, as Terry Eagleton argues, that to create a literary mode of production is related to the general mode of production of a society as well as to the general ideology of that society.[106] In this social formation, there is always a place for human agency and creativity. The political commitment or isolation and loneliness are defined from two completely different points as essential characteristics of the artist, and the author. In addition to these, the collective nature of the production of literary work may require a more collective definition of the concepts of "artist" and "author."

Pierre Bourdieu responds to the question of "who is the artist" by saying that this question cannot be answered, because to draw the limits of a domain is always an issue for struggle. But different political, ideological views try to dominate this definition. There are different approaches that seek to exclude some types of artist as they do not fulfil some criteria. Commitment, collectivity, and individualism were the basic axes of this differentiation.

First of all, the definition arguing that commmitent is the necessary condition for an artist has its origins in the eighteenth century. For instance, Clark writes:

---

[106]Terry Eagleton, , *Criticism and Ideology : a Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (New-York: Verso, 2006), pp. 48, 53.

> Contrary to the expectation of one who is familiar with the notion of committed or aligned literature on the Left, the first advocates of the idea that writers should commit themselves politically and use the aesthetic means at their disposal for the achievement of a political goal were the representatives of reaction in the period that followed the French revolution of 1789.[107]

In Marxist aesthetic theory, commitment should be distinguished from "tendency." Tendency and the *bildungsroman* tradition are harshly criticized by Engels who argued that, "Commited art in the proper sense is not intended to generate ameliorative measures, legislative acts or practical institutions like earlier propogandadist (tendency) plays against syphilis, abortion law or borstals but to work at the level of fundamental attitudes."[108] The realist, naturalist distinction is also based on this difference. The choice of Marx and Engels, Balzac over Zola was the main aspiration for Marxist literary critics to make distinctions between ampiricist literature and realism, which is not only a collection of data but reflecting the spirit of the age even by contradicting by the political views of its author.

In Marxist theory, this problem of commitment is the direct product of the freedom of choice of the artist. The artist is the more or less an active reproducer of a social meaning, a maker as well as a product of the social.[109] This interrelation may be centered at the core of the domain. Lukacs and Goldmann regard artist as projecting something essentially subjective into expressions, shapes, and statements which are significant and meaningful for others, and thus as engaged in individual creativity.

---

[107]Clark, p. 127.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Ibid., p.114.

This however is rooted in mankind's collective experience.[110] As an important thesis of Marxist theory, people makes their own history, but under the circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. This essential doctrine of the Marxist theory is applied to the domain of the production of a work of literature by its author.

Jean Paul Sartre, as a part of his identity of philosopher sought to define the functions of the literature and the writer. He developed the concept of *literature engagé*, arguing that the producer of the literary work has to make political choices. Calinescu writes that,

> For Sartre, commitment task as it seems contradictorily, is to awaken the free choice of the agent, that makes authentic existence possible at all, as opposed to the neutrality of the spectator. Literature with the exception of the poetry. (Sartre defines as a non communicative, self referential and self objectifying use of language) has no excuse for not choosing, with a full awareness of all the tragic paradoxes involved in any specific act of choice.[111]

Sartre also wrote that" the author is a man of his age; Everything that he/she says or does not say has an echo."[112] This kind of close relationship between the work of art and its public existence is very useful to comprehend the several debates of the 1960s. In the Turkish literature of the period, the political responsibilities of the author were very frequently defended.

This problem of political commitment was seriously debated. Calinescu wrote that:

---

[110]Burns, p. 15-16.

[111]Matei Calinescu "Literature and Politics," in *Interrelations of Littérature* ed. Jean Pierre Barricelli and Joseph Gibaldi (New York: Modern Language Assoiation of America,1982), p. 135.

[112]Jean Paul Sartre, "Les Temps Modernes," in Mehmet Başaran, "An Introduction of Existentialism," *Yeni Ufuklar*, no 126, (Novembre 1962), in *Türk Edebiyatı* ed. Memet Fuat, (Istanbul: De Yayinevi, 1963), pp. 112-114.

> Although Sartre concept of literature engagé has been criticized for its ideological and individualistic component by Orthodox Marxist critics, the Satrean theory of commitment shares a basic element with the orthodox Marxist view of literature: they are both content oriented. What makes Sartre theory of commitment relevant to our discussion is its insistence that choice in today's world can be only political.[113]

This political choice or awareness may conflict with the choice of Balzac by Marx, but Marxist theory of literature defends the possibility of the author reflecting unconsciously the true social meaning of his period.

Second, a more collective definition of the artist was produced by Lucien Goldmann, who wrote that great literature is the expression of a cohesive social group. In certain historical conditions, these ideas cohere in an explicit world vision or world view, and this occurs when the group in question is forced to define its own identity in struggle with and in opposition to other groups in society. Goldmann asserts that great literature is the expression of a world vision and is a product of a collective group consciousness.[114] Therefore the author, at least the author of great literature is defined by his membership in a collectivity.

Third, the emphasis on the creativity of the individual artist also may differentiate the definition of the artist. The humanist criticism of the sociology of literature and art often attempts to rescue a notion of "creativity" that allows art a special transcendence over all contingencies, particularly social and ideological contingencies.[115] A individualistic definition of the artist or author is that these people were not ordinary mortals; that they necessarily work alone, detached from social life and interaction, and often are in opposition to social values and practices.

---

[113]Calinescu, p. 135.

[114]Wolff, p. 57, 58.

[115]Ibid., p. 69.

> In every society.., there are some persons with an unusual sensitivity to the sacred, an uncommon reflectiveness about the nature of the universe and the rules which govern their society.., a minority of persons who, more than the ordinary run of their fellow men, are inquiring and desirous of being in frequent communion with symbols which are more general than the immediate concrete situations of everyday life .... This interior need to penetrate beyond the screen of immediate concrete experience marks the existence of the intellectual or the artist in every society... It is practically given by the nature of the intellectual's or artist's orientation that there should be some tension between the intellectuals and the value orientations embodied in the actual institutions of every society).[116]

The aesthetic dimension and the priority of the form in the works of art over the content were defined against the content oriented and politically oriented definition of the author. This individualistic definition certainly contradicted with the politically affiliated artist.

The problem to which social classes an author belongs is important in the sociology of literature. Pierre Bourdieu arrived at the conclusion that in the period of consolidation, the situation of the artist and writer was characterized by a specific ambiguity: he was a member and a dependent of the group in power simultaneously, that is, he belonged to the oppressed fraction of the rulling class.[117]

Second, Goldmann argues that it is an historical fact that writer groups nearly always wanted to behave as a social class. He describes these groups as being a position contradictory to the social classes on which they were economically dependent, but to which they were ideologically and politically opposed.[118] Works of

---

[116]Fritz Ringer, "The Intellectual Field, Intellectual History, and the Sociology of Knowledge." in *Theory and Society*, no. 19-3, (1975), pp. 269-294: 281.

[117]See Pierre Bourdieu, *Champ de Pouvoir, Champ Intellectuel et Habitus de Classe* (Paris: Minuit, 1971).

[118]Lucien Goldmann, *The Hidden God: A Study of Tragic Vision in the Pénsées of Pascal and the Tragedies of Racine* (London: Routledge, 1964), p. 120.

art now appear as the product of social groups or oppressed part of the dominant classes.

A third approach was to separate the artist or author from any social group or class and from any secure form of patronage by the formation of the market in which the artist is left in a precarious position.

The conditions for intellectuals and writers were transformed during all the twentieth century. Lipset and Basu writes that,

> The years 1967 and 1968 were marked by the rise of mass unemployment that jobs were not available in sufficient quantity to keep up with the wave of expansion of Universities. These contradictions affected the intellectual community in the same way as they affected workers. 80 to 90 percent of the intellectuals in the big capitalist countries are not wage earners. Few intellectuals can earn a living from creative activity, that most of them devote only their spare time to their vocation.[119]

To be intellectual or artist is not generally to be like an ordinary wage earner, then what is the motivation for artists to produce literary works?

The authentic artist is conceptualized as somebody who continues to work for impersonal ends (the advance of art) by personal means (an invention in his/her original way), whereas in fields like diplomacy or administration a normal career requires in continuing personal ends (promotion) by impersonal averages (obligated steps from one post to another.) Under these conditions, to reduce a biography of artist to a strategy of career may not be an appropriate description, and the authentification of the efforts of artists is not precisely reducible in a career plan.[120]

---

[119]Seymour Martin Lipset and Asoke Basu, "The Roles of the Intellectual and Political Roles," in *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals* ed. Alexander Gella (Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications, 1976), , p. 123.

[120]Nathalie Heinich, *Ce que l'Art Fait à la Sociologie* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1998), p. 19.

Then, as being artist is more than a career plan; creativity, political engagement, and identification with a collectivity are the key factors for authors to produce works of art. But, on the other hand, being artists may give then the opportunity of social mobility and reputation. These motivations are generally defined as secondary or as a possibility.

Artistic activities are considered to be unlike those of other wage earners more appropriate for social mobility and reputation, but only a very small percentage of the artists have this opportunity, and also they can earn money from their artistic production. If the author is a dissident public intellectual, his vision may be an obstacle to the social mobility.[121]

Another important reason to write many to find a meaning for human life or to make his own life meaningful. The novel was brought into being for men who wanted to find their place in historical continuity, and moreover were aware of constituting a certain stratum of society.[122] Then, a writer was defined to be a person who have ethical and political responsibilites. Zereffa writes that: "Those whom we know as great writers are those who have informed us best about our relations with one another."[123] This definition of author presumes an ethical or political consciousness that in the act of writing, poet, novelist, and playwright is trying to make sense of our lives by trying to make sense of his own.

---

[121]See Pierre Bourdieu, *Les Règles de l'Art, Genèse et Structure du Champ Littéraire* (Paris: Seuil, 1992).

[122]Zeraffa (1972) , p. 40.

[123]Ibid.

Jean Paul Sartre wrote that, one of the essential motivation of the artistic creation is certainly a need to feel himself important in his relationship against the world.[124] Second, human beings are creative. Creation is more than a perception of a landscape, but in the process of creation, the creator loses his ability to see from the outside and to perceive his own creation. The strong feeling which motivates the artist to create may be one of the essential factors to produce works of art.

The synthesis between perception and creation is provided by the reader. Because the real creation is only realized by the reception of the work by the others. The relationship between reader and author is determined by the concept of freedom. Both of them are mutually respectful. The first step came from the author, by the externalization of his perception, and the second step is the reader's internalization. Consequently the reader feel that "*le monde est ma tâche* - the world is my spot" and the reader's feeling is defined as an aesthetic pleasure.[125]

Sartre attempted to make a synthesis of aesthetic pleasure and political engagement to describe the motivation to produce a work of art. As a result, I also think that ethical and political consciousness and aesthetic creativity may not be contradicted. But in literary theories, these axes are sometimes defined in a kind of contradiction, and artistic creativity and political ideas are disintegrated. From sociological perspective however they are defined in terms of an interrelation.

---

[124]Jean Paul Sartre, *Qu'est ce que la Literature?* (Paris: Gallimard, 2005).

[125]Ibid.

Who is an Intellectual?

What distinguishes the intellectual, artist, and author (a significant part of intellectuals)? I will discuss different points of view about the functions and definitions of the intellectual. I will not attempt to pigeonhole various role intellectuals perform into a rigid logical framework. I will discuss the essential roles which generally are expected from the intellectual.

First, the intellectual is defined as a person to express and reflect a good example of the mentality and spirit of his people, and advises his people on the notion of justice. Second is that he is capable of making a statement that goes beyond his individuality and reaching universal realm. And last, he has the authority to speak on matters even beyond its field, for the sake of the truth, not by a technical function, but as a political, ethical right. Justice, universality, and truth are three concepts strictly related to the values and responsibilities of the intellectual. Objectivity is another concept that is generally used to define intellectuals. Zygmunt Bauman says that the intellectual is someone who goes beyond the relation that he has founded with his profession, or his vision of art, and he can contemplate subjects like reality, judgement, and the taste of the age. [126]

As Gérard Noiriel states in his book, *Dire la Vérité au Pouvoir: Les Intellectuels en Question* – (Speaking the Truth to Power, the Intellectuals in Question),[127] the reforms of the Third Republic in France caused the separation of the

---

[126]See Frank Furedi, *Nereye Gitti Bu Entelektüeller?* (Istanbul: Birleşik Yayınevi: 2010).

[127]See Gérard Noiriel, *Dire la vérité au pouvoir: Les Intellectuels en Question* (Marseille: Agone, 2010).

scientist and the political domain, creating a “vacuum” in the public space that “intellectuals” sought to occupy. But with the Dreyfus case in 1898 in France, this situation changed. After the Dreyfus affair, the word "intellectual" came to be used specifically to describe someone who engaged in the public sphere to defend universal values.

Even if the term was used the first time by anti Dreyfusards, after the initial negative connotation (the intellectual thinker was defined like a refugee in an abstract world, a person who has lost the feeling of reality, and a person who discusses topics he does not know well) widely disappeared in favor of a positive image of men belonging to the intellectual professions, but above all the intellectual’s duty was to defend real causes, even by taking political risks. Intellectuals became an essential part of the political field, with undeniable authority. As stated by Eagleton:

> An intellectual is not a mere specialist, but somebody whose interest are wide ranging and who graples with the important social issues of their time. Intellectuals refused to be pinned in a single discipline. Instead the idea is to bring ideas critically to bear on a social life as a whole.[128]

The formation of the intellectual

The formation of the intellectual may be seen as the product of the Enlightenment period, and modern and representative democracy. With modernity, the intellectual became part of a public space as a creator of public opinion. Four components dominate public opinion: political parties, the press, the university and literature. The process of formation and realization of the intellectual are related closely with these four institutions. Meanwhile, as argued by Frank Furedi, the

[128]Terry Eagleton, *New Statesman* (13 September 2010).

concept of intellectual is not a job description, it does not mean how someone makes money.[129] But these institutions give intellectuals the opportunity to earn money for the intellectuals, as they have special skills and they need free time to produce intellectual works. I argue that modernity and these institutions fulfil the necessary conditions.

Another factor is the technological development. Thanks to development and innovations in the printing industry, print culture was developed very quickly. Books and journals were the two key means for a communication at a distance. In seventeenth and eighteenth century, a new social environment composed of bourgeoisie and aristocracy was created in Europe.

The French revolution was a turning point at the end of the eighteenth century. The intellectuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw that in the French Revolution, thinkers through intellectual force of their writing, could change the course of history. Intellectuals who are influenced by the philosophers of the Enlightenment call themselves the guardians of universal values like truth, justice and reason. If the intellectual is the possessor of truth, he sees an opportunity to share this truth with his people, who cannot find the way without his voice.

This approach based on the philosophy of philosophers of the Enlightenment is criticized. It is argued that intellectuals are not as influential over people as they imagine. For instance, Richard Rorty[130] argues that the rationalist scholars were blind to the problem of the reception of their writings, acting as if the world was solely

[129]Furedi, p. 56.

[130]Richard Rorty defends relativism, by arguing that the reality does not have any significance in the wirtten text and the political and social messages of literary works can not be appropriated to the larger public.

composed of intellectuals. This critique is at the center of the populism and elitism duality that grew out of the problem it looks at whether it is possible for intellectuals to transmit messages or share their thoughts with larger audiences.

Two types of Intellectual

However, the philosophers of the Enlightenment and the nineteenth century philosophers like Karl Marx, Immanuel Kant, and Auguste Comte are the source and the essential reference of intellectuals. During the nineteenth century, positivism, social darwinism may come to define the civilizing mission of the intellectuals of the civilized countries for the rest of the world, and for the intellectuals of the rest of the world in their own uncivilized countries, and this mission motivated intellectuals who were in the service of colonial power and service of their state. On the other hand, Marxism, other subversive ideologies, and socialism defended a kind of intellectual who supported the oppressed or colonized nations and working classes. As argued by Boggs:

> The first type of intellectuals, technocratic intellectuals served to legitimate in various ways, the effective functioning of bureaucratic state capitalism and other forms of industrial society. They are primarily located in the state bureaucracy, in the universities, in the private corporations, in the military, in the media and in the culture industry. Evolving out of and against this stratum is a critical intelligentsia situated in the higher education, the media and the arts but typically confined to local spheres of influence and therefore lacking the cohesion of the technocrats.[131]

[131]Boggs, *Intellectuals and the Crisis of Modernity* (New York: New York State University, 1993), p.4.

For instance, this distinction between these two kind of intellectuals was seen in the English context, in which the French bohemian intellectual and novelist were defined as abnormal:

> The educated Englishman, according to Times Literary Supplement, pried himself that 'Oxford and Cambridge are more in touch with reality than the Ecole Normale Superieure' and that the existence of an Intelligentsia was an abnormal phenomenon, an abberation in countries which took the political views of their novelist seriously.[132]

Selahattin Hilâv, in his book *Entellektueller ve Eylem* (Intellectuals and Praxis) defines two types of intellectuals. One of them is intellectual who distances himself from political events, but in the domination of the dominant ideologies consciously or unconsciously. The other intellectual is against the dominant power and his ideas have grown not out of the existing situation of society but of an imaginative, ideal vision of society.[133] Carl Boggs underlines the same duality: "A recurrent theme within virtually all currents of social and political theory has been the effort to conceptualize the role of intellectuals in both reproduction of order and the struggle for change."[134]

Since the 1890s, critical intelligentsia agenda is largely monopolized by Marxism. According to the Marxist theory, the critical intellect needs to provide not only historical analysis but also a vision and strategy of change and has to be engaged within an evolving social totality. The dynamic core of that totality was of course the proletariat, which is expected to generate its own democratic opposition to

---

[132]Quoted in Alexander Gela, *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals* (California: SAGE publications, 1976), p. 49, (Times Literary Supplement, 1955:533).

[133]Selahattin Hilâv, *Entelektueller ve Eylem* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2008), p. 12.

[134]Boggs, p 1.

capitalism.[135] But the critical intellectual may define himself outside of the Marxist tradition. The critical intellectuals of anarchism, nihilism and modernism distanced themselves from Marxism because of the central role of its transformative social project and its undermining of individualism.

For two types of intellectuals, the traditional and critical, "economic interest" or "desire to govern" based explanations are generally proposed. Regis Debray however argues that it is not their status that defines intellectuals but their project to influence the entire society, and this is an ethical project.[136] The ethical dimension of the intellectual has to be defended against the argument that his desire was for only political authority or in some cases for economic interest.

It is clear that the authority of the intellectual is strictly depended on its power to speak for the entire society. This discourse is also nourrished from ethical responsibilites and political ideals. The intellectual's own interests, or their "will to power" should not be exaggerated. The radical and idealist dimensions of the intellectual's claims should not be reduced to personal interests.

In the twentieth century, the distinction between the scientist and politics was completely rejected by many intellectuals. Especially, during the first half of the century, the intellectual was always politically engaged. For example, Jean Paul Sartre defines the intellectual as someone who graples with subjects that does not concern him.

Therefore, being an intellectual implies social engagement. As discussed above, commitment and engagement are also defined necessary by some scholars in

[135]Ibid., p. 38.

[136]Furedi, p. 89.

the definition of the artist. Thus, the artist, the literary man who specifically makes political choice can be considered to be a public intellectual. Artists and authors are also an important part of the intellectual stratum, and their creative power makes them more influential than other political actors.

The artists and writers in my case in the 1960s were generally intellectuals who prefered to be outside of mainstream politics and to resist the increasingly developed mechanisms, like state instituions in which traditional intellectuals reproduce social order. These definitions will be meaningful to think about in the later discussion about the Turkish intellectuals of the 1960s and 1970s.

Intellectuals, Artists, and Politics and Their Role in the Public Sphere

The period of the Enlightenment and the project of modernization led directly or implicitly to the creation of a public sphere. In the formation of the public sphere, the role of the intellectuals was considerable. Goodman writes,

> According to Jurgen Habermas, in the eighteenth century, the Republic of Letters was the zone of interaction between the state and the individual that formed the ground of an authentic public sphere, the realm of civil society and the public. The Republic of Letters in France was at the dynamic heart of this authentic public sphere.[137]

The notion of the bourgeois public sphere as a space to be entered with equal rights and opportunities as rational-critical subjects was strictly related to the

[137] Goodman , p. 13.

existence of public intellectuals who were like assurances of this public sphere. Intellectuals were generally defined in this public sphere like fish in water.[138]

Intellectuals who were assumed to be rational and critical subjects aimed to transform the whole society into critical and rational subjects. The ultimate goal of the Republic of Letters (intellectuals) was to create a public in which they could diffuse their opinions for the higher good of the society.[139] In these circumstances, Goodman writes, "Men of Letters (intellectuals) sought to establish themselves as the arbiters of public opinion, they did so because they recognized its power. At the same time, they were empowered by the public, or at least they arrogated to themselves the power they claimed the public had vested in them."[140]

The most important feature of the intellectual or writer in this new public space was his affiliation to politics, a search for social justice, and a desire to be respected by his audience. They contemplated the international world order, the political and economic organization of contemporary society, the institutional and legal frameworks that regulate the lives of ordinary citizens, the educational system, and media networks that controlled and disseminated information. For instance, a symbolic intellectual, Jean Paul Sartre systematically refused to keep quiet about what he saw as the inequalities and injustices in the world.[141]

In the formation of this new public sphere, literature also played a significant role, as already discussed. The intellectuals of the Republic of Men of Letters

---

[138]Jurgen Habermas, "An Avantgardistic Instict for Relevances : Intellectuals and their Publics," available at < http://publicsphere.ssrc.org/habermas-intellectuals-and-their-public/>

[139]Goodman, p. 33.

[140]Ibid., p 40.

[141]Michael Scriven, *Jean Paul Sartre: Politics and Culture in Postwar France* (London: St Martin's Press, 1999), p : xii.

benefited generally from literature to express their political visions. The philosophers of the Enlightenment, such as Rousseau, Voltaire and Diderot, produced literary works to share their ideas with the larger public.

The Formation of a Public Sphere in Turkey

The formation of a public sphere in the European countries generally is assumed to have occurred in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. However, the process of the formation of the public sphere in Turkey is an issue of debate. The late Ottoman Empire or early Republican eras generally are considered as the beginning of this kind of a public sphere.

Literature as a whole takes part in the construction and in the socialization of a shared world, a common public life; it establishes reading instruments for society's readers, creating myths which help to reinforce or to question the seemingly natural existence of some social groups. For instance, in the case of the 1960s, in Turkey the educated middle classes' existence was reinforced and bourgeois and feudal lords' power was questioned by writers through their works.

In Turkey, in the 1960s, in a similar way, in the construction and in the socialization of a shared world, intellectuals and writers became increasingly political actors who reinforce some segments of the society as against the others in the public life.

A public sphere in which intellectuals and writers exist in an influential manner was not created in this period as is argued, but this period definitely can be seen as the most visible and influential period of the formation of a rich public life and

a formation of a larger audience who followed of the works and discourses of the intellectuals.

New Public Life and Artists

In this new public life, I will mainly focus on the literary production, and writers who became public intellectuals. I think that literature was at the core of this intellectual world. I assert that, during these years, the process of formation of a more vivid and dynamic public life was accelerated as part of a struggle of different sections of the society. This process was triggered by the formation of many public intellectuals and writers who motivated the ordinary people to declare their own opinions about different social issues and political events.

In my study, I will focus on these Turkish authors as an important part of the intellectual world. I also will show writers in their relationship with other areas of the intellectual world. These intellectuals, who had been educated by the early Republican institutions and became politically engaged during their university educations and the social events of the 1960s, participated in political activity, opposed the existing social order, and criticized the underdevelopment of the country and its dependency on imperialism, became public intellectuals. Hence they lived under the oppression institutionalized for the reestablishment of the social order by the coup d'état regimes of 1971 and 1980. They were tortured, imprisoned, and killed; those who survived had to live their everyday life in the paranoid atmosphere shaped by these threats. Thus, "repression" and "struggle" are the key words for this period. This kind of repression may be the basic threat for the relation of the intellectuals with the rest of the society.

But this repression may be also the evidence of the influence of the writers over a larger public.

During this period, as a result of the formation of a public sphere, intellectuals and authors embraced a larger public and they became publicly known as they maintained their power to influence public opinions. Thus, I consider the period between 1960 and 1980 as a one of transformation in Turkish literature, just like in theatre, cinema and painting, as all of these artistic activities were diffused in the public life. I argue that intellectual specialization was very limited in these years. Metropolises such as Istanbul and Ankara were the main centers for the emanation of intellectual common space and discourse.

In addition, the intellectuals were not specialists of an isolated and determined intellectual or artistic field; they shared a more common agenda. In their debates and at their meetings they talked about issues from the vast area of intellectual culture. These topics were connected closely to their everyday lives and actual political circumstances.

A struggle over representations, meanings, and who had the right to use them were the major characteristic of the period. Intellectuals and artists played an important role by struggling over representations and meanings. These artists produced symbolic books, films, theatre plays and cinema reviews for this new public. The books of the authors were important symbols to show their political identities and the myth of the Enlightenment. The myth of political identity was more powerful than before and after. The myth of the Enlightenment was very influential in this period.

All of these symbols are conducive to carrying some specific meanings and representations to a public. This public obtains a political and intellectual identity via

these instruments. The intellectuals and artists who were the producers of cultural capital created a public that was to a certain extent independent from the economic capital as a result of the class struggles in the 1960s and 1970s. A public sphere which consisted of transitory, free social spaces was established where the university students and ordinary people could meet with the leading intellectuals of the time. These cultural milieus provided an arena for intellectual and political debates.

I call these actors the "new public" of Turkey. This public was especially consisted of the university and high school students as a product of the Turkish education system which was in a complete change and development during the1960s and 1970s. With the significantly increasing rate of the University students, the public lives of the big cities were completely transformed.

The University students became an important focus of power: the cultural and artistic transformation of the decade had correlations with this youth culture. Young authors became key figures of this work. This increase in the number of university students can be defined as a main cause of the increasing literary activities in the 1960s, which in turn led to an increase for the audience of literature and all of the cultural activities.

The autonomy of the universities after the 1960s was an important change. Due to this autonomy and emancipation of a new public sphere, university students wanted to be part of the intellectual public space and they were always curious about thought and artistic activities. Students who can also be defined as young intellectuals had intrinsic interests as both young people and intellectuals.

I argue that literature, mainly poetry and short story, as well as cinema served as a very adequate means to satisfy these needs. It is my contention that intellectuals

and students were going through a period of individualization which was also part of finding a political identity. Those individuals found ways to construct themselves by exploring new films, new books, by meeting new people in cultural environments and by writing poems and short stories. That is to say, their political ideals and visions demanded a new conception of the socio-cultural whole, of society, and in terms of themselves a new sense of subjectivity or individuality. They realized this with the help of the cultural instruments that became indispensable activities of the public life. Literature was an important part of this new public life, as well cinema and theatre.

The End of the Era of Intellectuals

As argued by Michael Ignatieff, the prestige of an earlier generation of writers (he gives as examples, Sartre, Beauvoir, Camus; and in the British context, Priestley, Berlin, Ayer, Gombrich in 50s and 60s.) "depended on habits of deference which have rightly had day." But however deferential it might have been, it was a public culture." He argues that "what we have lost is not merely intelligence disinterestedly and visibly at work within public life (and therefore a good in itself) but a more active custodianship of our cultural values."[142]

For the cultural industry, the notion of "the public," with its contingent modes of access and articulation, has been replaced by the notion of "the market", implying commodity-exchange and consumption as modes of access and interaction. This also means that the idea of the Enlightenment, rational-critical subjects and a disciplinary

[142]See Michael Ignatieff, *The Needs of Strangers* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986).

social order, have been replaced by the notion of entertainment as communication, as the mechanism of social control and producer of subjectivity. The classic bourgeois spaces of representation likewise either have been replaced by markets, such as the mall replacing the public square, or transformed into a space of consumption and entertainment, as is the case in the current museum industry.[143]

The explanation for this transformation lies, according to Furedi, in the rise of an instrumentalist ethos which treats knowledge and culture as means to achieve economic and political objectives rather than as ends in themselves.[144] This instrumentalist vision has led to the exclusion and marginalization of the intellectuals to some extent in the public life.

I attempted to show that this new public culture and the intellectuals and writers ability to dominate public life also existed in this period of Turkey. In this public sphere, alternative and plural but also common trends were visible. But, as we know, after the coup d'etat of 12 September, intellectuals lost relatively their important roles in public life. The bureaucratic-technocratic tendencies were defeated to a great extent and, according to Çağlar Keyder solidarist-populist hegemony of the 60 years of the Republic were eliminated.[145] The modernist attempt of the 1960s and the 1970s cannot be reduced to this solidarist and bureaucratic tradition. Although it cannot be separated from this tradition easily, there were independent and popular dynamics that triggered this evolution.

Finally, Helen Small, in her *The Public Intellectual*, argues that in the era of

---

[143]Simon Sheikh, *Representation, Contestation and Power: The Artist as Public Intellectual* available at: <http://www.republicart.net> 10.2004.

[144]Furedi, p. 78.

[145]See Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1984).

globalism, the geographical fragmentation of cultural life is not conducive to the emergence of a sense of cohesion among the intellectuals, nor does it encourage the rise of a cohesive public for them and this leads to a decreasing prestige of intellectuals.[146] This total transformation transcends the limits of this work. New technologies of communication diminished the public role of the intellectuals and writers, but it can also be argued that thanks to these new opportunities, intellectuals and writers would become once again as important social actor.

[146]See Helen Small, *The Public Intellectual* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2002).

CHAPTER TWO

THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

Before discussing the Turkish context, it is necessary to examine the global context during the years under discussion. The period between 1960 and 1980 may be defined an era in which Turkey was the most open to worldwide political, social and cultural events in its history. It can be argued that the world was also interrelated in these decades and there was an important communication between different countries.

Hobsbawm states that the world has been transformed into a global unity. The same book is sold at the same time in Buenos Aires, Rome and Hamburg.[147] There are three important consequences of the international conditions which certainly affected Turkey's social, cultural, and intellectual life and these three points are particularly significant for my subject.

First, the student movements of 1968, and the international environment which was favorable to the leftist politics, will be considered. Second, counter-culture movements in the realm of culture as a reaction to the capitalist order and to the mentality of the consumption society (this counter-culture movement was especially significant in analyzing the tension between social realist and modernist tendencies in Turkey, which were defined as individualist) will be discussed and last the notion that a common international, intellectual and artistic culture or a network between authors from different countries existed during two decades will be defended.

[147]Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p 446.

Leftist Politics and the University Students' Movement of 1968

The international environment in the 1960s was favorable to the leftist movements all over the world, first as a result of the thaw started by Nikita Khruschev in the mid 1950s, which continued until the government of Brezhnev in the USSR. In the Thaw period, repression and censorship in the Soviet Union were reversed and millions of Soviet political prisoners were released from Gulag labor camps, due to Nikita Khrushchev's policies of de-Stalinization and peaceful coexistence with other nations

The thaw in the Cold War prepared suitable conditions for liberal reformisms by nullifying conservative paranoias, and opened room for leftist politics.[148] Contrary to the escalating conflicts and clashes of the Cold War conditions of the 1950s, during these years, leftist ideas were more visible, tolerable and plural in many Western countries, as well as in the Third World. In the Third World countries, repressions, and reactions against leftist ideas and movements were more intolerant and also physically and ideologically violent and inhuman.

Another reason for the suitable conditions for the leftist movements may have been the reactions against U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War which led to the questioning of the illegitimacy of the Western political governments as a whole. The majority of the university students of the Western countries were attracted by the anti-war leftist discourse. In addition to this, the myths of guerilla war, especially the legendary myth of Che Guevara, made people interested leftist politics.

[148]Alper, p. 35.

Finally, the student movements of 1968 marked a turning point and the apogee of the social struggles in the period, especially in France. The 1968 student movements were also experienced in Turkey; this movement had powerful relations with intellectuals and transformed to some extent cultural life.

The symbolic meaning of 1968 as an important turning point in world history will be discussed in this part of my thesis. These cultural and political movements had direct or indirect influences on the artistic literary production. First of all, I will examine the particularities, reasons and demands of these international movements.

During the 1960s, most of the economies of European or Western societies entered into a period of expansion and enrichment. There were some positive and negative periods and differences in the economies of these countries. For instance, in the 1960s, the prices fluctuated in France as a result of the immigration of one million people, after the independence of Algeria. The expansion may not have had direct consequences on the life standards of the Western youth because of the increasing university capacities and high rate of supply of graduates to the market. Social sciences students and art students did not benefit from the privileges of the enlarging market and they were critical of the unifying mentality of the ideology of consumerism.

1968 was a unique year in history on a global scale. The uprisings of students were influential from the United States to India, Eastern Europe to Latin America, and China to Western Europe, and certainly Turkey. The students shared some common feelings and sympathy with each other. Fink writes that, “They believed that their actions were linked to a global revolt against capitalism, imperialism, colonialism that

spanned the First, Second and Third Worlds,"[149] and they had a sense of shared identity. In this sense, 1968 was international and internationalist. The members of the student movements in one part of the world were interested about the members of the movements in the other parts of the world. They collected information about them and discussed their faults and successes.[150] Moreover some protests shared common agendas. For instance, students in England protested the police violence against students in France and when the prominent figure of a student movement in Federal Republic of Germany, Rudi Dutschke was assassinated, students in many countries protested this assassination.

The 1968 movement also was a spontaneous one. Cohn-Bendit said, "It all happened so fast. It didn't have time to work. The situation provoked decisions."[151] This spontaneity may be seen as a result of the world political and social context.

There were main international events which contributed to the radicalization of the university youth. For instance, the Vietnam War was the main common subject of protest, as was the reaction to US imperialism. Another important event for the radicalization of the French youth was the Algerian War.[152] Guerilla movements and the myth of Che Guevara, who was assassinated by the CIA in Bolivia, were also a main inspiration of the youth.

---

[149]C. Fink, P. Gassert and D. Junker, "Introduction," in *1968 – The World Transformed*, Fink, Carole, Gassert, Philipp and Junker ed. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-27.

[150]Tanıl Bora, "İkinci Eleme," *Birikim*, no. 109 (May 1998), p 33.

[151]Cohn Bendit as quoted in Kurlansky, p. 224.

[152]Mark Kurlansky, *1968: The Year That Rocked the World* (New York: Random House, 2005), p. 217.

Another very debated and influential event of 1968 was the Prague Spring and the Soviet invasion of this country by other countries of the Pact of Warsaw. This situation can be seen as an obstacle for the left-wing students to adopt the Soviet ideology of the period, moreover, the strength of the Maoist or Trockyst fractions in the University student movements may have been as a result of this alienation to the Soviet regime and to its satellites.

Tariq Ali argues that utopian anarchism was one of the philosophies that captured interest of the young; but 1968 mostly revived the early years of the Russian Revolution. The youth who suddenly transformed into Leninists, listened to Bob Dylan and the Rolling Stones. He writes that every activist led a double life.[153]

The media's contribution to this internationalist culture and to the interaction between the movements of different countries was great. This generation of 1968 was the first to grow up with the TV broadcasting. For instance, the French student leader, Daniel Cohn Bendit stated that they met through television. He said: "Through seeing pictures of each other on television. We were the first television generation. We did not have a relationship with each other, but we had a relationship with what our imaginations produced from seeing the pictures of each other on television." [154]

Even though the students had their own communication network it cannot be compared with the contribution of the press. Through the media they learned about the latest events in other countries. Moreover, the media, using the term "world youth," made the people aware that students were affecting each other and had common ground and interaction.

---

[153]Tariq Ali, Susan Watkins, *1968 Marching in the Streets* (London: Bloomsbury, 1998), p.12.

[154]Kurlansky, p. 224

.

Uprisings in the West may be related to the students who were not satisfied with academic life. The problems about the university life were an important motivation of these protests. But these movements transcended the scale of the University rapidly and, they focused on the problems of the capitalist system and to some extent, the bureaucratic system of the real socialist countries, especially the invasion of the Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Army and the Warsaw countries' armies. As was mentioned above, the international agenda was a central motif of their protests, especially the Vietnam War.

1968 in the West took its shape during the welfare state period and mainly attacked the effects of consumer society. It sought to raise the awareness of the people about it. Youth movements criticized the way of life that rapidly mechanized and alienated humans from social and natural life. They also protested to the technology that killed many people in the Vietnam War. They wanted the production of technology for human use rather than profit and the protection of the imperialist order. The motto of the youth was that the world had to be rebuilt anew so that it served the interests of the majority.[155]

Even though in the West the position of the youth was related closely to the problems of Western societies, 1968 created the most powerful internationalist trend of all time. It was felt that the entire world had become one and the same place. Students' criticism of the Western consumer society was side by side with their anti-imperialist attitude and there was a great sympathy and support for the demands of independence in the Third World countries. As Tanıl Bora states their internationalist position turned sometimes to the glorification of the struggles of the Third World

[155]Tariq Ali, Susan Watkins, *1968 Marching in the Streets* (London: Bloomsbury, 1998), p.8.

countries' with nationalist and anti-Western tendencies.[156] Contradictorily, these struggles were also alien to the Western youth movements as well as they thought that they were not totally emancipated from the Western imperialist culture.

The movements of 1968 were experienced differently in the Third World countries. A leading theoretician of the postcolonial movements, Frantz Fanon appealed to Third World revolutionaries not to imitate Europe, and to combine their muscles and their brains in a new direction, and to try to create the whole man, whom Europe was incapable of bringing to birth.[157] This statement was meaningful and significant for the social movements of these countries. In a period of decolonization, they contested Western imperialism, and they tried to create independent movements that were hostile to the West.

As argued by Emin Alper, the 1960s was a golden age of anti-colonialist nationalisms and anti-imperialist feelings, and the most important event was the defeat of the U.S. military forces in the Vietnam. Then, the anti-imperialist radicals of the Third World countries, a significant portion of whom were young students, in an escalating way, believed that they also could do what the Vietnamese people had done and that they could build an independent country by evicting the imperialist forces from their countries.[158] The most important difference from the Western country was this immediate struggle which might also have been an armed struggle. The counter-cultural and libertarian connotation of 1968 was often absent in the Third World countries' movements. As argued:

---

[156]Bora, p. 33.

[157]See Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967).

[158]Alper, p. 36.

> In some of these countries, 1968 started a chain of events that would lead to revolutionary situations in some countries, like Ethiopia in 1974. Many countries replied to the 1968 events with increasing authoritarianism, like Egypt, Mexico, Argentina, Congo, Brazil, and Turkey. The student protests in 1968 started the cycles of protests in many countries, which shattered the regimes and which could be suppressed only by military coups or increasing authoritarianism.[159]

Turkey's 1968 movement can be considered within the framework of the Third World countries (but Western influence was also important in the Turkish case) in which university student movements were transformed into guerilla movements and increasing authoritarianism and civil war conditions resulted in a military coup d'état régime. Turkey's specific conditions will be discussed below.

Counter-Culture Movements

Student movements in the Western countries turned into or produced counter-cultural movements against capitalism and consumer society, Western parliamentary democracy, and also "real socialisms" which made people passive puppets in the big machine of industry and bureaucracy. The point that was most stressed was autonomy and freedom in everything personal, social, and sexual. It was against all institutionalization and political goals that deprived people of using their own autonomy.[160] As discussed above, the distinctive feature of the student movements was their demand for personal and social emancipation.

According to some scholars, personal demands were more central and these people were against the morality and culture that restricted human freedom in modern

[159]Ibid., p. 93.

[160]Taner Akçam, "68'den Geriye Ne Kaldı?" *Birikim*, no. 109 (May 1998), p. 46.

societies. As a central point, personal pleasure and the will not to abandon it for the sake of society were the main motifs. Personal and social emancipation were contradicted to some extent, as against the more traditional socialist approach of the 1930s and 1940s which united these two struggles in a single one and even reduced personal emancipation to the condition of social freedom. So the protestors did not want to die for the revolution; rather, they wanted to experience it and new ways of life tried to create new ways of life immediately in communes or in everyday life. But this interpretation excluded an important part of these movements, throughout the world, especially in the Third World countries where a desire for personal emancipation and political freedom were generally replaced by social equality and national freedom.

But, even if individualism was more central in the Western countries, mainly in the USA, this may not be generalized even for these countries. For instance, the different forms of Maoism and Leninism which espoused by these countries' youth were generally defined as against bourgeois individualism. But it is plausible to say that a cultural agenda was always accompanied to this movement, by trying to redefine the intricate relationship of art, literature, culture, and politics.

This student culture provided suitable conditions in which arts and literature would be more significant. In the literary circles of the young artists, there was a search for an avant-garde and revolutionary art. Cinema or other artistic forms were also used by the movements of the youth. The anti-war movement, women's movement, hippie, beatniks and gays were the oppositional movements that were parts of the 1968 events in the West. These movements created counter-culture movements and they gave full weight to cultural activities and they benefited from cinema and

other artistic forms. In the US and European countries, but mainly, in France, there were significant counter-culture movements, similarly in literature.

First, France was a country in which avant-garde movements were very influential and these movements shared a common ground with the Communist Party and leftist ideas. As Turkish intellectuals followed the intellectual, artistic movements of this country, and they were attracted by them, it was necessary to bring about the conditions of this country. In this period, as argued by Kauppi, in France, a unique form of theoretical and political radicalism (later labeled "French theory") was forged. He writes that:

> A cultural revolution provided the background for this radicalism. This Cultural Revolution undermined the old social conventions and social relationships of authority and power (Hobsbawm 1999: 334) and created new types of intellectual identities. This development was embedded in broader social and economic transformations that affected key social institutions such as the university (Bourdieu 1984, Kauppi 1996). All parts of French society were touched by these developments. Some major transformations took place in French culture with the *nouveau roman* in literature, the new wave of French cinema, and intellectual production with radical ideas that were later labeled "French theory."[161]

In this landscape, a key journal in the aspirations of the young intellectuals was *Tel Quel*, a theoretical-literary publication.[162] In the 1960s, a significant group of thinkers gathered around the journal, among them Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, and Kristeva. In this period, another important review was *La Nouvelle Critique*[163] which

---

[161]Niilo Kauppi, *Radicalism in French Culture, a Sociology of French Theory in the 1960s* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010), p.1.

[162]*Tel Quel* journal issued four times a year, edited from the beginning (1960) by Philippe Sollers.

[163]*La Nouvelle Critique* (The New Criticism) was a magazine founded in 1948 by the French Communist Party. The philosopher Jean Kanapa was its editor. It was continued from 1967 to February 1980 by the journalist Francis Cohen. It is established to propagate analysis of the "Marxist" theory in the literary areas, by the French Communist Party. Its subtitle was "the journal of militant Marxism."

is in the direct line of the French Communist Party. The Telquelians also worked closely with communist intellectuals gathered around reviews such as *La Nouvelle Critique* and *La Pensée* (Thought)[164] During the May 68 events, most Telquelians supported the main Communist trade union, *Confédération Générale du Travail* (CGT), while a minority composed of Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida, among others, remained indifferent. *Tel Quel* succeeded at being close to the sensibilities of the students and on the side of the CGT.

During the May 68 events, Sollers openly presented himself as the representative of the Communist party and its main union, the CGT. For instance, he did not sign the Writer's Union (a writers' pressure group led by former Telquelian Jean-Pierre Faye) protest against the government's extradition of student leader Daniel Cohn-Bendit from France. After May 68 some Telquelians like Marcelin Pleynet became Maoists, although the review as a whole continued to "officially" support the Communist party until the beginning of the 1970s. [165]

Another important aspect of the members of the *Tel Quel* group is that they developed what came to be known as the *nouveau roman* (the new roman).[166] In the 1950s, the nouveau roman presented an alternative to young writers. This development was linked with broader intellectual transformations, mainly the development of the humanities and the social sciences. The nouveau roman presented an objective, "scientific" literature that functioned also as a way to tap into the

[164]*La Pensée* (Thought) was a multidisciplinary journal, founded in 1939 by communist intellectuals or supporters of the French Communist Party. Long subtitled Journal of modern rationalism, arts-sciences-philosophy, it is currently edited by Gabriel Peri Foundation.

[165]Ibid. p.13.

[166]Debates about, the *Noveau Roman* in Turkey will be determined at length in the followùng chapters. *The nouveau roman* was also introduced in Turkey by Memet Fuat's *Yeni Dergi*.

intellectual radicalism represented by Claude Lévi-Strauss and structuralism. This radicalization culminated in the events of May 68 when students and writers occupied the building of the venerated *Société des Gens de Lettres* (Society of the Men of Letters).[167]

The nouveau roman also attempted to question the roles of both the reader and the author. In the 1950s, the philosophy of the nouveau roman was called phenomenological realism, neo realism, or the school of the gaze. By admitting the independence of fiction from reality, the genre attempted to get away from literature's function as a reference (conventionalism).[168] It also made a clear distinction between political beliefs and literary praxis.[169] This distinction also was espoused by some Turkish avant-garde writers; but most of the Turkish writers did not accept it.

From the beginning of the 1960s to the beginning of the 1970s in France, the intellectual review and group *Tel Quel* provided a unique synthesis of all the major theoretical innovations of the moment. At first a literary review, *Tel Quel* quickly developed into an intellectual review and a symbol of radicalism for a whole generation of French intellectuals.[170] Between approximately 1963 and 1976, *Tel Quel* was a leftist intellectual review that published radical and innovative texts. As explained by Kauppi,

> *Tel Quel*'s ideological adventures were concordant with the ideological evolution of the part of the audience that belonged to the same age cohort as the Telquelians. First they were Communists, then Maoists, and then

[167]Ibid. p. 23.

[168]Ibid.

[169]Ibid., p. 14.

[170]Ibid. p. 17.

> apolitical. Little by little, opposition gave way to symbolic integration. The *Tel Quel* saga ended as it started: as an apolitical literary and artistic review that assembled a disparate group of thinkers and writers.[171]

In comparison with this journal, in Turkey many radical journals of the university youth followed a similar radicalization; however they did not have time to develop an apolitical stance as they were closed by the martial law or by their owners. This circle may be seen as a good example to study the relation of literature and politics in the same period, but in another country's social context.

The Situationist International circle was another artistic representation of the French alternative artistic culture of the 1968. Guy Debord and his highly popular book *The Society of Spectacle* must be mentioned. This circle tries to make a synthesis of the European avant-garde ideas and Marxism. Henri Lefebvre was also a key Marxist philosopher who had close ties with this group. The *Situationist International* rejected all art that separated itself from politics, the concept of the twentieth century art that was separated from topical political events. They believed that the notion of artistic expression being separated from politics and current events is one proliferated by reactionary considerations to render artwork that expressed comprehensive critiques of society impotent.[172] For the Situationists, 1968 was the moment that their dreams came true, because they believed that one had only to create a situation and step back and things would happen.[173]

---

[171]Ibid. p. 24.

[172]Guy Debord, *Report on the Construction of Situations and on the International Situationist Tendency's Conditions of Organization and Action* (Paris, June 1957).

[173]Kurlansky, p. 224.

In France, as a result of these counter-culture movements, a political theory which was generally known as a French critical theory was created from a multidisciplinary framework. Literary critique, sociology and psychoanalysis were main disciplines who contributed to the formation of this new theory, produced by people like Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and many others. This critical theory became influential in Turkey in the 1990s.

Second, in the U.S. and in the U.K., a counter culture movement also flourished mainly in the universities. The counter-culture movement, in the U.S. can be considered as having been a consequence of the antiwar protest against Vietnam War. Other reasons were the conflicts between generations regarding race relations, sexual mores, women's rights, traditional modes of authority, and experimentations with drugs. The American civil rights movements at the beginning of the 1960s and the Free speech movement of 1964 were also significant in the formation of a politically sensitive cultural movement.

The main elements of these cultural movements were like the formation of an alternative culture, hippie lifestyle, a sexual revolution, and the increasing use of drugs. The favorite artistic form was music which became an indispensable part of the youth culture. A social anthropologist, Jentri Anders, argues that aesthetic sense, love of nature, passion for music, desire for reflection, or strongly marked independence were characteristics of a desire to create a new culture. [174] This culture also had representations in the cinema culture. A movie, *the Graduate* (1967), and its soundtrack, *The Sound of Silence* were two of the most significant cultural symbols of

[174]See Jentri Anders, *Beyond Counterculture* (Washington: Washington State University Press, 1990).

this period. Dennis Hopper's movie *Easy Rider* (1969) represented the atmosphere of the counter-culture movements of the time.

Another important current was the Beatnik culture and its literary representations. This culture dated late 1950s, but these works were adopted by the counter culture movements of the 1960s. Allen Ginsberg's *Howl* (1956), William S. Burroughs's *Naked Lunch* (1959) and Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* (1957) are among the best known examples of the Beat literature. The works of this existentialist literary culture were also published in Turkey.

Poetry was an important instrument of the counter-culture movements in 1968. Allen Ginsberg was the most favorite of the university students, but Russian poets like Yevgeny Yevtushenko and Andrey Voznesensky also garnered huge followings among college students in the West.[175] Herman Hesse was also the most popular author of the 1968 movement. Wilfred Owen who lived in the early 1900s wrote a poem *War Requiem*. This poem written four soldiers who had been killed in the World War I, was considered as an anti war poem and Owen became popular again. Rupert Brooke, another young poet who also died in World War I was another symbolic poet of 1968.[176]

International Mobility of Authors

Competition of the Cold War

[175]Kurlansky, p. 134.

[176] Ibid.

During the nineteenth, but especially in the twentieth century, authors participated in the social and political struggles of their countries, and even in an international context, as in the case of the Spanish Civil War. The role of the intellectual in the resistence movements, like in France, has to be noted. This role of writers by participating into political and social struggles is important because of their capacities to narrate the history of the social process in both realist and fictive ways. These narratives were considered as real and romantic histories of the social struggles.

For instance, in the Spanish Civil War, many of the authors participated in the international brigades, and some died, aothers after the War produced significant novels. Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and André Malraux's famous work *Espoire* (Hope) are novels that were popular in Turkey; these novels became part of the leftist culture of Turkey.

Authors who participated into the French Resistence and who wrote the history of this struggle, like Louis Aragon in his book *Les Communistes* (the Communists), participated in political parties. Aragon was the public face of the French Communist Party, which was attractive to the Turkish writers.

This relation between authors and politics was clear in the 1960s and the 1970s. These decades may be considered the golden age of the international mobility of authors. The two camps during the Cold War separately organized literary events, competitions, symposiums, and other activities. The USSR and its allied countries established intricate relationships between authors in Western or Third World countries, figures like André Gide, Jean Paul Sartre and Albert Camus from France, and Walter Benjamin, Bertolt Brecht from Germany. They were attracted by these "real socialist" countries, but after they had visited them, especially Gide was

frustrated by these countries. The USA and other Western countries played important roles against the socialist network. They supported anti-Soviet artists, even socialists who did not appreciate the USSR's ideological line of socialism.[177]

Jean Paul Sartre and his refusal of the Nobel Prize was the most spectacular event of the 1960s. Sartre was the most popular left-wing intellectual of the decade. He also supported the counter-culture movements of the youth. He criticized the imperialism of the U.S. throughout all his life.

Meanwhile dissident Soviet intellectuals had also influential during this period. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn is widely acknowledged to have been a notable Russian intellectual, known all over the world as a Nobel Prize winner and the author of *The Gulag Archipelago*, in which he described the totalitarian governmental system of annihilating people in the USSR. During the period which has been called the "thaw", "Nonconformist" artists appeared and sought to find their way through the system.

The thaw was followed by a period of *refrost*. These artists in the USSR faced difficulties of existence. They were called "unofficial artists," and their art could not find its place in the State artistic institutions. They were supported by the West (by collectors or diplomatic members living in the USSR.) The Westerners gave recognition to these artists; they bought their works, and exhibited them.[178]

During the Cold War era, literature can be seen as having been a domain of competition between the U.S. and the USSR. Other places like China, Albania, Yugoslavia and Non-Aligned countries must also be noted. Turkish artists generally

---

[177]See Frances Stoner Saundres, *Parayı Veren Düdüğü Çaldı* (Istanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, 2004).

[178]Mathilde Chambard, Unpublished Master thesis, «L'Art non officiel soviétique de l'U.R.S.S à l'Occident de 1956 à 1986. Deux parcours : Oskar Rabine et la revue *A-Ya*.» (Grenoble: Université de Grenoble. 2010).

sided with the socialist camp. However, following the Western, leftist, critical artists, they also defended the autonomy of the artist from state institutions and political dogmas.

International Relationships of Turkey

I will briefly bring about the main events of the foreign relations of Turkey during these two decades. The most important case may have been the implementation of the U.S.-NATO's military bases in Turkey and the starting of common military activities with NATO and escalating protest movements against these events. As a result, there were massive protests against the U.S. and imperialism. The protests against the visit of the 6th fleet of the USA in İstanbul, in the 1960s were the top moment of these protests. The Cuban missile crisis of 1962 was another worldwide phenomenon of the period, before the thaw period of the 1960s; this was the last confrontation between U.S. and USSR.

In the 1970s, the letter of Johnson[179] and the Cyprus crisis were the most important international cases in which Turkish politics and the Turkish society were significantly influenced. Another important event was the 1973 petrol crisis which had direct effects on Turkish economic and social life. In this process, the Arab countries were discovered by the Turkish political and intellectual elites. The ban of opium was another important event by which the peasantry was influenced directly, and the misery of peasantry cultivating opium and tobacco were reflected in the literature.

[179]The letter of U.S. president Johnson sent to the Turkish prime minister İsmet İnönü in 5 June 1964.

Another important event was the attacks of the Armenian terror organization ASALA (1975) which was founded in 1973, on Turkish targets. The Armenian problem continued to be one of the taboos during those decades.

These international events were reflected directly in the artistic production and were topics of debates in the literature of the era. For instance, the consequences of the economic crisis such as the black market, and long queues to buy basic goods, were represented at length in the novels. These direct influences within international context discussed in the previous sections help to understand the context in which art and literature were produced.

CHAPTER THREE

TURKEY BETWEEN 1960 AND 1980

In this part, I will describe the main political and economic developments, and ideological and social circumstances during the 1960s and 1970s, in Turkey. In this time period, I will present an overview of a societal culture in which, after the foundation of the Republic, many different cultural transformations took place. I focused first on the international context, I will now depict the political, ideological and social conditions of Turkey.

Turkey's population increased throughout the Republican era, including the 1960s and 1970s by a high rate of 3 percent every year. As is well known, Europe had already completed its transition from an agricultural, rural society to an urban one by the twentieth century. Turkey, on the other hand, was in an unbalanced process of urbanization in the period under discussion. The emergence of new cities lead to an immense emigration during the 1950s and 1960s.

This great move in population meant drastic changes in the social and economic life of cities like Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir as they became more and more populated. Istanbul had a population of 770,000, in the 1950s, reached 1.5 million by the 1960s. The percentage of urban population increased from a 18.5 in 1950 to 33.4 in 1970, when total population was 35,666,549. This rapid increase continued and at the end of 1970s, the urban and rural populations became equal. In 1965, the percentage of the population occupied with agriculture was 75 percent of the total working population. But in the 1980, as a result of the rapid industrialization and the urbanization, this proportion was completely changed and decreased to fifty percent.

In 1971, the proportion of the peasant to urban population was 52 percent rural population to 48 percent urban. In 1971, sixty percent of Turkish society was illiterate. The first time that the urban population went beyond to the rural population was in 1980.

Immigration to European countries, especially to Germany, was one of the main socio-economic events of the day. 20 July 1972 was the day that the 500.000th worker immigrated to Germany. The industrial and general economic production on the national scale was not sufficient to meet the needs of the rapidly increasing population of Turkey. This phenomenon of the interior migration and emigration and its consequences in the peripheries of the urban center was a significant topic of literature during these decades.

As a part of the creation of societal cultures, the Republican elites in Turkey had the desire to create a synthetic society in which a civil culture could develop gradually. This development of a public sphere also was accompanied by the development of the artistic and literary world. As Kemal Karpat writes by 1960, the age-old process of the creation of a truly civilian society, entered its last and decisive phase.[180] The Second Republic, a conceptualization made by some historians to identify this new era, began as a completely new phase during which a plural and political life was fulfilled. Specifically, it might be noted that the 1960s commenced and ended with two military coups, namely those of 27 May 1960 and of 12 March 1971.

[180]See Kemal H. Karpat, *Turkey's Politics; the Transition to a Multi-Party System* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1959).

After the coup d'état of 27 May 1960, in January 1961, a constitutional assembly was established that started to prepare a new constitution. The main goal of this new constitution, as a result of the lesson drawn from the DP era, was to "control the assembly." However, the constitution of 1961 intensified the division of powers and guaranteed fundamental human rights and freedoms.

According to this new constitution, new institutions like the senate of the Republic and the independent Constitutional Court were established; the new constitution also granted autonomy to the press and the judicial authority and universities. Fundamental rights and liberties were defined more extensively in this constitution than in the previous and following constitutions. The document was submitted to a plebiscite and it was approved by 61 percent against 38 percent. However, this high proportion of denial vote was interpreted like the protest against the overthrow of the DP government.

In January 13, 1961, the bans on political activities were lifted, and ten new political parties were founded in addition to the RPP and RNPP (Republican Nation and Peasant Party- *Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi*). The most important of these parties was the JP (Justice Party –*Adalet Partisi*) which can be seen as the continuation of the DP. The first elections after the coup were held on 15 October 1961. In this election RPP won 34.7 percent of the votes and 158 deputies, and JP's rate was 36.7 percent and it gained 173 deputies.[181]

After the coup, another important change was the foundation of a socialist labor party on 13 February 1961. The TLP (Turkish Labor Party) was founded by a

[181]Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003), p. 359. For deputies numbers, *Gençler için Çağdaş Tarih*, ed. Ahmet Kuyaş (İstanbul: Epsilon Yayınevi, 2004), p. 315. For all other election results, I used the same sources.

group of labor union members. After a year of inactivity, the founders invited Marxist lawyer Mehmet Ali Aybar to become the leader of the party. Following Aybar, several other Marxist intellectuals also joined the ranks and the party soon adopted a Marxist programme. The party's breakthrough came in 1965 when it obtained three percent of the votes in the national elections and won 15 seats in the parliament. The TLP deputies' highly active participation in the parliamentary sessions contributed to a radicalization of the political scene in the country. These debates also were reflected to the press.

The TLP's entrance into the National Assembly was an important milestone and a unique phenomenon in modern Turkish politics. The TLP's insistence on the use of parliamentary and constitutional means to come to power was its distinctive feature; and it was this characteristic that distinguished the party from the other main organizations and movements of the Turkish left in the 1960s. TLP was considered to be a symbol of the 1960s ideological representation and it will be discussed at length below.

The proportional representation system that was used in the 1961 elections (in this new election system, the total vote of a party obtained throughout the country, allowed it to send a representative to the parliament) increased the number of the party represented in the parliament. For this reason, instead of a one party government, the RPP and JP coalition governments' period was started in November 1961 under the leadership of İnönü. This coalition did not continue very long and in May 1962 a new coalition was founded by the RPP, CKMP (RNPP) and YTP (New Turkey Party-*Yeni*

Türkiye Partisi). In November 1963, the JP won an undeniable victory in the municipal elections, and this led to a fall of the coalition government.[182]

After the resignation of İsmet İnönü government, there were always problems making up a government and in the 10 October 1965, JP won the new elections. The results of the November 1965 elections was very significant victory of the right, JP gained 52.9 percent of the votes and 240 deputies, RPP, 28.7 percent and 134 deputies, National Party (*Millet Partisi*) 6.3 percent and 31 deputies, New Turkey Party (*Yeni Türkiye Partisi*) 3.7 percent, and 19 deputies, CKMP (RPNP) 2.4 percent of the votes and 11 deputies. On the other hand, under the leadership of Mehmet Ali Aybar, the TLP won 3 percent of the votes and 15 deputies.

In the 1965 elections, the RPP propagated a new policy, stressing on social justice and social security, led by Bülent Ecevit. Ecevit's new policy, "the left of center" was planned to appeal to the public. This new policy in the beginning was prepared with the support of the national chef İsmet İnönü, the "left of center" policy, the new formation of the left-wing hand of the RPP started or tended to be part of an ideological competition with the TLP which was a newly established but ideologically influential socialist party among the young students. This new policy will be explained detail in the following sections. This policy did not work successfully in the politics of the 1960s, but in the 1970s it brought unprecedented success under the leadership of Bülent Ecevit.

Bülent Ecevit was selected in 1966 to be the party's general secretary with the support of İsmet İnönü. Ecevit aimed to appeal to the people living in shanty towns

[182]The result of the elections, JP 45.87 percent, RPP 36.97 percent, YTP 6.51 percent, CKMP 2.81 percent, MP 3.1 percent, TLP 0.38 percent and independents 4.3 percent votes. Source: http://www.yerelnet.org.tr/secimler/secim_analizleri1963.php.

(gecekondus) who moved recently from their villages to the cities and were about to become gradually part of the working class. Demirel declared this new policy to be communist propaganda and the popular slogan “the left of center is the way of Moscow” was adopted by the right-wing politics. With the fiasco of RPP in the 1965 elections, the “left of center” policy was criticized within the RPP and it led to a deep division in the party.

The JP’s leader, Süleyman Demirel became a very important public figure of the Turkish right-wing politics after the 1965 elections. Although the 12 October 1969 elections results were a small decrease for the JP votes, this right wing party under the leadership of Demirel became dominant. The election results were JP, 46 percent votes and 256 deputies; and the RPP 27.4 percent with 143 deputies. Other parties deputies numbers were: GP (Republican Trust Party) 15, TBP (Unity Party of Turkey) 8, YTP (New Turkey Party), MP (National Party) and the MHP (National Action Party - *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*) 6, TLP 2 and 13 independent deputies in the parliament. At the end of the 1960s, University student movements became more influential, and increasing left-wing youth movements faced with the reaction of the state institutions.

The 12 March 1971 Military Intervention marked an important turning point in Turkish politics on the justification of the rising political violence, the army gave a memorandum to the prime minister Demirel on 12 March 1971. Demirel resigned immediately, and a right-wing cabinet of technocrats from outside of political parties directed by Nihat Erim was brought in to govern. This new government claimed to provide public order and to make socio-economic reforms. Atilla Karaosmanoğlu, a technocrat who had before worked in the World Bank, prepared an economic reform

program including land reform, agricultural taxational, nationalization of mining industry, and protective measures. This program was accepted in the parliament.

In April 1971, martial law was declared including all major cities in 11 provinces and the hunt for the leftist militants was immediately started. Many intellectuals, many managers and trade unionists close to the TLP, nearly 5000 people were arrested. The main goal was clearly the suppression of the Left. The TLP was closed in July 1971, and Necmettin Erbakan's MNP in May 1972, and he later founded the National Salvation Party (*Milli Selamet Partisi* - MSP). The MHP and Nationalists were not arrested. In this period, Ecevit started to win more and more power in the RPP and, in the May 1972 party conference, he came to power.

The Erim government gradually restricted political and individual freedoms. In a military atmosphere, they governed the country with restrictive decrees and hard pressure. In April 1972, the government resigned and Ferit Melen became the new president. These military-oriented governments were criticized by the RPP, but Demirel maintained a compromising relation with them. In 1973, the civil politics footsteps were felt and instead of the candidate of the army Faruk Gürler, Fahri Korutürk was elected.

After the coup d'état, the first free elections were held on 14 October 1973. The elections results were: RPP voted by 33.5 percent of the electorate and 185 deputies, and JP 29.5 percent (a decline of 15 percent compared to 1969) with only 149 deputies. Other results were National Salvation Party, 45 deputies, Democratic Party 45; Republican Trust Party 13; MHP 6; Unionist Party 3; and an independent deputy in the Parliament. With these elections, a new period of coalitions was started.

After long negotiations, prime minister Ecevit's coalition was established in January 1974, between the RPP and the MSP. Raising ban on opium cultivation and Turkey's intervention on the Cyprus, in the 26 July 1974 made Ecevit very popular. Because of the problems of the coalition government, Ecevit, on 16 September 1974, resigned. He was unable to realize early elections, because Demirel's AP founded the Nationalist Front government with the MSP, MHP, CGP, and DP as a coalition of all of the powers of the right. The first National Front (MC) government continued until the elections of 1977. Although there was growing political violence and economic crisis in the period before the 5 June 1977 elections, it resulted in the significant success of the RPP. According to the election results, the highest rating of the RPP was 41.4 percent of the votes and 213 deputies. The JP, by increasing the percentage of the votes in the previous elections with 189 deputies dropped to 36.9 percent. In the rest of the composition of the Assembly, there were 24 deputies of the MSP, 16 of the MHP, 3 of the CGP, and 1 of the DP and 4 independent deputies. Ecevit's RPP established a cabinet with independent deputies transferred from the right, in January 1978, but this government lasted only until the end of the January 1978. After the massacre in Maraş, the government introduced a partial martial law in the country.

As a result of the rising political violence (the incidents of the first May 1977, the Maraş massacres in 1 February 1979, the assassinatios of Abdi İpekçi, editor of *Milliyet* journal; Gün Sazak, Deputy and General Secretary of the MHP in May 1980; and former prime minister Nihat Erim, and Kemal Türkler [the former head of DİSK] in July 1980, and by the harsh opposition of Demirel against Ecevit's government, the government was forced to resign in October 1979. After his resignation, Demirel

constituted two “national” governments. The National Front governments supported directly or indirectly, right-wing circles against the leftist organizations of the period.

Before the coup d’état of 1980, the area of civil politics gradually weakened and a civil war atmosphere was emerged after 1978. The parliament fell into a crisis. For instance, the presidential elections were repeated 100 times and the results were always inconclusive. The economy toppled into a severe recession.

Authors were always interested in the political process and satirized its conflicts and absurdities. Aziz Nesin’s famous work *Zübük* was a satiric narration of the world of politicians. A pluralist political democracy led to the formation of new political characters who assumed that they were pragmatist and corrupted. A possible corrupted political person was always criticized from the world of writers.

Economic Model of the Period: Import Substitution Industrialization, 1960-1980

Intellectuals and state officers and bureaucrats, with the intention of supporting a social policy, and for the sake of creating political equilibrium and a more coherent administrative mechanism, proposed a new model of accumulation in the 1960s. They applied this model to the country with the help of the 1961 constitution and by the military support. During this period, countries with similar economic conditions used similar formula. This is called Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI). The distinctive feature of ISI was the production of manufactured goods in the country which had previously been imported from foreign countries. This model was applicable with the help of customs protection of domestic industry.

Another distinctive feature was the concept of planning. The State Planning Organization was established in September 1960, and its plans on economic and social issues were prepared by foreign consultants. It can be considered a turning point in the economic history of Turkey. First, starting in 1963, with three five-year plans, public investments and private investments were programmed in a very detailed way. This period of development as a form of protectionism provided the protection of the domestic market from the effects of foreign trade. The state provided formation of domestic industry in basically three ways: by applying heavy import restrictions and high customs tariffs, by intervening into the exchange rates, and by high wage policies and a policy of agricultural support.

During the period, the context of industrialization, as the distribution of investments, and the priority of the sectors changed drastically compared to the previous periods. This period was marked by the industrial sector, by the production of "durable goods" like refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, televisions, kitchen and household items. In this industry, technology was imported initially and continued to be dependent in terms of basic inputs to foreign countries.

The new target of durable consumer goods in these decades was the working classes in the cities and farmers who had relatively a high level of prosperity in the villages. This industry was completely designed for the needs of the import substitution system. For instance, the contribution of the public sector, especially iron-steel, copper, aluminum, chemical and petro-chemical construction, such as basic and intermediate goods, was significant. The public sector produced these goods to provide the input requirements, in a cheaper way than private industry and the agricultural production was provided very cheaply in the cities due to the support of

the state to the farmers. This created a significant relationship of interdependence between these sectors.

Another feature of the economics of this period was the populist policies, like the redistribution of sources. One aspect of this process was the increasing purchasing power because of the application of high-wage policies. Between 1964 and 1978, average wages increased two-fold. A high growth of national product was performed in these years. The average annual growth rate was 6.6 percent for all of the 1962-1976 period. The industrial sector contributed more than agriculture. The most dramatic development was that the services sector recorded excessive increase. During this period, there were two important turning points: One was the big devaluation which was done on 10 August 1970; the other was the world oil crisis of 1974, which led to an economic crisis that continued for many years.

The crisis of the inward-looking, export-dependent, interventionist, and populist model could be observed clearly in the period between 1977 and 1979. In 1977, foreign trade indicators were strongly distorted and all channels of credit were blocked. Meanwhile, Ecevit's RPP came to power, and did not accept the IMF agreement that proposed not to control prices, and to abolish wage and agricultural subsidies. They could not find solutions to alleviate the import bottlenecks and confusion in the market.

As a result, oil and gasoline shortages and the black market became the reality of the day. The rise in the general level of prices of goods and services was 53 percent in 1978, and increased to 64 percent in 1979. It was impossible to solve the problems, despite the devaluation and other economic measures taken by the government in

February 1978 and in June 1979. In a symbolic speech, Demirel in 1979 said "we need even 70 cents" and admitted that economy was in a real crisis.

The end of the ISI period may be marked by the decisions formulated by Turgut Özal in 1979. This plan reflected the wishes of the IMF on 24 January 1980. The implementation of the economic occurred after the September 12 coup, because this plan could not be implemented in an atmosphere of an average of 190 strikes per year between 1977 and 1980. These strikes had a total cost of 3.7 million working days lost.

Emin Alper writes that the ISI model became the main one for Latin America and for the independent part of the non-Western countries after the Second World War, with the consent of the U.S. There were however differences between the different countries.[183] In some countries in which the nationalist, bureaucratic elites were powerful, this project was realized in a more conservative way, like in Turkey. But in others, there emerged also a radical bloc of nationalist leftists and communists who considered the ISI model a transitional model for a non-capitalist way of development, and later socialism.

In these countries, they thought that to take one step further than the generally accepted reforms and to nationalize all foreign companies, foreign trade and big industries, to achieve a radical land reform, and to create a self-sufficient economy developing with its own resources was sufficient to start the way of non-capitalist development, the first step of socialist transformation. However, the conservative bloc

[183]Alper, p. 123.

just took ISI as a technical model for a temporary stage to integrate the economies of the peripheries to the world market, like in Turkey.[184]

The ISI model also was interrelated to another economic and social reality of Turkey. The workers who immigrated to Germany were important suppliers of foreign exchange that the industry needed to export technology which was dependent in terms of basic inputs to foreign countries. Immigration led to many economic and social transformations which have been represented in the artistic productions.

The ISI model was an integral part of the world and Turkey's economy until the 1980s. The consequences of these economic transformations were all largely reflected in the realm of the literature. This new economic model and its consequences produced conflicts between different classes and motivating new life styles, and helping to create a new industry of popular culture. This model of economy was generally defined by many scholars as Taha Parla[185] and Çağlar Keyder, as a solidarist, corporatist model.

This model's direct or indirect consequences were described in the novels and short-stories. For example, social realist or dissident literature reflected the social inequalities as a result of this model. The social consequences of this model, like the inflation and the economic crisis were criticized, reflected and the social struggles were also described to some extent in the works of art. Realist and modernist works of art reflected many faces of this economic transformation. Internal migrations, emigration to European countries, rapid urbanization, and the difficult conditions in the shanty towns were represented in the realist novels; and urban life centered

[184]Ibid., p. 96.

[185]See Taha Parla, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatrizm* (Istanbul: Deniz Yayıncılık, 2009).

problems were also depicted in the modernist novels. For instance, the changes in the lives of the ordinary people with the use of durable consumer goods, and foreign automobiles and people's desire to buy these new cars were represented. Adalet Ağaoğlu's novel *Fikrimin İnce Gülü* (1976) tells the tragic story of a migrant worker returning to his country with his own beautiful, yellow car. This story was also adapted to the cinema in a movie called *Sarı Mersedes* (Yellow Mercedes) by Tunç Okan, in 1992.

The Ideological Framework and its Social Dimensions

The military coup of 1960 and the constitution of 1961 opened a new era, one of cultural and political debates. The turning point in the changing ideological climate, after the coup d'état, was related in general to the new constitution.

The main characteristic of the constitution was the aim to limit the executive and legislative power of the governments, and distributing this power to other bodies. The parliament was divided into two houses. A constitutional court was established in order to control the correctitude of the laws to the constitution. The majority system in the elections was changed to a proportional system, to prevent any political party from gaining an open majority in the parliament. The two house character of the parliament limited the effect of the government on the legislation. Consequently, the political regime of the constitution was sought to prevent the possibility of the former authoritarian administration.

Another distinctive feature of the 1961 constitution was that it involved basic rights and freedoms. For the constitution, democratic life was not limited only to free,

fair and regular elections. The constitution recognized basic freedoms and rights as it was the case in the Western countries. The freedom of speech, freedom of the press and autonomy of the universities were traces of the reaction to the former totalitarianism.

Ahmet İnsel argues that the agency behind the 1960s military coup sought to change the previous choices of the ideological and political system:

> The powers behind the 27 May coup d'état had a desire to realize and to implant as soon as possible the economic, social and political institutions of the West in Turkey as a model of civilization. They preferred the unitary, centralist model of democracy, mainly the model of France instead of the model trying to make Turkey like a little USA and which had symbolized in the DP tradition. [186]

Thus, one of the main ideological themes of the period was the ideology of modernization, and this ideology was produced by the Kemalist bureaucratic elites aiming at the rapid development of the country. Intellectuals who were affected by developmentalist and modernist ideas did not position themselves in opposition to the Kemalist and Republican ideals of the early Republican period. Many Turkish intellectuals believed that Kemalism was the foundation for Turkish modernization; hence they tried to transcend Kemalist ideology by relying on a vision that was at once populist and modernist and which aimed at a more egalitarian, free, and economically independent, self-sufficient society.

A bureaucratic tendency or hegemony was the reality of the period as a result of the planning economy and the belief of the superiority of these well-educated

---

[186]"*27 Mayıs'ı gerçekleştiren güçlerin taşıdığı bir özlem de vardı: Cumhuriyet'i kuran kuşağın çağdaşlaşmanın örnek ülkeleri olarak benimsediği kıta Avrupa'sının iktisadi, sosyal ve siyasal kurumlarını bir an önce Türkiye'de gerçekleştirmek. DP geleneğini temsil eden Türkiye'yi küçük Amerika yapmak fikrine karşı, 27 Mayıs hareketinin muassır medeniyet örneği, özellikle Fransa'da yürürlükte olan merkeziyetçi, üniter demokrasi modeliydi."*Ahmet İnsel, "Demokrasinin Sancılı Yılları," in *Cumhuriyet'in 75 Yılı*, vol: II, (Istanbul: YKY yayınları, 1998), pp. 476, 478.

pioneers. The most important instrument of these intellectuals, *Yön* journal, will be discussed as it was the main forum for this political approach.

According to Doğan Kuban, in 1974, there were four or five currents of thought in Turkey: Islamism, which had deep-rooted origins; Marxism, with all of its branches; Panturkism which had developed in the era of Sultan Abdülhamit in form of ultra nationalism; and humanism which had been adopted from the West and, finally Kemalism.[187] Kemalism and its constitutive ideology of Nationalism and its transformation into an anti imperialistic culture, or in other words, redefinition in a leftist framework will be analyzed first. Then, I will try to bring about the formation of leftist politics with it relations to humanism which was brought with the Kemalist ideology. Islamist and nationalistic ideologies will not be discussed at length because of their limited influences on the literary world.

The Nationalism and Solidarity of the Oppressed Nations

First of all, the debate over the modernization of the society without leading to a collapse of national identity coincided with an anti-imperialistic emphasis brought on the scene by the leftist political discourse of the time. This discourse was shaped by such factors as the then ongoing process of decolonization, the disputes over the precise nature and import of theory of the Asiatic mode of production, the influential Non-Aligned Movement of the Third World countries, and the Chinese Cultural

[187]Doğan Kuban, *Yeni Ufuklar Dergisi*, no. 253 (October 1974), p. 11.

Revolution. International developments like the conflicts in the Cold War, the rise of Third Worldism, and the world-wide reaction against the Vietnam War were influential in Turkey as in other parts of the world.

Concerning Turkey, the basic ideological and philosophical influences of these debates can be outlined. Third Worldism may be seen as a significant ideological base of the decade. For instance, the rise of Third World countries and Third Worldism as an ideology with an independent model of industrialization significantly affected Turkish intellectuals and some of the Kemalist elite in the sixties. The rise of anti-imperialist sentiment in the world encouraged them to question the submissive attitude of Turkey toward the US, which had lasted throughout the 1950s.[188]

It is argued that nationalism in Turkey substituted religion as an important power.[189] However, between 1960 and 1980, nationalism lost its hegemonic power, or was redefined in different ideological contexts. For instance, the left espoused the Kemalism as necessary ground for its existence, especially in the 1960s. The international sensitivities of the left changed the nationalism's position to be predominant to all other ideologies, to some extent.[190]

It is necessary to bring about the anti-imperialistic discourse by the example of a declaration of the 4 May 1968, criticizing the US intervention in Vietnam by the students associations like *FKF* (*Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu*, Federation of Thought Clubs), *Talebe Cemiyetleri* (Association of Students), that were supported by other

---

[188]Alper, p. 45.

[189]Herkül Milas, "Milli Türk Kimliği ve Öteki, Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Milliyetçilik* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2002), p. 200.

[190]See Tanıl Bora, "Introduction," *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Milliyetçilik* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2002).

social organizations. In this discourse, an internationalist message of solidarity was declared by comparing these anti-colonialist struggles to the Turkish War of Independence. Their anti-imperialism was more than nationalism, and an internationalist concern of solidarity of the oppressed countries was clear.

However, the anti-imperialistic element in these movements also encompassed a critical approach to western values and ideals, which were seen as products of the imperialist world system, the imperial heritage of the Ottoman Empire, and the Republic's model of modernization. These seen as presented obstacles for intellectuals in adopting an anti-colonialist discourse as such a discourse naturally problematizes the western cultural and political tradition. Kemalism and its model of civilization grounded itself on the values of Western civilization and hence took the realization of these in Turkey as its principal task. This alignment with the West on the part of the Kemalists was a pervasive feature of their political perspective. This attitude also can be seen as the result of their political choices:

> The republican elite had inherited an imperial past altered into a narcissistic nationalism that stayed foreign to the Indian cause or the Third World in general. They proposed that Turkey set an example for the Third World countries in the creation of an independent state, but thus at the same time also imagined themselves as above other Third World countries, closer to Western countries and only slightly less developed than they. It is no wonder that while sending troops to Korea in return for being a NATO member, Turkish politicians never tried to participate in the Bandung Conference of 1955.[191]

Therefore, their modernist tendencies prevented these intellectuals to some extent from adopting the extreme anti-Western, anti-colonial and populist perspective that prevailed in the Third World countries. Then, by clinging to the imperial heritage of the country and to the Western culture as the epitome of civilization, Turkish

[191]Savaş Arslan, *Hollywood Alla Turca* Ph.D. Diss. (Ohio State University, 2005), p. 58.

intellectuals put themselves into a very complex situation, enveloping many contradictions.

In this era, the key political concepts were being redefined. The 1960s and early 1970s was a period in which the intellectuals, who generally had been accustomed to thinking in a more solitary vein until then, began to engage themselves more in broader political and social issues. This intermingling of elitist, populist, nationalist, and internationalist aspects that can be seen in different approaches, was possibly on the basis of a common agenda that had been solidarist before and increasingly socialist in a broad sense. The modernist hegemony was in the process of adapting itself to the populist and socialist approaches, that is, of incorporating these. The paradigm of modernity, as an experience of westernization and modernization, came to be more seriously contemplated. The state lost its monopoly on the circulation of these ideas as they became the objects of public discussion.

The nationalist or conservative line is also a significant expression of an opposition in the social and cultural sphere which took various forms. Ultra-nationalist and religious movements are the basic political representatives of the opposition to the modernist tendencies. Nationalists and conservatives focused on the issues of identity, of national culture in general, with an emphasis on the particularities of Turkey and its internal dynamics whereas the modernists sided with universal values, and identified broadly within the parameters of the western idea of progress. Modernist intellectuals, with their emphasis on social progress and economic development, represented a more influential or dominant axis. In this work, this modernist attempt of the 1960s and the early 1970s will be considered as a phase of the Turkish modernization movement and will be evaluated as a comparatively democratic, participatory historical period, and

its relative success amidst the fierce state opposition that incessantly sought to suppress these attempts will be emphasized.

These attempts on the part of state were given an institutional footing with the coup d'état regimes of 1971 and 1980. The military intervention of 12 March 1971, however, did not put a complete end to the political struggles or conflicts. In the late 1970s, the radical student and worker movements of the late 1960s were transformed into a deeper polarization throughout the country, which led to what was nearly a civil war between the extreme nationalist political powers and radical leftist groups. It was only in the 1980s that this struggle lost its power after the blow of the military coup of 12 September 1980 and the beginning of the neo-liberal period.

All of these ideological tensions also were reflected in realm of literature. The tenisons between nationalist and internationalist intentions, and populist and elitist attitudes will be discussed below.

The Foundation of the Left Politics and Thoughts in Turkey

Cahit Kayra writes that, "My generation got to know Left Doctrine and Leftist politics after the age of forty. We were brought up as nationalists and statists."[192] Leftist thought became suddenly dominant after 1960. In this process, intellectuals, artists and their productions, and the periodicals in which they discussed matters, played important roles in the formation of the leftist politics. As will be discussed below, this leftist culture was absolutely influential on the literary and artistic world.

[192] "*Benim kusağım, Sol Doktrini ve Solculugu kırk yasından sonra öğrendi. Bizler milliyetçi ve devletçi olarak yetistirildik.*" Cahit Kayra, *38 Kusağı: Anılar* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002), p.316.

In the formation of the leftist culture, intellectuals and their political and artistic reviews had central roles. In the shaping of the intellectual life, the function of the *Forum* and *Akis* magazines on intellectual atmosphere of the 1950s and 1960s can not be underestimated. But *Yön*, *Devrim*, and *Ant* in 1960s were also very important political reviews in which there were always pages concerning developments on the cultural and artistic agenda. These reviews were all leftist and were published by a large number of leftist intellectuals. In these political reviews a political program was shaped. Çetin Altan, Sadun Aren, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Mehmet Ali Aybar, Mihri Belli, Niyazi Berkes, Pertev Boratav, Behice Boran, Sencer Divitçioğlu, Selahattin Hilav, Abdi İpekçi, Mehmet Kaplan, İdris Küçükömer, Sıddık Sami Onar, Tarık Zafer Tunaya, were very significant intellectuals in the intellectual climate and the formation of the new political tendencies. In the next part, I will discuss these periodicals, intellectuals, and parties, and the organization they established, supported and in which they participated.

Yön (Direction) Magazine and the Association of Socialist Culture

Yön magazine was an important common venue for leftist intellectuals, starting with December 20, 1961. *Yön* magazine under the leadership of Doğan Avcıoğlu, defended rapid industrialization with social justice, the elimination of the feudal relationships, land reform, state intervention in the economy and an anti-imperialist stance, mainly against the USA. It was published for five and a half years and during this period in the leadership of Doğan Avcıoğlu. A study about Ankara University students in 1962 showed that by a rate of 40.4 percent, *Yön* was the most popular

periodical among university student leaders.[193] Its circulation increased to 30,000 at the beginning, but by 1965, it was printed of only 6000 or 7000 copies.

Rapid economic development was one of the leading statements of the *Yön* circle. Etatism and state interventionism were defended by the circle of *Yön*.

The journal's significance for our subject was its pages concerning the cultural subjects and events, which were prepared by the notable intellectuals like Fethi Naci and Konur Ertop. *Yön* magazine was the first to publish Nazım Hikmet's many poems in 1964 and in 1965. This is credited to the acknowledgement of Hikmet and accordingly socialist ideas.

The Association of Socialist Culture (*Sosyalist Kültür Derneği*) deserves mention. The planners who resigned from the State Planning Organization established this association with other significant left-wing intellectuals.[194]

This association represented the developmentalist, modernist tendencies of the intellectuals. With many other associations, many people began to have sympathy to socialism by separating it from the Soviet type communism. The legitimate ones were the European type socialism and the Third World socialism based on postcolonial era struggles of independence. This association reflected the intellectuals' relative autonomy from the state and engagement to alternative political visions.

---

[193]Quoted in Jacob M. Landau, *Radical Politics in Modern Turkey* (Jerusalem Academic Press, Leiden, 1974; Özer Ozankaya, *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Siyasal Yönelimleri* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1966), p. 35.

[194]Mümtaz Soysal "Sosyalist Kültür Derneği," *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi* Vol. 8, (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986), p. 2022.

Türkiye İşçi Partisi (Turkish Labor Party)

After the coup, another important change was the foundation of a socialist labor party on 13 February 1961. The Turkish Labor Party was founded by a group of labor union member, by twelve trade unionists in Istanbul as a consequence of the emerging working class, and the movement of trade unions. In the beginning, the party was clearly pro-worker (*ouvriériste*), but in 1962, associate professor Mehmet Ali Aybar became the head of the party and he brought together the unionist and socialist intellectuals in the same organization. Following Aybar, several other Marxist intellectuals joined the ranks and the party soon adopted a Marxist programme. The party rapidly was transformed and organized as a modern socialist party.

The TLP was always subjected to pressure and political violence from the right. The party meetings and congresses were attacked by conservatives in such places as Akhisar and Bursa. Up to the 1965 elections, the TLP was unable to hold local organizations in all provinces. However, the radio speeches of the party in the election campaign made the party known to the public. The language of the party was very different from that of the other parties. Social justice was the essential subject of the party discourse. As mentioned, the party's relative success came in 1965 when it received 3 percent of the votes in the national elections and won fifteen seats in the parliament. The TLP deputies' highly publicized, active participation in parliamentary sessions contributed to a radicalization of the political scene throughout the country.

The TLP's entrance into the National Assembly was an important milestone and a unique phenomenon in modern Turkish politics. The TLP's insistence on the use

of parliamentary and constitutional means to come to power was its distinctive feature; and it was this characteristic that distinguished the party from other main organizations and movements of the Turkish left in the 1960s. The TLP was considered to be the symbol of the 1960s ideological world.

Consequently, in the early stages of the party, its pro-worker character prevented the party from becoming influential, but the party escaped from this with the leadership of Aybar. The most important success of the TLP was not electoral but its ideological agenda which changed the previous ideologically ambigious Turkish politics. The program of the TLP was a synthesis of a populist, radical, Kemalist, nationalist, and socialist ideas.[195]

After the transformation of the Workers' Party by Aybar and other intellectuals, the TLP immediately became a center of attraction among intellectuals. Behice Boran and Sadun Aren were other intellectual figures of the party. They had conflicts after the invasion of the Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and Aybar resigned and Behice Boran continued to determine the ideological line of the party.

TLP was a very influential organization among intellectuals, artists and literary people. Fethi Naci, Şükran Yurdakul, Ferit Edgü, Yaşar Kemal, Fakir Baykurt, Leyla Erbil and Demir Özlü were some of these writers. The TLP's circle of intellectuals and artists are discussed below.

[195]Artun Ünsal, *Umuttan Yalnızlığa Türkiye İşçi Partisi 1961 – 1971* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yurt Yayınları, 2002).

The RPP's Left of Center Discourse

When discussing the late 1960s and 1970s, the transformation of the Republican's People Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*), the work of Bülent Ecevit *Ortanın Solu* (left of center) must be discussed. This policy can not be considered to have been like the realization of the social democracy of Western Europe in Turkey. The social democracy of Western Europe and the RPP's left of center had clearly dissimilar features; moreover, in many aspects, they had exactly contrary perceptions. Yunus Emre writes that,

> The left of center emerged as re-production of Kemalism in the conditions of 1960s' Turkey. This re-production was realized via the hegemonic views of the 1960s, nationalism and developmentalism. Thus the link between the left politics and Kemalism that was socially and culturally constructed was called left of center in terms of a special blend that was peculiar to the 1960s.[196]

The clashes between the Kemalist elite were also important during the 1960s. It may be necessary to remember that the DP elite were also part of the RPP in Turkey until 1945.[197] The new clashes between Kemalist elite in the 1960s were visible after the left of center positioning of the RPP. The term of "left of center" was first used by İsmet İnönü before the 1965 elections, but just after the 1965 elections, the RPP gave it up. As Yunus Emre writes,

> This demonstrated the pseudo-importance of standing on the left of center for the RPP. However, the formation of two groups as the supporters and opponents of the left of center soon revived the term "left of center." The struggle was at its peak between 1965 and 1967. And İsmet İnönü's open support of the supporters of the left of center that were led by Bülent Ecevit

[196]Yunus Emre,"The Genesis of The Left of Center in Turkey: 1965-1967," Master Thesis (Bogazici University Istanbul: 2007).

[197]Emre Kongar, *İmparatorluktan Günümüze Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Yapısı* (Remzi Kitabevi, Istanbul: 1997), p. 470.

> changed the inner-party balance, and left of center became the official party policy.[198]

The working class was more visible after the events of 15 and 16 June 1970. The RPP became more engaged in working class politics after 1970. The election of 1973 and the success of the left of center were significant in the transformation of the Turkish politics, even a turning point. According to Kongar, instead of the Kemalist, statist front, a popular leftist front had been established by the success of the left of center policy of the RPP. Building a left-wing coalition between the Kemalists and the urban poor and landless peasants became a prevalent strategy for the 27 May coalition.[199] This strategy could not be achieved, but in the 1970s, Turkish politics consisted of many leftist political organizations and strategies.

Bülent Ecevit's close relationship[200] with literature and authors must be noted. Left-wing Kemalist artists supported his left of center policies. Intellectuals like Sabahattin Eyuboğlu and Haldun Taner who also supported the TLP during the 1960s supported Ecevit's RPP in the 1970s, by arguing that even if the RPP did not completely represent its political vision, it had to support the RPP, because of its role against the right-wing powers.

---

[198]Emre, p. 12.

[199]Alper, p. 49.

[200] As a good example, after the death of Eyuboğlu, Ecevit wrote an article in *Yeni Ufuklar* magazine.

The Significance of 1968 in Turkey

As well as its shared forms of actions like boycotts, faculty occupations and spontaneous movements, both in the West and Turkey, the student uprisings targeted not only university systems, but they also revolted against the establishment, and even detached themselves from leftist political organizations, socialist or communist parties and acted independently from them. Like their European counterparts, students in Turkey became deeply concerned with questions of social justice, social equality, economic development, and socialism and again as the students in Europe they rebelled against the TLP for its political line that defends parliamentary way of power struggle.

Believing in and desiring revolution, radicalism, non-parliamentary ways, opposition outside the parliament, guerilla warfare, Marxism, Maoism, Leninism and anti imperialism were common means and ideological tools for the movements both in the West and Turkey. The movement in Turkey also has shared anti-authoritarianism with the youth movements of the West, at the very beginning to a limited extent. For instance demands for self-rule or autonomy demands in the universities, the questioning of daily culture, and forming a new art form or revolutionary morality, creating anti-authoritarian and egalitarian society were the issues of student movement.[201] Even though some students in Turkey read Marcuse and Sartre, whose books were appreciated very much by the Western youth, unlike the Western youth who stressed on anti authoritarian and libertarian Marxism different from Soviet

[201] Bora, p. 32.

Marxism and the "bureaucratic and oppressive real socialism," these tendencies were not really observed in the Turkish case.

For instance, a modernist tendency can not be observed in the Turkish youth movements. Soviet literature, a social realist approach, and an orthodox way of Marxism were more common than the modernist literature and theoretical Western Marxism. The Turkish youth read the social realist novels of the writers who will be discussed below. But the modernist literature of the West, Kafka, Sartre, and Faulkner were also translated and reached to the Turkish public. Modernist literature and avant-garde cinema were also popular in this period in Europe. In the 1960s, cinema increasingly took into consideration the problems that individuals faced in their everyday lives, their inquietudes, their desperation in the flux of modern life, bringing the modernist perspective of the novel and poetry to the realm of cinema. Philosophical and theoretical debates about the constitutive and representative notions of cinema and literature, and especially a search for new narrative systems, flourished in these areas. However, there was a reaction to the modernist and avant-garde literature and cinema of these movements in Turkey. They were considered individualistic and to symbolize the mentality of the petit-bourgeoisie.

The cultural and political tools of anti-war movement, women's movement, hippie, beatniks and gays were also present in Turkey but to a very limited extent. These kinds of movements were underestimated generally by the Turkish political left and cultural circles.

But in fact, contrary to the shared common characteristics, each country experienced 1968 according to its own peculiar social and political conditions. Thus, the events of 1968 took place across the globe, but happened within national

contexts.[202] The student movement in Turkey was influenced by the ideological orientations of its European fellows, but it was interpreted according to the particular ideological and cultural climate of Turkey and some of the ideological tendencies of the student movement in the West were not adopted.[203] Moreover, a one dimensional perception of events of 1968 in the West was produced. The radical individualist dimension of these movements were criticized and considered as petit bourgeois radicalism, or a different form of Western individualism.

The SFK (*Sosyalist Fikir Kulüpleri*- Clubs of Socialist Thought) and the FKF (*Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu*- Federation of Clubs of Thought) and especially *Dev-Genç* (Organization of the Revolutionary Youth) were the main associations of the progressive university youth. 1968 university events gave the revolutionary fervor to the youth to break up the elder TLP and to establish *Dev-Genç*. This independent organization of the left was an important ground for different political movements that would be influential in the 1970s. Students criticized the degradation of all political elites. This age group movement especially started to define itself with more universalistic leftist ideologies. This youth is very important for our subject because, they were the audience for literary and artistic productions as well as political thought.

As was mentioned, this period was the only period in Turkey in which radical leftist movements and labor organizations were powerful and influential in the public scene. A literary movement which supported these movements was also developed in these decades, as will be discussed in the following chapters. The university youth and

[202]Fink, p. 1.

[203]Gün Zileli, "68'in İdeolojik Kaynakları," *Birikim*, no. 109 (May, 1998), pp. 96-104, p. 100.

their search for a revolutionary art led to involvement and intervention in the artistic milieus. Literature was possibly their most important ideological medium.

The Development of a Societal Culture in Turkey

First of all, it is taken for granted by many scholars that modern conception regarding social and cultural institutions is formed within the sphere of the social-economic development of the modern state since the 18th century. The process of modernization went hand in hand with the realization of societal cultures.[204] Modernist ideologies subscribe to the thesis that it is possible to create a common societal culture. The core element of this culture is a standardized language, allowing the possibility of a system of social and cultural institutions. This need for the uniformity of language arises from the necessity of maintaining a high level of solidarity within modern democratic states, and can only be secured through these cultural and social institutions. To provide a common, equal, homogenous education system is an important responsibility of the state.

The search for the proliferation of culture and art is also defined as the responsibility or duty of the state. As a core elements of a societal culture, education and common public sphere in which artistic production and interrelations between artists and audience can develop, were defined as necessary conditions. Education and the institutionalization of art and literature were very important for the intellectuals of the 1960s and 1970s. These policies and their transformations in the creation of a societal culture in the 1960s and the 1970s are critial to understanding the

[204]Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship* (London: Oxford University Press 1995), p. 5.

transformations in the realm of education, language and popular culture. The formation and conceptualization of the artistic mainly literary common space will be discussed below.

Education and Its Transformation: Students, Intellectuals of the Future - Literature a Relevant Way to Find New Identities

Education in the early years of the Republic was in a state of total change and in a process of construction as a result of the language and other educative reforms. Some scholars argue that the educational mentality of the Kemalist elite was significantly far from encouraging the education of the lower classes apart from in primary and vocational schools and hardly aimed to create a meritocratic elite from the popular classes.[205]

In my opinion, the Kemalist elites sought to create a meritocratic elite in the early years for the realization of the modernization project of Turkey. This ideology led to the creation of an educated people irrespective of class origins. This goal was the motivation of their project of modernization. With the rise of the leftist ideologies, however, this project led to the formation of an educated leftist community that tried to reach the uneducated, poor masses. The mentality that their first mission was to educate the people was evident in the leftist discourse of the intellectuals. Then this project of creating a meritocratic elite was disturbed and transformed after the 1960s.

[205]Alper, p. 137.

The illiteracy of peasantry was the main challenge. However, it is possible to think that more peasants could afford to send their children to towns and cities in the 1960s relative to the early Republican era since their incomes had significantly risen in the 1950s.[206] Even so, in 1969, only one percent of five million young people who were living in the villages had the chance to study after primary school, In this minority, 50 students went on to the normal school, 30 students went on the religious schools, and 20 students went on other schools. The rate of literacy increased throughout this period.

This was a period of mass education. In the 1960s, institutions of education were in a complete process of transformation. This period was very important for the proliferation of a new societal culture because of the change in the meaning of education. Education became a national policy of the state which aimed for a rapid development. Increasing numbers of university students formed different and new cultures in Turkey, and certainly provided the formation of the student movements.

The student movements unquestionably were among the most significant actors of this period between 1960 and 1980, especially as catalysis for all different social movements. The prominent role of students in the uprisings of the period depended on the reality that they were not satisfied by the existing education system. According to some scholars, this was a result of the positivistic and monolithic understanding of the Kemalist education system.[207]

---

[206]Ibid., p. 141.

[207]Şerif Mardin, "Sosyal Yapımız ve Öğrenci Eylemleri," *Milliyet'den Seçmeler Dizisi 1975 Yılı* (Istanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1976), pp. 24, 25.

Another reason may have been the capitalization of the education system. As education became increasingly organized around the needs of the market, universities became places of political struggle and anti-capitalist student movements arose.

This sharp political radicalism in the universities had connections with other social and cultural developments, too, but its essential character as a student movement was necessarily shaped by the problems and conflicts produced by this transformation in the universities. The status of the private schools was a subject criticized frequently by the leftist discourse of the time. For instance, nearly 50 private colleges were opened with the promulgation of law No. 625, private educational institutions, which started on 3 July 1965. The students of these schools numbered more than 40,000.[208] These private schools were criticized for increasing the privileges of the upper classes and the inequalities in the education system.

In the 1960s, an important factor in the growth of the political radicalism of the youth was the increasing rate of participation in higher education which produced far more graduates than could be absorbed by the professional market.[209]

The massive spread of university education took place all over the world, almost at the same time. All developed and underdeveloped countries experienced major increases in the enrollments of university students from the second half of the 1950s.[210] Before the 1960s Turkey's educational process had many phases, but the

---

[208]"*3 Haziran 1965 tarih ve 625 sayılı "Özel Öğretim Kurumları Kanunu"nun yürürlüğe girmesinden sonra öğrenime açılan yüksek dereceli özel okulların sayısı 50'ye yaklaşmıştır. Buralarda okumakta olan öğrenci sayısı ise 40 binin üzerindedir."* Şükrü Koç, *Akşam Gazetesi*, 18.January.1969, "Özel Okullar Faciası," *Varlık Yıllığı 1970* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1971), pp. 218, 219.

[209]See Eric J. Hobsbawn, *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991* (London: Abacus, 1995).

[210]Alper, p. 125.

1960s was very important for the increase in the number of students in the universities. The number of university students increased to from 65,000 in 1960 to 97,000 in 1965. In 1970, there were 159,000 students in higher education.[211]

To show the changing structure of education, it may be also necessary to talk about increasing rate of lower class students in the university education after the 1960s. In every ten thousand people, the following numbers of university students corresponded in different countries in 1968: 26 in Turkey, 34 in France, 23 in Switzerland, 24 in Germany, and 27 in Holland. Sixty four of 100 students in Turkey were studying social sciences and literature, while 20 of them were studying positive sciences and engineering, 11 medicine , and 5 agriculture. In 1968, the number of students studying in a foreign country was 4756.[212]

As a center of the university student movements of 1968, in France, there were an important increase in the number of university students. For instance, in 1958, there were 175.000 University students and by 1968 there were 530.000, twice as many students as Britain had.[213]

The oversupply (the unversity student boom) thesis and the status decline thesis (Bourdieu thesis that upper or middle classes which have a fear to loose their status)[214] are developed to understand the causes behind these student revolts as the student boom of the 1960s was a global reality.

---

[211]İlhan Tekeli, "Osmanlı Imparatorluğu'ndan Günümüze Eğitim Kurumlarının Gelişimi" In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 3 (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1983), p. 666.

[212]Cavit Orhan Tütengil, "Sayılarla Türkiye'nin Bazı Toplumsal Görüntüleri," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1972*, pp. 195-209; "Sayılarla Türkiye'nin Sosyo-ekonomik ve Kültürel Durumu," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1974*, pp. 209-225, "Cumhuriyet'in 50. Yılında Sosyo-ekonomik ve Kültürel Göstergeler," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, pp. 199-211.

[213]Kurlansky, p. 217.

[214]Alper, p. 17.

The cultural and artistic transformation of the decades in question certainly correlated with this youth culture. This increase in the number of university students cited as the main reason for the increasing literary activities in the 1960s. This increase provided a larger audience of literature and other cultural activities.

The autonomy of the universities after the 1960s provided by the new constitution was an important change. Thanks to this autonomy, more critical and independent academic works were started to be produced. Due to this autonomy and emancipation of a new public sphere, university students wanted to be part of an intellectual public space and they were always curious about new intellectual and artistic activities. Students, who can also be defined as young intellectuals, had intrinsic interests in the cultural activities, as both young people and intellectuals.

The youth also challenged the older generations, criticizing their conformism and their political visions. They argued that to be older was to be passive, conciliatory, and even corrupt.[215] They tried to create a new tradition which was active, transformative, and revolutionary. Memet Fuat writes that,

> The intention to go to the sources was dominant. The youth was more revolutionary than the older generation, which is more conformist and conservative.[216]

An important feature of these young intellectuals was their interest in art, mainly literature. However, it was important for the youth of the period to acquire an identity as well, a search for subjectivity or means for personal emancipation. The

---

[215]Ibid.

[216] "*Kaynaklara yönelme isteği baskın A dergisi, Değişim dergisi Gençliğin başkaldırısı, Yalana, sahte tavırlılığa, kofluğa, kulaktan dolmalığa, düzenciliğe karşi, yıkıcılıkla değil de, kuruculukla el ele veren bir başkaldırma. Bu karışık durumun önceki kuşakların kolaya kaçışı, düşünceye uzak duruşları hazırladı diyebilirim.*" Memet Fuat in "Kaynaklara Yönelen Kuşak" defends the youth generation. Mehmet Fuat, "Kaynaklara Yönelen Kuşak," *Yeditepe* (16 January 1962).

basic economic or social motives of their revolt also required a cultural agenda to provide a sense of integration. I would argue that literature; mainly poetry and short story as well as cinema served as very adequate means to satisfy these needs. It is my contention that intellectuals and students were going through a period of individualization. Those individuals found ways to construct themselves by exploring new films, new books, and meeting new people in cultural environments. Their political ideals demanded a new conception of the socio-cultural whole, of society, and in terms of their selves a new sense of subjectivity or individuality.

On the other hand, this new period was not only limited to the movement of the University students. For instance, Zafer Toprak compares this new period with the Young Turk revolution:

> Another factor is the way the 1960s functioned as a particular "era of enlightenment." There have been two periods in Turkish history that have cleared the way for enlightenment. The first one is the *"Kanun-ı Esasi"* years following the Young Turk revolution; the other is the years of the 1961 Constitution after 27 May. The Turkish intellectual and the youth have never read as much as they did in those years. Translations were made and the world was perceived differently in those years. In both phases, the Ottoman and the Turkish people opened up to abroad respectively. In the first one, they read Durkheim, Seignobos, Cauwes; in the other, Marx, Engels and Lenin. The search for a nation-state rendered solidarist thinking in the first. In the second, the longing for a social-state brought the class question to the fore.[217]

A new educated middle classes was on the rise in Turkey, as it was throughout the world during these two decades. As many scholars note, new educated middle

[217] *"Diğer bir etmen 60'lı yılların bir tür'aydınlanma çağı' işlevi görmesi. Türkiye tarihinde iki dönem aydınlanmayı getiriyor. Biri Jön Türk devrimi ertesi Kanun-ı Esasi yılları, diğeri 27 Mayıs devrimi ertesi 61 Anayasası yılları. Türk aydını ve gençliği, çağlar boyu bu dönemlerde olduğu kadar hiçbir zaman okumuyor. Çeviriler yapılıyor, dünya bir başka algılanıyor bu yıllarda. Dışa açılıyor her iki evrede Osmanlı, ardından Türk insanı. İlkinde Durkheim'i, Seignobos'u, Cauwes'i okuyor; diğerinde Marx'ı, Engels'i Lenin'i. İlkinde solidarist düşünceyi hâkim kılıyor ulus-devlet arayışı. İkincisinde sınıf sorununu ön plana çıkarıyor sosyal-devlet özlemi"* Zafer Toprak, "1968'i Yargılamak Ya da 68 Kuşağına Mersiye", Cogito, no. 14 (Spring 1998).

class and student youth were the main political agents behind the moderate liberalization and social movements in the 1960s, mainly in Europe.

Turkey did not have a privileged status but did have some differences from the developed European countries. Şerif Mardin consideres the period as a period of cultural chaos and conceptualized it in terms of an encounter between the culture of the center and cultures of the periphery. "Possibilism," that is, the attitude of "we can change the current political situation" also played a role.[218]

In this atmosphere of class politics and in a search for a social justice, intellectuals saw it necessary to awaken the people. Urban intellectuals believed that the masses were uncultivated and hence open to reactionary ideologies. They engaged themselves in society engineering and adopted the modernizing ethos of the Western countries as the right path on which to proceed. These intellectuals considered art to be a complementary tool for their political agenda and by considering the "people," or "society" as an object to be manipulated by political parties, mainly right-wing political parties, and they wanted to make the "people", or the "masses" the object of their projects. The modernization ethos as the cultural and symbolic capital, which had been inherited from bureaucratic families, also strengthened the view that they were the responsible for the direction of the country. Coming from the most modern stratum of the country was an additional factor pushing these intellectuals to modernize it.[219] This conception was important. Whether this was true for literature is difficult to say as many of the authors were from middle or lower class. This will be discussed further below.

[218]Mardin, pp 24-25.

[219]Alper, p. 165.

Popular Culture, New Life-Styles, Artistic Production

After the 1960s, as a result of the rapid industrialization and urbanization, the population of the cities increased significatively. Populist economy policies, and a developmentalist model provided an important increase in readership of newspapers and a huge audience for movies. In these decades, the proliferation of the mass media and cultural products was very important. The quantity and quality of newspapers were highly increased. This can be seen as the new age of a more profound print culture.

The profile of the readers was completely changed. To read journals was no longer considered something only well educated, privileged people did. For instance, the *Hürriyet* newspaper circulation increased from fifty thousands, in 1948 to one million in 1968. *Milliyet*, *Cumhuriyet* were other significant newspapers of the period.

Hurriyet as a mainstrem right-wing political newspaper excluded many left-wing intellectuals. As a very symbolic example, *Hürriyet* distributed a book titled *Türk Edebiyat Tarihi* (Turkish History of Literature). in 1969, in which Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal, Attila İlhan, Sabahattin Ali, Nazım Hikmet, Kemal Tahir and Aziz Nesin were not considered as a part of the history of the Turkish literature, as well as these authors were the most popular Turkish left-wing authors of the period.[220] Another book, however, *Sovyet Türkologlarının Türk Edebiyatı İncelemeleri* (Researches of Soviet Academician on Turkish Literature) included articles by Soviet

[220]*Türk Edebiyat Tarihi* (Istanbul: Hürriyet Gazetesi Yayınları, 1970).

scholars about left-wing writers such as: Sabahattin Ali, Sait Faik, Nazım Hikmet, Kemal Tahir, Orhan Kemal, Aziz Nesin, Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca and Yaşar Kemal.

First, as a part of this print culture, another format that became part of the public life was cartoon journals. These journals were functioned as a part of the dissident political identity and also part of the sexual emancipation for the young male public. This popular culture in the realm of mass media led to the formation of a specialized domain, creating sexual satisfaction or education for a larger public who were interested with them.

Second, it is necessary to add the introduction of a visual culture with a vast cinema production and, finally, with the establishment of T.R.T. (Turkish Radio and Television) Another significant development was the inroduction of the telephone which became widespread in homes.

In Turkey there was ambivalence in attitudes about Western youth culture. Until approximately 1969, the long hair, rock music and miniskirts were welcome by leftists, and consumed side by side with Turkish folk music. This was changed in the following years as leftists began to position themselves as the representatives of the people.[221] Meanwhile, many new habits, generally imported from the West were espoused by a larger part of the Turkish society, especially the Turkish youth. Pop music, football culture were all developed during these decades; as already mentioned cinema was an undeniable part of this rapidly expanding popular culture.

Artistic or literary production also may be defined as an important part of the popular culture. One of the main instruments of the popular culture was artistic productions.

[221]Alper, p. 114.

Artistic Fields: Theatre, Cinema, Visual Arts, Music

In the 1960s, a national cinema appeared as a notable domain of popular culture, as many other national cinemas did in parts of the World. Before the 1960s, American cinema had been very popular throughout the world. Before Turkish cinema became a considerable industry, many debates about its quality and problems were held. Intellectual debates, which always occupied intellectuals in the areas of literature, theatre and music, found a new interesting and fertile arena.

The 1960s were both a turning and a transition period for the cinema. In these years it was changing throughout the world; the social movements and problems of countries were reflected in their national cinemas. The 1960s were the golden years of Turkish cinema. Turkish movies were increasingly popular among people, and they constituted a considerable commercial market.

The Social Realist movement also produced significant films during the first half of the 1960s. To name few of these films, *Yılanların Öcü* (The Vengeance of Snakes 1962); *Susuz Yaz* (Dry Summer 1963), which brought Metin Erksan the Best Film Award at the Berlin Film Festival; *Otobüs Yolcuları* (Bus Travelers 1961); *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* (Those Awaking in the Dark) by Ertem Göreç in1965; *Haremde Dört Kadın* (Four Women in the Harem 1965) by Halit Refiğ; and *Bitmeyen Yol* (Road Without End 1965) by Duygu Sağıroğlu.

This trend was effective, as also argued by Aslı Daldal, thanks to the

Yeşilçam[222] system which still left a room for alternative ideological attitudes.[223] Producers who did not maintain a considerable capital in the conditions of an undeveloped cinema industry were interested less in ideological matters. They did not attempt to determine the ideological choices of the directors, and there was a closer and more complex relationship with directors, scenarists and producers.

The 1960s were marked by an unprecedented flourishing and politicization of film magazines, festivals and clubs. *Si-sa, Yeni Sinema, Sine-Fil* and *Sinema 65* were some of the new intellectual film reviews. In 1962, the first private cinema club was established by Sami Şekeroğlu: *Kulüp Sinema 7*. This club was founded in the Art Academy of Mimar Sinan University. The Ankara Film Society and the Film Club of the Institute of French Studies are also noteworthy.[224]Sinematek founded in 1965, attracted intellectuals and educated youth as an alternative to Yeşilçam Sinema. It promoted the "universal art" or "European art cinema."

During this period, Sinematek was one of the most active organizations providing a lively atmosphere for the educated middle classes, intellectuals and university students. For instance, Sinematek had a variety of intellectuals, such as Şakir Eczacıbaşı, Onat Kutlar, Aziz Nesin, Yaşar Kemal, Yılmaz Güney, Aliye Rona, Atıf Yılmaz, Ali Özgentürk, Selim İleri, Doğan Hızlan, Gencay Gürsoy, Dora Karabey, Yavuz Özkan, Umur Bugay, Atilla Dorsay, İlkay Demir and Zeynep Oral, These were the cinema critics, directors, freelance writers and journalist. Onat Kutlar,

---

[222]Yeşilçam" is the name of the street in Beyoğlu where cinema companies and coffehouses of "extras" are located.

[223]Aslı Daldal, Art, Politics *and Society: Social Realism In Italian and Turkish Cinemas* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2003), p.148.

[224]Ibid., p.141.

in his book *Sinema Bir Şenliktir*[225] gives the names of significant intellectuals of the period: Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Azra Erhat, Kuzgun Acar, Prof. Cavit Orhan Tütengil, Oğuz Atay and Hasan Ali Ediz, who participated in a film screening at Sinematek.

In this climate, Yılmaz Güney produced popular, commercially successful films, which were welcomed by the Sinematek group. The first film of Yılmaz Güney, *Seyyit Han* (Seyyit Khan), despite its technical failures, received a positive review from Onat Kutlar in *Yeni Sinema*. After this, Güney wrote, directed and performed in *Umut* (Hope) in 1970. The first screening of this film was held in Sinematek's hall in Mis Sokak. After the film, Ömer Lütfi Akad embraced Yılmaz Güney and said, "This is our first realist film."[226] Umut came to be one of the most debated films in Turkish cinema and was evaluated as a milestone.

According to Güney, art was the most important device for class struggle. Its function was to motivate people to think about political and social issues. Güney dominated and also was affected by the Sinematek circle. Şalom said,

> In other words, the Sinematek association, by arguing for the impossibility of attaining the good and the beautiful, in the "corrupt order" of *Yeşilçam*, relied on the youth, and on a director like Yılmaz Güney who struggled against the Yeşilçam conditions from within.[227]

Güney's masterpieces *Arkadaş* (Comrade), *Sürü*, (The Heard, with Zeki Ökten) and *Yol* (The Road with Şerif Gören) were all very significant films. Yılmaz Güney, Atıf Yılmaz and Ömer Lütfi Akad, who were the most creative and productive

---

[225] See Onat Kutlar, *Sinema Bir Şenliktir: Sinema Yazıları* (İstanbul, Can Yayınları, 1991).

[226] Interview with Giovanni Scognamillo (May 2007, Istanbul).

[227] *"Yeşilçam'ın "bozuk düzen"i içinde daha iyiye, daha güzele ulaşmanın olası olmadığını bir önyargı gibi ileri sürerek, gençlere, Yılmaz Güney gibi Yeşilçam ortamında "kaçak" güreşen bir sinemacıya bel bağlamıştı."* Interview with Jak Şalom (May 2007, via Internet, e-mail.)

directors of the period, were endorsed by the Sinematek circle, and directors like Erden Kıral, Ömer Kavur, and Nuri Bilge Ceylan were deeply influenced by them.

It is also necessary to note the National Cinema Debate. The nationalist tendency of the decade had its followers in the cinema circles, who criticized the Sinematek circle (National cinema was defended by Halit Refiğ and Metin Erksan, who were also directors of social realist films of the first half of the 1960s, against the Sinematek with an emphasis on the possibilities of producing cinema in an alternative way in the actual cinema industry.) They criticized the Sinematek members for underestimating national values and for adopting the western heritage, and moreover, for avoiding the popular, authentic values of the people.

The response of the members of Sinematek was that the production of national films necessitated adopting the values of universal cinema and an independent and alternative position to the current capitalist system. After 1968, a political and revolutionary radicalization on the part of students affected the inner dynamics of the Sinematek Association and led to a split with these students who criticized the elitist atmosphere of the association by an emphasis on populism, and these students formed the circle of *Genç Sinema* (Young Cinema).

Theatre

The 1960s was also a brilliant decade for Turkish theater. Metin And says that "the 1960s was the golden age of our theater."[228] Nadire Mater writes that there was a

[228]Metin And, *Başlangıcından 1983'e Türk Tiyatro Tarihi* (Istanbul: İletişim, 2004), p. 160.

great interest in theatre in the epoch; she argues that there were 43 theatrical companies in Istanbul.[229]

There was certainly a boom of theatres and plays. In this period, when political, social and economic matters were consciously debated, plays were themselves engaged in these problems, and the problems of peasants and workers. While on the one hand, plays about middle class families were written, on the other hand, plays about the life in villages and shanty-towns were brought to the stage.

Other popular themes in this period were the Ottoman history and Antique mythology in a lyric style. Antique tragedies were also interpreted as metaphors to be able to make a criticism of the actual political life. For instance, a modern adaptation of *Antigone* by Jean Anouilh was played by Kent theatre in 1961. This play was a feminist and political allegory against dictatorships. The play *Kurban* of Güngör Dilmen was also inspired from the stories of the Antiquity.

At the end of 1960s, some political and documentary plays were written. Sermet Çağan's play, *Ayak Bacak Fabrikası* (Factory of Feet and Legs, 1964), an adaptation of the Brechtian lyric style, is a good representative of social realism in the theatre.

In the 1960s, Güngör Dilmen, Orhan Asena, Turan Oflazoğlu and Necati Cumalı were the most famous playwrights. Haldun Taner provided a base for the transformation of both the form and the content of Turkish theatre. Taner's plays were generally performed by Gülriz Sururi-Engin Cezzar company. For instance, *Keşanlı Ali Destanı*, which opened in 1964, that tried to combine traditional values with a

[229]Nadire Mater, *Sokak Guzeldir: 68'te ne oldu?* (Istanbul : Metis, 2009), p. 306.

modern political point of view. In the 1970s the role of the political theatre became more important. In this period, foreign or native documentary plays were staged. Many realist peasant, musical, cabaret, and epic plays were written. Turgut Özakman, Oktay Arayıcı, and Vasıf Güngören (with his play *Asiye Nasıl Kurtulur*) were important playwrights.

The Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu (AST, Ankara Art Theatre) which was a real phenomenon for the "leftist art" in Turkey staged the plays like *72. Koğuş* (Dormitory 72 which was written by Orhan Kemal)*, Godot'yu Beklerken* (Waiting for Godot, Samuel Beckett) *Sarıpınar 1914, Mayın* (Mine), *Küçük Burjuvalar* (The Petit-Bourgeosy), *Zengin'in Maceraları* (Adventures of a Rich Man)*, Müfettiş* (Inspector), and *Durdurun Dünyayı İnecek Var* (Stop the World, Someone will Descend). These plays were a large collection of modernist and realist, and international and national literary works. In 1966, the AST with Genco Erkal, a significant actor staged *Bir Deli'nin Hatıra Defteri* (Memory Book of an Idiot) and *Arthur Ui'nin Yükselişi* (The ascension of Artur Ui) in 1973, *Jeanne D'Arc* (Joan of Arc) which was put on a show by Rutkay Aziz, first was forbidden by the martial law, but then it was allowed. Asaf Çiyiltepe, the director of AST and the most prominent figure of this circle who directed these plays died in 1967, in a car accident.

Dostlar Tiyatrosu (Theatre of Comrades), which was opened in 1969, for the 1970-71 seasons, staged plays like, *Rosenbergler Ölmemeli* (The Rosenbergs should not Die), Jean Paul Sartre's *Nekrasov*, Turgut Özakman's *Asiye Nasıl Kurtulur* (How Asiye can Save Herself), Hans Magnus Enwensberger's *Havana Duruşması* (The Trial of Havana), and *Aslan Asker Şvayk* (The Good Soldier Svejk, adaptation of the

work of Jaroslaw Hasek) in 1972. Throughout these years, Ankara had a vivid cultural life like that in Istanbul. [230]

Two other interesting and revolutionary theatrical companies were *Halk Oyuncuları* (People's Actors) and *Devrim için Hareket Tiyatrosu* (Theater of Action for Revolution, DIHT). These two companies sought many ways to take theatre to the urban poor and peasantry, people who could not watch plays in the buildings. They also aimed to make political propaganda by using their plays.

Devlet Tiyatroları (State Theatres), *Şehir* (Municipal) Thaatres were also very productive during all of these decades. Many of the actors who played in the private companies were originated from these institutions in which they were educated.

New trends in theatre, such as experimentalism, should also be taken into consideration. Theatre in cafes and pubs, lunch theatre between 12:15-13:15, theatre in schools, plays without speeches for the working people, and pantomime were different experimentations, as well as cabaret theatres, especially the Devekuşu (Ostrich) Cabaret theatre. Political and social satires and musical plays flourished.

In 1969, Halk Oyuncuları (People's Actors), including young actors Tuncel Kurtiz, Umur Bugay, and Aydın Engin, during their representation of *Devri Süleyman* (The Age of Süleyman, this play was an allegorical way of making a critique to the Justice Party government of Süleyman Demirel) were attacked by reactionary and ultra-nationalist groups. In Tunceli, the interdiction of the play led to clashes between demonstrators and police in the city, people contested to this decision.

[230]Devlet Tiyatroları, Devlet Opera ve Balesi, Şehir Tiyatroları, Ayfer Feray, Bulvar, Kenterler, Kent, Bizim Tiyatro, Dormen, Gazanfer Özcan-Gönül Ülkü, Bizim Tiyatro, Dormen, Gazanfer Özcan-Gönül Ülkü, İstanbul Tiyatrosu, İstanbul Sanat Tiyatrosu, Nejat Uygur, Nisa Serezli theatres in 1970s were the most popular theatres. Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu and Dostlar Tiyatrosu were located in Ankara.

In 1969 and 1970, there were strikes at *Şehir* (Municipal) Theatres and AST, as a result of the struggle of the *Türkiye Tiyatrocular Sendikası* (Syndicate of the Turkish Theater Actors, Tİ-SEN) a union was established to protect the drama domain. Art periodicals focused on foreign plays on their pages. International prizes in theatre were also given.[231] Another development was the publication of a journal about theatre, such as in 1970, the *Tiyatro 70*.

Visual Arts and Music Production

I would also like to note briefly the developments in the fields of the visual and plastic arts within the Istanbul Art Academy and in France. Figures like Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu, Fikret Mualla, Abidin Dino, Avni Arbaş, Nejat Devrim, Selim Turan, Hasan Kaptan, Osman Dinç, Mehmet Güler, and Komet produced masterpieces of Turkish painting and visual arts; these were the general positive dynamics of the period.

Finally, Music production was also at the apogee, especially in the field of popular and alternative music. In the realm of popular music, there were alternative, innovative trends and also a discovery of musical traditions, such as Aşık İhsani and Aşık Fermani. Turkish folk music was reconstructed with a new, politically engaged interpretation. A modern interpretation of folk songs by Ruhi Su influenced the young

[231]Prizes were given to Haldun Taner's play *Keşanlı Ali Destanı* in Czechoslovakia, Yaşar Kemal's play *Orta Direk* in Finland, Nazım Hikmet's play *Sevdalı Bulut*, under the direction of Haluk Ulusoy, in France, and *Keloğlan* played by Anadolu Çocuk Oyunları in Hamburg International Child Plays Festival. Selmi Andak, 1965-1975 arası Türkiye'de Tiyatro *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1976).

intellectuals. Ruhi Su and Tülay German performed Turkish folk songs in modern, Westernized styles.

Additionally, in the style of Western musical production, there were significant developments in the production of pop and rock music. There was also a search for a synthesis between Anatolian folk and Western rhythms, like Anatolian Rock as performed by Moğollar and Cem Karaca. A tradition of protest music became popular during these years. Turkish pop music reached a larger public, and hand in hand with Yeşilçam cinema industry, became a significant part of the Turkish popular culture. Moreover, many popular journals of music and cinema were also published.

Transformation and Reconstruction of the Turkish Language during the 1960s and 1970s

In this section, before observing the direct consequences of the Turkish language reform, which took place in the 1960s and 1970s, this reform from the early years of the Republic will be discussed. The transformation of the Turkish language is a very important process for the discussion of literature, as the changes in a language influence significantly the literary realm, and in turn, literature is one of the main factors which determines and influences this change and tries to appropriate this change to a larger public. I think that this “new language” was definitely accepted primarily by the intellectuals, the media, and the people during the 1960s and 1970s. During this period many words were adopted by the general public.

The real transformation or revolution of the Turkish language, as is well known, started early in the young republic. It was a necessary initiative from a modernist and nationalist movement to transform especially the written language, and

then spoken language. The other intention of this reform was to detach people from the heritage, tradition and culture of the Ottoman Empire. This approach was intended to adopt the universal culture, that is, Western culture with all of its cultural institutions, and to bring it to the people. According to the late Ottoman and early Republican elites, to fulfill this purpose, it was necessary to implement a simplification, purification and nationalization of the Turkish language.

According to Murat Belge, Ottoman intellectuals from the end of the nineteenth century, as in the example of the *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens) who thought that the purification and simplification of the Turkish language would ensure the country's total progress and thanks to this reform, the various problems of the country could be resolved. The purification of the language was always seen as a part of the civilization, modernization, nationalization process of the country.

The reform of the language was certainly part of the nationalist policies of the early Republic. This policy of nationalism was not unique to the Ottoman Empire. One can find several examples during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in many different countries. For example, the reform of the Hungarian language was started in the early 1800s. The reform of the Albanian language transformed Albanian language in the early 1900. It is possible to argue that all nationalism passes through a phase of linguistic reform.

Language and translation had many links in the case of Turkey. It has often asserted that at the end of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish intellectual was born in the Bureau of Translation (*Tercüme Odası*) at the end of the nineteenth century. The translators of the world classics during the 1930s and 1940s, under the direction of

Nurullah Ataç and by the initiative of Hasan Ali Yucel minister of education, were all intellectuals who supported the reform of the Turkish language.

During the 1930s and 1940s, this transformation of language was not completely accepted by many people who continued to use Ottoman Turkish Language, especially in written language. *Türk Dil Kurumu* (Turkish Language Association) was founded in 1932 by Atatürk under the name of *Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti*. Subsequently, it was renamed *Türk Dili Araştırma Kurumu* and finally it was changed to the *Türk Dil Kurumu*.

At that time, the minister of education, Hasan Ali Yücel, was the president of the institution. The institution was very anti-Ottoman. At the third congress of *Türk Dil Kurultayı* (Turkish Assembly of Language), the theory of Sun-Language (*Güneş Dil Teorisi*) was accepted by the Congress and by the institution in1936. According to this theory, Turkish was one of the sources of the Indo European family of languages, so it did not pose any problem to use foreign words. This decision greatly slowed the movement of purification and during the 1950s under the government of Democrat Party; the ancient Ottoman language was considerably returned to institutional life. The Society for the Study of the Turkish language lost its semi-official status in 1950 and Persian and Arabic words started to reappear in the government publications.

After 1960, the institution was again supported by the state. Although during this period, critics and many of nationalist-conservative intellectuals were critical of the transformation of the language, on the other side, especially, modernist intellectuals supported this trend. During the 1960s, there was a real debate between conservatives and modernists.

Oktay Akbal, a passionate modernist writing an article in the newspaper *Cumhuriyet* said that "the language is changed, even if you are not happy with this situation (*olan oldu, biten bitti!*)" He argues that the language reform was the most successful transformation of the Turkish Republic. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, professor and ultra nationalist who had measured the skull of Nihal Atsız, one of the founders of the extreme nationalism in Turkey, said that nationalists did not approve the changes completely. He suggested that the real supporters were the leftist intellectuals, with some exceptions of the conservative intellectuals, like İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and Nuri Pakdil.

The defenders of the language reform pointed out that their opponents were using several of the words produced during the language reform even if they criticized this reform. Moreover, it was in the 1960s that the success of these reforms became clear. We can mention some statistics. The language of the periodical *Varlık* in 1933 contains a proportion of 57.3 percent of Turkish origin, and 31.6 percent of Arabic origin words. In 1965, the proportion of words of Turkish origins had increased to 82.3 percent, and the frequency of words of Arabic origin was reduced to a proportion of 11.6 percent. It was analyzed in *Akşam* newspaper in 1925 and it was found a ratio of 26 percent Turkish words, and 68 percent of Arabic and Persian, and 6 percent of Western origin. The same analysis was conducted in 1962 of the same paper, and this time it was found a 61 percent use of Turkish words, and 29 percent of Persian, and Arabic, and 10 percent of Western origin.[232]

---

[232]Emin Özdemir, "1973'de Dilimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1974* (Istanbul: Varlık, 1974), p. 103.

It is necessary to define an approach that always wanted to ridicule the institution, claiming that they made up absurd words that had not been produced by the institution, as gökkonuksal avrat which means airline hostess. The real words which are offered by the institution were: *alan,* (space) *ayraç* (parenthesis) *aylak* (idle), *bencil* (egoist), *çaba* (effort), *denetlemek,* (to control) *doruk,* (peak) *güney,* (sud) *işkil,* (doubt), *kavşak* (crossroads), *kuşku* (doubt), *ödül,* (award), *sivil,* (civil) *uyarmak* (to alert), *ürün* (product), *yankı* (echo), *yitirmek,* (to lose), and *yoğun* (intense). These are words which were frequently used in the language of the day.

Tarık Buğra, in an article written in 1972 criticized the use of words, *yargı* (judgement), *yargıç* (justice), and *bakanlık* (ministry) that are now impossible to delete from the language.[233] Cemil Meriç was strongly against this reform, writing in June 1973,

> If civilization, national income could be increased by the change of the alphabet, the Russians and the Chinese people would have change theirs, None of the nations have changed their own alphabet so far, (which is far from historical reality) so why this madness, to return to the old characters would not make much profit in the short term to increase our national income, but that we can ensure our leadership position in the middle East.[234]

The *Turk Dilini Koruma ve Geliştirme Cemiyeti*, (Association for Developing and Preserving the Turkish Language) was a harsh opponent of the reform. In its foundational General Congress, it criticized the defenders of the purification of the language by arguing that the reform had led to the alienation of generations from their identities and their social existence. The *Kubbealtı Cemiyeti* (Kubbealtı Association) was founded by the association against the reform of language.

---

[233]Emin Özdemir, "1972'de Dilimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık, 1973), p. 105.

[234]Cemil Meriç, *Sosyoloji Notları ve Konferanslar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2008), pp. 271, 272.

In an article in 1973, many words were criticized such as *boyut* (dimension), *siyasal* (political) *saptamak* (to determine), *kanıt* (evidence), *kısıt* (constraint), *araç* (instrument), *gereç* (device) *koşul* (condition) *birey* (individual), *uzay* (space), and *yaşam* (life) which today are used frequently in spoken and written language. In 1973, TRT prohibited the use of some words, by a circular, however these words continued to be used by the invited guests on TV and this prohibition could not be applied. Moreover, in 1972, *Türk Dil Kurumu* proposed the words that are used now such as, *seçenek* (option), *yaşamöyküsü* (biography), *iletişim* (communication), *bilgisayar,* (computer), *kadınsı* (effeminate), *özeleştiri* (self-criticism).

In my opinion, changes in the language might not have been as successful without the factor of progressive intellectuals and progressive movements. For example, the periodical *Dönüşüm* (Transformation), a cultural review which was published by the University youth of the Turkish Labor Party and several other names of periodicals of the labor movement and the left were selected from these new words, like *Devinim* (Movement), *Yordam* (Procedure), *and Soyut* (Abstract). *İletişim* (communication)*, bağlam* (context)*, tetikçi* (gunslinger) were produced in the 1970s, and words like *sınav* (exam), *neden* (cause), *kimlik* (identity), *genel* (general), *gözlem* (observation), all of which had been invented during the 1930s and 1940s, started to be used routinely in the 1960s.

After the coup of 12 September 1980, the TDK and TTK were completely transformed and the Turkish-Islamic synthesis began to dominate the institution. The modernists founded another organization called *Dil Derneği* (Language Asociation). TDK changed numerous official rules of writing that were created in 1930 and they published a new dictionary of spelling.

Language issues continue today to be part of political debates. Since the death of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1938, each decade brings its discussions on whether to favor a more traditional lexicon or a more modern one. Admittedly, the language reform has fostered an undeniable convergence of oral and written language and, consequently targets the elimination of illiteracy. We can say that modern territorial nationalism contributed by providing the conditions needed to the success of these reforms.

There are many criticisms against the breakdown of culture and historical memory disappearance because of the language reform. This reform was part of total transformations of the Turkish society and it is argued that even if there are things to be approved of, in this process of the Turkish modernization, we must not forget the factors to criticize such as the policy as against minorities and so on. Then the language reform was considered as a part of the very sudden, unexpected, even violent intervention and as against the will of the people.

A specialist of this issue, Geoffrey Lewis' directed four main criticisms to this refor. Firstly, he argues that reformers were unable to bridge the linguistic distinction between intellectuals and non-intellectuals, and what they did was to create a new gap.

Second, the language reformers changed the language without conscience replacing many Persian and Arabic words, which made impossible for people to express their feelings. Third, many of the replacements that were produced were far from purely Turkish words. Last, most of the Turkish citizens under the age of fifty do not have access to the literary works of the 1920s and 1930s, one of the greatest periods of modern Turkish literature.

The critics are correct, to a certain extent, but the Turkish words which are now used by the Turkish writer then increased to a ratio of ninety percent with a significant increase since the 1950s which had the proportion of thirty five percent. Even some writers who were against these reforms often use these new words as it is impossible to speak Turkish in today's Turkey without using these new words.

The Republican educational system, which was stronger than that of the Ottoman Empire fought against illiteracy. The number of literary works which published in six months now is almost equal to all of the works that had been published during the entire last century in the Ottoman Empire. Things were completely changed with the influential reform of the Turkish language.

The transformations in the realm of the language were essential to the subject of this dissertation. The main instrument of the literature is language; and transformations in the language naturally influences the literature itself. Literature is a domain in which the changes can be directly observed. It is also a good instrument with which to view for the diffusion of the new words and adoptation of them, by a larger public. The transformations in the language was more visible, during the 1960s and 1970s.

I argue that, if these changes had not been adopted by the modenist movements of the period, the reforms would have not been succeeded. These changes, and the transformations in the Turkish language, were more easily adopted by the people thanks to the contributions of the modernist, literary and political movements of the 1960s and the 1970s. This new literary generation of the period especially preferred to use these new words, to manifest their novelty, and to create a more profound rupture with the old literary generation.

CHAPTER FOUR

LITERARY PRODUCTION AND ITS IMPULSES BEFORE AND DURING THE 1960S AND 1970S

This chapter aims to map the landscape of this literary culture and associations such as literary journals, works, circles, trends, and genres and to show the diversity of this literary culture and what its role was in this landscape, that is, in Turkey before the 1960s and after. Before discussing the 1960s, the long history of Turkish literature will be elaborated with the intellectual history of the country as the two intersected and literature played a significant role in the formation of the intellectual identity in Turkey.

In this chapter, my objective is to show the consequences of the social, economic, ideological and cultural structures in the realm of literature and to think about these representations in order to prove or test the described social and cultural history in the special limits of an artistic area.

To be able to demonstrate the elements of this intellectual or artistic culture, I based my research on the discourse of the reviews, journals of literature and content analysis of the some literary works that I brought together. I used literary reviews such as *Varlık, Yeni Ufuklar, Yeni Dergi, Papir*üs, *Türk Dili* (Turkish Language), *Yeni a Dergisi* (New a), *Sanat Emeği* (Labor for Art), *Yeditepe*, and *Milliyet Sanat* as my primary sources and political reviews concerning literary debates like *Yön*, *Ant* as the secondary resources. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Azra Erhat, Vedat Günyol, Tahir Alangu, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Mehmet Fuat, Haldun Taner, Attilâ Ilhan, Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal, Güzin Dino, Aziz Nesin, Edip Cansever, Ferit Edgü, Onat Kutlar, Fethi Naci, Cemal Süreya, Tomris Uyar, Sevgi Soysal, and Kemal Tahir are some of the writers

and critics on whom I will mainly focus. I almost completely analyzed all the complete collections of *Varlık Yıllığı*, *Yeni Ufuklar*, *Yeni Dergi* which were published during the 1960s and 1970s. I identified the main trends and collected relevant information to show the scale of the literary production.

The discussion begins with the historical background followed by an examination of the literary culture of Turkey between 1960 and 1980. In this chapter, there will be a general analysis of three literary genres, the poetry, novel, and critiques and essays. An overview will be given of the literary journals on which this literary production was based.

The Intellectual and Literary History in Turkey before the 1960s: The Significance of Literature in the Formation of the Intellectual Culture

I will identify the role of the intellectuals, specifically the writers, in Turkey from a chronological perspective beginning from the late Ottoman Empire and to the evolution of the modern Republic. I will argue that literature and authors who produced this literature were an important part of the intellectual culture. As already discussed above, several types of intellectuals that existed in the European context, had correspondences in the Turkish context. These intellectuals followed types such as affiliated, rebellious, independent.

From the Ottoman era, most of the intellectuals had close links with literary production. Journalists and bureaucrats were also authors and public intellectuals, such as Namık Kemal, Şinasi and other young Ottomans. They represented their social and political beliefs by producing literary works in general. They expressed

themselves and their political and social ideas in a literary form and context by using allegories. People who were called intellectual and men of letters were similar or same people, these two qualities, identities intersected in the same person. Two concepts, intellectual and author or man of letters coexisted together from the very beginning.

Writers as intellectuals had absolutely the right to declare their opinions about the actuality and political problems, and even defended or diffused them against their opponents in the public scene. But this intellectual attitude of the writers is generally criticized by underlining the autonomy of the artistic realm from the political realm.[235] However, in the modern Turkish case, the distinction between the scholar, the scientist and politics is almost never realized. Intellectuals, writers participated frequently into political activities and they are producers and products of the modernization of Turkey. Intellectuals constructed close, powerful relationships between literature and politics. This phenomenon may not be a particularity of the Turkish context, as argued by Frederic Jameson,[236] but a Third World phenomenon in which the political, cultural, and intellectual elites were not excessively separated in distinct groups.

Murat Belge writes that:

---

[235]Ramis Dara, *Edebiyatçı Aydın Değildir* (Ankara: Öteki Yayınları, 1997), p. 66.

[236]"Frederic Jameson, in his article "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism," argued that the Third World Literature is based on national allegory and its relation with social events is not similar to the modern canonical literature. The sentence famously quoted from his article is this: "Third-word texts, even those which are seemingly private and invested with a properly libidinal dynamic necessarily project a political dimension in the form of 'political allegory.'" Frederic Jameson's argument, which attempts to show the distinctiveness of the countries' economic or historical circumstances to be reflected to the artistic productions, was realized or defended by Turkish writes and intellectuals, and also including all artistic products, with a very similar comparison or separation twenty years before that the argument would be defended, in a coherence with Jameson's assertion. For instance, many Turkish intellectuals, mainly the category of "sui generis" intellectuals believed in the incoherence of Western products dealing with the libidinal dynamics of the western individual to the Turkish case." In Hakkı Başgüney, *Turkish Cinematheque Association: Cinema and Politics* Master Thesis (Bogaziçi Universtiy, 2007).

> As well as political conflicts were assembled in the superstructure like an Eastearn and Western debate, to produce literary works was a political activity. Simple love stories and theatrical representation were considered equivalent to represent a political attitude. Literature, which has been considered a "serious literature," from its beginning was constructed as an important device for political agitation and propoganda.[237]

As a result, literature generally replaced and played the role of philosophy, politics and other disciplines. Because of the insufficiency of intellectual works, in these eras, literature was the medium of communicating political thoughts and all kind of human ideas. Cemal Süreya writes that: "in Turkey, poetry has been a substitute for philosphy for long time."[238]

The significance of literature in the role of understanding the Turkish social, political and economic structure is also assumed by Kemal Tahir. He argues that in Turkey no worldview could take root and flourish without having any philosophical and cultural foundation and adds that due to the lack of such an infrastructure, literature replaced politics and social action. It is impossible to think of literature independent of the history of society and the social reality.[239]

According to Kemal Karpat, the most important characteristic of Turkish literature was its interest to the social and political events, even the most famous

---

[237]Murat Belge, *Edebiyat Üstüne Yazılar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), p 84, 85.

[238]"*Türkiye'de şiir nicedir felsefenin de yerini tutmakta."* Cemal Süreya, *Şapkam Dolu Çiçekle*. (Istanbul: Yön Yayıncılık, 1981), pp. 30-32.

[239]"*Türkiye'de hiçbir dünya görüşünün felsefi ve kültürel temeli olmadan yerleşip gelişemeyeceğini belirtirken, böyle bir altyapının olmaması dolayısıyla da Türkiye'de politik ve sosyal aksiyonun yerini edebiyatın aldığını belirtir. Ona göre edebiyatın toplumun tarihinden ve sosyal gerçekliğinden bağımsız olması düşünülemez."* İsmet Bozdağ, *Kemal Tahirin Sohbetleri* (Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınları, 1980), p.100,101.

authors of the Turkish literature gained their celebrity from the social and political approaches that they declared in the guise of their literary works.[240]

Therefore, in the 1960s, writers like all intellectuals, even if taking a political attitude contradicted with individual tendency, were part of the politics. It required much more time to establish literature as a field in which intellectuals could escape from politics. According to Murat Belge, the second important feature of the Turkish intellectuals and writers is the fact that they were naive about politics, although to their affiliation with politics was much more stronger than that of their Western colleagues. According to him, it can be explained by two factors. The problem grew out of the freshness of the political consciousness. Because the concept "Turkish intellectual" was a very new one gained consciousness during the Tanzimat era, at the second half of the nineteenth century, he/she does not have time to learn politics in a more profound manner. Therefore, their political ideas and desires were both vivid and childish.[241]

This paradox is not difficult to explain. Turkish intellectuals, unlike Western intellectuals, were not estranged from political life or had not grown tired of politics. From the Tanzimat era, Turkish intellectuals were faced with a problem of social change, and this problem was vital for them. Intellectuals who could not exist outside the state mechanism were in close relationship with the state. Educated people forced to take all responsibilities for political missions. Because of the weakness and unstability of the society's structure, they had to be interested in political problems.

---

[240]Kemal Karpat, *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1971), p. 30-58.

[241]Murat Belge, *Edebiyat Üstüne Yazılar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), p 84 85.

Therefore, even intellectuals whose character, their individiual taste, and tendencies were completely apolitical, were forced to have political attitudes. For instance, Tevfik Fikret may be one of the best examples.[242] Fikret was a modernist author who had to interest in Turkish politics as a result of the political atmosphere of the country.

The young Ottomans, such as Namık Kemal, Şinasi and a significant symbol like Ahmet Mithat Efendi who tranlasted and wrote many works of art, in a pedagogic and didactic manner to educate and to inform of a large Ottoman public, were the first generation of Turkish intellectuals who provided from different literary genres to transmit their ideas, and especially political ideas.

A second generation of authors who were interested wholeheartedly with politics were *Genç Kalemler* (Young Authors) circle, Ali Canip Yöntem, Ziya Gökalp and Ömer Seyfettin, who defended a reform of the Turkish language, and they participated into the the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) which was also established in Salonika.

Ömer Seyfettin has been defined as the consititutive symbol of the Turkish nationalist literature by many scholars. Nüket Esen writes that, the most important thing for the authors of the Tanzimat period was not to write a good novel but to transfer their own ideas to the reader by way of the novel.[243] They are generally compared to the encycplopedists of the Enlightenment philosophers.

Huseyin Cahit Yalçın was a leading author of the *Servet-i Fünun* period of Turkish literature. He was especially known as journalist and politician. Among the

[242]Ibid.

[243]Nüket Esen, *Modern Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Okumalar* (Istanbul: İletişim, 2006), p. 79.

authors of the *Jeune Turque* and the early Republican period, he may be the best example of those who were engaged in politics.

Therefore, Turkish intellectuals and writers sought solutions to save the Ottoman Empire and then to found a new Republic, using their literary works. Their positions were constructed and developed in relation to the process of political and social modernization of Turkey.

Thus, in the early years of the Republic political debates mainly were determined by two main trends: the nationalist intellectuals and radical modernists, on the one hand, and the conservative intellectuals on the other who were part of this modernization project. The modernists focused on social progress and reorganization, economic development and the subsequent derivation of the cultural from the social, while the conservatives focused on the particularities of Turkey, on its internal dynamics. The problems of identity, or culture in general were defined as essential to deriving or imagining a social life depended on the cultural base. The emphasis on cultural and social dimensions still reflected a relationship of intellectuals with the people, to protect and respect to the cultural values of the people or to transform them.

In any case, the relationship between the "intellectual" and the "people" led to the distinction of elites and intellectuals who were the subject, or dominant force, and the people, who were the object of important changes and transformations or an abstract glorified value. A third axis can be defined in the 1960s and 1970s, with the introduction of another type of intellectual, more rebellious and politically leftist who wanted to integrate with his people by transcending this duality.

In Turkey, the process of modernization is considered to have been a political synthesis or as a process of conflicts because of the confrontation between the current

situation of the country with the new social, cultural and economic transformations as a result of the adaptation of the social, cultural and economic values of European society.

The first effort to create a new Turkish society was proposed by Ziya Gökalp, member and ideologue of the CUP. According to him, Ottoman society had to adopt a synthesis of Turkishness, Islamization and Civilization (Western civilization). However, he reconsidered his plan, by placing nationality and national culture at the center, as the essence of an organic society, in the foundation process of the Republic of Turkey, he adopted the vision of the secular nation and he eliminated the concept of Islam. Ziya Gökalp was one of the most important intellectuals of the founding generation. His duality between material innovations and novelties of the West and cultural values of “our own civilization” may be an important distinction to understand the conflict between the universalist intellectuals and the defenders of the native values.

However, the political project of Kemalism and its intellectuals was to raise the cultural level of the people by the educational reforms and to educate the activists who would be the vanguard of the entire society, which was mostly composed of illiterate and non-cultivated people. In other words, they sought to develop society's intellectual and cultural life through the development of an educated public. And, for the unity of society, it was necessary to found a nation-state. Thus, they wanted to create a more culturally homogeneous Turkey to provide a sense of national consciousness among individuals.

The modernization of Turkish society and Turkish people sought to replacing the traditionalist, emotional and religious practices with rationalist and modernist ones

that were products of the ideas of the the positivism of the nineteenth century European thinkers, especially August Comte. Faith in progress and the modern values defined in Western countries was the main reason behind their policies. They wanted to create a new model of a Turkish citizen as a rationalist, modern and anti-traditionalist person. The elites and intellectuals wanted to reduce the influence of religion on the everyday lives of the people. To achieve this goal, the application of certain cultural practices was prohibited (such as polygamy, traditional customs, Arabic religious rituals and religious education). The Swiss civil code, the French administrative law and the Italian Penalty Code were adopted.

On the other hand, the Turkish state tried to transform public life by establishing and renewing education, socio-cultural institutions, military, and economic institutions. During this process, the production of ideology was taken into possession of intellectual actors, among them there several writers. The action of realizing this ideology required the transformation of the life styles and mentalities of the people to be able to create a new society. Boggs describes this attitude of intellectuals in the Third World context by comparing these intellectuals with the intellectuals of the European capitalist countries:

> Preindustrial settings in the twentieth century produced yet another type of relationship between intellectuals and modernity. In many Third World countries the dominant classes (in tandem with Western imperialist powers) generated intellectual strata that, while isolated from the populace as a whole, drew inspiration from secular ideologies of change and development: nationalism, liberalism, socialism, even religious ideology itself, which sometimes took on the character of a political theology. These intellectuals were more integral to political struggles of the post war period, more keenly focused on the unity of knowledge and power… the Third World model gave educated elites a more directly political and active role…The "ascetic

vanguard" of Europe corresponded to the modernizing intellectual elite of the Third World. [244]

In the Turkish context, these intellectual elites were formed beginning in the Tanzimat era, but increasingly after the Republic.

The efforts of the Republican elite to create a systematic ideology led to the publication of a monthly magazine called *Kadro*. *Kadro*, which began to publication in Ankara in 1932, aimed to create an `original ideology for the Kemalist revolution. They made their main configuration of the Marxist class warfare as the conflict between developed and underdeveloped nations. The combined effect of their positions was to highlight the indispensable role of intellectuals as agents of social, cultural, and economic transformation. *Kadro* tried to reproduce the idea of the official ideology of Kemalism to establish a society without class distinctions and to transform the society into a totality of non privileged people.

In this first period of the Republic, committed intellectuals gathered around *Kadro*. Asım Karaömerlioglu[245] describes this Republican mentality as "for the people, in spite of the people" and he says that this mentality was very strong among the politicians and intellectuals. The elites thought that they had the right to think and decide for the entire society and to carry out policies independently even if people do not approve. For example, intellectuals throughout the country made proposals to increase the educational level of the people and to create cultural institutions to cultivate them. This generation is described having constituted and supervised the Republican ideals.

---

[244]Boggs, p. 13.

[245]Asım Karaömerlioğlu, *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta: Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Köycü Söylem* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006).

The intellectuals who edited *Kadro* journal were also significant producers of literature, like Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu and Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. These two authors were also active in the 1960s, to some extent.

Kemal Karpat explains the factors that underlying these characteristics of the intellectuals. The reason underlying the regime's depression was the clash between a social structure and a social organization left from the old age, a scholastic and formalist philosophy, an authoritarian attitude with respect to the state and the individual developed according to the needs of the twentieth century. The intellectuals who administered and the people who were administred appeared as two distinct social groups which had been brought up separately and whose cultural levels and understandings and life standards had been differentiated to the utmost degree.

According to Karpat, the place and function of the body of intellectuals had been determined by means of historical and social developments, at a distance from the people and in a wrong way. This was a product of one or two past centuries. He says that in the 1960s and 1970s, the intellectuals see themselves at the top of society, and view themselves as its owners. They see themselves as responsibles for educating, and developing the people. They regard the people as if they were inferior, they avoid them, and they always say that the Turkish people are reactionary. This is the heritage of the Ottoman period. The republican system firstly aimed to transform this understanding but in the course of time, they also maintained this duality and they continued the old sytem.[246] In this social system, intellectuals, who were not economically productive, always depended on the absolute authority of the state

[246]Kemal Karpat, "Collective Survey," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1962* (Varlık Yayınları: İstanbul, 1961), p. 167-220.

institutions and they did not hesitate to defend the use of force against the people to change their cultural, religious beliefs.

In the period between 1930 and 1950, a new generation gained its theoretical and cultural knowledge from literature. Some of the most creative people decided to produce works of art. Belge writes:

> Until the 1960s, people in Turkey were more interested in the arts and literature. I mean an elitist approach, people who were genius, for instance Orhan Veli, Sait Faik, and the following generation of Edip Cansever, Turgut Uyar, Cemal Süreyas. They were most intelligent, sensitive, creative people of their period. But after, everything changed. Until the 1960s creative people oriented toward these domains. Some special people were interested in these things. The most important reason may have been the capitalist development. There occured jobs which were more attractive for creative people. Before, as a rule, these people had worked in jobs like civil service jobs and at the same time they were interested in art and literature.[247]

In the 1940s, the close relationship between the state and some intellectuals and writers continued:

> In the totalitarian period, İnönü declared that he began an era of culture and, he supported three distinct circles of writers. These circles which had conflicts between them were, first, Ataç, Garipçiler, and Eyuboğlu, Günyol, Erhat, Halikarnas Balıkçısı, who were around the Ministry of Education; second, in this period, Suut Kemal and the people around him, Fazıl Hüsnü, Cahit Külebi, Behçet Necatigil, Oktay Akbal, Salah Birsel were considered like the B team, and third, *Ülkü* review and the Anatolians. In the course of time a fourth circle, Village Institutes-originated writers, who were the defenders of the single party regime, participated into the world of literature.[248]

---

[247]Belge (1998), p. 488 489.

[248]"*Atatürk'ten sonra bir sanat ve kültür devri başlattığını ilan eden İnönü totaliterliği, üç ayrı edebiyaçı grubunu tek partinin nimetlerinden yararlandırıyordu: Aralarında hiç geçinemeyen bu gruplardan ilki, Ataç, Garipçiler, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı etrafındaki Eyuboğlu, Günyol, Erhat, Halikarnas balıkçısı vs., o tarihte B takımı muamelesi gören Suut Kemal ve çevresindekiler yani Fazıl Hüsnü, Cahit Külebi, Behçet Necatigil, Oktay Akbal, Salah Birsel vb.; üçüncüsü ise Ülkü dergisi ve Anadoluculardı. Zamanla bunlara dördüncü bir grup olarak Köy Enstitülerinden yetişmiş, tek parti sanatının neferleri olan edebiyatçılarda katıldı."* Attilâ Ilhan, *Hangi Edebiyat* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002); Edebiyat Çeteleri (27 Nisan 1995), p. 382 383.

> During the 1940s, the three official currents were first, *Varlık*, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Ataç, Eyuboğlu, Institute graduates; secondly *Yeditepe* review, Hüsamettin Bozok; Garipçiler; and last *Yenilik* review of Suut Kemal and his circle still represented the really Westernized and original face of Turkish literature. A young poet and writer who was not approved of by these circles, could not defined like a writer and sometimes he was excluded from anthologies. In most of the anthologies published in this period, Nazım, Dinamo and some others were absent.[249]

But in the 1940s, there were also dissident intellectuals who were excluded from the established culture of literature. In the generation of the 1940s, alternative thoughts multiplied. This generation struggled in an humanistic way for freedom against the totalitarian regime. These intellectuals came from peasant families and these families who were generally poor or lower class. The following generation of these writers flourished in the 1960s. Most of these dissident intellectuals of the 1940s would be more influential in the 1960s with the creation of a tradition of leftist intellectuals.

A more conservative cultural synthesis was favored by other intellectuals. The significance of religion and tradition was emphasized by the supporters of this approach. They suggested the need for the protection of the institutions and cultural values and defended the argument that Turkish society was, in all its forms, carrying an almost intrinsic specificity. According to the argument, which I called "the cultural thesis" the "existing culture" had an absolute value and it had to be supported because of the dynamism and vitality it contained and other were trying to destroy or reject it.

---

[249] *"40'lı yıllar boyunca ağırlığı hissedilen üç resmi akım, Varlık, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Ataç, Eyuboğlu, Enstitü çıkışlılar, Yeditepe Hüsamettin Bozok, Garipçiler, Yenilik Suut Kemal ve takımı, Türkiyenin hala gerçek Batılı ve yeni edebiyatını temsil ediyorlardı. Genç şair ve yazar bu odaklar tarafından tezkiye edilmedikçe, edebiyatçıdan sayılmaz, bazı hallerde antolojilere bile alınmazdı. O zaman yayımlanmış antolojilerin çoğunda Nazım, Dinamo ve başkaları yoktur."* Attilâ Ilhan, *Hangi Edebiyat* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002), "Soğuk Savaşın Çeteleri Nasıl Oluştu?" (1 May 1977, 29 April 1995), p. 384 385. p. 424.

In this context, culture was essential. This attitude can be described as "partial-modernism." Their position was based on the tension between the universal and the local, the West and East. In this tension, the intellectuals faced the problem of destruction of the old civilization to which they thought that they belonged, while rejecting to understand this problem as a question based on the underdevelopment of the country in the capitalist world system.

These intellectuals, most of them writers, Peyami Safa, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Nurettin Topçu, Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Hilmi Ziya Ülken, and İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, were especially influential during the first half of the twentieth century. Even if they had many differences between them, especially in their relations with modern ideologies, they suggested alternatives to the process of nation building, generally by proposing the East-West synthesis. These intellectuals were not central to the tradition which had been established by Kemalism. They criticized the approach which denied the Ottoman heritage.

These movements of thought were transformed into political movements after 1950. This can be explained with the relative autonomy that conservative thought obtained after the establishment phase of the state. During the early years of the Republic, the Turkish elites had tried to create a new country in a nationalist context with an emphasis on secularism, but starting with the 1950s, and especially after the 1980s, the Turkish-Islamic synthesis challenged the radical modernist hegemony on nationality. The relationship between nationalism and Islamism is redefined, and after the 1980s, the radical modernist synthesis which was defended by bureaucrats, technocrats, intellectuals was almost completely liquidated. It is generally argued that

conservatives were less "intellectual," and rationalized their defense of the traditional order in reaction to arguments of their opponents. This argument is not applicable to the case of conservatives like Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who had a very powerful and profound intellectual identity.

The 1950s is generally considered to have been a period distinguished from the single party governments. Zeynep Yasa Yaman writes that many important changes took place in the 1950s, in the field of art after the single party governments:

> In the 1950s, the romantic atmosphere of the early years of the Republic came to an end. During these years DP governments were inactive in the realms of art and culture. The head office of fine arts was closed. The museum of sculpture and picture which had been founded in 1937 was always kept closed. Associations had been founded in the 1950s were the Association of Philarmony (1954), Sanatsevenler Cemiyeti (1950), Sanat Dostları Derneği, Helikon Sanat Derneği (1952) tried to create an independent artistic world which was independent from the state.[250]

In the 1950s, intellectuals defended a more critical perspective in the realm of the literature; artists and writers tried to transform traditional forms of the poetry and novel. The relation of art and politics was debated. Innovative attempts were discussed in their environment not only for dealing with social topics in terms of realist, critical and political dispositions, but also for transforming conventional, repetitious and static artistic forms. In an extremely limited atmosphere, especially in the late 1950s, intellectuals and artists began to become a part of these debates as well as having an interest in the current situation of the artistic field in the world. They were curious about the international artistic developments, and wanted to make Turkish art a part of this intellectual. They were not totally indifferent in politics. State oppression forced

[250]Zeynep Yasa Yaman, "1950'lerin Sanatsal Ortamı ve Temsil Sorunu," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 79, (1998), p. 97.

them to adopt a more abstract, individualistic artistic attitude. This individualism was against the state oppression and it reflected the alienation and angst of the intellectuals from the society in which they belonged.

Within these debates, social realism which was more effective, especially in the field of poetry,[251] was transformed during the 1950s by the movement of the *İkinci Yeni* (Second New),[252] when poets in the avant-garde movements wrote their poems in a more symbolic and allegorical styles. These poets continued their search for new artistic styles. Existentialism which was held as a reaction to the social realist movement in the realm of novel and poetry, for instance against peasant realism,[253] was defended and adopted by some of the poets, writers and philosophers of the period, such as Demir Özlü, Ferit Edgü,[254] Orhan Duru, and Selahattin Hilâv. Yücel criticizes the oppressions of the state institutions:

> Literary language generally questions, it interrogates, everything ranging from itself to the whole world; the dominant discourse, on the other hand, determines, assures, as it were. Perhaps because of this fundamental differentiation, most of the powers, especially authoritarian powers always had been suspicious of about literary people. For example, between 1950 and 1960, have those who made the power most suspicious were literary people. They were the ones who were monitored and harassed most. When looked at from the perspective of power, this attitude was not unwarranted. Questioning involves freedom; conservative and authoritarian powers require citizens not needing freedom.[255]

---

[251]The Social Realist movement of poetry was very influential during the 1940s. This movement maintained its importance during all the 1960s and 1970s. The leading figure were A. Kadir, Rıfat Ilgaz, Arif Damar, Ahmed Arif, Hasan Hüseyin and Enver Gökçe.

[252]Second New poets were also productive in the 1960s and this circle will be discussed below.

[253]This movement was very effective in the 1940s, and 1950s. The prominent figures of the movement were Fakir Baykurt and Mahmut Makal. These two figures and the followers of this movement were also active in the 1960s and they were the subject of an important critique which argues that this movement's approach is more close to a documentary than a work of art.

[254]Demir Özlü and Ferit Edgü were close members of the Sinematek Association. This existentialist movement was also called as *1950 öykücüleri* (Short-stroy writers of the 1950s). These authors will be largely discussed below.

In the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s, philosophy and literature journals like *Yeni Ufuklar* (New Horizons), *Varlık, Yeditepe* (Seven Hills), *Cep Dergisi* (Pocket Journal), and *A Dergisi* (Journal A) were published. The hard state oppression was transcended by these independent intellectuals and by their publications.

For instance, while the peasant realism trend was embraced by the Republican project to transform rural life with the help of educational reforms and by the foundation of the Village Institutes (*Köy Enstitüleri*), existentialism was a very individualistic and modernist theme, which defined its position regarding the social projects of the state from a distance. This meant a real clash with the monopoly of the state over the cultural sphere during the early Republican period.

Between 1950 and 1957, Turkey experienced an expansion in the area of literature. There were new publishing houses, literary journals; foreign literature, especially from the U.S. with authors like Steinbeck, Hemingway, and London were very popular. Between 1957 and 1960, intellectuals were faced with hard political repression. Writers were generally discontent from the policies of the DP government. During these years, literary production decreased.

---

[255]"*Genellikle yazınsal dil sorgular, kendi kendinden dünyaya değin herşeyi sorgular; egemen söylemse yalnızca kesinler. Belki de bu temel ayrılık nedeniyle çoğu iktidarlar, özellikle de yetkeci iktidarlar, yazın adamlarından hep kuşku duymuşlardır. Örneğin 1950 1960 yılları arasında iktidarı en çok kuşkulandıran kişiler yazın adamlarıydı. En çok onlar izlenir en çok onlar rahatsız edilirdi. İktidarın kendi açısından bakılınca haksız da sayılmazdı bu tutum, Sorgulama özgürlüğü içerir, tutucu ve yetkeci iktidarlar ise, özgürlüğe ihtiyaç duymayan yurttaşlar ister.*" Tahsin Yucel, *Kaan Özkan ile söyleşi kitabı, Görünmez Adam, Tahsin Yücel Kitabı* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2001), p. 246.

The Increasing Visibility of the Literature in the 1960s and 1970s

In the 1960s and 1970s, literature's visibility increased and its influence grew over a larger part of the population. In the following sections, this visibility will be demonstrated. Three dynamics contributed in this visibility. First newly established cultural institutions, reviews, journals and publishing opportunities appeared at the public scene. The number of publications of native books gradually increased. Second the role of the new schools of thought was central for the increased popularity of literature. Literature also functioned as a medium to introduce thoughts such as thougts from philosophy, sociology, history, and other theories. Finally, as a catalyzor of this visibility, the formation of a concept of public intellectual in the domain of literature will be examined.

The Development of Cultural Associations and Publishing Houses, and Increase in the Quantity of Works of Literature

As discussed in an earlier part, in the 1960s, institutions such as cinema clubs like the Sinematek Association[256], theatres like AST (Ankara Art Theatre), and the Association of Men of Letters (Türkiye P.E.N.Yazarlar Derneği),[257] and T.Y.S (Turkish Authors Union-*Türk Yazarlar Sendikası*)[258] brought together intellectuals and artists from various fields in a more defined way. They became better able to present

[256]The Sinematek Association was founded by Onat Kutlar, Şakir Eczacıbaşı and Hüseyin Baş, in 1965.

[257]This association was established by Halide Edip Adıvar in 1950, but it became a major institution only in the 1960s.

[258]This association was founded in the leadership of Aziz Nezin, at 7 May 1973.

their political and cultural views in the public sphere rather than only in the spaces in which they had existed before, such as the Küllük Coffehouse in Beyazıt and Markiz and Baylan patisseries in Beyoğlu, as well as pubs and restaurants. *Türk Yazarlar Sendikası* (Turkish Union of Writers-TYS), under the leadership of Aziz Nesin, was an influential association. The Sinematek association was also significant for literary actors to introduce with a universal cinema culture. Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK) was also a significant association for literary actors, especially, in the late 1970s. As an example, Yaşar Kemal, Fakir Baykurt and Ülkü Tamer, as members of TYS were accepted also as members of the TDK on 10 March 1977. This institution like TRT was the subject of a conflict between the right-wing and left-wing artists who all sought to benefit from it for political and professional reasons.

Several literary reviews were published in the 1960s: *Varlık, Yeditepe, Cep, Papirüs, a Dergisi, Yeni a, Yeni Dergi, Dost, Yeni Edebiyat,* (New Literature) *Yücel, Hisar, Ufuklar and Yeni Ufuklar, Türk Dili, Milliyet Sanat, Türk Edebiyatı, Halkın Dostları, Türkiye Yazıları*, (Writings of Turkey), and *Türkiye Defterleri* (Books of Turkey) were the most important literary reviews of the period. The four main reviews were: *Varlık*, (1933-present), *Yeni Dergi* (1965- 1975), *Yeditepe*[259](1951- 1984), and *Yeni Ufuklar* (1951-1975). There were also many small reviews which were not regularly published. Some of them, however, such as *Türkiye Defterleri*, *Türkiye Yazıları*, *Papirüs*, *Halkın Dostları* and *Oluşum* (Being), even if they were published for a small time period, were also influential. In 1966, *Varlık* was in its 33rd year, and *Yeditepe* and *Yeni Ufuklar* were 15 years old. They were indispensable and significant

[259]Emel Yiyen, *Yeditepe Dergisi Etrafında Gelişen Sanat Faaliyetleri, 1970 1983* Master Thesis (Gazi Üniversitesi, 2007).

instruments of the literary world. *Yeni Dergi, Şiir Sanatı, Soyut, Yordam,* and *Papirüs* were newly published but popular reviews.

As stated below, the cultural and intellectual enrichment of the country was also augmented by the establishment of the new publishing houses such as *Ant* (Oath), *Cem* (established in 1964 by Oğuz Akkan), *De*, *Yön* (Direction), *Habora*, Muzaffer Erdost's *Sol* (Left), *Dost* (Friend) and *Bilgi* (Knowledge, established in 1965). Some of the old publishing houses such as *Varlık*, *Çan*, *Remzi* and *Dost* (Friend) were very productive during these years. Two of them, *Çan* and *Varlık* publishing houses which established in the 1940s by Vedat Günyol and Yaşar Nabi Nayır, provided the translations of world classics, like Steinbeck, Hemingway, Tolstoy and many others during the 1950s and 1960s. These works of art were masterpieces of the World literature. These books sold very well.

During this period, there were some developments in the quantity of publication thanks to increasing paper production of the SEKA foundation (State Paper factories), as the supplies of paper increased. Despite this increase of paper production, the rate of printed material per capita was very low compared to other developing countries in the 1960s.[260] But, this fact started to be gradually changed. At the end of the 1970s, printed material per capita reached higher levels. It can be also argued that the print technologies certainly developed. New print machines were imported to the country.

Another point is that the prices of printed material were not high for a larger literate public. For instance, according to Kemal Tahir, books in general were cheap.

[260]Cavit Orhan Tütengil, "*Varlık* Dergisi'nde toplu soruşturma", *Varlık Yıllığı* 1970 (Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi, 1971). p.166, (the 187th page of II. Five Year Development).

He writes that, "Especially recently, the most expensive book was cheaper than a bottle of raki and the average book was cheaper than a waiter's tip. Especially, the reader who can choose books which are resistent to the time, can buy a value which will be effective for the rest of his life."[261] Tahir also says that, in 1969, the publication and sales of books increased to the significant numbers in Turkey.[262]

There are data to show the increasing rate of publication of books. The number of books published in 1959 was 4124; in 1963; 3440, in 1964; 5744, in 1965; 5442, in 1966; 6100, and in 1972; 6542. According to rough estimation, the number of books published in 1963 was 11 million. Of this amount, 7 million were school books and the number of books per capita is 0.36. This number reached hundred millions by the end of the 1970s.

The number of novels published in 1961 was 15. In 1965, the number was 19, but it rose to 30 in 1969. Throughout the 1970s the average was more than 40 novels. The number of books of short story, poetry and essay were also increased. The total number of native literary production did as well. I know that these numbers are not huge numbers, but many of these publications sold well and were appreciated by a large public.

There was also a major increase in the sales of the newspapers. Between 1920 and 1960, the number increased six times. In 1962, the number of different newspapers and magazines was 1653. It continued to escalate throughout the 1960s and 1970s. This number was continued to increase in the 1970s. The quantity of sales

---

[261]"*Genellikle Türkiyede kitap ucuzdur. Hele son zamlardan bu yana en pahalı kitap bir şişe rakıdan, ortalama kitap garson bahşişinden daha ucuzdur. Hele eskimeyen kitapları seçebilen okurlar için bu ucuzluk ömür boyu işe yarar bir değer satın almak demektir."* Kemal Tahir, *1968, Notlar Sanat Edebiyat* (Istanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1989.), p. 408.

[262]Ibid., p.409.

of newspapers increased, such as in the case of *Hürriyet* reached to one million. The newspapers were important for the introduction of literary work, as a tradition of feuilleton. Writers had also opportunity to write articles in newspapers such as *Milliyet*, *Hürriyet* and especially *Cumhuriyet*. I think that newspapers contributed to the increasing visibility of the literature and writers.

Many critics agree that at the end of the 1960s, Turkish literature underwent an important expansion. According to Mehmet H. Doğan, Turkish literature was not attractive for the Turkish public until the end of the 1960s, but after 1969, this situation changed little by little and literature gained more significance. After the 1960s, the revolution in the field of the expression of thought motivated large numbers of people to read books. In addition, authors began to earn money from the literature. First, he argues, an important number of the translations of foreign literature came together with a larger audience and then Turkish authors' works of art were published as they now were appreciated by the reading public. The 1969 and 1970 were important years for the growth of Turkish literature.[263] For instance, in 1970, 5854 works were published. The works from the literature numbered 935.[264]

This vivid atmosphere survived throughout the 1970s, although there were some interruptions during the coup d'état period of 1971. But, after 1973, at the end of the martial law, another big boom in the production of books occurred.

---

[263] *"1969'dan sonra bu durumun yavaş yavaş değişmeye başladığını, edebiyatın kendini kabul ettirdiğini görüyoruz. 1960'dan sonra düşünce özgürlüğü alanında gerçekleşen devrim sonucu yağmur gibi yağan kitleler zaten var olan okuma potansiyelini harekete geçirdi. Kitap para etmeye başladı. Önce yabancı dillerden çeviri yapıtlarla zamanla yerli düşün ve edebiyata dönecekti. 1969 ve 1970'li yıllar yerli yapıtların başarılı açılım yılları oldu."* Mehmet H. Doğan, *Tekrarın Tekrarı* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), p. 30.

[264] Cavit Orhan Tütengil, "Sayılarla Türkiye'nin Sosyo Ekonomik ve Kültürel Durumu," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1972* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972), pp.209, 225, p. 224.

Increasing production and all of these changing material conditions contributed naturally to the increasing visibility of the literary world.

Literature and the Social Sciences

Another reason for this increasing visibility was the new intellectual trends from the social sciences that were carried by the form of literature or directly by the authors in the literary reviews. This period of getting to know the world motivated Turkish intellectuals to embrace all of these sources both by developing sensitivity to the social realities of their country, but also through the experience of the individual tensions of human life. During this period, socialism, existentialism and other modernist theories became widespread among the university students and intellectuals. These ideologies were closely related to the literary field as they were introduced by the works and journals of literature to some extent, and the authors and literary critics introduced these ideas, throughout their articles in literary journals. The attractiveness of these ideas and literary world went hand in hand.

The modernist, humanist tradition had more profound origins in Turkey, beginning with the translation of the modern classics by the minister of education of the period, Hasan Ali Yücel. This period of the 1960s however also had a specific weight for the diffusion of the Western intellectual modes of thought. Furthermore, the translation of dissident books contributed not only to the flourishing of social/political movements and provided nourishment for intellectual hunger, but also

were by themselves the constitutive products of this development.[265] Ataol Behramoğlu writes that: "the translation of the Marxist classics on the one hand and, on the other hand, trends like existentialism and surrealism that aim to transform the artistic and aesthetic perception of the reader went hand in hand in the beginning of the period."[266]

Enis Batur, in a similar vein, notes that in the 1960s and 1970s, the Kemal Tahir "line" that emphasized the particularity of Turkey, denying to some extent the Kemalist tradition by criticizing it for being despotic and thereby defending the Ottoman heritage, was accompanied by the line that adopted and introduced the political and cultural agenda of the international socialist movement looked at the world from the same perspective as Western socialist intellectuals and emphasized the international dimension of art and politics in contradistinction to the narrow nationalist conception. He also was a proponent of another line which had existentialist and modernist tendencies.[267] All of these projects, even the one represented by Kemal Tahir were modernist viewed from the perspective of the circumstances in Turkey. Literature played a key role for the diffusion of all of these intellectual projects. As Murat Belge claims, the *47liler* (people born in 1947 and at university in the 1960s and 1970s)[268] began to learn intellectual theory and socialist

---

[265]See Erkal Ünal, *Invited Sojourners: A Survey of Translations into Turkish of Non-Fiction Left Books Between 1960 and 1971* (M.A. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2006).

[266]Ataol Behramoğlu, Conference under the moderation of Hasan Bülent Kahraman, 7 March 2007, Aksanat Centre of Culture.

[267]See Enis Batur, *Alternatif Aydın* (Istanbul, Hil Yayınları, 1985).

[268]University students in 1968 who had been born in 1947 were called as *47'liler*. Füruzan wrote a book about them, with the title *47'liler*.

ideas with art, literature, and history.[269] Academics, intellectuals and students interested in socialist, modernist and existentialist ideas at the same time as their interest of literature.

Literary journals were places were philosophical ideas and different schools from the general field of thought. The social sciences were also introduced in these journals to some extent. Political journals also provided space for social scientists and philosophers. Avşar Timuçin, Cengiz Gundogdu, Nermi Uygur, Ali Karatay, and Önay Sözer produced articles in these literary journals.

Literature and Public Intellectuals

This visibility can be also seen as a result of the formation of a public intellectual. Another significant characteristic of the period is the fact that a considerable number of intellectuals were at the same time, artists, and authors; the intellectuals that will be discussed below were with some exceptions, the producers of art or critics of art. This might not be a specific dimension of Turkish intellectual life but the interrelation between intellectuals and art can not be underestimated. There were certainly intellectuals other than writers and artists, but even these intellectuals had interactions with this world of literature. For instance, Doğan Avcıoğlu, who edited *Yön* political journal worked with many writers and poets.

An atmosphere was taking shape in which the artists could express themselves more freely. They introduced new styles and innovative, revolutionary forms in the

[269]Murat Belge, "Introduction," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Sol* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2007), p. 20.

artistic domain. This resurgence was effective in the artistic field in itself, for defending the importance of art in the everyday lives of the people and for the intellectuals adopting specific political attitudes. To be artist meant to have capacity to affect public life, and art was a more visible activity in the public sphere during this period. I do not assert that the decade of the 1960s was a period of total freedom, but in these years, democratic and participatory organizations appeared and a struggle for a freer public life was started. I argue that, in the 1960s and 1970s, the domination of the state in the artistic field was replaced by such new institutions and thus independent intellectuals mainly were influenced by the social movements of the period, which transformed the relation between society and the intellectual field.

The political and ideological attachments and dissident nature of these intellectuals requires some discussions. As mentioned, in the 1930s and in the 1940s, there were two leading figures of the leftist thought in Turkey. They were Sabahattin Ali and Nazım Hikmet who were the founders of a tradition of a socialist writers. Young people introduced leftist ideas thanks to them:

> *Virgül review*: Can you explain to us how you came into contact with leftist thought?
>
> Selahattin Hilav: In the library of Beyazit we read the books of Nazım Hikmet.They forget the books there. It was in the years 1943 and 1944. The leftist people began generally with reading poetry books and especially Nazım Hikmet, because there were not books about ideas and philosophy.[270]

[270] *"Solla nasıl tanıştığınızı anlatır mısınız? Beyazit Kütüphanesinde Nazım'in kitaplarını okuyoruz, adamlar unutmuşlar orada kitapları. 1943 ve 1944 seneleri bunlar, aslında biliyorsunuz solcular genellikle işe şiir ve Nazım Hikmet okumakla başlarlar, çünkü fikir diye birşey yok, felsefe kitabı yok."* Selahattin Hilâv, "Bu İnsanla Başa Çıkılmaz," in *Entellektüeller ve Eylem* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları: 2008), p. 102, Selahattin Hilav during his residence in France had a close relationship with the important sociologist of literature, Lucien Goldmann.

This tradition was continued with significant competence and undeniable dominance in the 1960s and in the 1970s by different writers, but five of them were also close friends or disciples of Nazım Hikmet and Sabahattin Ali: they were Aziz Nesin, Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Kemal Tahir and Attilâ Ilhan.

These authors influenced each other, even though sometimes they disagreed. Yaşar Kemal and Orhan Kemal were close friend, as were Aziz Nesin and Kemal Tahir but there was an important personal conflict between Orhan Kemal and Kemal Tahir continued in the 1960s. These authors were influential between 1965 and 1975 by their productivity and by opening new intellectual topics. They assumed their socialist identities in a very active way and discussed the problems of the socialist movement and the social realist literature. Literature was defined by them as an instrument which helped to provide a consciousness to the public.

Attilâ İlhan and Kemal Tahir, contrary to Aziz Nesin, Yaşar Kemal and Orhan Kemal, defended a more authentic version of socialism. Their original approaches in the literary realm were both criticized and accepted by younger authors. Attilâ Ilhan and Kemal Tahir were considered to be as independent and sui generis intellectuals. Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal and Aziz Nesin were three socialist authors who had an important legacy and authority in the circles of the socialist writers and in socialist parties.

These seven authors were some of the more charismatic and influential public intellectuals of Turkey. They also started many debates about the social and historical circumstances of the country. They wrote articles in the daily journals and participated in the collective surveys of the literary and political reviews; and these reviews made interviews with them. They were also important for different academic disciplines like

history, sociology, political science and certainly literary studies. The topics which were developed by the social sciences also were mentioned by these authors and all of them, sharing a common but variable socialist agenda, supported the socialist ideology. They brought about their own particular, original style to the problems of socialism. Their works can be considered as representating the social realities. By showing the poverty, inequality, ignorance, they tried to show the demand of a socialist order for the country. They attempted to show the oppressive nature of the capitalist order and the state bureaucracy. Their works led to the formation of a socialist public as they introduced many young people to the leftist ideas The socialist movement was endorsed by these writers.

The dominance of the socialist movement in the cultural and the literary realms was an undeniable reality of the period between 1960 and 1980. This process was two-sided. Writers were attracted by the increasing influence of the social movements; however they contributed to the attractiveness of the socialist movements with their works of art. These writers dealt with the economic and social system of the country. In their novels, they criticized of the official history writing and proposed a different perspective. The problems of the Turkish society in betwenness of the East and the West were also depicted, but with also an economic and social approach. For instance, Turkish society's problems were considered to have been the results of the Western cultural and economic imperialism. Researches into the roles of the imperialist powers (*Düveli Muazzama*) during the period of the late Ottoman Empire were started. Novels about the War of the Independence also were written from this anti-imperialist perspective. This interest in historical issues was important in that these public intellectuals reflected their opinions about the actuality.

Another important topic was the poverty of the working classes, their problems, and the exploitation they faced. The problems of the peasantry were an important topic of these works of art. A different from the tradition of the Kemalist writers, who insisted on the ignorance or illiteracy of the peasantry, the socialist-oriented approach focused to the problem of the peasantry mainly on the economic dimension and the problem of the feudal or newly developing capitalist relations. These two beliefs existed at the same time. Economic and social privileges of the feudal lords, in Turkish "*ağalık düzeni*" and the oppression of the peasantry were constant topics of thr novels written in the 1960s. Necati Cumalı, Fakir Baykurt, Orhan Kemal, Kemal Tahir, and Yaşar Kemal were socialist writers who wrote these novels and many articles in the socialist reviews about the problem of peasantry, the underdevelopment of Turkish society, inequalities between the classes and the concept of the people.

Kemal Tahir was the most original and debated of the period. He was criticized by the other socialist writers like Can Yücel, Mete Tunçay and Yalçın Küçük and he also constantly criticized the Turkish socialist intellectuals and movements. Another sui generis writer of the period was Oğuz Atay who maintained original ideas in the domain of form and content. He used innovative techniques of writing. Another very original author, Attilâ İlhan will be also particulary discussed.

In addition to these social realist writers, most of the avant-garde and modernist authors were also socialist oriented. Especially, the representatives of the groups ike Second New and 1950s short story writers who were productive in the 1960s. Turgut Uyar, Cemal Süreya and Can Yücel shared many common points with the social realist authors, but their style was more different and they thought that

revolutionary content also needed a new, alternative form and style. The debates between avant-gardes and social realists will be discussed below.

It is generally accepted that there is not an evolutional history of the Turkish novel. Oğuz Atay and Yaşar Kemal produced works of art, in the same period. Turkish literature did not follow the European classical scheme of development which is assumed to have existed; realist and modernist tendencies were observable at the same time.

Another literary tradition of the 1960s was the circle of writers who had a special attachment to the process of the Kemalist foundation, they had had close relations with the state institutions of the 1940s. For instance, the circle of *Mavi Anadolucular* (Blue Anatolians) were translators in *Tercüme Odası* (Translation Office) with Nurulllah Ataç. Another circle of peasant realists were writers who were first students and then instructors at the Village Institutes.

These two left-Kemalist circles had different syles, the first one was more Western oriented with a humanist perspective. The most important conflict and tension of these writers was the dichotomy between the educated and urbanized parts of the society and the ignorant, illiterate, rural population. In this dichotomy, on the one hand “our people” were the source of all of the richness, and on the other, “our people” were ignorant and could not find true way without the guidance of the intellectuals. These left-Kemalist intellectuals supported the Turkish Labor Party (TLP) in the 1960s and also the RPP of Bülent Ecevit in the 1970s. Throughout these two decades, this literary tradition was an important tendency in the Turkish literature. These authors generally were considered to be politically leftist and they represented a modernizing elite who tried to transform cultural habits of its country by introducing

Western, humanist cultural values which were not always accepted easily. They may be also described as the traditional intellectuals of their time.

These writers, from all of these various circles, worked in journals, reviews or in other professions like Cemal Süreya who was a bureaucrat in an important state institution. They participated in political parties, and had close relationships with the Universities, and they even generally replaced the public intellectual missions of the University professors during these years. However, the works of these authors were constantly excluded from the school libraries. Some of them were arrested and had to leave the country, especially after the 12 September 1980 coup d'état.

A more conservative and nationalist political attitude had also its literary representatives. These writers as public intellectuals, such as Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, and Tarık Buğra will be also discussed.

The politically engaged literary tradition of the period was harshly criticized. For instance, Belge criticizes this tradition for developing new methodological approach which underlined the role of social and economic factors. He writes, "In the 1960s, there was an important revival in all the fields of the intellectual life. An important aspect of this revival was a search for method. To make critiques or revolutions no longer mattered, if you can find the true method, you can resolve the problem. This led to a dogmatic belief in method, and method became a goal."[271]

Another important criticism of Turkish literature in the 1970s is that its political dimension shadowed its aesthetic qualities. The value of a writer, or a poet was considered to be the extent of his contribution to politics.[272] Hızlan argues that

[271] Belge, p. 488, 489.

literary actors were situated themselves against the state.[273] I will mention these considerable critiques below.

Poem; Novel and Short Story; and Essay, and

Literary Critiques Production during These Years

:

This section of my thesis examines the three main genres of the Turkish literature during this period under discussion. The most influential literary events, works, figures will be introduced. Literary production will be seen both as the fruit and the producer of the social context. In this plan, I argue that social contextual actions and interactions were observable in this process. As a part of this section, different themes and motifs will be discussed.

This discussion will make it easier to understand interrelations, differences and influences of the intellectuals and their circles and their relatively independent positions that will be examined on the following section. In this part, novel and short story, poetry, and essay and critiques will be the three main literary era in which many of the Turkish writers produced significant works of art, during this period. In this context, I will show the increasing or decreasing impacts of different genres throughout a process of change.

---

[272] *"1970'lerin edebi ortamında siyasi ölçütler edebi ölçütlerin önüne geçmişti. Bir yazarın şarin değeri edebiyata değil siyasete katkısı ölçüsündeydi,"* Doğan Hızlan, *Edebiyat Daima* (Istanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, 2006), p. 318.

[273] *"Edebiyat önce devletin yanındaydı, sonra karşısına geçti, şimdi politika dışında kaldı*." Ibid., p. 299.

Poetry

First, it is necessary to stress the distinct and special prominence of poetry in Turkey. There was a rich tradition of poetry throughout the Ottoman Empire. During the epoch of the Tanzimat, Constitutional Monarchy and in the early years of the Republic, there were many significant poets who were also politically and intellectually committed followed by a larger public. The 1950s and 1960s may be considered to have been a turning point in the Turkish poetry with the formation of a modernist tradition and proliferation of a realist tradition.

I will focus on the main poetry tradition of the decade. First, after 1960, while the *İkinci Yeni* (Second New) circle was disintegrated,[274] but poets, like Cemal Süreya, Edip Cansever, Ülkü Tamer, Ece Ayhan, Can Yücel and Turgut Uyar remained significant, respected intellectual figures of the period. I will discuss this tradition at length below in the section on the modernist literary tradition.

In addition to the Second New circle, Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, Behçet Necatigil, Metin Eloğlu and Gülten Akın were also significant poets. They developed very original and private styles by synthesizing the possibilities of Turkish folk poetry. Gülten Akın was sensitive to gender problems and she severely criticized the social injustices. It may be noted that she was one of the first female poets of the age. Metin Eloğlu, in his poems generally described the everyday lives of the little men of the suburbs.

[274]*İkinci Yeni* movement will be largely debated in the next chapter; but many of the poets who were considered members did not approved of this collective identity. They wrote many poems in the litrary journals of Ankara, as they were also known by a large public, but they were also gathered in Memet Fuat's *Yeni Dergi* after 1965.

Moreover, the social realist poets of the 1940s, who before had been isolated in the literary realm because of their political views, became more visible after the 1960s. Among them were Ahmed Arif, Arif Damar, Rıfat Ilgaz, A. Kadir, Enver Gökçe, and Hasan Hüseyin. This poetry tradition of the 1940s was disapproved of by the actual political power but then in the 1960s, these poets were more influential in the public life and they came together with a new audience.

Another considerable categorization of the Turkish poem was proposed by Uyguner, in 1971. In an article of *Varlık* Yıllığı, he wrote that there were three main tendencies in the realm of the Turkish poetry, the Second New, the Social Realist poetry and poets who were difficult to reduce into a single category but who were nourished from the tradition of folk poetry, such as Dağlarca, Külebi, Rıfat.[275]

Varlık, Papirüs, *Yeditepe* and *Yeni Dergi* were more popular magazines which published poetry during the 1960s. In addition to them *Halkın Dostları* at the end of the 1960s and *Sanat Emeği* in the 1970s often featured young poets. Socialist intellectuals, mainly the *Yön* milieu, began to publish mostly the previously unpublished works of the poet Nazım Hikmet. In addition to *Yön*, in the middle of the 1960s, *Varlık*, *Yeni Ufuklar* and *Yeni Dergi* started to publish his poems. The role of his son Memet Fuat in the publication of these poets, in *Yeni Dergi* journal has to be noted. These poems introduced many people to leftist thought and the new poets espoused the Nazım's way of poetry in the style or content of their works. The social realist poets of the 1940s were all attracted to his political and literary approaches. This tradition was also very active in the 1960s and 1970s.

[275]Muzaffer Uyguner, "1971'de Şiirmiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1972* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972), pp. 48 79, pp. 49-50.

The poets of the Second New generation appreciated Nazım's poetry and generally his political vision. For instance, Cemal Süreya argues that: "If we keep Nazım separate, the poets who grew up before the World War II period compromised with the existing social system; in this period, nearly all poets were in a similar position. However, this denial was sometimes escapism, sometimes to destroy all of the entire values, but the poets were generally in an attitude of protest."[276]

Süreya considers Turkish poetry after the 1940s:

> The shining simple present tense of the Divan poem (the Ottoman Poetry Tradition which was a rich and ancient poetic tradition that lasted for nearly 700 years) had ended. The past tense which was used from the Tanzimat to Yahya Kemal had also ended. A present tense which represents the pessimism of the Second World War was adopted. In this period, the lover's preference for Istanbul girls was replaced with the lover from the people.[277]

And after the 1960s, this pessimism which before had been shared by all of these poets, was transformed into a more optimistic attitude. They firstly thought that something could be changed during these years. For instance, poems about freedom and in support of social and political struggles were written.

In the second half of the 1960s, especially in 1966 and in 1967, there were many poems sharing similar themes such as social problems, inequalities and injustices. Ataol Behramoğlu, Ahmed Arif, Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, Necati Cumalı, Oktay Rıfat, Rıfat Ilgaz and Ceyhun Atuf Kansu wrote poems about freedom, political

---

[276]"*Öte yandan Nazım Hikmet'i ayrı tutarsak, İkinci Dünya savaşından önce yetişmiş şairler toplum duzeniyle bir uzlaşma içindeydiler. 1940'dan sonra ise temelde toplum duzenini yadsıma eğiliminde olmuştur şair. Bu dönemde belirmiş, kendini kabul ettirmiş bütün şairlerin hemen hepsi böyledir. Gerçi bu red, bazen kaçma, bazen alaya alma, bazen yerleşik değerleri ufak ufak yıkma şeklinde belirmiştir, ama şair temelde hep bu red tavrı içindedir."* Süreya, pp. 30-32.

[277]"*Divan şiirindeki parlak geniş zaman bitmiş, Tanzimattan Yahya Kemal'e kadar uzayan geçmiş zaman bitmiş, İkinci dunya savaşının kötümserliğini yansıtan bir şimdiki zaman baslamıştır." diyor, ayrıca bu zamana kadar hep İstanbul kızlarından seçilen sevgili bu kez halktan seçilmektedir dıye ekliyor."* Ibid.

struggle and against social inequalities. They also benefited from the ways of expression of the popular tradition of poetry. These artists wanted to escape from their loneliness as they had before and they wanted to influence people.

These artists created a common literary tradition that was politically oriented, and social inequalities and international themes were represented. They attempted to be part of the creation of a new public life. Different poets even if they produced in very different styles, represented escalating common political attitude.

These poets were also appreciated by the social and political movements. Among the university students, to write poems and to recite the poems of social realist poets was fashionable. This period can be seen as the golden age of the modern Turkish poetry, as many young, educated people wrote and read poems. In these decades, to write poetries was a fashion which adopted by a wide spectrum of people, especially by the university students.

Love and revolution were the two main topics of the poetry. In the contemporary European and US poetry, as a result of the counter culture movements, poetry was suitable for expressing powerful feelings and to fulfill human self realization and emancipation. The dissident and innovative nature of poetry became more visible, contrary to the more conventional, traditional way of writing poetry. As mentioned by Enis Batur, in Turkey, during this period, because of the miserable conditions of the school books, high school students had contact with the contemporaneous poetry only through reviews. When he firstly read *Yeni Dergi*, his world was totally changed.[278]

[278]Enis Batur, Conference in moderation of Semih Gümüş and Ömer Türkeş, Istanbul Modern Museum, (20 March 2012).

During all of this period, poets and their poems became deeply engaged into the social and political movements. There were many symbolic poems representing the spirit of their epochs. Nazım Hikmet's poems, which before had been unknown by an important part of society, were discovered especially by the university youth. Ahmed Arif poems were also emblematic for the social movements and they were important for the recognition of the social realities of the Eastern part of Turkey. For instance, his poem, *Otuzüç Kurşun* (Thirty Three Bullets) of 1969 was about the massacre of 33 Kurdish peasants who had been executed, shot to death for smuggling.

In these years, poets and their poems were at the forefront of the social struggles. They were written about social topics, and they were used by the social movements. This close relationship, however, was criticized for its underestimation of other topics which could have been made the subjects of poetry. For instance, Ahmet Oktay in 1966 wrote that the exploitation of Turkey by foreign powers, the appropriation of the labor, land problem of the peasantry, and imperialism were all sacred problems. But these topics could not be defined as the only content of poems. Poems which were not based on the economics but on the philosophical consequences of this economic base should not be judged by general social criterion.[279]

I will attempt to discuss a general overview of poetry in Turkey in a chronological manner. For instance, in the 1962 almanac of *Varlık*, the poem section of 1961 was written by Memet Fuat. He continued to write these articles in his own

---

[279]"*Açık ve net örneklerle konuşalım: Türkiye'nin sömürülmesi, emeğin çalınması, köylünün topraksızlığı, emperyalizm, kutsal sorunlar hepsi, kabul. Ama şu da kabul edilmeli: Şiirin biricik içerik'i haline getirilemez bunların hiç biri. Bırakın toplumcuyu, biçimci bir şair bile uzağında kalamaz bu sorunların. Ne var ki bu sorunların dışındaymış gibi görünen bir şiirin varolabileceği de dikkate alınmalıdır. Somut durumlara yaslanan, kendini dolaysız biçimde ekonomik olana değil, ekonomik olanın yarattığı felsefi sorunlara çeviren bir şiir genelgeçer toplumcu ölçülerle yargılanmamalıdır."* Ahmet Oktay, "Toplumculuk, Yabancılaşma ve Şiir," (Socialism, Alienation and Poetry), *Papirüs*, no. 4 (September 1966) .

literary almanac, *Memet Fuat'ın Türk Edebiyatından Seçtikleri*. In 1963 *Varlık* Yıllığı, the poem section of 1962 was written by Behçet Necatigil. And, many other articles were written by Rauf Mutluay and Muzaffer Uyguner in the following years. These comprehensive articles provide us the possibility of gaining general overview of Turkish poetry.

At the beginning of this new decade, in 1961, Memet Fuat wrote that a plurality of modernist, social realist and poets benefiting from the popular, rural poetry produced many significant poems.[280] According to Behçet Necatigil, the most important poetry books of 1962 were İlhan Berk's *Mısırkalyoniğne*, Attila İlhan's *Bela Çiçeği* (Flower of Trouble) A. Kadir's *Dört Penceresi* (Four Windows) and Arif Damar's *Saat Sekizi Geç Vurdu*. In 1963, according to Fuat, the most significant and productive poets of the period were Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, Behçet Necatigil and Kemal Özer, and he insists on the fact that social realist poets had come to the fore.[281] The increasing influence of the social realist poets, and legitimacy of writing about political topics led to the formation of a more political and contentious poet.

In addition to this realist tradition, a modernist one also flourished in many significant poets. For instance, in 1964, a notable modernits artist, Turgut Uyar wrote that,

> The insufficient idealism of the 1930s, the realism of the 1940s and the invalid romanticism of the 1950s are not sufficient to describe today's human being. It is clear that poetry is in a dilemma. Because the human being is in a dilemma. But the main problem is to have a consciousness of this dilemma. We do not

[280]Memet Fuat, "1961 Yılında Şiiirimiz," in *1962 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1962), pp. 21-42:35.

[281]Memet Fuat, "1962 Yılında Türkiye'de Şiir, Öykü, İnceleme," *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul : De Yayınevi, 1963), p. 6.

> think that Turkish poetry is not in a dilemma. We think that this dilemma is an opportunity for consciousness, knowledge, coherence, and modern poetry.[282]

Turgut Uyar's approach represented that of modernist circles. He thought that social conflicts could be represented in poetry, but in a modernist style and in innovative forms. According to avant-garde artists, revolutionary or innovative art needed new and innovative forms. He always used a sociological perspective to consider the development of Turkish literature.

Another dynamic of the period was the rediscovery of the dissident poet of the 1930s and 1940s, Nazım Hikmet. According to Memet Fuat, the most important event of poetry in 1964, was the publication of the poems of Nazım Hikmet for the first time, after a long prohibition.[283] The poems of Nazım Hikmet were published by many literary and political journals, especially *Yön*. Memet Fuat continued to publish the poems of Nazım Hikmet in the 1980s and 1990s.[284] He was a key figure in the introduction of the poems of Nazım Hikmet as he was his son. His assessment may be considered to have been subjective, but during all the 1960s, the poems of Nazım Hikmet were undeniably appreciated by a large public.

Another critic, Rauf Mutluay wrote that,

---

[282] *"Türkiye'de şiir için şöyle diyor: 1930'ların eksik idealizmi, 1940 realizmi ve 1950'lerin hastalıklı romantizmi ile bugünün insanını betimlemek mümkün değil. Evet şiir çıkmazda. Çünkü insan çıkmazda. Ama bütün sorun bu çıkmazın bilincine varmakta. Şiirin çıkmazda olmadığını düşünenlerden yana değiliz. Çünkü bu çıkmaz; bilince, bilgiye, uygunluğa, çağdaş şiire ve insana yeni bir imkandır."* Turgut Uyar, *Dönem*, no. 2, (November 1964), in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul : De Yayınevi, 1965), pp. 90 92, p. 91.

[283] "*1964'ün önemli bir şiir olayı da uzun yıllardan sonra Nazım Hikmet'in şiirlerinin yeniden Türkçede yayınlanmasıydı*." Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1965), p. 5- 9.

[284] Ataol Behramoglu indicates that *Adam* publishing house under the direction of Memet Fuat, published Nazim Hikmet's collected works and between 1987 and 2001, the 26 books were sold, in all, 1.500 000 copies. Ataol Behramoğlu *Kendin olmak ya da Olmamak* (Istanbul: İnkilap, 2003), p. 166.

> More than hundred poetry books were published in Turkey, in 1964. In all of the reviews contained articles on poetry. Some reviews contained only poetry... jammed and troublous translations of poetry. As a result, thrown peeples in a revolted sea. Peeples inefficient, powerless, silent... There is no reason to be optimistic. Most of them were solace, imitation and dawdling, verses of enthusiasm of poetry enthousiastics.[285]

This pessimistic attitude would change in the course of time, but this represents the impatience of the Turkish critics who desired a more advanced Turkish literature.

Turgut Uyar's poem *Ölü Yıkayıcılar* (Corpse Washers) was a very important poetry event. The most significant poem of Oktay Rifat, *Elleri Var Özgürlüğün* (Freedom has Hands) was also published in the first number of *Yeni Dergi* in October 1964. This poem represents the socialist approach which sought social and political freedom which generally had been under repression in Turkey, in the previous years.[286] The poem of Necati Cumalı in June 1965, *Kısmeti Kapalı Gençlik*[287] (The Youth who Has no Future) represents perfectly the spirit of the period and the mentality ofthe lonely intellectual. The newly increasing social struggles, a reaction to the state oppressions and atrocities, and the ordinary people keeping a distance from the intellectuals and a need for alcohol. But this situation was finally started to change.

The most important event of 1965 was the publication of *Yeni Dergi* by Memet Fuat. *Yeni Dergi* provided a platform for modernist poets during ten years in the pages

---

[285] *"İrili ufaklı yüzden çok şiir kitabı...Bütün dergilerde şiir üzerine yazılar...Salt şiirle sayfaları dolan küçücük dergicikler...Kalabalık ve karışık şiir çevirileri...Sonuç: Büyük dalgalarla ayaklanmış bir denize atılan küçük, küçük taş parçaları; etkisiz, güçsüz, sessiz. İyimser olmak için hiçbir sebep yok. Büyük çoğunluğu avuntu, özenti, oyalanma; şiir heveslilerinin heves şiirleri."* Rauf Mutluay, *1964 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1965).

[286] Tomris Uyar wrote an article about this poetry in which he criticized and even if he appreciated and respected Rifat, she expected new and innovative styles from him. Tomris Uyar, *Papirüs*, no. 1, (June 1966).

[287] Necati Cumali, *Yeni Dergi*, no. 9 (1966).

of this review. Thanks to this journal French or Western intellectual life, especially including its avant-garde dimensions were largely introduced to he Turkish reading public. Mutluay notes that there were two tendencies which transformed the conventional style of publishing of reviews. *Yeni Dergi* was very careful in its choices of poems and *Yön* published many significant, forbidden poems which were attended by a large public. Kemal Özer began to publish the *Art of Poetry* (Şiir Sanatı).[288]

Mutluay also thinks that the *Yeni Dergi* editors resisted without sacrificing their art to their beliefs or to the needs of society, they took the risk of not reading too much, not to be comprehended. At this point, Memet Fuat, personally was very important to continuing this resistence. *Yeni Dergi* published on the one hand, articles about *Nouveau Roman* (New Novel), Kafka, and on the other hand, masters of the Turkish poetry as Oktay Rifat, Edip Cansever, Behçet Necatigil, Cemal Süreya, Ülkü Tamer and Nazım Hikmet.[289]

Mutluay states that "Briefly, 1965 was a very hopeful year for our poetry"[290] According to Fuat, 1965 would be remembered with the old and new poets and with some people who firstly published their poems, as a very diversified, very powerful year of poetry.[291] However, according to Mutluay, there were too much books of poem in 1965, and this quantity did not go hand in hand with a similar quality. The

---

[288]Rauf Mutluay, "1966 Yılında Şiir," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1966* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 24- 39, p. 24.

[289]Ibid., p. 27.

[290]"*Kısaca şiirimiz için 1965, ayrı dallarda yarı çiçekler açan umutlu, müjdeli bir yıl oldu yeniden. Daha iyilerin bekleyişiyle birlikte, şiire ve sorunlarına layık olduğu yeri verme düşüncesini de getirecek..."* Ibid., p. 39.

[291]"*1965 yılı edebiyatımızda eskileri, yenileri, hatta ilk şiirlerini yayımlayanlarla, çok yönlü, çok çeşitli, çok güçlü bir şiir yılı olarak anılacak."* Ibid.

publication of *Yeni Dergi* and the publication of the poems of Nazım Hikmet (this year was seen as the year of Nazım Hikmet) were considered as important events. He argues that this was a hopeful and good year for Turkish poetry.[292]

In the mid 1960s, in the domain of literature, as a result of the social realist movement, the everyday lives of the peasants and lower classes were represented by the writers. Another concern was the internationalist concern. Poems were written supporting the Vietnam resistence. The Viet Cong forces and its prominent leader Ho Chi Minh were popular figures of the counter culture - anti war movements and generally the leftist culture of the epoch. The disaster of Hiroshima was also commemorated in many works of art. Another topic was the decolonization of the Africain countries. For instance, Arif Damar wrote a requiem for Lumumba[293] who had been assassinated, and in his poet, he quotes from Dağlarca who wrote: "Lumumba you were killed barefoot but the world also walks barefoot."[294] This poem reflects the internationalist intentions and a feeling of solidarity with the social movements of the world.

---

[292]Rauf Mutluay, "1966'da Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1966* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 25 39.

[293]Patrice Émery Lumumba (2 July 1925 – 17 January 1961) was a Congolese independence leader and the first legally elected Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo after he helped win its independence from Belgium in June 1960. Only twelve weeks later, Lumumba's government was deposed in a coup during the Congo Crisis. He was subsequently imprisoned and executed by firing squad, an act that was committed with the assistance of the government of Belgium, for which the Belgian government officially apologized in 2002

[294]"*Sen Lumumba. Yalın ayak öldürüldün. Ama yeryüzü de yürümektedir yalın ayak."* Arif Damar, In *Varlık Yıllığı 1964* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967), p. 105.

In 1966, Rauf Mutluay wrote that Turkish poetry was in a dilemma, waiting for something from the past and preparing itself for the future, in a different way. An important change was coming.[295]

The most interesting poetry books of 1966 were Edip Cansever's *Çağrılmayan Yakup* (Yakup who Was not Invited), Oktay Rıfat's *Elleri Var Özgürlüğün* (March 1966), Ülkü Tamer's *İçine Çektiğim Hava Değil Gökyüzüdür*. (What I Breath is not Air but the Sky - April 1966) [296]

Modernist poems were endorsed by Memet Fuat: "The most succesful poem of the year was written by Turgut Uyar, but the most beautiful poem of the year was possibly the poem of Cemal Süreya's *Ortadoğu* (Middle East), but I prefer Ülkü Tamer's *Giyotin* (Guillotine)."[297]

Social realist poets were also very productive. For instance, in the review *May*, there was published some verses of Hasan İzzet Dinamo and Rıfat Ilgaz; and Ahmet Arif's verses were published in *Soyut*, and Nazım Hikmet's poems, in *Yeni Dergi*.

The most popular artist of 1967 was Nazım Hikmet. The sales of his book which declined somewhat in 1966, once again increased. Another interesting thing is that *Second New* poets appreciated Nazım Hikmet more than the generation of Orhan

---

[295] *"Bugünün şiiri, geçmişten birşeyler beklemenin umuduyla yarına başka türlü hazırlanmanın kararsız bunalımı içinde. Yakında çok şeyler değişecek. Hiçbir şey bilmiyorum ama seziyorum bunu."* Rauf Mutluay, "1966'da Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1967* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 31 51: 51.

[296] Ibid., p.47.

[297] *"Yılın en başarılı şairi Turgut Uyar'dı ama yılın en güzel şiiri Cemal Süreya'nın Ortadoğu'su da denebilir ya, bence Ülkü Tamer'in Giyotiniydi…. May dergisi Hasan Izzet Dinamoya, Rıfat Ilgaza, Soyut Ahmet Arife, Yeni Dergi Nazim Hikmete yaslandı."* Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı 1967*, (İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1967), p. 8.

Veli Kanık.[298] *Second New* poets were politically and ideologically followers of the Nazım Hikmet's tradition which undeniably flourished during these two decades.

According to Memet Fuat, the most important poetry book of 1968 was Ahmed Arif's *Hasretinden Prangalar Eskittim* (Fetters Worn Out by Longing for You). This book of poems was enormously appreciated by a large public and also by the members of the left-wing social movements. Memet Fuat noted that "There is a need for artists who are also intellectuals and who are supporting the social movements with their thoughts. 1968 may be described as a succesful year, but it is difficult to say that it was a hopeful year."[299] This statement shows us the synthesis of intellectual and artist in the same figure.

The militant, revolutionary trend of the young poets escalated in 1969. Many young poets participating in the University movements wrote also poems defending revolutionary themes. For instance, the poem of young poet Sureya Berfe's *Gün Ola* (One Day) was published in the journal of the association of the youth (*Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu*.)[300]

In 1970, according to Memet Fuat, the leading poetry books of the year were Melih Cevdet Anday's *Göçebe Denizin Üstünde* (Above the Nomadic Sea), Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca's *Hiroşima* (Hiroshima) which was also translated in French and

---

[298]"*1967'de en çok anılan, incelenen sanatçı Nazım Hikmet oldu. Kitaplarının bir önceki yıla göre duralar gibi görünen satışı yeniden arttı, adına üç özel sayı çıkarıldı...Bu arada işin en ilginç yönü İkinci Yeni kuşağı sanatçılarının, Orhan Veli kuşağına oranla, Nazım Hikmet'i şair olarak daha fazla sevdiklerinin görülmesiydi*." Ibid., p. 9.

[299]"*1968'in şiir olayı denebilecek kitabı Ahmed Arif'in Hasretinden Prangalar Eskittim'i. Sanatçı olarak ta ağırlığını koyabilen, toplumcu gidisin düşünce yönüyle oluşabilecek içeriklerini getirebilen sanatçılar özleniyor. 1968 yılı getirdiği şiirlerle başarılı bir yıl diye anılabilir, ama umutlu bir yıl olduğu söylenemez."* Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı 1969* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1969), pp. 5-7.

[300]Doğan Hızlan, "1969'da Şiirimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1970* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1971), pp. 46- 64: 46 - 47.

English, and also an epic play *Vietnam Körü* (Blind of Vietnam). Attilâ İlhan's famous poetry book of *Sisler Bulvarı* (Boulevard in Fogs) was published in its third printing. Edip Cansever's *Kirli Ağustos* (Dirty August), Turgut Uyar's *Divan*, and Ataol Behramoğlu's *Birgün Mutlaka* (One Day Absolutely) were significant works of the year. *Birgün Mutlaka* became one of the emblamatic poems of the 1968 student movements in Turkey. Another significant person at the end of 1960s was Arkadaş Z. Özger, who died in 1973, in the age of 25.[301] His poems reflected a revolutionary desire, but without hate and propogand. The student movements of 1968 reflected by the poems of these authors, who expressed love, passion, enthousiasm, and desire for a new country.

Turgut Uyar's book *Divan* was read and debated on a wide scale. Kemal Tahir in an article in *Yeni Edebiyat* supported this book, considering it as a return to the powerful history of the Ottoman Empire. Ece Ayhan's *Orta İkiden Ayrılan Çocuklar* (Children Leaving the Secondary II) was also an important poetry event.[302]

In 1971, the TRT prize for poetry was awarded to Tahsin Saraç for his poetry book *Direnme* (Resistence). An interesting poetry book of this year was Gülten Akın's *Kırmızı Karanfil* (Red Carnation). Many translations of poems from various foreign languages were produced. For instance, *Varlık* review, in its section called *Dünyaya Açılan Pencere* (Window Opening onto the World), published many translated poems. Other poetry reviews were *Türk Dili, Yeditepe, Özün,* (Essential) *Dost, Halkın Dostları*. European poetry including the poetry of the real socialist countries (these

[301]There are suspicions that he was asssasinated as a result of an atack of right-wing students to the leftist students in 1968.

[302] Memet Fuat, " 1968'de Şiir, Öykü, İnceleme," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1968* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1969), pp. 6-7.

countries, especially that of Yugoslavia, Romania and Bulgaria) was the most translated. But poems from all over the world, Latin American, Australian, African poetries, were also translated.[303] These translations activities will be discussed at greater lenght below.

One of the important poetry events of 1971 was the organization of a symposium on Yunus Emre sponsored by Akbank (leading private bank). Yunus Emre was discovered and appreciated by the populist, leftist tradition of the age, along with the discovery of the popular literary tradition. They discovered an author like Yunus Emre who had also universal dimensions.[304]

Uyguner, in his analysis on the poetry of 1971, argues that many poets who were politically oriented did not produce works of any aesthetic values. Art created for political propaganda was criticized by many of the critics.[305] However, after the military coup, this politically engaged poems could not be published in the reviews as some of them, like *Halkın Dostları* was closed by the martial law.

In 1971, Turkish poems received attention in the international context. For instance, a featuring anthology of the Turkish poems was translated into German by Yuksel Pazarkaya, 52 poets like Yahya Kemal, İsmet Özel and many others. Poems of Melih Cevdet Anday, *Kolları Bağlı Odisseus* (Odyseus) and many other poems were also translated and published in French. Orhan Veli's poems were translated into

---

[303]Muzaffer Uyguner, "1971'de Şiirimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1972* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1971), pp. 68, 71.

[304]Ibid., p. 51.

[305]Ibid., p. 50.

English by Talat Sait Halman and there were published in the US, with the title of *I Am Listening to Istanbul*, as the title of his most famous poem.[306]

Gülten Akın broke the tradition of male dominance in 1972 with her works Kırmızı *Karanfil* and *Maraşın ve Ökkeşin Destanı*; she broke the male dominance of the world of poetry. Akın was one of the few female poets who were able to challenge to the mentality defining poetry as a male pursuit.

Metin Eloglu's book *Dizin* (Index) achieved the prize of *Türk Dil Kurumu* (Turkish Association of Language). In 1972, an anthology of Turkish poetry was published in Italy. The poems of Behçet Necatigil were translated to German language; Daglarca's selected poems were translated and published in Hungarian language.

Foreign poets' works were also translated in the Turkish language. Many books of Pablo Neruda were translated in 1972, Henrich Heine's poems were translated by Behçet Necatigil, and poems of Bertolt Brecht were translated by A. Kadir and A. Bezirci, in the same year.

In 1972, a review of the nationalist-conservative axis which was published in Konya called Çağrı (Invitation). *Türk Edebiyatı* (Tukish Literature) review published poems by Arif Nihat Asya and Ilhan Geçer with a nationalistic vision.[307]

It is generally accepted by many critics that there were two axes during this period, a social one, and the other a more individualistic axe. An important critic, Muzaffer Uyguner harshly criticized some poems which were designed to transmit

[306]Ibid., p. 53.

[307]Muzaffer Uyguner, "1972 Yılında Şiirimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1973), pp. 54-76.

only political ideas; he argues that ideas must melt inside a poem, like the melting of sugar inside an apple.[308]

The books of poems which were published in 1973 were about social realism, the economic and social development of the nation and desires about the fulfillment of the social justice throughout the country. Cahit Külebi's book *Türk Mavisi* (Turkish Blue) was different from these politically engaged books. Cahit Zarifoglu's book *Yedi Guzel Adam* (Seven Beautiful Men) which follows the Islamic tradition and beliefs was an example of the existence of an Islamic poetry tradition as a part of the nationalist-conservative literary tradition. This book was published by *Edebiyat Dergisi*. Other nationalist-conservative poets' works were published by this publishing house, such as works of Erdem Beyazıt and Rüya Çağrısı (Call of Dream) of Mustafa Miyasoğlu. *Akşamla Gelen* (Road Coming with the Night) of Yahya Akengin was translated by *Hisar* publishing house.

Left-wing poets were also very active and passionate during this era. Some of the titles of the poetry books, such as *Acıyı Bal Eyledik* by Hasan Hüseyin, *Direnmeler* (Resistance) by Tahsin Saraç, *Kavganın Yüregi* (Heart of Combat) by Kemal Özer, and *Ağıt Yok* (No Requiem) by Tekin Sönmez are meaningful to understand the spirit of the age; all of them were about sufferings, struggles and resistance. After the military intervention of 1971, the poets who supported social struggles resisted and suffered, but they were at the heart of the struggle.

In 1973, a book about modern Swedish Poetry was published by Yeditepe publishing house of Hüsamettin Bozok who also edited *Yeditepe* journal which

[308]Muzaffer Uyguner, "1973 Yılında Şiirimiz" in *Varlık Yıllığı 1974* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1974), p. 52.

represents the Westernized and modernist face of Turkish literature. Another book of poetry was *Vietnam Şiiri* (Poem of Vietnam) which was edited by A. Kadir and Afşar Timuçin. These books were efforts to bring in international dimensions to the Turkish world of Turkish poetry.

The most influential line of poetry was the line of the social realist poets in 1974. The oppressions of the young poets, their arrests and their sentencing were all represented in these poems.

There was an increase in the publication of books after the ending of the martial law. The main topic of this poetry was society and human being in this society. Anthologies of Turkish poetry were published in 1974, in Bulgaria and Azerbadjian.[309]People in these two countries were especially interested in the Turkish poetry.

Some of the titles of the books of poetry in 1974 were *Özgürlük için Ölmek* (To Die for Freedom) by Şinasi Özdenoğlu, *Bir Yeni Dünya Kurmuşum* (I Found a World) by Mehmet Çınarlı (Hisar), *Hem Hurriyet, hem Ekmek* (Both Freedom and Bread) by Nuzhet Erman, *Tutuklunun Günlüğü* (A Diary of an Arrested Person) by Attila Ilhan, *Kelepçemin Karasında bir Akgüvercin* (A Black Pigeon in the Dark of my Handcuff) and *Hücremde Ay Işığı* (Moonlight in my Cell) of Hasan Hüseyin, *Fırtınayla, Borayla Denenmiş Arkadaşlıklar* (Friendships Testified by Storm and Hurricane) by Nihat Behram and *Mapusanemden Şiirler* (Poems from Inside) by Hasan İzzettin Dinamo, and *Dost Dost illa Kavga* (Friend, friend, Always Struggle)

[309]Muzaffer Uyguner, "1974 Yılında Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1975* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi, 1975), p.59.

by Enver Gökçe gives us insight into the spirit of the age. They were all about the political and social topics, as is represented in the titles.

Toplandılar (They came Together) by Turgut Uyar and *Sıragöller* of Ülkü Tamer were also good examples of the Second New poetry which became more political, as in the book of Can Yücel, *Bir Siyasinin Şiirleri* (Poems of a Political Person).

Çiçekleri Yemeyin (Do not Eat the Flowers) of Özdemir Asaf and *Cinayetler Kitabı* (Book of Crimes) of İsmet Özel[310] were important works of 1975.

Dağlarca wrote about the Turkish War of Independence, with an anti imperialistic spirit, in 1975, like *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* (Human Landscapes from my Country) of Nazım Hikmet. Muzaffer Uyguner wrote that in the realist poems of 1975, there was a change. Instead of imitating Latin American passionate and crying poems, poets returned to their own culture. [311]

In 1976, in his annual observations about the evolution of Turkish poetry, Uyguner noted that Turkish poetry had become part and instrument of a harsh struggle between the radicalized left-wing and nationalistic youth circles; to be revolutionary had to exclude acts of violence and to appeal for humanity, fraternity, and love. Even if he was closer to the left wing ideology, he tried to have an objective attitude and he always criticized the over politicization of the Turkish poem. As I have already mentioned, at the second half of the 1970s, there was an intensive influence of political and ideological visions on artists that was reflected in their art and especially

[310]İsmet Özel is of the most complex personality of the Turkish poetry; he had during these years, his leftist, revolutionary political identity, he adopted an Islamist worldview after 1980s and then he became a Turkish nationalist.

[311]Muzaffer Uyguner, "1975 Yılında Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1976* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi, 1976), p. 51.

poems. This trend was disapproved of by traditionalist, left-Kemalist literary critics, like Uyguner with a humanist and universalistic vision.

There was a notable increase in the number of the poetry books published in 1976. This increase may have been the consequence of many factors, but the expansion of the literary public and increasing production were incontestable realities of the day. As I have already mentioned, titles of books were radicalized in these years; an example is a book by Nihat Behram titled *Dövüşe Dövüşe Yürünecek* (We Will Continue to Walk by Fighting).

In 1976, the works of many famous Western poets were translated, among them, works of Guillaume Apollinaire, Aragon's *Elsa'ya Şiirler* (Poems to Elsa), Reiner Maria Rilke and Paul Eluard's collective poems. In addition to this, Sezai Karakoç translated many Arabic, Islamic poems with the title of *İslamın Şiir Anıtlarından* (From the Islamic Monuments of Poetries). At the same time, left-wing Latin American poems which appealed to the struggle continued to be translated.

Edip Cansever's modernist work, *Ben Ruhi Bey Nasılım* (Me, Ruhi Bey How I Am?) was also written in 1976. Another important modernist work, *Yort Savul*, the collected poems of Ece Ayhan was published in 1977. Two notable works, Attilâ İlhan's *Böyle Bir Sevmek* (To Love like That) and *Horoz* (The Cock) of Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca have to be remembered. The international mobility of the Turkish writers continued during this year. For instance, in 1977, Gülten Akın, Sennur Sezer, Kemal Özer and Adnan Özyalçıner participated in a poetry festival in Yugoslavia.[312]

[312]Mehmet H. Doğan, "1977'de Şiir," in *Nesin Yıllığı*, (Istanbul: Nesin Yayınevi, 1978), p. 50.

In 1978, poetry continued to be a popular domain of art production. Unlike today's literary production, during the late 1970s, books and reviews of poetry were an important part of literature.

Novel and Short Story

In Turkey, in spite of the peculiar and specific status of poetry, the novel, which came from behind but powerfully with novelists like Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal and Kemal Tahir, entered in a period of productivity and creativity in the 1960s. Melih Cevdet Anday, Fakir Baykurt, Adnan Binyazar, Samim Kocagöz, Salah Birsel, Cemal Süreya, Necati Cumalı, Tarık Buğra and Oktay Akbal were significant novelists. Feyyaz Kayacan, Demir Özlü and Ferit Edgü have to be noted as they had modernist sensibilities in the early 1960s.

Tomris Uyar, Sevgi Soysal, and Selim İleri were significant, young and modernist novelists of the late 1970s. In addition to the novel's leap in popularity, short story, with prominent figures like, Rıfat Ilgaz (*Hababam Sınıfı* Class), Necati Cumalı (*Ay Büyürken Uyuyamam*, I Cannot Sleep when the Moon is Raising), Aziz Nesin (*Sosyalizm Geliyor Savulun*, Socialism is Coming) and again Orhan Kemal have to be remembered. Vusat O. Bener, Bilge Karasu, Sevgi Soysal, Tomris Uyar, and Selim İleri came on the scene in the 1970s. A modernist, individualistic perspective was acquired due to the efforts of these writers. This modernist tradition was respectful of individuality.

However, a social realist approach had been dominant throughout the novels and short stories of the 1960s. The number of published social realist tales and novels grew during both the 1960s and 1970s.

As one of the leading figures of the social realism, Kemal Tahir wrote novels that had social dimensions. His works started to be increasingly published with increasing frequency (some of them were completed before the 1960s) as well as other social realist novelists. Orhan Kemal, who had published many books in the 1940s and 1950s, reached full maturity in his novels. *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde*[313](Upon Fruitful Lands), *Bir Filiz Vardı* (There was a Girl, Filiz 1965) and *Murtaza* republished in 1968 by rewriting some parts of the novel were the "good examples" of the social realist novel and they met the expectations of the audience. Yaşar Kemal's works, especially *İnce Memed II and* III (Memed my Hawk), *Ortadirek, Yusufçuk Yusuf, Akçasazın Ağaları* (Aghas of Akçasaz) and *Demirciler Çarşısı Cinayeti* (Murder at the Blacksmith's Market) invigorated the relationship between literature and the problems of people. In 1969, his *İnce Memed II*, and Orhan Kemal's *Murtaza* were published. These novels marked the height of the very influential social realist school.

Haldun Taner, Füruzan, Tomris Uyar, Sevgi Soysal, Füruzan, Oğuz Atay, Adalet Ağaoğlu and Leyla Erbil were the most creative and innovative writers of the following decade. Adalet Ağaoğlu's novel *Ölmeye Yatmak*, (To Lie to Die) Sevgi Soysal's *Yenişehir'de Bir Öğle Vakti* (Noon in Yenişehir, 1973), and Oğuz Atay's T*utunamayanlar* (Disconnected Erectus 1972) are the modern masterpieces of Turkish

[313]This famous novel of Orhan Kemal was firstly published in 1954, but it twas republished many times in the 1960s and after. This book was also adapted to the cinema by Erden Kral in 1979.

literature. This modernist tradition also can be seen as a proliferation of a tradition of women authors who would be very successful. Gender problems and women's sensitivities were strongly reflected in their works. Sevgi Soysal, Tomris Uyar and Adalet Ağaoğlu were the most popular.

Two politically engaged authors, Vedat Türkali and Bekir Yıldız were also very productive during the 1970s. Vedat Türkali's *Birgün Tek Başına* (One Day Alone) tells the secret love story of a middle class intellectual man and a young female university student who participated in the University student's movements before the 27 May of 1960. Bekir Yıldız's short story *Kaçakçı Şahan* (Şahan the Smuggler) describes the smuggling, an important social fact in the Eastern regions, especially in the city of Urfa.

Then novels which written by Fakir Baykurt, Yasar Kemal, Orhan Kemal and Kemal Tahir made up a significant percentage of the total novels published during all the 1960s. The everyday lives of the ordinary people were narrated in many of the works of authors like Orhan Kemal, Haldun Taner and many others.

Between 1960 and 1980, the traumatic and violent political transformations and an implicit class struggle and class distinctions were also reflected in the Turkish novel.

During all this period, leading publishing houses were *Varlık*, *Remzi*, *Cem* and after 1965, *Bilgi* publishing houses. They supported the publication of the works of Turkish authors during all of these decades. In the tradition of serials in newspapers like *Hürriyet, Milliyet* and *Cumhuriyet*, novelists published their works in installments before they were published in full.

The significance of the Turkish novel is discussed by Hobsbawm in the *Age of Extremes* testifying to the central role of literature in society at that time also emphasized the significance and the success of the Turkish novel. According to Tahir Alangu, writing in 1966: "Since 1960, in our literature, a literary genre has been shining, another genre has been diminishing. First, novels overtook instead of the short story, and then a rapid rise took place in the theatre. In 1966, intellectuals became interested in literary and social research."[314] Necati Cumalı said "If I compare with the 1950-1960 period, our literary life, and especially our novel is in a process of enrichment."[315]

Another writer, and a historian of literature, Cevdet Kudret wrote that the distribution of the famous review *Servet-i Fünun*, during the late Ottoman Empire had been much more than a thousand. Even in the Republican era, until the 1930s, books of poerty and short story that sold more than one thousand copies were considered to be as succesful. But in the 1960s, Doğan Avcıoğlu's book *Türkiye'nin Düzeni* sold 22,000 in eight mounths. Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Necati Cumalı, Fakir Baykurt and Kemal Tahir's books sold in amounts of more than 10,000 and 50 thousands.[316]

N. Ziya Bakırcıoğlu's book *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türk Romanı* (Turkish Novel from Its Beginning) indicates that from the first Turkish novel Şemsettin Sami's *Taaşşuk-ı Talat ve Fıtnat* (Taaşşuk-ı Talat and Fıtnat) the number of novels published

---

[314] Tahir Alangu, "1965'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *Varlık Yıllıkları 1965* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1966), p. 41.

[315]Necati Cumalı, "Collective Survey," in *Varlik Yıllığı 1968* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1969), p. 150.

[316]Cevdet Kudret, "Varlık Dergisi'nde Toplu Soruşturma," *Varlık Yıllığı 1970* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi: 1971), pp. 154-155.

between 1872 and the end of 1979, during 110 years was 1106. The golden years of the novel production were between 1960 and 1979, a third of the Turkish novels, 432 novels were published during this period. In this period 41 novels in 1976, 34 in 1974, 33 in 1973 and 32 in 1975 were published.[317] This data supports our thesis that the novels had increasing visibility.

Table 1 Numbers of the publication of the Turkish novels

List is stated below:

Date	Historical Events	Period	Novels
1872-1901	The abolishing of Servet-i Fünun	30 years	71
1901-1908	Declaration of 2nd Constitution	8	7
1908-1923	The End of War for Independence	13	48
1922-1950	The Beginning of Multi-party Political Life	28	400
1951-1960	The 27 May Coup d'état	10	149
1961-1979		18	432[318]

Table 2 Collection of Novels and Short Stories:

In 1960	9 novels	10 story books
1961	11	4
1962	10	20
1963	6	11

[317]N. Ziya Bakırcıoğlu, *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türk Romanı* (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1973), pp. 11, 12.

[318]Ibid.

1964	5	9
1965	4	15
1966	12	8
1967	8	8
1968	10	13
1969	12	18 [319]
1973	33	
1974	34	
1975	32	
1976	41	
1977	30	
1978	21[320]	

The transformations and changes the Turkish novel underwent began in 1960. First, 1960 and 1961 can be considered as Orhan Kemal's (*Küçücük, Dünya Evi* [Home of the Earth] (1960) *Hanımın Çiftliği* [Farm of the Lady (1961)) period of maturity as he made his marks on the realm of the novel. Second, Yaşar Kemal, he published his important novels *İnce Memed*[321] and *Orta Direk* (Mainmast), in 1960. This second novel was lauded by Fethi Naci and Hasan Bülent Kahranan as one of the ten most important Turkish novels.

---

[319]Tahir Alangu, "1967 yılında Türk Romanı," *Varlık Yıllığı* 1967 (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1968), p. 33.

[320]Bakırcıoğlu, p 11, 12; Fethi Naci, *Türkiye'de Yüz Soruda Roman ve Toplumsal Gelişme* (Istanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi ,1981), p. 349.

[321]Second edition.

In this period, social realist works were written at the same time with some avant-garde works like the very original and surrealist novel of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (The Institute for the Readjustment of Clocks). Other significant novels of 1961 were Fakir Baykurt's *Irazca'nın Dirliği, Onuncu Köy* (Tenth Village), and Kemal Tahir's *Esir Şehrin Mahpusu* (The Detainee of the Captive City).

An important literary critic, Tahir Alangu prepared the section for novel as well as that for short-stories of *Varlık Yıllığı* in 1962.[322] In an article, he criticized the low quantity and quality of novels. But this critical opinion would change in the following years. The number of novels, however, produced at the beginning of the decade was very low, a few works were written. In 1962, Orhan Kemal (*Gurbet Kuşları,*[Expatriate Birds] *Eskici ve Oğulları* [Secondhand Dealer and his Sons) and Kemal Tahir (*Kelleci Mehmet*) were the most productive novelists of the year.

In a considerable analysis, in the novel and short story section of the *Varlık Yıllığı*, Tahir Alangu presented the balance sheet of the year.[323] He stated that Turkish literature was not sufficiently attractive for the Turkish public; the reading public prefered to read foreign authors. Publishing houses published authors like Hemingway, Steinbeck, London, Gorky and other world classics.

In 1963, the leading novels were written by Attilâ İlhan (*Kurtlar Sofrası*, [Dinner Table of Wolves]), Tarık Buğra (*Küçük Ağa*, [Petty Lord]), Orhan Kemal, (*Kanlı Topraklar,* [Bloody Lands], *Sokakların Çocuğu*, [Children of the Streets])

---

[322]Tahir Alangu, " 1961 Yılında Roman, Öykü," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1962* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1962), p. 36 - 49.

[323]Ibid.

Yaşar Kemal (*Yer Demir Gök Bakır*), and Şevket Süreya Aydemir (*Toprak Uyanırsa,* [If the Land is Awakening]). In the field of short story, authors like Oktay Akbal, Samim Kocagöz, İlhan Tarus and Orhan Kemal were most popular.[324] The young authors as Bilge Karasu, Demir Özlü, Adnan Özyalçıner were appreciated by Fuat as promising writers of the future.[325]

1964 was not a productive year. Two novels about peasantry, Talip Apaydın's *Ortakçılar* (Shareholder) and Samim Kocagöz's *Bir Karış Toprak* (A Little Land) were written, and the second volume of Attila İlhan's *Kurtlar Sofrası* (Dinner Table of Wolves) was published. In the literary reviews, writers from the "socialist countries" and their literary acitivities were some of the most discussed topics. Turkish writers participated in meetings in these countries and some of them adopted ideologically the real socialist vision of these countries. The novels and poems of authors such as Sholokhov, Gorkiy, Mayakovsky, and Andrey Voznesensky were translated. Hasan Ali Ediz was an important translator of some of these works.

In 1965, Tahir Alangu's third volume *Cumhuriyetten sonra Hikaye ve Roman* (Novel and Short Story in the Republican Period) and Cevdret Kudret's *Türk Edebiyatında Hikaye ve Roman* (The Novel and Short Story in the Turkish Literature) were published and served as the main guides of literary historians. Orhan Kemal's novel *Bir Filiz Vardı*, Melih Cevdet Anday's *Aylaklar* (Idles), and Kemal Tahir's *Yorgun Savaşçı* (Weary Combatant) were published in 1965. Nazım Hikmet's novel *Kan Konuşmaz* (The Blood Has no Voice) was also published during this year.

---

[324]Memet Fuat, "Türk Edebiyatında Şiir, Öykü, İnceleme," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1965), p. 7.

[325]Ibid., p. 8.

In the mid 1960s, social realist novels were at the center of the literary production. Kemal Tahir and Orhan Kemal grew increasingly popular. Most of the popular novels were written by these three emblematic social realist novelists, Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal and Kemal Tahir (*Üç Kemaller*- the Three Kemals). If we add to them, a symbol of the peasant novelists, Fakir Baykurt, one can say that a significant percentage of the novels were written by these four writers.

Tahir Alangu makes important observations about the evolution of literature in 1966: he argues that the parts (*tefrika*) of novels (feuilleton) which were published in the journals could not be finally published by the publishing houses, in the end. The publishing houses did not accept to publish Turkish novels. Turkish novelists complained of this fact. The owners of the publishing houses defended themselves by pointing out that foreign novels sold more than Turkish novels, another reason may be that in this period, the copyright system for foreign novels was not yet completely established and then for the houses, it was cheaper to publish them.

Writing in 1966, Alangu stated that the decrease which started in the second half of the 1950s had been caused by two things: first, the publishing houses had not prefered to publish their works, and second it was not possible to earn money by publishing literary works.[326] He described also the progress of the novel and short story since the Republican period. In the field of literature, in the first years of productions, the realist tradition, pioneer authors, thanks to innovative observations, and the freshness of their literary experience produced significant works, but after the first descriptions, if they did not work about economics, sociology, history and other

[326]"*Gazetelerde tefrika edilen romanların yayımlanamaması, yayınevlerinin Türkçe roman, hikaye basmak istememeleri 1950'lerin ikinci yarısında roman alanındaki sıkışmanın altında yayın imkanlarının daralması ve geçim dertlerinin artması gösterilebilir."* Tahir Alangu, "1965'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1966* (Istanbul: Varlik Yayınevi, 1966), pp. 40-41.

sciences which were necessary to understand the people and society in which they produced their works, could not avoid superficiality.[327]

In 1966, as in the previous years, Orhan Kemal published several novels (*Müfettişler Müfettişi, Yalancı Dünya, and Evlerden Biri*). The first novels of Oya Baydar, *Savaş Çağı* (Year of War) *Umut Çağı* (Year of Hope) and Bekir Yıldız's novel *Türkler Almanya'da* (Turks in Germany) were published.[328] *Turgut Reis* (Turgut Reis) by Halikarnas Balıkçısı was also published in 1966.

Tahir Alangu's article "The Avant-garde role of the Literature - *Edebiyatın Öncü Rolü*" argued that "the most important problem of the majority of our writers is that they could not find a publishing house which would accept to publish their works of art." Writing in 1966, he said:

> After the 1960s, literature was incapable of surveying the rapid evolution and consequences of Turkey, but before, first, literature represented the problems of Turkey and because of this pioner role of literature, it was attracted a larger public. When these avant-garde realist artists were on the scene, these problems were not debated in the media and in the scientific circles of the universities. But, after 1960, all of these problems by the role of politics were generalized to larger publics. And literature was replaced by these mediums. In the underdeveloped societies, when literature lost its role of representing the problems of the country, it was replaced by other mediums.[329]

---

[327]"*Edebiyatta gerçekçilik yoluna girince ilk basamaklarında gözlemlerin yeniliği, çevrelerin ilk edebiyata açılışlarının verdiği tazelikler, öncülerin ilk eserlerini ayakta tutabiliyor. İlk tasvirlerin ardından, temeldeki büyük sorunlara, tarihten gelen belirleyici niteliklere çarpınca, artık öncü gerçekçilerin yetersizlikleri ortaya çıkmaya başlıyacaktır. Bundan böyle gerçekçiler ekonomi, toplumbilim, tarih ve o memleketin insanlarını belirlemede işe yarayacak bilimlere ulaşamazlarsa yüzeyde kalacaklardır*," Ibid. p. 44.

[328]Halikarnas Balıkçısı was the leading figure of the current which can be called *Mavi Anadolucular* with Azra Erhat and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu.

[329]"*1960'dan sonra çok hızlı bir tempoda gelişen Türkiye şartlarından ve evrilişinden gittikçe uzaklaşan öncü edebiyat, başlangıcında büyük ve dallı budaklı görünüşü ile ortaya çıkan Türkiye sorunlarını yansıtıyor, bu yoldaki öncülğüdür ki, okuyucuları geniş ölçüde çekiyordu. Öncü gerçekçiler ortaya çıktıkları zaman, Türkiye gerçekleri ve sorunları ne basında, ne üniversite bilim çevrelerinde tartışılıyordu. Ama 1960'dan sonra üstü açılan bütün sorunlar, bütün bir alanı kapladıktan başka, radyolar ve açıkoturumlar, politikayla beraber büyük kitlelere doğru yayıldı. Böyle olunca vaktiyle yeni gerçekçilerin eserlerini yalnız sanat ve edebiyat merakıyla değil, yurt sorunlarına duydukları merakla*

In an article, in *Türk Edebiyatı* of 1966, Memet Fuat described the main events of the literary world. He wrote that the famous novel *Castle* of Kafka was sold fewer than 3,000 copies, but it was one of the most popular books of the year. The best-selling book on the year was *Sözcükler* (The Words) of Jean Paul Sartre with 6,000 copies. In 1965, the sales of poems of *Saat 21 22* reached 7,000 copies. Another more important book *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*, (Human Landscapes from my Country) in 1966 sold only 2500.[330] Sartre's other novels like the Nausea (Bulantı) and Camus' novel the *Plague* (Veba) were also popular. These existentialist, modernist works were read by a large urban, educated public.

In 1967, according to Fuat, Bilge Karasu was a very productive author in the realm of the short story writing. Accurate, intellectual, extremely Westernized pieces. Tomris Uyar and Sevgi Sabuncu[331] were more succesful than the others who were represented as important.[332] As is known, Soysal and Uyar were considered two of the most succesful female authors. Fuat's prediction and encouragement have to be noted. He played an important role for the recognition of these authors.

Tahir Alangu wrote that in 1967, the field of novel was very active and this was hopeful for him as new publishing houses had begun to publish Turkish short

---

da okuyan aydınlar yavaş yavaş edebiyattan koptular, ilgileri aksiyona ve başka yayınlara doğru kaydı." Tahir Alangu, "1966'da Roman ve Hikayemiz," (Novel and Short Story in 1966), *Varlık Yıllığı 1967* (Istanbul: Varlık Yıllığı, 1967), pp. 52 84, p. 53-54.

[330]Memet Fuat, "Türk Edebiyatında Şiir, Öykü, İnceleme," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1966* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1967), p. 5.

[331]Sabuncu is the early name of Sevgi Soysal.

[332]*"Sonra Bilge Karasu vardı hikayede: Titiz, bilgili, aşırı Batılı. Birkaç yıldır adları sürülmekteyse de bana bir türlü yeterli görünmeyen genç hikayecilerden daha iyisini R. Tomris gibi, Sevgi Sabuncu gibi dışarıdan oynayanlar da bulmak vardı."* Ibid., p.8.

stories and novels.[333] Even so, he also thought that since the beginning of the 1960s, the scarcity could not be transcended. Although the number of publishing houses and bookstores increased, translations and works about social events were appreciated and demanded by a public; and Turkish books did not enjoy enough success.[334]

In 1967, six long and two short novels were published. *Devlet Ana* by Kemal Tahir with 625 pages was an important social event of the year. Tahir introduced a theory similar to the Asiatic Mode of Production which was developed in the historical context of the foundation process of the Ottoman Empire.[335]

Another novel of Orhan Kemal, *Sokaklardan Bir Kız* (A Girl From the Streets) was published in the journal *Milliyet* in 1968. Fakir Baykurt's two novels *Kaplumbağalar* (Turtles) and *Amerikan Sargısı,* were published. Kemal Tahir's *Bozkırdaki Çekirdek* (A Grain in the Dessert) and Tarık Dursun K.'s *Sabah Olmasın* were also published during this year. Nazım Hikmet's *Yaşamak Güzel Şey be Kardeşim* (To Live is Beautiful, my Friend) has to be noted. Nazım Hikmet novels were published after the widespread popularity of his poems.

In 1969, Adnan Binyazar wrote that 1968 had been a productive year for novels and short stories. Publishing houses had oriented themselves toward the native novels. It is possible to feel that the reading public was ready to pay attention to these

---

[333]Tahir Alangu, "1967 Yılında Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1968* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi, 1969), pp. 44 -75: 45.

[334] "*1960'dan beri sürüp giden darlığın henüz ortadan kalkmadığı görülmektedir. Yeni yayınevlerinin ortaya çıkmaları, basımevlerinin, kitapçı dükkanlarının, dağıtım örgütlerinin çoğalıp gelişmeleri, kitap baskı sayılarının gittikçe artmaları, çeviriler ve toplum konularındaki eserlerin rağbet görmelerine karşılık, telif roman ve hikaye alanlarındaki bu sürekli azalma dikkati çekecek bir anlam kazanmaktadır."* Ibid., p. 47.

[335] Ibid.

novels.[336] Peasant novels and novels about the War for Independence were the most popular ones, whether reinterpretation or revision of the official history.[337]

Two novels (*Arkadaş Islıkları* [Whistles of friends], *Sokaklardan Bir Kız* [A girl from the streets]) of Orhan Kemal and two (*Ankara Mahpusu*, [A prisonner of Ankara] *Fosforlu Cevriye*) of Suat Derviş[338] were published in 1968; Yaşar Kemal's *Ölmez Otu* (Plant who Does not Die) was also published during this year.

Another interesting novel, Hekimoğlu İsmail's (Ömer Okçu) *Minyeli Abdullah* (Abdullah from Minye) was published in 1968. This book was republished many times. The story was about an İslamic hero. This book became one of the symbols of the Islamic and conservative thought in the realm of literature.

Fuat stated that in the field of the short story, some authors imitated the Western examples to such a degree that if someone said that they have had been translated, nobody would have been astonished. He also argues that, in 1968, as a result of a desire for social realist art, as the youth had not been able to produce what had been expected from them, the older artists continued to be appreciated. And artists who were leftist but leaving themselves outside of the politics because of their approach to the arts were criticized by a large public.[339]

---

[336]"*1968 roman ve hikayemiz için hareketli bir yıl oldu. Yayınevleri yerli romanlara eğilmek gereksinimi duydular. Okurlarda da yerli romanları tanıma eğilimi sezilmektedir."* Adnan Binyazar, "1968'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *1969 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969), pp. 49-82: 49.

[337] Ibid., p. 49.

[338]Suat Derviş was an important Turkish female author who was also wife of Reşat Fuat Baraner who was the national secretary of the Turkish Communist Party.

[339]"*Hikaye içinde umutlu sözler edilemez bu yönden. Önceki yıllarda olduğu gibi, gene iki tür hikaye sürdürülüyor. Biri, toplumcu sanatçıların geliştirdiği, bir ara çok güzel örnekleri verilen, düzanlatımlı hikaye türü. Öbürü, biçim oyunları, anlatım incelikleriyle süslenen hikaye türü. Birinci türü sürdürenlerin tek düzeliği, çoğaltmacılığı yüzünden, yeni yetişenlerin daha çok ikinci tür hikayeye*

Fuat argues that the debates around the novel *Devlet Ana*, excluding some articles, can not go beyond to a compliment or a satire.[340] *Devlet Ana* represents the most symbolic debate of the Turkish literature. This novel was a symbolic work as a ground to discuss the Turkish society's economic and social characteristics in comparison with the Western societies.

The second volume of Yaşar Kemal's *İnce Memed* (Memed My Hawk) was published in 1968, in *Hurriyet* journal with a massive promotion campaign, this was increased the sale rates of the journal, the book reached the second volume in a little time, in 1969.[341] Another important work of literature was Orhan Kemal's famous novel Murtaza.[342] Nedim Gürsel and Hasan İzzettin Dinamo wrote articles about this novel.[343] This novel, *Murtaza* was extended by his autor, by rewriting the first and the third chapters, and published by *Cem* publishing house. Orhan Kemal's two other

---

yöneldikleri görülüyor. Sanatçı olarak gösterdikleri başarı umut verse de, toplumsal yaşantı eksikleri, batılı örneklere çok yakın bir yerde kalmalarına yolaçıyor. Aralarında öyleleri var ki, yazdıkları hikayelerin çeviri olduğunu söyleseler kimse yadırgamaz. 1968'de, toplumcu sanata duyulan özlem gençlerden beklenen atılım gelmeyince gözleri eski toplumcu sanatçılara çevirdi, günün sol düşünceli olduğu bilinen, ama sanat anlayışları yüzünden politika dışı kalan ünlü sanatçılarına karşıysa gittikçe artan bir öfkenin yaygınlaşmasına yol açtı." Memet Fuat, "Türk Edebiyatında Şiir, Öykü, İnceleme," in Türk Edebiyatı 1968, (İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1969), p. 8.

[340]"*Kemal Tahir'in Devlet Ana romanı çevresinde kopan tartışmalar da birkaç yazı bir yana bırakılırsa övgü ya da yergi olmaktan öteye geçemedi."* Ibid., p. 9.

[341]Rauf Mutluay "1969'da Roman ve Hikayemiz,"(Novel and Short Story in the 1969), 1970 *Varlık Yıllığı* pp. 23-45. Yaşar Kemal, İnce Memed (İstanbul: Ant Yayınları, 1969), p. 30, (590 pages, 15 liras).

[342]This book was also filmed by Ali Ozgenturk in 1986, The name of the film was *Bekçi* (Watchman) Sources for the adaptation in Turkish cinema: Aylin Sayin, (2005), *Türk Sinemasında Edebiyat Uyarlamaları ve Bu Uyarlamaların Toplumsal Yapıyla Etkileşimi*, Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü (Istanbul: Master Thesis) Another source: http://w3.gazi.edu.tr/web/bucelik/bucelik/pedi/ci1.pdf. Several works of Orhan Kemal were adopted to the cinema. In 1979 *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde* by Erden Kıral (Orhan Kemal 1954) In 1974 *Sokaklardan Bir Kız* by Nejat Saydam (Orhan Kemal 1968). Works of Necati Cumali, Bekir Yildiz, Aziz Nesin and Rifat Ilgaz were also adopted to cinema during the 1970s and 1980s.

[343]Ibid., p. 32. Orhan Kemal, Murtaza, (Istanbul: Cem yayınevi, 1969). In *Yeni Ufuklar* journal, in the 206th issue, Nedim Gürsel published an article about this novel, Hasan İzzettin Dinamo published also an article in *Yeditepe*, in its 160th issue.

novels, *Kötü Yol* (Bad Way) and *Üçkağıtçı* (Cheater) were also published in 1969. These works were about the lives of the ordinary suburb people. The book of Sevgi Sabuncu, *Tante Rosa* (Tante Rosa) was published in the December 1968.[344] This short story book was an outstanding modernist work of art, which is developed in a satiric and surrealist style.

Another important novel by Kemal Tahir, *Kurt Kanunu* was published in this year. This novel offered an important critique of the official history writing, and it may be seen as a part of the trend of the historical novels.[345] Halikarnas Balıkçısı's novel *Deniz Gurbetçileri* (Expatriates of Sea) and Rıfat Ilgaz's *Karadeniz Kıyısında* (At the Seaside of Black Sea) also were published in 1969.

In 1970, the novelists of the year were yet again social realist artists such as Kemal Tahir (*Büyük Mal*), Fakir Baykurt (*Tırpan*, Scythe), Orhan Kemal (*Kaçak*, Escapee), Yaşar Kemal (*Ağrı Dağı Efsanesi*, The Legend of Mount Ararat). Sevgi Sabuncu (Soysal) with his novel *Yürümek* and Demirtaş Ceyhun with his novel *Asya* (Asia) were new members of the social realist, politically socialist literary tradition.

The prominent short story writers were Haldun Taner, Tarık Dursun K., Fakir Baykurt, Mehmet Başaran, Bilge Karasu, and Bekir Yıldız with his famous short story *Kaçakcı Şahan*, and Samim Kocagöz. According to Fuat, the most important author was Füruzan with his short story *Edirne'nin Köprüleri* (The Bridges of Edirne) and *Su Ustası Miraç* (Miraç, Expert of Water).

In 1971, the most important event of the year was the announcement of the TRT novel competition. There were other important novel prizes, T.D.K. prizes, Sait

[344]Sevgi Sabuncu *Tante Rosa* (Istanbul: Dost Yayınları, 1968).

[345]Kemal Tahir, *Kurt Kanunu* (Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1969).

Faik Abasıyanık prizes, and Orhan Kemal novel prizes which were started this year by his family. In 1971, the TRT novel for best novel was awarded to Oğuz Atay with his novel *Tutunamayanlar* (Erectus Disconnectus).[346] Forty-seven works of art were participated into this competition of novel. For the section of short story, nearly 500 works were submitted. These datas show the increasing interest of an array of people who desired to be men of letters, to the competitions.

Significant novels of this year were Yılmaz Güney's *Boynu Bükük Öldüler*;[347] Kemal Tahir's *Yol Ayrımı* (Separation of the Ways), Yaşar Kemal's *Binboğalar Efsanesi* (Legend of Binboğalar) and Orhan Kemal's *El Kızı*. Füruzan's short story book *Parasız Yatılı* was appreciated by Rauf Mutluay in 1972. He said that an important progress in the realm of books of short stories had occurred during this year. The change and progress in the realm of the short story reflected evident progress in comparison to earlier years.[348]

In 1972, authors who were considered to be part of the Peasant Novels movement wrote books such as Talip Apaydın's *Defne* and *Boz Davar*, and Kemal Bilbaşar's *Başka Olur Ağaların Düğünü* and Ümit Kaftancıoğl's *Yelatan.* Yusuf Ziya Bahadınlı and Çetin Altan were two former deputies of the Turkish Labor Party and they wrote novels; *Güllüceyi Sel Aldı* (Güllüce Left under Inundation) and *Büyük*

---

[346]*Tutunamayanlar* (in Eng. Erectus Disconnectus) is the first novel of Oguz Atay, one of the most prominent Turkish authors. It was written in 1970-71 and published in 1972. Although it was never reprinted in his lifetime and was controversial among critics, it became a best-seller when a new edition came out in 1984. It has been described as "probably the most eminent novel of twentieth-century Turkish literature."

[347]This novel will win the Orhan Kemal novel prize in 1972.

[348]"*Hikayedeki yenileşme ve değişme, geçen yıla göre çok belirgin bir düzer yükselişi gösteriyor. Romanda hep eskiden yazılmış eserler çıktı ortaya. Sonunda bir yetinme, bir susma, bir mayalanma yılı oldu 1971."* Rauf Mutluay, "1971'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı* 1972 (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1973), pp. 40, 47; Füruzan, *Parasız Yatılı*, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınları, 1971), (180 pages, 10 Lira, 12 short stories).

Gözaltı (Big Detention). Füruzan's *Parasız Yatılı* (Tuition Free State Boarding School Students) was awarded by the Sait Faik Abasıyanık prize. They questioned in the *Varlık Yıllığı* of 1972 the quality and value of the Turkish novel in its collective survey. This important question was answered by many authors. A common opinion was that the Turkish novel was in a good way by constant progress.[349]

According to Talip Apaydın in 1972, the Turkish novel, with its quantity and quality, it was undergoing the most shining period of its history. This progress did not mean that in the future, there would not be more powerful novels. But compared with the past, especially, before the 1950s, the Turkish novel was in a good place, because the novelists had begun to look into the basis of Turkish society, to the majority of society.[350] Kemal Bilbaşar argues that:

> Since 1961, Turkish production of novel has had important success in finding its own character and an integration with the larger part of society. Universal novels which were well-established structures, and also a Turkish attitude were written and would be written in Turkey. Therefore, due to many literary works of translation, the Turkish novel was able to find a large literary public. There are many novels and short stories with 4 or 5 printings. Aziz Nesin's, Yaşar Kemal's, Orhan Kemal's, Rıfat Ilgaz's, Kemal Tahir's, Baykurt's, Yıldız's, Fürüzan's, Korcan's, Tuncer's, Akbal's works are examples of this process.[351]

---

[349]"*Türk romanının bugün varrmış olduğu aşama daha önceki dönemlerle karşılaştırıldığında nitelik ve nicelik bakımlarından, içinde bulunduğumuz kültür dünyası ölçütleri içinde hangi durumdadır? Başlıca nitelik ve eksikleri nelerdir?"* Sennur Sezer, "Collective Survey," in *1973 Varlık Yıllığı*, p. 212.

[350]"*Türk romanı nitelik ve nicelik bakımından bugün en parlak dönemini yaşıyor kanısındayım. Bu gelecekte daha güçlü romanlar yazılmayacak anlamına gelmez. Geçmişle karşılaştırılınca, özellikle 1950'den sonra Türk romanı olumlu bir çizgiye girmiş ve gerçekten başarılı örnekler vermiştir. Bir kere romancılarımız dikkatlerini Türk halkının tabanına, büyük çoğunluğuna çevirmişlerdir."* Ibid., p. 246.

[351]"*1961'den bu yana Türk romancılığı, öz kişiliğini bulma, halkla bütünleşme yolunda büyük başarılar sağlamıştır. Yapısı sağlam, evrensel ama Türk tavrı belirgin romanlarımız yazılmıştır ve yazılmaktadır. Bu yüzdendir ki çeviri eserler sağanağına karşın Türk romanı geniş bir okuyucu kitlesi bulabilmektedir. Birkaç yıl içinde 4, 5 baskı yapan hikaye ve romanlarımız az değildir. Aziz Nesin'in, Yaşar Kemal'in, Orhan Kemal'in, Rıfat Ilgaz'ın, Kemal Tahir'in, Baykurt'un, Yıldız'ın, Fürüzan'ın, Korcan'ın, Tuncer'in, Akbal'ın eserleri bunun açık kanıtıdır."* Ibid., p. 248.

On the other hand, Halman, in 1974 thought that the Turkish novel had many problems; its tragic approach and sensitivity were poor and a satiric social novel had not yet been produced.[352] Attilâ Ilhan also said,

> The Turkish novel is a poor novel, contrary to what is supposed. When you leave the individual authors aside and consider the level of the novel as a whole, the level you are facing is a novel narrating the miserable conditions of the society. This novel developed within the capacities of the classical architecture of the novel writing. That was the nineteeth century novel school following some certain mottos, based on primitive observations with a narrow psychological dimension, and loaded with almost no original ideas. The present day Turkish novel does not experience the transformations that have been lived all over the world. The Turkish novel's only developed axis is a social realist dimension and this was an imitation of the nineteenth century's Russian novel, and this was not a genuine one. If it is compared by the world literary production, it is enough to say that the Turkish novel is undeveloped.[353]

İlhan's evaluations has to be taken into account as a product of his sui generis, original attitude. His comments which contradicted most of the authors who were more optimistic, were accepted by them, after the 1990s. They also accepted that the Turkish novel had been sacrificed to the need to give political and social messages, during this period.

Writing in 1973, Tarık Dursun K. cited three different generations of Turkish literature. The first generation was part of the transformation period during the foundation of the Republic, and included such authors as Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Yakup

---

[352]Talat S .Halman, *Varlık Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık yayınevi, 1974), p. 251.

[353]"*Türk romanı sanıldığının tersine yoksul bir roman gibi görünür. Tek tek romancıları bırakın da, bütünüyle romanın ulaştığı düzeyi düşünün, göreceğiniz, klasik mimari içerisinde geliştirilmeye çalışılan, toplumcu özellikleri ağır basan yoksullukçu miserabiliste bir roman düzeyidir, ruhbilmsel boyutları hayli dar, fikir yükü yok denecek kadar az, gözlemleri ilkel ve sonuçları belli sloganları işleyen bir 19. yy roman çizgisidir bu. Günümüz Türk romanında, romanın dünya halinde yaşadığı değişiklikler yaşanmamış, sadece toplumcu roman damarı, o da özgün bir bileşim olmaktan çok, Rus toplumcu gerçekçiliğine öykünerek, yarı natüralist bir deneme olarak geliştirilmiştir. Bu bizim romanımızın öteki romanlarla karşılaştırıldığında yoksul kalmasına yeter."* Attilâ İlhan, in *Varlık Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973), pp. 253.

Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Halide Edip Adıvar and Peyami Safa. These may be called traditionalist and their aim was traditionalization. The second generation was the Peasant Novelists, who neglected the urban life, beginning by the 1950s. The third was a new group who had begun to write short stories who would overcome the qualitative and quantitative imperfections, and write the story of the urban life.[354]

Samim Kocagöz was very optimistic about the quality of Turkish literature, saying that "until the 1960s, the Turkish novel took in hand studies and the political and social observations of the realities in the social, historical and economic way that scientists did."[355] He also argued,"until the 1960s, artists were in front of the scientists, Turkish novelists had to do science with their intiution, research, and observations. In other words, the Turkish novel, in terms of nativity, nationality, social issues, and humanity, had an undeniable significance."[356]

Aziz Nesin said that Turkish literature, because of its special conditions, was not suitable for Marxist theory as "the superstructure reflects the economic and social base." According to Nesin, underdeveloped Turkey had a very developed literature.[357]

---

[354]"*Türk romanında 1973'de üç kuşaktan bahsediyor. İlk olarak Cumhuriyet'e geçiş döneminde Halit Zıya, Yakup Kadri, Halide Edip ve Peyami Safalardan bahsediyor, gelenekleşme ve gelenekleştirme. İkinci kuşakta şehrin biraz geriye düştüğü Köy romancılarından ve bir öncekilerin nitelik ve nicelik eksiklerini tamamlayacak, şu anda hikaye dolaylarında gezinen ama romana geçecek bir 3. kuşaktan bahsediyor.*" Tarık Dursun K, *Varlık Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973), pp. 254 255

[355]"*Romanımızın niteliğine gelince çok iyimserim. Bir yol 1960 yıllarına gelene dek Türk romanı; sosyal alanda, toplumsal alanda, tarihsel alanda, iktisat alanında bilimcilerin yapmaları gereken araştırmaları, gerçeklerin siyasal toplumsal gözlemciliğini, toplumsal yaşantımızdaki kaynaşmaların pek bilimsel olmasa da araştırmalarını yapmayı da yüklenmiştir."* Samim Kocagöz, *Varlık Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973), pp, 257, 258.

[356] "*1960'lara değin, eski dönemde Ziya Gökalp bir yana, bilmciler hep, sanatçıların ardında kalmıştır. Bir başka değişle bilimi de romancılar gözlemleriyle, araştırmalarıyla, sezgileriyle yapmak zorunda kalmıştır. Bu açıdan bakarsak yöresellik, ulusallık, toplumculuk, insancıllık bakımından Türk romanı; büyük, yüklü, yabana atılamayacak bir nitelik taşır. Bu söylediklerim Türk Hikayeciliği için de geçerlidir."* Ibid., p. 258.

Mehmet Seyda wrote that first the problem of bread had to be taken into account.[358] This led to the underestimation of pyscological profoundity, and new techniques of style in the domain of literature.

In 1973, 31 novels and 21 short stories were published in Turkey.[359] This was an increase in the number of pubished novels. Among the most successful authors were Necati Cumalı (*Yağmurlar ve Topraklar*, Rains and Lands), Atilla İlhan, (*Bıçağın Ucu*, Knife Edge), Erol Toy (*İmparator*, Emperor), Sevgi Soysal (*Yenişehir'de bir Öğle Vakti*, Noon at Yenişehir), Mehmet Seyda (*İçe Dönük ve Atak*, Introverted and Militant), Yusuf Atılgan (*Anayurt Oteli*, Motherland Hotel), Adalet Ağaoğlu (*Ölmeye Yatmak*, Waiting for Death), Yaşar Kemal (*Demirciler Çarşısı Cinayeti*, Murder at the Blacksmith's Market), Oğuz Atay (*Tehlikeli Oyunlar*, Dangerous Games), Fakir Baykurt (*Köygöçüren*, Destroying Angel), and Selim İleri (*Destan Gönüllüler*, Legendary Hearts).

This important increase in the number of the published novels in 1973 was continued in the following years. In the conditions of the period of the martial law, contrary to the poverty of the journals, the world of books was very rich.[360] Oğuz Atay's *Tehlikeli Oyunlar*, Adalet Ağaoğlu's *Ölmeye Yatmak* and Sevgi Soysal's

---

[357] "*Fizikteki bileşik kaplar kanununda olduğu gibi, bir toplumdaki üstyapı güçlerinin aşağı yukarı bir düzeyde olabileceği gerçeğine, kendine özgü toplumsal koşullardan ötürü, Türk edebiyatı uymaz. Az gelişmiş Türkiye'nin çok gelişmiş bir romanı vardır."* Ibid, pp. 260 261

[358]Ibid., pp. 262, 263.

[359]Rauf Mutluay, "1973'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *1974 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1975), pp. 27, 51.

[360]"*Sıkıyönetim koşullarında, gazete sayfalarının kuruluğuna karşın, kitaplar dünyasının zenginliğini getirdi."* Ibid., p. 27.

Yenişehir'de bir Öğle Vakti were considered to be masterpieces of Turkish literature in their portrayal of the paranoid and depressed world of the Turkish writers.

Mutluay underlined in 1974 the increase in the number of novels and short stories thanks to the hard work of the responsibles the publishing houses, the growth of the reading public and the proliferation of prizes for novels.[361] This increase was considered by Mutluay as superfluous inflation.[362] 1974 also can be seen as one of the golden years of Turkish literature, when many classical works were written.

The most interesting event of 1974 was a competition organized by *Milliyet* newspaper. A huge number or novels were submitted to the council of competition.

> The competion led to surface many interesting realities. For instance, 174 of the 274 novels which were accepted to the competition were about social problems. 126 of 174 chosed villages as the scene, and main characters were state official doctors, idealist instructors, university students, and peasants who had become more conscious. Agha and peasant; sheikh, agha and village headman; official charged with governing a provincial district, instructor and peasant relationships were discussed with great skill. Inequalities in the distributions of land and water, and injustice in the elections, etc. were most favorable topics. The ending of the novels were also similar and most of them, even if they were honest, can not be considered as novels.[363]

---

[361]"*Yayınevlerinin sorum görevleri, okur kalabalığının artışı, güncel sorunları konu eden kitapların etkisi, siyasal yaşamın ardında kalmayan çalışmaların vakitliliğiyle bu yıl da gerekli ve yararlı eserler yayımladı. Roman ödüllerinin artışı, türün halka yönelmiş etkisini belirlemeye yaradı. Hikayedeki zayıf sese karşılık roman alanındaki emek çeşitliliği, toplumsal yaşamı yansıtan ve ilgi gören bu edebiyat dalının yaygınlaştığını gösterir."* Rauf Mutluay, *Varlık Yıllığı 1975*, (Istanbul: Varlık yayınevi, 1976), p. 32.

[362]"*Bu yıl roman ve hikaye kitabı sayısında büyük bir artış var; bunu Mutluay gereksiz kabarma olarak değerlendiriyor."* Ibid. p. 58.

[363]"*Yarışma birçok ilginç gerçeğin de su yüzüne çıkmasını sağladı. Sözgelimi yarışma koşullarına uyan 274 romandan 174'ü toplumsal sorunlardan yola çıkmıştı; 174'ün 126'sında ise mekan köydü; başkişilerse hükümet tabipleri, ülkücü öğretmenler, üniversite öğrencileri, bilinçlenen yoksul köylüler. Ağa - köylü, şeyh, ağa – muhtar, kaymakam, öğretmen - köylü ilşkileri ustalıkla ele alınıyor, aradaki kopukluklar ustalıkla vurgulanıyordu. Suyun ve toprağın dağılımındaki eşitsizlik, oy vurgunu, kan davası, öç, ırza geçme, başlık sorunu, eşkiyalık, dil ve töre çatışmaları, din sömürüsü, alevilik, suça itiliş nedenleri başlıca konulardı. Romanların sonu da değişmiyordu. Ne yazık ki bu dürüst çıkışların çoğu roman niteliğini taşımıyordu.*Tomris Uyar, "Millyet Yayınlarının roman yarışması neler getirdi," *Milliyet Sanat*, no. 130, (2 May 1975).

These novels proposed such solutions as *Atatürkçülüğün doğru anlaşılması* (A good interpretation of Kemalism), *Kooperatiçiliğin yaygınlaştırılması* (Becoming Widespread of the Cooperatives), *Aydınların halka inmesi* (Intellectuals' access to the people), *Kız çocuklarının okuması* (Instructions of the girls). These novels reflect perfectly the over politization of the literary world.

There were also novels about urban life: *Pansiyon* (Pension), *Huzur* (Peace of Mind), *Koca Kurt* (Monstrous Wolf), *Grevden Sonra* (After the Strike) can be considered as critiques of the capitalist system, the petit bourgeosie as a social class, the corruption of state institutions and the violence exercised against their opponents. They analyzed class inequalities. The most important novels of the year were Erdal Öz's *Yaralısın* (You are Wounded), Attila İlhan's *Sırtlan Payı* (Share of the Hyenas), Kemal Tahir's *Namusçular* (Honesty), and *Karılar Koğuşu* (Women's Dormitory), and Aziz Nesin's *Tatlı Betüş* (Sweety Betüş).

The novels published in 1975 were about many different subjects but mainly about the disastrous consequences of the miltary intervention. Among them were Sevgi Soysal's *Şafak* (Dawn), Füruzan's *47'liler* and Vedat Türkali's *Bir Gün Tek Başına* (One Day Lonely). They were all focused on the young people, University students who participated in the social struggles of their period. According to Memet Fuat, the most succesful authors of the year were Attilâ Ilhan and Füruzan; the surprise of the year was *Birgün Tek Başına*; Yaşar Kemal and Sevgi Soysal were also productive during this year with their new novels.[364]

[364] "*Yılın başarı sahipleri 1974'ten kalan eserleriyle Attila İlhan, Füruzan; 1975'in büyük süprizi Vedat Türkali, yeni eserleriyle kendine değer katan Yaşar Kemal, Sevgi Soysal...*" Rauf Mutluay, "1975'te Roman ve Hikayemiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1976), p. 45.

In 1975, Mutluay wrote, "some very brillant books of short story and significant novels were written. This is important because a year was not a long period in social and political life."[365] His comment was about the increasing quality of the literary production.

Some of the novels of 1976 were Aziz Nesin's *Surname*, Rıfat Ilgaz's *Sarı Yazma*, Yaşar Kemal's *Yılanı Öldürseler* and *Al Gözüm Seyreyle Salih*, Pınar Kür's *Yarın...Yarın* (Tomorrrow...Tomorrow), Selim İleri's *Her Gece Bodrum* (Every Night at Bodrum), and Aziz Nesin's *Surname* and two modernist authors, Ferit Edgü and Demir Özlü wrote respectively, *Kimse* (Nobody) and *Bir Uzun Sonbahar* (A Long Autumn).

Some of the novels of 1977 were Pınar Kür's *Küçük Oyuncu* (Little Player) Aziz Nesin's *Yaşar ne Yaşar ne Yaşamaz*, Yılmaz Güney's *Soba, Pencere Camı, İki Ekmek İstiyoruz* (We Want a Heater, Window Glass and two Breads), Demirtaş Ceyhun's *Yağmur Sıcağı* (Hot Rain), and Güney Dal's *İş Sürgünleri* (Exile Workers) Political novels were especially produced in these years; but they were criticized for being mediocre novels which could not really be said novels, but to be rather political declarations.

Filler sultanı ile Kırmızı Sakallı Topal Karınca children storybook by Yaşar Kemal, was published. This book represented the political vision of Kemal. He used allegory to represent an imaginary vision of socialist society. Some of the novels of 1978 were Çetin Altan's *Küçük Bahçe* (Small Garde), Attila İlhan's *Yaraya Tuz Basmak*, Aziz Nesin's *Tek Yol* (One Way), Yaşar Kemal's *Deniz Küstü*, and Erol

---

[365]"*1975'de birkaç güzel hikaye kitabıyla birkaç roman başarısı çıktı ortaya. Az mı? Bir yıl dediğiniz toplum ve sanat yaşamında ne ki? "* Ibid., p. 50.

Toy's *Kuzgunlar ve Leşler* (Crows and Death Bodies). At the end of the 1970s, publication of of novels and short stories boomed. Starting with 1973, for seven years, unlike the previous years levels of ten novels maximum, thirty or fourthy novels were produced, and some of them came to be recognized as very important works of Turkish literature.

Translations of the Foreign Literature

Another important development was the escalating of translation activities during these two decades. Translations of modernist, realist and the classics of Western literature had started in Turkey during the Ottoman Empire. Translations activities were started in *Tercüme Odaları* (Chambers of Translations), in 1821, in the era of the Mahmut II. But the real increase in the numbers of translations from authors of foreign countries, mainly from France occurred in the 1880s.

This increase may be seen as having been a result of the lack or insufficiency of the native novels. The translations were done mostly from artistically poor, second class French authors like Pierre Zaconne, Emil Richebourg, and Jules Mary. In addition to these, a few translations of the works of significant authors were also done, like Victor Hugo, Paul Bourget, and Emile Zola. There were very few translations from German, Russian and British literature, only a few translations, like the works of Shakespeare were done from the French.

In the Republican era, translation activities were accelerated. The translations of the world classics on the initiative of Hasan Ali Yücel, who was the Minister of Education, was a turning point. Nurullah Ataç and his disciples Sabahattin Eyuboğlu

and Azra Erhat translated many world classics within the *Tercüme Bürosu* (Institute of Translation). Other publishing houses, like Varlık and Remzi in the 1940s and 1950s and then Cem and De in the 1960s translated many significant works of literature from foreign languages.

Cem and De publishing houses had critical roles in the publication of many modern world classics. Cem published in 1964, as a part of the Nobel prize series, Jean Paul Sartre's novel *Akıl Çağı* (The Age of Reason) as a first novel of the triology *Hürriyet Yolları* (The Roads to Freedom) with the translation by Gülseren Devrim. In 1965, other novels of the triology *Yaşanmayan Zaman* (The Reprieve) and *Yıkılış* (Troubled Sleep) were published. In 1966, in addition to the *Nobel* series, another series *Yirminci Yüzyıl Klasikleri* (Classics of the Twentieth Century) was also started.

Among the most significant translations were for instance, in 1964 and in 1965, the translations of the *Trial* and the *Castle* of Kafka by Kamuran Şipal. An article by Jean Paul Sartre, "*Çağdaş Yazarın Durumu*, The State of the Modern Artist" was published in June 1968, in *Yeni Dergi*. The debate about the current situation of the New Novel and its leading author, Michel Butor, were published in *Yeni Dergi*'s 109th issue. *Yeni Dergi* introduced this trend to Turkey.

The significant influence of the Russian literature or in other words, Soviet literature, can be observed as well. For instance, the works of an important poet, Voznezenski, were translated.

Panait Israti was the most translated social realist author of the period. It is argued it was in Turkey that the works of this writer were the most translated and appreciated.

Significant translations of the modernist and realist art were Cesar Pavese's *Ölüm Gelecek* (Death Will Come), André Malraux's *Umut* (Hope) in 1968 from Ağaoglu publishing house, Ilya Ehrenbourg's *Paris Düşerken* (The Fall of Paris), Reiner Maria Rilke's *Malte Laurids Brigge'nin Notları* (The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge), Jean Paul Sartre's *Edebiyat Nedir?* (What is the Literature?) and *Sözcükler* (The Words), Kafka's *Şato* (The Castle), James Joyce's *Sanatçının Bir Bilimadamı Olarak Portresi* (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man) and Howard Fast's *Hürriyet Yolu* (Freedom Road) from De publishing house in 1966. These books were meaningful for a Turkish reader who was ready to read modernist works of Western literature.

Ferit Edgü compares the social realist authors like Şolohov, Fadayev, Bilbaşar, İlhan Tarus with Joyce, Kafka, Proust, and Faulkner, who were modernist. Edgü supported the translations of these modernist works of art during the period in which social realism had an indisputable hegemony. He and other modernist authors defended the modernist axis. They thought that problems based on human alienation, human psychological complexity deserved to be developed in Turkish literature.

The translations of poems from foreign countries were also very popular during this period. Literary journals published many poems from a wide array of countries.

In the 1980s and 1990s, other publishing houses were founded such as Metis, İletişim, Can, YKY. These would play important roles in the translations activities which would make Turkey one of the countries in which the translations of Western works of art were most published.

Critiques and Essays

Literary criticism, essays, and political and social analysis including also academic ones were produced by some literary figures and intellectuals, like Mehmet H. Doğan, Hilmi Yavuz, Selahattin Hilâv, Metin And, Asım Bezirci, Doğan Hızlan, Murat Belge, Suut Kemal Yetkin, Mehmet Kaplan, Azra Erhat, Vedat Günyol, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mehmet Fuat, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Rauf Mutluay, Konur Ertop, Adnan Binyazar, Ferit Edgü and Fethi Naci. These critics produced many articles in the literary reviews and journals of the period. This period, especially the 1970s, was the golden age of the critics and essayists. In many reviews and journals, critiques and essays about literature, the social system and politics as a mixture or synthesis of artistic and social issues were published.

As a part of a common intellectual atmosphere, an effort to create a common artistic public was the motivation behind the debates and surveys in art periodicals. Literary critics played an important role in the formation of a common public of literature; by criticizing and recommending novels and poems. By introducing new novelists and poets, they became authorities on literature. For instance, it is argued by Doğan Hızlan that the most important progress in Turkish literature was experienced in the realm of critique, essays and theater.

These literary critics and essayists also produced political articles, and they declared their political opinions in public. I argue that they were the most popular and influential public intellectuals of their time. As a result of this active participation, they were seen as threats by the political authorities. For instance, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Azra Erhat and Vedat Günyol were humanist intellectuals who were

arrested in 1971 and released after a few months. Many others also were arrested in the following years. The military coup d'état of 1980 treated these men more brutally.

Fethi Naci was a leading character of the leftist literary critics. He was very active during all the two decades under discussion. His identity as a leading literary critic was increasingly transformed into one of a political, intellectual and cultural authority. He was also very active as a member of the Turkish Labor Party; he was a public intellectual and he largely dominated the literary world with his Marxist literary aesthetics. He referred to Lukacs and Goldmann as sources of inspiration for his approach.

Murat Belge, Ataol Behramoğlu and Asım Bezirci became also important critics as they gained experience in the literary journals and by working with the older critics. Vedat Günyol, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Hüsamettin Bozok and Memet Fuat were considered to be literary authorities. Thanks to their journals and publishing houses, they introduced many young authors to Turkish literature. Ferit Edgü, Konur Ertop and Rauf Mutluay wrote regular articles in the main magazines, reviews, and art pages of the journals.

The rate of publication of essays and critics as published books escalated in the middle of the 1960s. Important essayists of the 1960s were also editors of literary journals and publishing houses. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, a leading figure of Turkish literature, published many books of essays about literature and social issues. For instance, Kemal Karpat's book about the social history of Turkish literature was published by him. Another publishing house was Çan Yayınları by Vedat Günyol and Sabahattin Eyuboglu. For instance, Vedat Günyol's book *Dile Gelseler* (If They can Speak) and *Yeni Türkiye Ardında* (Behind New Turkey) and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu's

Yunus Emre'ye Selam (Salute to Yunus Emre) and *Mavi ve Kara* (Blue and Dark) were significant collective essays of 1966 published by Çan. Memet Fuat and his publishing house De and its review *Yeni Dergi* were also important forums for essayists and critics.

In the second half of the 1960s, Memet Fuat, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Vedat Günyol, Nermi Uygur, Konur Ertop, Doğan Hızlan, Asım Bezirci, Hüseyin Cöntürk, Muzaffer Erdost, Berna Moran, Onat Kutlar, Ferit Edgü, Rasih Güran, İlhan Berk and Attilâ İlhan were more productive critics, essayists of the Turkish literature.[366]

Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Tahir Alangu, Memet Fuat, Behçet Necatigil, Rauf Mutluay, Adnan Binyazar, Doğan Hızlan, and Hasan Bülent Kahraman were literary critics who shared their observations in literary almanacs like *Varlık Yıllığı*, *Memet Fuat'ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı*, and *Nesin Yıllığı* that I benefit. In these almanacs as in the literary reviews, I argue that it would be possible to survey the main trends, debates, and events of the literature. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, editor of the *Varlık* review and *Varlık* Almanacs published articles, to comment on the political events of the year. The Vietnam War, the Cold War, the relationship between the USSR and the USA, and the entire international agenda discussed above were all debated by Nayır. He also made comments about Turkish politics; he was a good example of a Kemalist, Republican who distanced himself from the Democrat Party tradition. His most important concern was secularism. In the international issues, Nayır was not totally against the U.S. imperialism; moreover, he had more detachment towards the USSR. He generally defended the Third Way (other than capitalism and socialism), but this

[366]Memet Fuat, "Şiir, Öykü, İnceleme," in *Memet Fuat'ın Türk Edebiyatında Seçtikleri, Türk Edebiyatı 1966* (Istanbul: De yayınevi, 1967), p. 8.

way was not the way of the Third World countries vision of Non-Alignement, but rather the European countries' position, like De Gaulle's France. He reflected left Kemalist intellectuals in a very symbolic way. In these articles, over the two decades, a transformation, a more evident support of leftist thoughts, can be observed. These articles in literary almanacs represented the close relationship between politics and literature. An important literary figure made important observations about the Turkish and international politics. Topics and developments in the domain of politics discussed above were largely analyzed in these articles.

Memet Fuat, another important literary critic and author of the Turkish Literature almanacs assessed every year the position of Turkish literature, and the intricate relationship between politics and literary events. All of them focused on the social context and political and social process in which literature was produced, and the role and intervention of the literature in this context. For instance, in 1966, Fuat argues that the most interesting essays were written by Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Vedat Günyol and Asım Bezirci.[367]

In the 1970s, there was certainly an important increase in the publications of books of essays, ciritiques and research. Many writers produced essays about politics. The close relation between literature, politics and social sciences can be observed in many different works.

For instance, Attila İlhan as a notable writer produced also books about politics, like *Hangi Sol* (Which Left) in 1971, and *Hangi Batı* (Which West) in 1972. These were popular books of essays which reflected his ideologically authentic vision.

---

[367]"*Bu yılın ilgi çeken denemeleri Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Vedat Günyol ve Asım Bezirci."* Ibid., p. 8.

Yasar Nabi Nayır's book, *Değişen Dünyamız* (Our Changing World) in 1973 can be also considered like good evidence of the public identity of writers and their intentions to interest with actual politics.

The main books of references were also written during this period. For instance, in 1973, Metin And wrote many works such as *Elli Yılın Türk Tiyatrosu*, (Fifty Years of the Turkish Theatre), *Tiyatro Kilavuzu* (Guidebook of Theatre), Cevdet Kudret published his work *Ortaoyunu*, Rauf Mutluay accomplished his works *Türk Halk Siiri Antolojisi* (The Anthology of Turkish Folk Poetry), and *50 Yılın Türk Edebiyati* (Turkish Literature of the Fifty Years).

In 1976, Adnan Binyazar wrote that 1975 had been a very productive year for essays, critiques and social research.[368] In some reviews like *Halkın Dostları* which had been closed in 1972, *Militan*, *Yansıma, Türkiye Defterleri, Türkiye Yazıları* and *Birikim*, many articles on literay criticism, and social and economic research had been published.

In 1975, books of essays like Bedri Rahmi Eyuboglu's *Delifişek* (Delinquent), Vedat Gunyol's *Bu Cennet, bu Cehennem* (This Heaven, This Hell), Attila İlhan's *Faşizmin Ayak Sesleri* (Footfalls of the Fascism) were all about Turkey's politics, social system, intellectual life and especialy artistic culture. Cavit Orhan Tutengil's *Atatürk'ü Anlamak ve Tamamlamak* (To Understand and to Complete Atatürk's Vision) perfectly reflects the left Kemalist ideology of the age.

Many of the titles of the books of essays and critiques that were published in 1976 reflected the close relationship between writers and politics: Melih Cevdet

[368]Adnan Binyazar, "1975'te Deneme, Elestiri ve İnceleme," *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*. (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1976).

Anday's *Sosyalist bir Dünya* (A Socialist World), Fakir Baykurt's *Şamar Oğlanları* (Problems of the Turkish instructors as they were insulted by all governments), Adnan Binyazar's *Kültür ve Eğitim Sorunları* (The Problems of Culture and Education), Necati Cumali's *Senin için Ey Demokrasi* (For You, Democracy), Asim Bezirci's *Bilimden Yana, Sosyalizme Doğru* (Close to Science, Towards Socialism), Aziz Nesin's *Böyle Gelmiş, Böyle Gitmez* were all collections of political articles and analysises of these authors. They wrote these politically engaged works as a result of their public intellectual identities. Cemal Sureya's *Sapkam Dolu Çiçekle*, Tahsin Yücel's *Yazın ve Yaşam* (Literature and Life), and Fethi Naci *Edebiyat Yazıları* (Writings of Literature) were all literary critiques written by left-wing authors from different approches. In contrast to them, Mehmet Kaplan's book, *Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Studies for Turkish Literature) published by Dergâh Yayınları can be considered a Turkish literary history from a nationalist-conservative perspective. Metin And's works on Ottoman theatre were also published in 1976.

Memet Fuat, Asım Bezirci, Şükran Kurdakul, Metin And and Hilmi Yavuz were considered the leading literary critics of 1977 by Murat Belge. He wrote that there was no one approach, but many different ones which had to be discussed in the realm of the Marxist aesthetics. He criticized the one dimensionality of the Marxist critiques.[369]

Many of the writers who wrote in the daily newspapers published their essays in the form of books. For instance, Oktay Akbal's book *Gençler Bize Bakıyor* (The Youth is Looking to Us), and Melih Cevdet Anday's book, *Yasak* (Forbidden) in 1978

[369]Murat Belge, "Deneme," in *Nesin Yıllıkları 1978* (İstanbul: Nesin Yayınevi, 1978), pp. 83 89.

were two of them. In these books, the two writers see it as responsibility as part of their public intellectual's identity to share their observations about Turkish intellectual life, literature, politics, youth and the problems of the country.

Haldun Taner, a leading play and short story writer, who wrote in *Milliyet* newspaper, and collected his articles in many books, like *Devekuşuna Mektuplar* (Letters to the Ostrich) in 1977. Çetin Altan's *Bir Yumak İnsan* (A Bobble of Humans) and Uğur Mumcu's *Sakıncalı Piyade* (Unfavorable Infantry) were collected essays of the notable public intellectuals of their time, in 1977. Sevgi Soysal's *Bakmak* (To Look) and Füruzan's *Yeni Konuklar* (New Guests) were also significant books of essays.

In 1978, Nedim Gürsel's book *Çağdaş Yazın ve Kültür* (Modern Literature and Culture) and Selim İleri's book *Çağdaşlık Sorunu* (Problem of Civilization) focused on modernity and to its cultural and literary dimensions and represented the topics of debates of their age.

As a conclusion, it can be said that these books of essays of the period were increasingly about social topics. The writers reflected the social realist, humanist and Universalist spirit of their period. Notable books of references were also produced as a result of an effort to create a more powerful Turkish common intellectual culture. In the domain of literary criticism, it may be argued that literary critics became a significant part of the Turkish literature and intellectual life.

The Development of Literary Reviews

As discussed, literary reviews, journals were augmented in the 1960s. In these literary journals, many literary debates took place; a literary and cultural world was shaped thanks to them. *Yeditepe*, *Yeni Ufuklar*, *Varlık* and *Yeni Dergi* may be considered as the most important common forums for authors from different age groups and schools of thought and places of origin. These reviews and journals presented many interviews with different authors, generally about the problems and the definition of the Turkish literature. For instance, in the 132th issue of *Yeditepe*, in April 1967, an important survey was answered by many authors like Attilâ Ilhan, Selahattin Hilâv, Behçet Necatigil, and Konur Ertop. The authors were asked what they understood when they heard the term "literary generation," and what the qualities of the Turkish works of literature had been translated to the foreign languages was, and last, if it was necessary to be national to be also universal.

All of these questions were important in the search for the definition of different literary generations, efforts to get Turkish literature to be acknowledged in the international arena, and topics of nativity and universalism. Another survey was in *Yeni Dergi*, in February 1967 to identify the generation of the 1950s and 1960s as a young generation. The Second New poets were debated; Mehmet H. Doğan argued that this generation was born in a poor social and economic context in which literature lacked capacity to reflect the social reality, but everything was attended from it. The frequency of the debates about the actual situation of literature increased in the 1970s. In these journals, mainly in *Varlık*, many questions about the actual politics were also asked of the authors as will be discussed below.

In 1965, Osman Mazlum[370](Cemal Sureya's pseudonym) wrote that the center of Turkish cultural life were reviews. Every poet published first his poems in a periodical and later, all of these poems were collected and published in the form of books. And this process provided the formation of a common literature.[371] Cemal Süreya very often emphasized the significance of the literary reviews. He edited many of them.

Firstly, It is necessary to cite the most productive literary reviews, in 1961, as *Varlık*, *Yeditepe* and *Yeni Ufuklar*. The most productive and significant critics of the *Varlık* reviews and almanacs were Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Behçet Necatigil, Tahir Alangu, Rauf Mutluay, Adnan Binyazar, Memet Fuat and Konur Ertop. During this year, the prominent publishing houses were *Varlık, Remzi, Dost*, and *De*.

1965 may be defined as a turning point with the publication of *Yeni Dergi* and *Şiir Sanatı*. *Soyut*, *Yordam* and *Papirüs* began publication in 1966. *Varlık, Dost, Yeni Ufuklar*, *Yeditepe*, *Yeni Dergi*, *Soyut*, *Hisar*, and *Cep Dergisi*[372] were the significant literary reviews of the second half of the 1960s.

---

[370]Osman Mazlum was one of the pseudonyms of Cemal Süreya.

[371]"*Dergiler.Osman Mazlum doğru söylüyordu: "Sanat hayatımız dergilerde soluk alıyor. Onlar sanat verimlerini sadece zenginleştiren değil, doğrudan doğruya yaratan bir görünümdeler. Türk sanat hayatında birim kitap değil dergidir. Her şair, her yazar yapıtlarını önce dergilerde sunuyor, sonra da o parçaları birleştiriyor oluyor kitap. Bir kere sanatçının her yapıtını önce parça parça dergilerde yayımlaması geniş ölçüde bir ortaklaşa edebiyatın doğmasına yol açmıştır."* Cemal Süreya, *Yeni Dergi*, (13 October 1965), Quoted in Rauf Mutluay, "1967'de Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1967* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970), p. 24.

[372]This review was a publication of the *Varlık* Publishing House which was published by the sake of reflecting the intellectual and artistic events of the foreign especially Western countries.

Yön was a significant political periodical that published poetry and articles about art until 1965, but then *Devrim*, and *Ant* periodicals replaced it by publishing two art pages in the editorial of Fethi Naci, and Ferit Edgü.[373]

In 1970, the leading literary reviews of the period were: *Yeni Dergi* (New review), *Hisar*, *Soyut*, (Abstract), *Dost* (Comrade), *Yeditepe*, *Güney* (Sud), *Yeni Edebiyat*[374](New Literature),[375] *Varlık* and *Halkın Dostları*. *Halkın Dostları* as a symbolic left-wing literary review was followed by many of the similar reviews. *Papirüs* reflects the great power of resistence of a one person, it is Cemal Süreya. This review was continued to be published until its 47th issue.[376]

The literary reviews which were published in 1971 were *Halkın Dostları, Hisar, Ilgaz, Özün, Türk Dili, Soyut, Varlık, Yeditepe, Yeni Dergi, Yeni Edebiyat, Gelecek, Güney*.[377] *Devrim, Ortam, Halkın Dostları* (it was closed by the martial law), *Gelecek*, *Yeni Edebiyat* were closed, but *Yansıma* (Reflection) *Türk Edebiyatı,* (Turkish Literature), and *Akademi* (Academy) were started in 1972.[378]

In 1972, *Yeni a* (New a) review was considered by Adnan Binyazar to be an important forum for young authors. Hilmi Yavuz, Adnan Özyalçıner, Doğan Hızlan,

---

[373]Rauf Mutluay, " 1966'da Şiirimiz,"*Varlık Yılığı 1967* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1968), pp. 31 51.

[374]Doğan Hızlan, "1970'de Şiirimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1971* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1972), pp. 19, 41.

[375]In the editorial of Doğan Hızlan was started this year.

[376]"*Papirüs 46 47. sayıya dek gücünü sürdürüyor. Papirüs Cemal Süreya'nın büyük direnme gücünün sonucudur."* Adnan Binyazar, "1970'de Deneme, Eleştirme, İnceleme," *Varlık Yıllığı 1970* (Istanbul: Varlık yayınevi, 1971) pp. 72 102, p. 78.

[377]This review's many numbers were prepared by Metin Eloğlu.

[378]Rauf Mutluay, "1972'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," *Varlik Yıllığı 1973* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970), p. 35.

Konur Ertop, Kemal Özer, Asım Bezirci, Onat Kutlar contributed to this journal. They debated several political and social topics, like the problems of Turkish Westernization.[379]

In 1973, *Varlık, Soyut, Yeni Dergi, Türk Dili, Yeni Ufuklar, Yeditepe, Güney, Türk Edebiyatı, Yansıma, Yeni a, Kitaplar* reviews and *Miliyet Sanat* were the art and literary reviews of the year in which political and social problems were also depicted by authors.[380] In 1975, many journals, *Türkiye Defteri, Yansıma, Köken* and Suut Kemal Yetkin's old review, *Sanat ve Edebiyat* ended their publications.[381]

In 1976, *Devrimci Sanat ve Kültür Kavgasında Militan* (Militancy in the Revolutionary Struggle of Art and Culture) and *Yeni Ufuklar* reviews were closed. Vedat Günyol's *Yeni Ufuklar*, in its last issue by organizing a collective survey with the participation of many authors, many authors that answered to these questions were notable public intellectuals of the age. In 1977, with the personal effort and initiative of Cemal Süreya, a review *Turkiye Yazıları* was started to be published. This review may be seen as a good example of a synthesis of literary review and political opinion periodical, this may be called as an opinion magazine.

In 1979, *Devimci Savaşımda Sanat Emeği* (Labor of Art in the Revolutionary Struggle), *Yazı* (Article), *Felsefe* Dergisi (Journal of Philosophy), Sanat *ve Toplum*

---

[379]Adnan Binyazar, "1972'de Eleştiri, Deneme, İnceleme," in *1973 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1973), pp. 81, 82.

[380]Adnan Binyazar, "1973'de Eleştiri, Deneme, İnceleme," in *1974 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970), p. 36.

[381]"*1975'de birkaç güzel hikaye kitabıyla birkaç roman başarısı çıktı ortaya. Az mı? Bir yıl dediğiniz toplum ve sanat yaşamında ne ki? Yeni Dergi 1975 yılında kapatılır. Kapanan diğer dergiler Türkiye Defteri, Yansıma, Köken ve Suut Kemal Yetkin'in çıkardığı Sanat Edebiyat dergisi de yayınına son veren dergilerden..."* Ibid., p. 50.

(Art and Society), and *Ulusal Kültür* (National Culture) were started to be published. *Sesimiz* (Our Voice) and *Oluşum* (Being) reviews were renewed.[382] Propoganda journals of literature like *Devrimci Savaşımda Sanat Emeği* were disapproved of even by the leftist authors for having close relations with the socialist organizations of the period. These authors defended the freedom and independence of writers vis-à-vis the politics.

[382]Adnan Binyazar, "1978'de Deneme, Eleştiri, İnceleme, Araştırma," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1979* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1978), p. 82.

CHAPTER FIVE

LITERATURE AND POLITICS

The Intricate Relationship between Authors and the Social Circumstances and Politics during These Two Decades

In this chapter, I will focus on the relationship of literature with social circumstances and politics as a reciprocal process. This chapter will discuss the evolution of literature in relation with changing political process. I will discuss the main politically determined literary circles of the period. I will argue that dissident, politically committed, socially engaged leftist culture was influential in the literary field, and I will try to identify this culture's sociological and political dimensions. I will formulate the four typologies to identify main literary traditions of the period, from an axis as a combination of the political and literary identities of the authors.

These four typologies were defined as traditional, left-kemalist authors; Marxist, affiliated, social realist authors; modernist authors and three sui generis authors as Attilâ İlhan, Kemal Tahir, Oğuz Atay as they were popular, authentic and influential intellectuals. In this literary landscape, I will also attempt to show the role of the conservative, nationalist currents and authors who resisted and even challenged to some extent, this hegemonic literary culture and produced also very political works of art.

Evolution of the Relation between Artists and Politics

In 1961, the debates and articles of many authors were influenced by the 1960 coup d'état regime. Many of them openly supported the coup d'état and the process of making of a new constitution.[383] They argued that the new constitution might be a good development or a turning point to create a more democratic and developed society in which they supposed that art would be more influential.

They hoped the constitution would overcome the imperfections of the social transformations that had been introduced in the early years of the Republican period and they supported the reconstruction of social institutions like the Village Institutes and the Public Houses and the restarting of the social reforms of the early years of the Republican period, which had been weakened by counter-attacks during period of the the DP governments. They demanded from political authorities to make reforms in the realm of education and to raise the cultural level of society. They wanted to realize a cultural transformation as a part of the social changes.

At the beginnig of the 1960s, writers declared that a new era, in which social struggles would be more influential, had begun. For instance, Melih Cevdet Anday in his article, "*Korkunun Gereği Yok!*" (To Fear is not Necessary!)[384] stated that a social awareness had grown in Turkey, after the 27 May coup d'état. He asks to himself: "How it can be defined the relation between the artistic intention and political action?" Anday said that this topic which was discussed in France had no significance in

[383]Yaşar Nabi Nayır, "Collectıve Survey," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1961* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961).

[384]Melih Cevdet Anday, "Korkunun Gereği Yok," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1962*, (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1962), pp. 34-37.

Turkey; he mentioned that in Turkey there was no artists who questioned being a member of political parties or any limitation to produce his work of art.[385] He criticized those who imitated the debates and fashions of the Western countries. In Turkey, writers were voluntarily part of the political activities.

Another important topic was the problems of social realism, and peasant novels. Attilâ İlhan argues that: "For many years, many writers have lost their realist beliefs with their characters and after that, their *joi de vivre*, and their power to struggle and finally their art. According to me, peasant novels and poets transformed realism into a confomism which was bloodless, inflexible and has lost its capacity to understand its period."[386]

İlhan insists on the problem was whether realism dealt profoundly with the interior problems of the social circumstances and historical evolution or on the contrary like a large number of novelists, in a superficial way and in an everyday life manner.[387] Suut Kemal Yetkin, as a one of the literary critic, known for his conservative, traditionalist political tendencies, also criticizes the peasant novel for its superficiality. He wrote that art was not an explanation but a creation, "Peasants do not want to read their own lives. Urban people are reading about the lives of the peasants." He made a distinction between a document and a work of art. He asked a

---

[385]"*Sanatsal eğilimle siyasal eylem arasındaki ilişki nasıl olmalıdır? O günlerde Fransa'da yürütülmekte olna bir tartışmanın Türkiye'de karşılığı olmadığını, Türkiye'de siyasi partilere katılmak ve eserini özgürce vermemek gibi bir gündemin olmadığını savunuyor*." Ibid.

[386]"*Yıllar var ki nice sanatçının gerçekçilik inanışlarıyla birlikte önce kişiliklerini, sonra yaşama sevinçlerini ve savaşma güçlerini en sonrada sanatlarını kaybedip durduklarını görüyoruz. Bana sorarsanız köy romanları ve şairleri gerçekçiliği donuk ve kalıplaşmış ve çağını kapsamak yetisini kaybetmiş bir conformism haline getirmiştir bile."* Attila İlhan, "Gerçekçiliğin İç Sorunları," *Ataç* no 2, pp.38 40.

[387]"*Büyük gerçekçilik toplumsal ortamın iç problemlerini derinlemesine ve tarih örgüsü içinde mi alacak bizimkiler tam tersine ve çokluk yüzeylemesine ve gündelik olarak ele alıyorlar"* Ibid. p. 40

work of art could be considered as a document or whether it had to be an artistic expression of reality. He cited the example *Yaban* by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu as an example of this kind of novel which had artistic qualities and represented the problematic relation of the intellectual and peasantry.[388]

In the literary reviews, the relation between the work of art and the reality was debated at length. Political and social approaches intervened into the autonomy of the artistic domain. This was criticized by many of the authors. This debate was focused on the instrumentality of the work of art for political and social causes; many authors thought that it was legitimate to think about and bring up social and political problems in the works of art, but they warned not to ignore the artistic values. The novelist might be influenced from the different realities of his country, but he continued to exist on the condition that he really produced a work of art.[389]

Memet Fuat, in 1963 wrote that: "Since the 1960s, politics have attracted every kind of concern to itself.[390] This statement reflects the increasing legitimacy of writers to participate in the political developments. Memet Fuat said, "the circumstances in which we found ourselves were unavoidable results of our conception of education. In the cities with millions of people, books which were sold only two or three thousand copies."[391] This declaration shows us a desire of the artists to be known and to be read

---

[388]"*Sanat bir çıkarış değil bir yaratıştır. Köylüler kendi hayatlarını okumak istemiyorlar, köy romanlarını şehirliler okuyor. Belge mi, sanat eseri mi, sanat eseri belge midir yoksa gerçekliğin bir sanatsal ifadesi mi?"* Suut Kemal Yetkin "Köy Romanı" *Türk Dili*, no. 145 (1964), p. 126.

[389]Yaşar Nabi Nayır, "Collective Survey," *Varlık Yıllığı Yıllığı 1964*, (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1964), p. 111.

[390]"*1960'lardan beri politika ilgileri hep kendine çekiyor."* Memet Fuat, "Türk Edebiyatında Şiir, Öykü, Deneme," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi 1964), p. 5.

[391] "*İçinde bulunduğumuz durum eğitim anlayışımızın kaçınılmaz sonucu Milyonluk şehirlerde iki bin üç bin satamayan kitaplar."*Ibid.

by a larger public. Therefore, they think that education reform was necessary to create a new literate public that would be interested in literature.

In 1963, art for art's sake and art for politics debates started. This debate also continued during the following years, but even today, it is argued that the approach of political art which overwhelmed art's for art sake approach, dominated Turkish literature, and political actors severely intervened in the field of art.

As a good example, Ayperi Akalın, a young critic (she was a member of the Socialist Culture Association, defending wholeheartedly principles of the social realist art) wrote an article about the relationship between art and politics. This article was contrary to Memet Fuat, she emphasizes the social responsibilities of the artist. In this article, the autonomy of the art from politics was denied. She argued that freedom of the artist could only be realized in a new society, and to attain to this new social order, the artist had to be part of politics. This approach was increasingly espoused by the artistic circles of the young revolutionary artists. The autonomy of art was strictly denied.[392]

Modernist poet Edip Cansever participated in this debate writing that, "the glorious side of the relationship between art and politics is to reach to the universal and humanist values initiating from the point of unique eternity lying on the unique borders.[393] Cansever also stressed the universal value of art that had to be defined

[392]Ayperi Akalın, "Sanat ve Politika İlişkisi," Türk Edebiyatı 1964 (Istanbul: De Yayınları, 1964), pp. 127 132, In *Yön*, no 74 (15 May 1964).

[393]*"İşin görkemli yanı bu eşsiz sınırlar içindeki o eşsiz sonsuzluktan yola çıkmak, insancıl ve evrensel olana bu yoldan ulaşmaktır."* Edip Cansever, "Sanatçı ile Politikacı," *Yeni İnsan* no. 5 (4 May1964), in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayınları, 1964), pp.139, 142.

above politics. In his opinion, the politician had should not interfere in politics and artist should not think that he was independent from everything.[394]

The approaches of Melih Cevdet Anday and Memet Fuat also can be considered as a response to Akalın. They emphasized the universal and autonomous role of art. All of them tried to mediate between two extreme approaches, one arguing the absolute autonomy of art and the other which is reducing art to politics.[395]

These writers thought that this was the first time that the desire for freedom, and demands of emancipation could be freely raised. For instance, Rauf Mutluay emphasized that there was an increasing social awakening. He wrote that in 1964 the social awareness of the last years, increasing domestic and international political problems, journals which had become widespread, the cheapness of the radio, the liveliness of the theatre were significant social changes.[396]

In his important analysis of the literary events of 1965, Memet Fuat wrote about the political intentions of the literary world. In that year intellectuals became completely interested in politics. A similar process was also dominant in the realm of publishing; books about politics, economics, underdevelopment, and especially books about Marxism and socialism were wery popular.

---

[394] "*Sanatın politika üstü evrensel değeri vurgulanıyor. Politikacı sanatçıya karışmasın, sanatçı da kendini herşeyden bağımsız görmesin*." Ibid., p. 142.

[395]Memet Fuat, "Sanat Politika İlşkisi," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964*, (*Yön*, no. 75, 23 Mayıs), pp. 133 138. Melih Cevdet Anday, "Sanatın ve Politikanın Özü," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (*Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 134, July 1963), pp. 143, 147, p. 146.

[396] "*Son yılların toplumsal uyanışı, ard arda gelen canlı olaylar; bütün ilgiyi toplayan iç ve dış politika sorunları, gazetelerin sürümü, radyonun ucuzluğu, sinemanın kolaylığı, tiyatronun canlılığı çok arttı biliyorum.."* Rauf Mutluay, "1967'de Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1965* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1966) pp 23 43, p. 17 20.

Second, books of Nazım Hikmet attracted a wide array of people. Turkish literature had a lively year, and this was a strong year of poetry. National culture, and Western Influence in the Literature were the topics of the debates that appeared in the pages of the literary reviews.[397]

In *Varlık Yıllığı*, every year, the results to important surveys in which many authors declared their opinions were seen. One of these surveys was the Collective Survey of 1966.[398]

In this survey, the questions were: first, "Can you assume that there may be a restriction on freedoms?" Second, "Can economic development be realized only by investments? The devolopment of the education may be seen as a result of the economic development or for the economic development, is it necessary to promote a campaign of education?" Last, "some intellectuals think that in the last elections people voted against their own rights and interests. Can it be argued that Turkish people may really vote with this wrong consciousness?"

There were other questions in the domain of art:[399] First, to be avant-garde in the art and arguments about the difficulties of comprehension and adaptation of the

---

[397] *"Aydınların kendilerini bütünüyle politikaya verdikleri bir yıl görünümündeydi 1965 yılı. Yayın hayatında da buna paralel bir gelişme, büyük bir hareket vardı; politikayla, ekonomiyle, az gelişmişlikle ilgili kitaplar, özellikle sosyalizm, Marksizm üzerine olan kitaplar kapış kapış gitti. Bir de Nazım Hikmet'in kitapları...Güçlü bir yıl yaşadı edebiyatımız, güçlü bir şiir yılı...Çeşitli dergileri dolduran "Ulusal Kültür", "Edebiyatta Batı Etkileri" tartışmaları, açıkoturumları da yaşandı. Memet Fuat Ocak 1966'da yayımlanan Türk Edebiyatı seçkisinde 1965 yılını böyle değerlendirmiş."* Memet Fuat, "Introduction," in *Memet Fuat'ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1966* (Istanbul: De yayınevi, 1970), p. 5.

[398] *"1. Mutlak özgürlüğü insan topluluklarında gerçekleşmeyecek bir ütopya olduğuna göre, toplumumuza uygun bir özgürlüğün nelerle sınırlı olması gerektiğini kısaca belirtir misiniz? 2. Ekonomik kalkınmamızın yalnız yatırımlar yoluyla gerçekleşebileceğine inanıyor musunuz? Yani eğitimin gelişmesini ekonomik kalkınmadan mı beklemeliyiz, yoksa ekonomik kalkınmanın gerçekleşmesi için geniş bir eğitim seferberliğini mi gerekli görürsünüz?* 3. *Bazı düşünürler son seçimlerin sonucu halkımızın kendi hak ve çıkarlarına karşı olduğunu ortaya koyduğu sanısındadırlar. Halkımızın oyunu gerçekten bilinçle bu açıdan kullandığı öne sürülebilir mi?"* Sennur Sezer, "1966 Collective Survey," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1966* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 141 142.

people to this kind of art and the necessity of establishing a balance in this domain was an important debate in the world of literature. In relation to this debate, they asked,"Can you define Turkish artists' responsibilities?" Second, literature and the adaptation, imitation, and copying of Western trends were debated. The third question was about the argument that every novelties brought with him some kind of corruptions."

These questions were answered by many of the authors. I will consider these questions to show the literary climate which was too close to politics. The responses of Oktay Akbal to the first two questions of art are notable:

> Our society is an underdeveloped society. Works of a certain quality have not been adopted by a large part of society. There will not be appreciated for a long time, because, an artist who produces works of art in a Westernized style can only attract three or five thousand people. However, an artist producing significant, functional works of art does not have to forget that he is a member of an underdeveloped society. An artist will struggle for a more superior, more abundant, more correct order, but he will not lose his artistic values. He will not say that his mission is completed after he wrote his work of art.[400]

Second, Akbal thought that in Turkey in 1965 there were two seperated society as two different nations, "Çetin Altan says that there was a kingdom of Istanbul, in Turkey, where isolated intellectual circles were dominant. An important critical approach is that as long as Turkish authors imitated or adopted unconsciously, isolated

---

[399]"*Sanat öncülüğü ile halkın anlama ve sindirme gücü arasındaki dengeyi sağlama gereği dünya edebiyat çevrelerinde yine geniş ölçüde tartışılırken sizce bu açıdan bizde sanatçılara düşen görevler var mıdır? 2. Edebiyat ve öbür sanatlarda yeniye yönelişte gerçek bir gereksinme yanında sadece modaya uyma ve kopyacılık gayretlerinin de etkisinin görüldüğü, böylece de gerçek ve sahte yeniler ortaya çıktığı ileri sürülüyor. Bu konuda ne düşünüyor sunuz?3. Her deformasyonu yeninin şaşmaz koşulu sayan eleştirmenlerin bu görüşünü paylaşıyor musunuz?"* Ibid.

[400]"B*izim toplumumuz geri kalmış bir toplum. İyi yapıtlar benimsenmiyor. Benimsenmeyecek de...Batı anlayışında yapıt veren bir sanatçı ancak üç beş bin kişiyi ilgilendiriyor. İster toplumcu, ister bireyci olsun, ilgilenen halk değil, yığınlar değil, üç beş bin aydın...Ama sanatçı iyi sanat yapıtları, yararlı sanat yapıtları yaratırken geri kalmiş bir toplumun kişisi olduğunu unutmamalı. Sanatıyla sanat değerlerini yitirmeden yurttaşlık görevleriyle, insanlığa daha iyi, daha üstün, daha doğru bir yaşam, bir düzen için savaşacak... Öyküsünü, romanını, şiirini yazıp görevini bitirdim demeyecek."* İbid., p. 144.

and avant-garde Westernized intellectual, their work could not reach a larger public."[401] This was a standard approach which emphasized the problematic relationship between Western art and its negative influences on the Turkish artist.

Necati Cumalı wrote,

> On the other hand, as in all underdeveloped countries, we have also an avant-garde minority. This minority has a constructive, creative, and deconstructive power for the preparation of the future of our country. The revolutions that we have had since hundred years were the result of the struggle of this minority.[402]

These questions and their answers were significant. Cumalı represented a direct Jacobin and Republican attitude; he stressed the significance of the intellectual minority for the realization of political and social developments.

During 1966, artists and authors were arrested and put on trial. Many intellectuals blamed Justice Party (JP) government.[403] Fuat wrote,

> Another important aspect of 1966 was an increase in the numbers of the men of letters who were arrested. First, Orhan Kemal was arrested and he was put on trial. He was put in jail and then he freed. Then, the book of Aşık İhsani, *I Will Write* was withdrawn from circulation, he was arrested. He was put on trial, jailed for a while and then freed. Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca was put on trial as

---

[401] "*Bugün Türkiye'de iki ayrı toplum yanyana. İki ayrı ulus gibiyiz. Çetin Altan İstanbul dükalığı diyor ya, onun gibi İstanbul'da, Ankara'da birkaç bin kişilik aydın çevreler, birkaç Anadolu şehrinde yer yer yanıp sönen ışık noktaları. Geriye kalan kapkaranlık... Gazete girmiyor, radyonun sesi ulşamıyor, öğretmen, okul yüzü görmüyor. "Sanat dükalığı içinde şairler, ressamlar, öykücüler çağdaş yapıtlara öykünerek yapıtlar yaratıyorlar. İyisi de var, kötüsü de. Ama ayıran yok, seçen yok, alan yok, gerçekten anlayan yok. Şiir kitapları bin tane satılmıyor, dergilerde öyle...Bir mutlunun mutlusu azınlık ki sormayın sayısını! Geleceğe kişiliği güçlü olanlar, moda akımların etkisini kişiliğinin gücü ile yenebilenler, kalıcı yapıtları yaratanlar kalacak."*Ibid.

[402] "*Öte yandan bütün geri kalmış ülkelerde olduğu gibi bizde de nasılsa yetişebilmiş bir öncü azınlık vardır. Bu azınlık, yapıcı, yaratıcı hatta yıkıcı toplumumuzun geleceğini hazırlayıcı bir güç taşır. Yüz yıldır gerçekleştirdiğimiz devrimleri bu azınlığın savaşına borçluyuz. Mutlu azınlık sözünden anlaşılması gereken doğru anlam budur. Bazı dar görüşlü toplumcuların kullandığı anlamda, sömürücü bir azınlığı multu olarak görmek, mutluluk sözüne aykırı bir anlam vermek, mutluluğu uğramadığı bir yerde aramak olur. Bu azınlığın özgürlüğü kısıtlandığı ölçüde, bu toplumun devrimci gücü baskı altına girer. Bunun için ki bu konuda hiçbir pazarlığa yanaşılmamalıdır. Özgürlüğün tek ölçüsü zora başvurmanın akla getirilmemesi, ahlak dışı sayılmasıdır.*" Necati Cumalı, "Collective Survey," in *Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970), p. 162.

[403]Halit Refiğ, film director, argues that after the Justice Party government, their social realist movement of cinema was liquidated because of the state represssion by censorship.

> he pasted his poem, *Horoz* (Cock) up on the window. The poetry book of Nazım Hikmet, *New Poems* was whitdrawn from circulation and his publisher, Nezihe Meriç was put on trial. And the collected poems of Nazım Hikmet, *From Four Prisons* was withdrawn from circulation and his publisher, Mehmet Fuat, was put on trial. Again, the book of Nazım Hikmet, *Saat 21 22 Şiirleri* (The Poems of 21 22 Hours) was not withdrawn from circulation, but his publisher was put on trial. All of these trials are continuing. As a whole, in 1966, only for works of literature, apart from books and articles of thought, the prosecutors demanded 40 or 70 years of punishment.[404]

In 1966, Vedat Günyol, in his article "Burjuvalık Özentisi" (Admiration to the Bourgeoisie) wrote,

> After the Constitutional era of the Ottoman period, a counter intellectual movement was started. Artists, qnd intellectuals returned to the sources, to the realities of their country and to the people, by slowly leaving aside their bourgeois desires. In the Republican Turkey, today, you cannot find any real artist or intellectual who does not challenge the bourgeois life styles and thoughts. [405]

In 1967, Memet Fuat wrote that in Turkey most of the artists shared an evident desire, a trend, for social realist art.[406] In many different articles of the period social realist art was already defined as an ethical and political obligation for the artists.

---

[404]"*1966'nin bir özelliği de mahkemelere, cezaevlerine düşen edebiyatçıların sayısında gözle görülür artma idi. Önce Orhan Kemal tutuklanıp mahkemeye verildi, bir süre cezaevinde kaldı, sonra çıktı. Arkasından Aşık İhsani'nin Yazacağım adlı kitabı toplatıldı, kendi tutuklandı, mahkemeye verildi, bir süre cezaevinde kaldı, sonra çıktı. Memet Fuat was put on trial Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca Aksaray'daki kitapçı dükkanının camına astığı "Horoz" şiiri için mahkemeye verildi. Nazım Hikmet'in Yeni Şiirler adlı kitabı toplatıldı, yayıncısı Nezihe Meriç mahkemeye verildi. Gene Nazım Hikmet'in Dört Hapishaneden adlı kitabı toplatıldı, yayıncısı Memet Fuat mahkemeye verildi. Gene Nazım Hikmet'in Saat 21 22 şiirleri adlı kitabında suç gözetilerek kitap toplatılmadıysa da yayıncısı Memet Fuat mahkemeye verildi. Bütün bu mahkemeler sürüyor. Topluca hesaplarsak 1966 yılında yalnız edebiyatçılar için düşünce kitapları, yazıları için istenen ayrı savcılar 40 ila 70 yıl arasında ceza istediler."* Memet Fuat, "1966'da Şiir, Kısa Hikaye, Eleştiri," *Türk Edebiyatı 1966*, (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1967), p. 6.

[405]"*Meşrutiyetle birlikte, ters yönlü bir akım başlıyor. Sanatçılar, aydınlar yavaş yavaş burjuva özlemlerini bir yana atıp, kaynaklarına, yurt gerçeklerine, halka dönüyorlar. Cumhuriyet Türkiyesinde bugün halka dayanmayan, halktan yana olmayan, burjuva düşünüş ve yaşayışlarına kafa tutmayan bir tek gerçek sanatçı ve düşünür bulamazsınız."* Vedat Günyol, "Burjuvalık Özentisi*," Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 169 (June 1966), p. 26.

[406]"*Bir yandan da toplumcu sanata doğru bir gidiş, açık bir özlem..."* Memet Fuat, "Introduction," *Türk Edebiyatı 1968* (İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 5-10, p. 10.

Cemal Süreya's approach in 1967 was significant. He argued that Turkey was living in the psychology that it had before the revolution. The stream of history had been accelerated, and they were in the middle of a great change of humanity. If the poet wanted to be in communication with his reader, he had to collect material about human lives more closely. He had to call great change which was in the profoundity of the poem to the surface.[407]

There would be an important change in the next years, in the literature as argued by Mutluay, but he was not yet satisfied by the actual conditions of literaure, as can be seen in his early observations of previous years. Mutluay complained from the postponement of literature as a result of unclear social circumstances. Even so, he respected the real poetry which resisted the easy call of actual conditions.[408] The transformation of the reading public from a common reading public of poetry and journals to one only journals had already been criticized.[409] Critics complained of from the over politization of the intellectual world and the interest in the social topics.

---

[407] *"Şiir sanatlar arasında eğlence niteliğini en az taşıyan sanattır. Son yıllarda daha da öyle olmuştur. Eski şiirin alışkanlığından yeni şiirin havasına girebilmek için okurun da kendi yönünde küçük bir adım atması gerekiyor. Yeni şiirin reklamı da yoktur. Edebiyatın ara kurumları olan okullar ve gazeteler şiiri tanıtmak kaygısını hiç duymamaktadırlar. Öte yandan Türkiye bugün bir devrim öncesi psikolojisini yaşamaktadır; tarihin akışı iyice hızlanmıştır; büyük bir insani değişimin ortasındayız...Şair okurla bir ilgi kurmak istiyorsa bu durumun insani malzemesini daha yakından harmanlamalıdır, şiirinin dibindeki büyük değişimi yüzeyde adlandırmaya çalışmalıdır."* Rauf Mutluay, "1966'da Şiirimiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1967* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1968), p. 30.

,

[408] *"İşte beş yıldır aynı şey: Edebiyatı hep geriye iten, şiiri okuyucusuz, ilgisiz bırakan bir ortamın karışıklığından yakınma; şiirin yalnızlığının, uzaklığının, toplumdan ayrılığının sorumunun arama; yeni umutların tesellileriyle sevinmeye hazır bir bekleyiş gerginliği; ortaları dolduran özenti örneklerin bolluğundan bıkkınlık; bunca dergiyi, kitabı, yazıyı taramanın, derlemenin usancı içinde en iyiyi görmeyi bekleyerek harcanmış uzun sabır ve bezginlik süreleri; gene de sanatın, has şiirin, günlerin kolay ve hazır çağrılarına yenilmeyen direncine saygı ve özlem."* Rauf Mutluay, "1967'de Şiirimiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1968* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1968), p. 27.

[409] Ibid., p. 30.

The collective survey of 1967, which was prepared by Sennur Sezer in *Varlık*, was about the intellectual's tendency to detach themselves from the people.[410] Most of the authors did not accept that there was any detachment in the literature from the people. On the contrary, they thought that the literature was excessively influenced by the politics, and highly interested in the social problems...

For instance, Türker Acaroğlu, who was a critic and researcher[411] thought completely in the opposite way to the question:

> In recent years, I have not observed a tendency in our literature to distance itself from the people. In direct contradiction to this statement, our literature, every year has grown closer to the people, he embraces people in a more profound way and it chooses its topics from the people."[412]

Fakir Baykurt was of a similar opinion; he wrote that artists thought about ways to reach the majority of the people. If they could not reach the lager reading public, this was not their fault, but the circumstances of the society in which they live.[413]

---

[410]"*1. Edebiyatımızın son yıllarda halktan kopma eğilimi yüzünden yeteri kadar basılıp yayılmadığı günün konusu haline geldi. Siz ne düşünürsünüz bu konuda? 2. Toplum görüşleri "Halk için" deyimiyle özetlenebilecek bazı yazarlarımızın sanatta en yüsek düzeyde bir azınlığa seslenmesini nasıl açıklıyor sunuz? Some socialist writers appeal to a very little minority. 3. Gerçek edebiyattan habersiz yaşayan geniş yığınlara seslenmek için edebiyatçıların hiç değilse çalışmalarının bir kısmını çocuklar ve halk için yararlı yayınlara ayarmaları gereğini duyar mısınız?"* Sennur Sezer, "Collective Survey," *Varlık Yıllığı 1968* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969), p. 158.

[411]He was originated from Bulgaria, he was well known with his many works about the conditions of the Turkish minorities in Bulgaria, he was also librarian and documentarist.

[412]"*Son yıllarda edebiyatımızda bir halktan kopma eğilimi görmüyorum. Tam tersine Türk edebiyatı her yıl halka biraz daha yaklaşıyor, halkı biraz daha derinden kapsıyor, konularını daha çok halktan alıyor."* Ibid., p. 159.

[413]"*Sanatçılar çoğunluğa ulaşmanın yolları üzerine düşünmeye başladılar. Edebiyat halk ilişkisi kurtarıcı kurban ilişkisi. Günümüz sanatçısı dilini, duygusunu, düşüncesini halkla birleştirmiş ve halkla buluşmayı gerçekleştirme yoluna girmiştir. Sanatçının bu olumlu çabasına rağmen bu buluşma henüz gereğince gerçekleşmemişse bunun nedenleri sanatçıda değil, başka yerlerde, sanat için pek elverişsiz bulunan yaşama koşullarında aranmalıdır."* Ibid., p. 192.

The famous Marxist literary critic Fethi Naci brought up the illiteracy of Turkish society, and said half of the population was illiterate. As there were not changes in the objective conditions, there occured a gap of communication. He said that there were 25 millions over the age of six, and 48 percent of them were illiterate. 58.4 percent of this population were graduated from primary schools; and 28 percent of them were not graduated from any institutions of education. The reasons for the failure of literature to reach the large public has to be sought in these numbers.[414]

Turgut Uyar, like many of his colleagues, thought that there was no disconnection of literature from the people. According to him, this approach was the result of a speculation of some circles against a new sensitivity in the realm of literature. People, who did not understand social changes and progress thought that it was not difficult to attack to the literature. He thought that at the beginning, avant-garde works were always written in a complex structure and they were not easily received by the ordinary people. Avant-garde or modernist works were not always suitable for some section of society as they continue to live in a traditional manner. He also emphasized that in a society in which all values were in a permanent change, the concept of people did not mean much.[415] Uyar challenged to the left Kemalist and

---

[414]"*Edebiyatımız ne zaman halkla kaynaşmıştı kim şimdi halktan kopma eğiliminden bahsediyor sunuz?... Nesnel şartlarda bir değişiklik olmayınca ister istemez edebiyatla halkın arası açılmış, edebiyat sadece okur yazar takımının meşgalesi olarak kalmıştır. Türkiye'de altıdan yukarı yaşı olanların sayısı 25 milyon; bunların yüzde 48'i okuma azma bilmiyor. Okur yazar sayılan nüfusun da yüzde 58.4'ü ilkokul mezunu, yüzde 28'i belli bir eğitim kurumundan mezun olamayanlar. Edebiyatın yeteri kadar basılıp yayılamamasının sebeplerini asıl bu rakamlarda aramak gerek."* İbid., p. 205.

[415] "*Edebiyatın halktan kopması diye bir sorun söz konusu değildir; bu kurgu bazı çevrelerin yeni bir duyarlığa karşı bir spekülasyon eğilimi içinde bulunmalarından doğmaktadır. Sosyal gelişmeleri ve değişmeleri kendi terimleriyle tartışmayan herkes, edebiyata saldırmayı kolay bulmaktadır; kaldı ki, şöyle bir gerçek te var: edebiyat ileriye dönük bir etkinlik olduğundan, yüzeyde hep halktan kopuk sanılabilir, oysa olsa olsa şartlandırılmış kitelere uzaktır, kaynağından kopmaz, kopamaz. Halkın belli bir edebiyat görüşü, kategorisi vardır, ama düzen değiştikçe tıpkı siyasal ve dinsel alanda gördüğümüz gibi değerlerini ve ölçülerini o düzene uydurmayı becerir. O düzenin içinde*

populist, socialist tendencies which favored the people's values, arguing that innovative works were not suitable for the people.

To make an interim evaluation, the educated parts of the society were not satisfied with the Turkish literary works; foreign literature were popular, howewer, in the course of the time, native works of art became increasingly more popular. It must be taken into account, however, that the half of the society were illiterate.

In another article, Eyuboğlu discussed about the complex relationship between politics and culture. He wrote,

> What I am briefly trying to say is that one of the main problems of our civilization is the intricate relationship between politics and culture, if there is no coherence between them, humanity will continue to have some important problems. This accord can only be realized by politicians who are really want the social justice instead of politicians who voluntarily continue the social injustice.[416]

The direct political commitment of writers was clearly visible in Eyuboğlu's statements. He supported socialist politics and he defended that culture would be only emancipatory on the condition that socialist system could be built in which social inequalities, or injustices were suppressed.

---

ya da dışında çıkışlar yapan ve bütün bir ülke edebiyatını temsil etme durumuna gelen edebiyatçılarla bir ilşkisi yoktur; o derinden derine kendi geleneksel hayatını yaşar, bir yerde bu geleneksel yaşamanın ve değerlerin dışına çıkılmasına dayanıklılığı yoktur. İleriye dönük bir yazara karşı çıkan ilk kendi halkıdır. Üstelik bütün değerleri karmaşık hale gelmiş bir burjuva düzeninde "halk" kavramından ne anlaşıldığı, bu kavramın hangi sosyolojik katları kapsadığı da ayrıca tatışılabilir. Bütün dünya edebiyatı düşünüldüğünde ileriye dönük edebiyat ne zaman halkla altbaşı gidiyordu? Halktan yanaydı demiyorum. Yazan adam yazar, kendisini zorla halktan koparmışsa yazar, bu çeşit soruların hiçbir şeyi çözümleyeceğini sanmıyorum." Ibid., p. 213.

[416]*Çağımızın büyük sorunlarından biri kültürün politikayla ve politikanın kültürle uzlaşmakta çektiği zorluktur, bu uzlaşma olmadıkça insanlık rahat etmeyecektir. Bu uzlaşmada ancak ve ancak sosyal adaletsizliği sürdürmek isteyen devlet adamları yerine sosyal adaleti gerçekten özleyen devlet adamlarının gelebilmesiyle gerçekleşebilir."* Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, *Yeni Ufuklar* no. 192 (May 1968), pp. 12, 16, p. 16.

The interesting question of the collective survey of *Varlık Yıllığı* in 1969 was about the crisis of the writer in Europe. This title was also the name of a conference of the World Union of Men of Letters in Switzerland, in which this subject was proposed to be debated by the participation of more than a hundred writers from different countries. This conference could not be realized however, because of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the USSR.[417] Adalet Cimcoz answered the question about the crisis of the European author as follows:

> In my opinion, today, not only the effort of the European writers, but all of the world writers' effort is to be to defend liberty for the emancipation of the conditions in which human beings can develop in the equal conditions as a function of society. Human beings have to be emancipated from economic and political oppressions. Technology is a human product. This product has to be used not for the exploitation of human beings, but for the happiness of the humanity.[418]

Tomris Uyar criticized in *Papirüs* in May 1968, another collective survey that was published in *Ant* review, he found fault with the emphasis on reductionism to the scientific resarch as a source of art. He argues that there were other sources, like a large cultural heritage:

> Turkish art undoubtely can be always mercilessly criticized. It can be criticized by everyone. What is important to bring about some problems, is not only the qualities of these problems, but also the attitudes against these problems. In Turkey, it is clear that people who speak in the name of science do not survey artistic progress, they do not have the right to condemn art totally and neither men of politics. Eveyone can condemn the other in these circumstances, but the most important is to maintain permenant and widespread gains in this atmosphere.[419]

---

[417] Adalet Cimcoz, "Collective Survey," in *1969 Varlık Yıllığı* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970), pp. 161- 193.

[418] *"Bence, bugün yalnız Avrupa yazarlarının değil, bütün dünya yazarlarının çabası, toplumun görevi olan insanların eşit koşullar içinde gelişmesini sağlayacak özgürlüğün savunulması olmalıdır. Ekonomik ve politik baskılardan kurtulmalıdır insan. Teknoloji insan ürünüdür. Bu ürünü insanlığın sömürülmesi için değil, mutluluğu için kullanmak gerekir."* Ibid., p. 175.

Uyar also said that the authors who answered the questions of the collective survey meant leftist artist, when they said artist; according to her, "legitimate" artists were artists of the left-wing.[420] She criticized the fact that political problems and an urgency to resolve social problems were put against the essential values of art, she also criticized people who used the expression of the "imitation of the West." According to her, this was used against the Western and world civilization's heritage.

In 1968, the collective survey of the year in the *Varlık Yıllığı* was about the increasing role of radio, television and popular theatre. Radio, television and theatre were criticized for diminishing the influence of literature. The question was whether radio, television and cinema could replace the role of literature? This question can be interpretated as a reflection of the dilemma between low culture and high culture.[421]

Metin And thought that these entertainment mediators like cinema, television, radio, theatre, and musical plays could be both functional and poor in quality. There was an exaggerated multitude in the publications of the right and left radicals. Including the Ministry of Education, many circles published right-wing works, but on the other hand, there was an abundance of socialist works and also avant-garde works

---

[419] "*Türk sanatı her zaman kıyasıya eleştirilebilir kuşkusuz. Herkesçe eleştirilebilir. Ne varki bir takım sorunların deşilmesinde yalnız bu sorunların niteliği değildir önemli olan, bunlara karşı takınılan tavırdır. Türkiye'de şu anda ne bilim adına konuşan ve sanatı izlemedikleri açık saçık görülen, (üstelik belki de işlerinin çokluğundan ötürü izlemeleri beklenmeyen) bilim adamlarının hakkı vardır sanatı bütünüyle mahkum etmeye ne de siyasilerin. Keşke olabilseydi ama bugün herkesin birbirini az, eksik bulacağı, yargılayabileceği bir ortam içinde soluk alıyoruz. Önemli olan, bu doğurgan ortamdan sanat, siyasa ve bilim adına kalıcı, yaygın kazançlarla çıkmak'*"Tomris Uyar, *Kitapla Direniş, Yazılar, Söyleşiler, Soruşturmalar* (Istanbul: YKY, 2011), p. 83.

[420]Ibid., p. 79.

[421]"*Radyo, televizyon ve bunların yanında sulandırılmış tiyatro edebiyatın etkisini azaltmakta mıdır? Popüler Kültür yüksek kültüre karşı mı? Sorumuz radyo sinema, televizyon edebiyatın yerine mi geçmektedir?"* Sennur Sezer, "Collective Survey," in *Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi: 1969), p. 141.

which were in extremes.[422] Metin And emphasized the two-dimensional nature of the popular culture and damages of the extreme political polarization.

Necati Cumalı declared that the entertainment industry excluded real art. This entertainment industry tried to erase literature because of its independece from the interest of capitalist society.[423] This was a very important statement, because, it is argued that popular culture's new mediums were more appropriate to the needs of capitalist society, but the dissident nature of novels was not approved of by the ideological mechanisms of capitalist society.

According to Vedat Nedim Tör, throughout the world, there was an enormous attack against good taste and the mental health of the people.[424] Popular culture was declared to be a danger to the taste of people, and to the intellectual health.[425] This debate between "high culture" and popular culture, which was considered as a banalization or negation of this culture has to be mentioned. These intellectuals, like European philosopher Theodor W. Adorno, thought and felt that the consumption

---

[422]"*Her şeyden önce eğlence araçları olarak nitelendirilen televizyon, sinema, radyo, tiyatro, müzikli sahneler gibi göze kulağa seslenen yayın araçlarının kötüsünün yanında çok iyisi de var. Örneğin ticari televizyon yanında ünlü edebiyatçıların metnini yazdığı değerli televizyon programlarının bulunuşu gibi... Bizde aşırı uçların yayınlarında gereksiz bir şişkinlik görülüyor. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın da son yıllarda katıldığı sağcı yayınlarla, gezdiğim ülkeleri hiçbirinde bizdeki bollukta görmedğim kadar sosyalist yayınlar ve gene aşırı uç sayılabilecek avant garde yayınların bolluğu ergeç bu yayınların satışını tıkayacaktır."* Ibid., pp. 143, 144.

[423]"*Niteliksiz programlarıyla özellikle ülkemizde radyo ve televizyonun, yerinde deyiminizle sulandırılmış bir tiyatro ve sinemanın, ve bunlar gibi daha başka eğlence araçlarının edebiyatın yerini almak, hatta onu ortadan silme çabasında olduğu bir gerçektir. Her şeyden önce bir düzen gereğidir çünkü bu. Anamalcı düzende, edebiyat ve sanat ürünlerinin ayakta kalabilmesi, öbür sanayi kollarının bir uydusu olma olanağına bağlıdır. Sanat bir eğlence niteliğinde olduğu sürece, bu düzende bir yeri olur, yoksa olmaz."* Ibid., p. 150.

[424]."*Yalnız bizde değil, bütün dünyada, halkın zevk kalitesine ve akıl sağlığına karşı korkunç bir saldırış var: Yayın piyasasında menfi selectin kanunu bütün hoyratlığı ile icrayı habaset etmekte."* Ibid., p. 165.

[425] "*Massmedia denilen gazete, dergi, kitap, radyo, televizyon, film, tiyatro, reklam, şarkı vs gibi bütün yayın ve haberleşme araçları, çokluk halkın zevkini, akıl sağlığını soysuzlaştırmak, çarpıtmak için birbirleriyle yarış halindeler."* Ibid.

based culture industry had become increasingly dominant over their dissident, elitist, and qualified productions. This approach was shared by many traditional intellectuals.

Different artists and intellectuals complained of the mass media and popular culture because of their negative influence over the aesthetic qualities of their works of art and because of their ideologically deforming and delusive affects. An important critique was made by Külebi, who cited about the underdevelopment of Turkey. In 1969, in Hafik, in a district of Sivas that was only at 28 km. far from the center, no newspapers were sold. He also thought that popular culture works were obstacles on social development. He defended the necessity of introducing the Enlightenment values to a wide array of people.[426] The underdevelopment of Turkish society was also expressed as against life styles of the privileged minority who lives in the big cities. This populist intention went hand in hand with discontent with the influential popular culture. Many of the writers were against the popular culture which they viewed as against their ideas about art.

Memet Fuat wrote that 1970 was a disorganized year for the progress of the Turkish literature because of many conflicts, misunderstandings and gossip. *Cumhuriyet*, *Yeni Gazete*, and *Ulus* newspapers started to publish special pages for artistic and literary events. Thanks to this, artists become part of the public life, and even came to the fore. Fuat criticized this event for the popularization of artistic

---

[426]"*1969 yilinda Sivas'a 28 km uzaklıktaki Hafik ilçesinde bile gazete satılmamaktadır...69'da eleştirmek için ülkeyi Cahit Külebi şöyle demiş bıçaklanan bir aşçının, yiyip içmekten çatlayan İsrailli bir şarkıcının 3. sınıf bir maçta başarı sağlayan bir ayaktopu takımının nerdeyse ulusal kahraman sayılmalarına rağmen Türk resminin kurucularından Cemal Tollu gibi bir ressamın ölümü gazetelerde kendine hiç yer bulamadı."* Ibid., pp. 155- 157.

values, and according to him, literature had been transformed into a realm of gossip.[427] It is possible to observe many conflicting statements between writers on this subject because the writers wanted to reach to a larger public, but they feared to lose ground because of the insignificant and insufficient works of art, they wanted to be popular and valuable at the same time.

In 1970, the subject of a collective survey of *Varlık Yıllığı* was about the attacks on the Kemalism from the right-wing or the left-wing politics. Orhan Hançerlioğlu's answers are significant. His emphasis on the formation of the left and right-wings of Turkish politics as a new process has to be noted.[428] The political atmosphere of the 1970s led to the subversion of the Kemalist intellectual hegemony.

After the military coup d'état of 12 March 1971, intellectuals, and writers such as Vedat Günyol, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Azra Erhat, and Sevgi Soysal were arrested, and they suffered from the very difficult conditions of these prisons. According to Fuat, 1971 was a year in which political developments were both intellectually and sentimentally influential. All concerns, all anxieties, all regards were directed to

---

[427] *"1970 Türk Edebiyatı için çekişmeler, anlayışsızlıklar, dedikodularla dolu dağınık bir yıl oldu. Cumhuriyet, Yeni Gazete, Ulus gibi gazetelerin sanat bölümleri açmaları önceleri sevinçle karşılandıysa da, iyi yönetilmeyen bu bölümlerin kısa zamanda sanatçılar arasında yeni çekişmeler kaynağı haline geldiği, son ikisinin ayrıca, verdikleri kısa haberlerle birer dedikodu ortamına döndüğü görüldü. Gazeteler sanatçıları daha çok okur önüne çıkarırlarken bir yandan da kısa süren bir günlük aracılıklarıyla pek çok şiirin, hikayenin, yazının sanat çevrelerinde hiçbir iz bırakmadan geçip gitmesine yol açtılar."*Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı 1970* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1971).

[428] *"Sağdan ve soldan saldırılar diyorsunuz. Sorunuzun karşılığı işte burada. 1960 yılına kadar Türkiye'de kamuoyuna yansıyan düşünce akımı olarak ne sağ ne de sol vardı. Kamuoyunda sağcılık ve solculuk bugünkünden büsbütün başka anlamlarda bir takım davranışları adlandırıyordu. Atatürkçülük düşünce düzeyine yükselemeyen bu imgesel görüntülerin üstünde ulusal bir simgeydi. Düşünceler bilimsel bir düzeyde gerçek kişiliklerini kazanınca Atatütürkçülük sağ düşünce için sol, sol düşünce için sağ bir nitelikte göründü. Sağdan ve soldan saldırıların kısaca nedeni budur. Gerçekte gericiler, Atatütkçülüğü kınamakta tutarlıdırlar, çünkü Atatürkçülüğün gericilikle en ufak bir bağlantısı yoktur. Ama ilericilerin Atatürkçülüğü kınamaları bir çocukluk hastalığından başka birşey değildir, çünkü Atatürkçülük tüm ilericiliktir. Bütün sorun sağı ve solu olduğu gibi Atatürkçülüğü de gerçek olarak tanımlayabilmekte."* Orhan Hançerlioğlu, Collective Survey, "Attacks against Kemalism - Atatürkçülüğe saldırılar," *Varlık Yıllığı 1970* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1971), p. 196. p. 214.

political events. The effects of these events were also felt in the artistic realm. Artists were arrested, books were forbidden, art reviews were closed, and intellectuals were excluded from social life. However, in the realm of short story, there was progress.[429] Mutluay also thought that writers were negatively influenced by the impact of the military intervention. After the coup d'état of 12 March 1971, many of the authors were arrested, and many reviews were closed. *Halkın Dostları* was closed in the second half of the year. The signficant political periodical of the epoch, *Devrim* (Revolution) was also closed. The military intervention disrupted the vivid literary climate.[430]

During the 1970s, one of the most significant topics writers discussed was the need for an educational revolution. This anticipation was defended in their speeches, and articles. The insufficiency of the school books, for first and second education level was criticized. In these books, modern literature and the left wing authors were especially excluded. These writers supported the progress of Turkish literature and their right to be included in the school books, and they also defended democracy. They were active participants of the social struggles. Under the conditions of the martial law, many authors were subjugated to the state's oppressions and atrocities.

According to Rauf Mutluay, Turkish literature continued to exert considerable influence in 1975. The quantity of works of art increased and it gained popularity in

---

[429]"*1971 siyasi olayların kafaları olduğu kadar, yürekleri de doldurduğu bir yıldı. Bütün gözler, ilgiler, kaygılar siyasi olaylara çevrildi. Bu olayların etkileri sanat alanına da uzandı. Tutuklanan sanatçılar, birdenbire su yüzüne öıkan kitap düşmanlığı, kapatılan sanat dergileri, küsüp köşesine çekilen aydınlar...Pek birşey beklenemezdi 1971 yılından şiir, kısa hikaye, eleştiri adına. Gene de özellikle hikaye alanında oldukça bol ürün verildi, başarılı çalışmalar yapıldı."* Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı* 1972 (Istanbul: De Yayinevi, 1973), p. 5.

[430]"*Edebiyatçılar çok zarar gördü bütün olanlardan; ama edebiyat zarar görmeyecek. Sanatın ömrü uzundur."* Rauf Mutluay, "1971'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1972* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1973), pp. 21 47: 47.

the large sections of society. But the political fragmentation and social problems have to be considered as having been important obstacles against the intellectual and literary freedom.[431] In 1975, this statement was shared by many literary critics and authors.

In the newspaper, *Politika*[432] there were writers who wrote regularly articles about political and artistic events: Fethi Naci, Mehmet H. Doğan, Hilmi Yavuz, Cemal Süreya, Selim İleri, Sevgi Sabuncu (Soysal) were all of left-wing authors. This indicates hat there was a close relationship between journalism and literature.

As a result of the governmental changes, there were changes in the broadcasting politics of TRT and many employees were let go. TRT was criticized for broadcasting from the axis of a left-wing ideology, but the television programme which can be considered to have been leftist was three hours in 2000 hours broadcasting. During the government of National Front, TRT was transformed by the extreme right politics. It was one of the institutions in which many intellectuals can work, but they suddenly lost their jobs as a result of the right-wing staffing decisions.

The Collective Survey of 1975 in *Varlık Yıllığı* shows that political events led to the serious worries among the intellectuals. In the questions of the survey, it was

---

[431] "*Kendi kaçamakları içinde de olsa edebiyatın sesi dinmiyor. Daha örgütlü bir özgürlük ortamında, gittikçe cepheleşen düşünce odaklarının arasında, biri batıp biri çıkan dergiler aracılığıyla olsun, inandıkları yerde görev alan gazete aynasıyla olsun, çeviri eserlerin yanında kendi edebiyatımıza yayın emeği katan kuruluşlarla olsun...berlirgin bir güçlenme ve zenginleşme."* Rauf Mutluay, "1975'te roman ve hikayemiz," in *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1976), pp 26 50, p. 26 - 27.

[432]*Politika* Journal was a left wing political journal of the second half of the 1970s, It started to be edited by İsmail Cem. In 1977, Politika journal was handed over to the main left-wing political Union of the period, DISK (the Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey) He once again changed hand to a left-wing political organization. Haluk Şahin, Hilmi Yavuz, Çetin Altan, Ahmet Kahraman, Hıfzı Topuz, Tan Oral, Vedat Dalokay, Oya Baydar, Şükran Kurdakul were some of the authors of this political journal.

proposed that important progress in Turkish literature had been observed in the previous years.[433]

According to Apaydın, "Our people entered into a process of becoming more conscious. In villages and in small towns, novels were appreciated by a larger public."[434] A. Başaran wrote that:

> Social consciousness rose to such a level as to create a fear in the dominant classes, and to establish tens of social fronts to stop this awakening. In spite of all obstacles, the number of readers and especially conscious readers increased. Although their translations were a little problematic, we can read the world classics in our own language. The possibilities of diffusion and publication were also increased. This motivates our literature. We see that novels have started to give us the hidden realities of human being and society with its different aspects.[435]

Fakir Baykurt wrote that they are living in a very critical period, a period of do or die and it was precious as a gold. According to him, poets had to go to the public, to their homes, and they had to read his poems. They had to do this to contribute to the success of left in the elections. [436]

However, in 1975, National Front was in power and making a stand against this government, Baykurt charged artists with the mission of making an effort in politics. He also said that there were not too manys ways to stop the reactionary

---

[433]Sennur Sezer, "Collective Survey," *Varlik Yıllığı 1976* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1977), p. 212.

[434] "*Halkımız gittikçe hızlanan bir bilinçlenme sürecine girdi. Köylerde, kasabalarda roman okunuyor artık.*" Ibid., p. 216.

[435]"*Sosyal uyanışın, egemen güçleri ürkütecek hıza ulaştığı, onlarca cephe kurma gereksinimi duyurduğu bir gerçek. Tüm engellemeye karşın okur sayısı, hem de bilinçli okur sayısı giderek artıyor. Çevirileri biraz aceleye gelmiş de olsa, dünyanın kaynak yapıtlarını dilimizde okuyabiliyoruz gayrı. Yayma, duyurma olanakları çoğalıyor. Yazınımıza da bir ivme kazandırıyor bu gelişmeler. Romanda toplum, insan gerçeğimizin değişik yanlarıyla verilmeye başlandığını görüyoruz."* Ibid., p. 218.

[436] "*Öyle yıllar yaşamaktayız ki, ölüm kalım yılları sayılabilir, altın kadar değerli yıllardır, bence ozan şiirini halka götürüp okumalı, aydın düşüncesini halka söylemeli, büyük topluluklar her zaman bulunmasa bile halkın mahallesine, evine giderek bu etkinlik artırılmalıdır."* Ibid., p. 219.

process. There was only one way, one solution. This was the government of the left. Everyday, society was awakening. The happy day was not too far away.

Dağlarca said in a similar way, "Literature is progressing, but this progress is a result of the left-wing literature, not a result of the right-wing literature. The miserable conditions of the Turkish country is a motivation for our authors to transform them. This is visible in all of the pro-revolutionary countries."[437]

These clear, direct political commitments and a hope for a leftist government justify the arguments that I make here. Many of the writers were open supporters of the left-wing ideology and in this period, the RPP was supported by many of them as against the governments of the National Front even if they identified themselves as being in the left of the RPP. To support political parties or organizations also may be seen in the answers of these authors to the collective surveys of the reviews, journals and in the articles that they published in the journals.

Murat Belge writing in 1976 said that an important reading public occurred in Turkey as a result of several developments. The period of 12 March was a period shook up of society, by profoundly influencing the literary field and it also started a new period for the arts and literature.

Art had founded a close relationship with general social life. This situation enriched the intellectual background of the novels. We can observe this tendency in the works of art, as a tendency to embrace social life in as more profound, as more fundemental, and as more concentrated platform for criticisms and debates was

---

[437] "*Yazınımız gelişiyor doğru. Bu sağ yazınımızla değil, sol yazınmızla oluşmakta. İşte apaçık anlaşılan gerçek: Ülkemizin düşürüldüğü acı durum ozanlarımızı, yazarlarımızı güçlü kılmaktadır. Bütün devrim öncesi yazınında olduğu gibi demiş*." Ibid., p. 223.

founded. In this process, in 1975, a significant development was the increase of the art and literature pages of the daily journals in comparison with the previous years.

Belge hoped that the positive results of this development would be more evident in the following years. These gains of art in the journals had led to transformations. Cultural debates limited to the art and literature reviews with lower rates of sale reached a larger audience of readers. But this was not a one dimensional development. Artist who then were able to speak with a more powerful voice were forced to balance its agenda on this new enlarged public. Therefore, art was able to go beyond of a conversation of the gossip of a limited circle in which everybody knew each other. He concluded that:

> A most important criterion of a healthier development of art, a relationship with masses was not far today than before. Every kind of oppressions of reactionary powers continues. The oppressions of reactionary powers continues with all its power in the institutions of education. An important struggle that started in schools was not immaterial. And oppressions to stop to sell of books in the small Anatolian cities, but something was obtained without struggle will not be significant. And difficulties existed only in a way, but in the end there will be a glory; May be we were at the beginnig of this way, but the most important thing is to complete.[438]

---

[438] "*12 Mart dönemi bütün toplumu sarsan, derinden etkileyen bir dönem olarak, sanat ve edebiyatta da yeni diyebileceğimiz bir dönemi başlattı. Bunların başında, sanatın genel toplumsal hayatla daha yakın bağlar kurması gelir. Böyle bir durum, sanatın düşünsel arkaplanını zenginleştiriyor. Bu eğilimi iki ayrı düzlemde gözlemleyebiliyoruz. Sanat ürünlerinde toplum hayatını daha derinlemesine, daha köklü bir yaklaşımla kucaklama eğiliminin yanısıra, ürünler dışında daha yoğun bir eleştirel tartışma platformu kuruluyor. İşte bu süreç içinde özellikle 1975 yılında belirleyici bir gelişme göze çarpıyor. Bu günlük siyasi gazetelerin sanat ve edebiyatta şimdiye kadar görünene oranla çok daha geniş bir yer tanımalarıdır. Bunun asıl verimlerini önümüzdeki yıllarda verecek önemli bir gelişme olduğunu söylersek herhalde yanılmış olmayız. Gazetelerin sanata yer açmaları, sanatın geleneksel işleyişinde değişiklikler yarattı. Sürümü, satışı az sanat ve edebiyat dergilerinde kalan, dolayısıyla dar sınırlar içinde dönen kültür tartışmaları böylece geniş okur kitlelerine ulaşma olanağını buldu. Ama bu elbette tek yanlı bir değişim olamazdı. Sanatçı böylece daha güçlü bir hoparlörle konuşma fırsatı elde edince, konuşacağı şeyleri de genişleyen dinleyici kitlesine göre ayarlama zorlamasını duydu. Dolayısıyla sanat kopukluktan, herkesin birbirini tanıdığı dar bir çevrenin zaman zaman dedikodulaşan sohbetinden sıyrılma olanağına kavuştu.*
Sağlıklı bir sanat gelişmesinin uzun vadede en şaşmaz ölçütü kitle ile ilişki, bugün eskisi kadar uzak değil. Tutucu güçlerin her türden baskısı sürüyor. Eğitim kurumlarında baskı olanca şiddetiyle devam ediyor. Tutucu hükümetlerin, demokratik uyanışı eğitimim başında durdurmak için, öğretmen okullarında giriştikleri zorlu mücadele bundan önemsiz değil. Sonra özellikle Anadolu şehirlerinde, kitap satışını önlemek için girişilen akıl almaz hukuk dışı baskılar. Ama birşey mücadelesiz

The collective survey of 1976 in *Varlık* was about the political separation, and polarization which had increased throughout the country by creating a civil war ambiance. The answers to this survey reflects a reaction to this process, but also an observation by the authors by arguing that literature was still alive and that it was enjoying a golden age.[439]

Talat Halman wrote that Turkish literature was in an process in which authors were producing important works of art. According to him, there were now mature and vigorous work of art which could go beyond the political problems. In comparison with other periods in Turkish history, they enjoyed a significant freedom in publishing, Turkish authors did not create new genres and did not open a new age, but they produced important works. Unfortunately, this powerful literature did not have the opportunity to become throughout the world.[440] This statement reflects the desire of the intellectuals to see Turkish art be part of the international artistic environment.

In 1977, the domain of literature was badly affected by the sharp polarization of the country. Several reviews and journals were closed, many intellectuals were assassinated, and the street violence hindered the literary activities. The increasing political activity of the right-wing political parties during the National Front government can be defined as an obstacle for the freedom of expression.

---

kazanılmışsa herhalde kazanımış sayılamaz. Ve güçlük ancak ucunda başarı olan yolda gösterir kendini. Belki bu yolun başındayız şimdi; sorun sonunu getirebilmekte..." Murat Belge *Milliyet* (8 Ocak 1976).

[439]Talip Apaydın, p 185; Fakir Baykurt, p. 190; "Collective Survey," *Varlık Yıllığı 1978* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970).

[440]*"Bugünki edebiyatımız siyasi bocalamaların çok ötesinde yönler aramakta, olgun ve dinç eserler verebilmektedir. Türk tarihinin başka dönemlerine ve az gelişmiş ülkelerin hemen hepsine kıyasla dikkate değer bir düşünce ve yayın özgürlüğü içinde yaşayan yazarlarımız, yeni türler yaratmıyorlar, yeni bir çağ açmıyorlar, ama önemli eserler veriyorlar. Ne yazık ki bu kadar güçlü bir edebiyat, hala kendini dünyaya tanıtıp kabul ettirmek olanağından yoksun."* Talat Halman, "Collective Survey," *Varlık Yıllığı 1978*, (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1978), p. 205.

In the answers to the collective surveys of the *Varlık Yıllığı* in 1978, there were two different tendencies, a desire for the government of the left-wing politics as a reaction to the extreme right National Front government, and an anxiety as a result of terrorist attacks by the right-wing militants to the authors. Increasing polarization, political frontation and the conditions of the civil war were obstacles to literary production and debates.[441]

Literary reviews were transformed into political reviews, and writers contributed in these political journals by writing many articles on both political and artistic subjects. For instance, in the process of the inauguration of *Birikim* review, Can Yücel and Onat Kutlar were also part of the publishing committee. The activity and liveliness of the literary reviews also decreased. For instance, this fact can be largely observed in the *Varlık Yıllığı* at the end of the 1970s. The almanacs of 1979 and 1980 were much more smaller as a volume than the previous ones and a despair and angst can be observed. Political journals and periodicals completely stopped reporting on art and cultural activities.

The assassination of Bedrettin Cömert in 11 July 1978 was a symbolic attack on the cultural hegemony of the left in the realm of art. Cömert had been a critic of art and essayist who produced many works of art, including Islamic art. Cavit Orhan Tütengil was also assassinated on 7 December 1979. They very symbolic attacks on the physical and moral destruction of intellectuals and their artistic culture.[442] Left-

---

[441]Sennur Sezer, "Collective Survey," *Varlık Yıllığı 1979* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1978), pp. 174. 218.

[442]Rauf Mutluay, "1977'de Roman ve Hikayemiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1978* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1977), pp. 23 49.

wing authors and intellectuals were systematically excluded from the state institutions during the National Front governments.

In the late 1970s, the liveliness in the art reviews and journals, which had been observed between 1965 and 1975, went into a decline. The reading public grew smaller and although the number of novels and short stories increased, there was an atmosphere of civil war. Writers left the scene. The conditions in which art could flourish gradually decreased.

To sum up, the coalition governments, and the changing balances from the left wing to the right wing affected the left intellectual circles, and this changed the members of the cultural associations with the new assignments. Associations like the TDK and TRT passed through many hands. The pressure of political governments on writers highly increased in 1975; for instance, in October 1975, the Ministry of National Education took the decision to destroy several books of Turkish authors like Aziz Nesin, Yaşar Kemal, Oktay Akbal, Fakir Baykurt and many international authors, like Dostoyevsky, Gogol, and Camus from the libraries of the high schools.

During the National Front government, many similar politics of pressure were applied. The role of the National Front government in the attempts to destroy this intellectual movement can not be overlooked.

In 1977, Fethi Naci wrote that Turkish society was in a period of total change. Atilla Özkırımlı also noted that the literary world, which had fared quite well until 1977, was in a relative crisis in this year.[443] A critical approach which argued that social art had been transformed more and more into art for political propaganda has to

---

[443]Interview with Fethi Naci, Atilla Özkırımlı, *Varlık Yıllığı 1978*, (Istanbul:Varlık Yayınevi, 1979)..

be kept in mind. The pressure of politics and "civil war" on the realm of art was one of the negative dynamics which brought this "new public" to an end, but the ultimate end was the coup d'état régime of the early 1980s and, consequently, the military governance and "neo-liberal period" of the 1980s.

In the progress of the socialist movements and socialist ideology, literature played a significant role, but after the military intervention, this influence was diminished naturally. Literary rewiews, however, continued to be forums for socialist movements in the conditions of the state's oppressions over political movements, after the 1980s. After the military intervention of 1980, there were literary journals which were published by some socialist intellectuals in order to express their political ideas in the form of literature. Two of these reviews will be *Yarınlar* (Tomorrow) and *Edebiyat Dostları* (Friends of Literature) in the second half of the 1980s.

Main Trends and Circles in the 1960s and 1970s

During the 1960s and 1970s, a plurality of the left-wing, politically committed authors had an indisputable hegemony over other ideologies. The three main categories of left-wing intellectuals can be defined. There were politically oriented, Marxist, populist intellectuals; Universalist, humanist, left Kemalist intellectuals, and Modernists, avant-garde intellectuals. Three literary figures that I define as "sui generis or unique" deserve to be analyzed independently. And finally, nationalist-conservative authors, intellectuals produced works of art to challenge the leftist-modernist hegemony.

Left Kemalists Writers, Traditional Intelectuals, followers of the first constitutive generation of intellectuals

In the 1960s and 1970s, left Kemalists were still important actors in the public life, Bedrettin Cömert, Cavit Orhan Tütengil, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Haldun Taner, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Oktay Akbal, Yaşar Nabi Nayır and the *Kadro* circle were some of the significant figures of these years.

Vedat Nedim Tör, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu were the first generation of the Turkish Kemalist intellectuals who were still alive and active in these years, in intellectual milieus. They had always problematic relationships with the state institutions. They were always vulnerable to the changes in the composition of political power and to the changes of this government's political intentions. There were two significant periods in which left-kemalist intellectuals came into action.

The first period followed after the coup d'état of 1960 and the new constitution. During this period, some of these intellectuals, adopting a synthesis of universalistic and popular values, humanist and even socialist world views supported the Turkish Labor Party. In this period, however the main circle of these intellectuals was gathered around the periodical *Yön*. They proposed a program of national developmentalism and they wanted to realize a nationalistic revolution to complete the early Republican reforms and to give a more social and economic drive to these early reforms. Some of them attempted to cooperate with the military bureaucrats and state bureaucrats for a military coup which they thought might provide an independent way of development.

Another period was the 1970s, when Bülent Ecevit's RPP came to the power; Bülent Ecevit gave hope to these intellectuals. It is necessary to take into account the fact that Ecevit was also one of them as he wrote poems. For instance, after the death of Sabahattin Eyuboğlu,[444] Bülent Ecevit wrote an article about him. His governments provided some opportunities for these intellectuals in the state institutions, like TRT and TDK.

The right-wing governments however especially continuously excluded intellectuals. İsmail Hakkı Tonguç and Hasan Ali Yücel may be some of the symbolic figures of these intellectuals of the early Republican period who were excluded for political reasons. For instance, while Sabahattin Eyuboğlu participated in the building process of the Village Institutes, he was marginalized. He went to France, and then returned and in the 1960s, he was once again very active in the intellectual world.

Many intellectuals, artists and even journalists like Abdi İpekçi and İlhan Selçuk were left-wing intellectuals who were targeted by the right-wing governments. İpekçi was killed in a terrorist attack and Selçuk was tortured after the military coup of 1971.

The question is that if these intellectuals, artists can be considered to have been part of the bureaucratic, technocratic elite formed in the early Republican era. I consider them to have been fragile or underestimated actors of this elite composition. Their approaches were considered part of the solidarist and corporatist ideology by many scholars. They supported attempts of modernization with a culturalist, romanticist and utopist approach. Attilâ Ilhan which may be considered one of them,

[444]Sabahattin Eyuboğlu was an important intellectual as a main fugure of the *Mavi Anadolucular* circle and who had politically left kemalist and humanist vision.

labeled these intellectuals as cultural leftists who were active in the superstructure but he thinks that they were not aware of the realities of the economic and social base.

These intellectuals problematic but close relationship with the state in the 1930s and 1940s became more fragile in the 1960s and 1970s. They were unable to conform generally to the political power of the period, especially JP and NF governments, they were defined as threats by these right-wing powers and they were generally part of the political protests. In this group, like the others, intellectuals were also writers. They maintained a nostalgic approach toward the first years of the Kemalist regime and they supported the reestablishment and revival of the Public Houses and Village Institutes.

The literary circles that can be considered left-kemalist or traditional intellectual need discussion. First, a significant school of thought which is called *Mavi Anadolucular* (Blue Anatolians) has to be defined. These authors were humanist, Universalist intellectuals. The prominent figures were Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Vedat Günyol, Azra Erhat and Halikarnas Balıkçısı. They defended an Anatolian-centered humanist approach, including the ancient civilizations of Anatolia, mainly the ancient Greek civilization. They were humanist who had adopted Western culture and they thought that Anatolia and the Turkish society was a natural part of Western society as Turkish people were the descendants of the ancient Anatolian civilizations.

Yaşar Nabi Nayır's famous journal *Varlık*, Vedat Günyol's *Yeni Ufuklar*,[445] and Hüsamettin Bozok's review *Yeditepe* were the most important literary reviews. They were the most important and institutionalized forums for literature. Young

[445]In this master thesis, a significant analysis of this review was provided. Ümit Akagündüz, *Yeni Ufuklar Dergisi perspektifinde Türkiye'de Düşünce Hayatı,* (*1952 1965*) (Master Thesis, University of Ankara, 2007).

authors became known for publishing their poetries or short-stories in these platforms. These reviews were the forums of these traditional intellectuals who defended politically the left Kemalist vision and who also brought about Western culture, in nearly all of its dimensions, especially the values of the Enlightenment. For instance, Ahmet Say wrote *Varlık* review influenced people, including bureaucrats and peasant instructors; *Yeditepe* was the review of intellectuals. These were the main institutions of the literary world. As mentioned above, Cemal Süreya said that journals were the centers of the Turkish intellectual life; three of them may be considered to have been the most influential.

The Village Institute movement led to the formation of group of novelists who had graduated from the Village Institutes. These Village Instititues had been transformed into the Instructors School in 1946, and had been closed in 1954. It is argued that the philosophy of foundation had been denied because of the influence of the U.S. which thought that these institutions had been adopted from the Soviet model. Village Institute-originated artists and intellectuals created an important type of literature. Mahmut Makal, Fakir Baykurt, Talip Apaydın, Dursun Akçam, Mehmet Başaran, Adnan Binyazar and Ümit Kaftancıoğlu were some of these artists. They all were of peasant origin and had graduated from the *Village Institutes* or they had worked as instructors in them. They formed an important literary tradition which depicted the problems of the rural life employing such themes as ignorance, illiteracy and poverty.

Novels about rural life had been written since the 1930s. The most successful one was the famous novel *Yaban* (Savage) of Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, published in 1931. It may be considered as an early masterpiece of this genre. The first novels

were written at the end of the 1940s, as a product of the experiences and research of the field work. One of the leading figures of this genre was Mahmut Makal, who read his first novel at the age of eighteen. His best known work was *Bizim Köy* (Our Village).[446]

Many other works were written in the 1950s by young peasant authors. The 1960s may have been their golden years, when they attracted a larger reading public and their works were also debated and criticized in literary circles. This people also can be considered to have the newly created peasant elites of the Republican period who tried to resolve the problem of alienation between modern urban citizen elites and the peasantry.

These writers were not the only ones to write about rural life. This tradition, called Peasant Novelist was criticized by other writers, and alternative expressions and narratives of the peasant realities were proposed. The authors who produced novels about the peasantry also were situated outside of this Kemalist's intended direction of the Peasant Novel. Since the beginning, in the 1940s, Sabahattin Ali, and later, in the 1950s, and the 1960s, Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal and Kemal Tahir wrote novels about peasantry from a socialist perspective.

Paul Dumont's, *"Littérature et Sous-développement: les « Romans Paysans en Turquie"* (Literature and Underdevelopment: Peasant Novels in Turkey) about Peasant Novels written in 1973, said that the movement consisted of popular short stories and pastoral novels of questionable artistic value. This genre was also one of the most significant of the Turkish literature. It aimed to show the underdevelopment

---

[446] Significant works of Mahmut Makal were*:* Bizim Köy (Our Village), Köyümden (*From my Village*), *MemleketinSahipleri* (The Masters of Country).

of the rural regions and to directly or indirectly influence state institutions to produce social and cultural policies for the problems of these villages and their inhabitants.[447]

This article also focused on the conditions of the production of this genre: It was strictly a production of the Kemalist revolution, which motivated intellectuals to observe and to transform the rural life as vanguards. It was a product of state policies aiming to transform the conditions of rural life. For instance, the abolition of the special tax, achar in 1925, the foundation of agricultural credit cooperatives in 1929, and the creation of the conditions for a land reform were some of these policies. One significant policy was the establishment in 1932, of the People Houses, which organized meetings and travels for intellectuals in the rural areas. In these conditions, a new literary genre about rural life emerged.[448]

Some other Kemalist authors were also very active in the second half of the 1970s. Haldun Taner was an important left-wing author who regularly wrote articles in the *Milliyet* newspaper, which was edited by Abdi İpekçi. In this newspaper, he was a popular, public intellectual who represented a culturalist, intellectual attitude. He always defended a Westernized, humanist vision of art, supported Ecevit's RPP, and he adopted the Kemalist heritage of the early Republican era. Taner was also the author of the famous play *Keşanlı Ali Destanı* (The Ballad of Ali of Keshan) and master of ceremonies of the Cabaret Theater. *Keşanlı Ali Destanı* was an epic play that became one of the symbols of the populist tendencies of Turkish literature, as it

[447]The most important source about this subject : Paul Dumont, « Littérature et sous-développement : les « romans paysans » enTurquie » In: Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations. 28e année, N. 3, 1973. pp. 745-764 : 745. Other sources : Kemal Karpat, *Turk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular* (Les thèmes sociaux dans la littérature turque), Istanbul, 1962, and Muzaffer Sencer, « Turkiyede Kôye Yônelme Hareketleri » (Les courants en direction du village en Turquie), Sosyoloji dergisi, Istanbul, 1962-63, pp. 223-241.

[448]Dumont, p. 746.

satirized Turkish political life beginning from the early Republican era to the end of the DP era, in the 1950s.[449] Taner also wrote many short stories about the lives of poor, working people.

In this left Kemalist tradition, two contrary approaches, a humanist-populist attitude, and a universalist-elitist framework, as followed the heritage of the culture of Western civilizations (in other words, Universal human Culture) were observable. I believe, these contrary tendencies were all represented in the context of the left-Kemalist literary tradition.

Marxist Affiliated Intellectuals, Social Realists

The dominant literary tradition of the decades under discussion was composed by the Marxist, socialist, realist intellectuals and writers. This bloc of the intelligentsia was composed of especially many writers who became the most powerful axis of Turkish intellectuals as a result of the Turkish and international social contexts.

For instance, the notable Soviet literary critic Svetlana Uturgauri wrote that, in the 1960s and 1970s, socialist views entered the realm of the literature in a very influential way. Criticial realism was the main literary trend and was adopted by many authors who were also the champions of an anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist

[449]This play was perfomed by Gülrüz Suriri and Engin Cezzar theatre companies between the 31 March 1964 and 1970, 493 times. It was about the poor people who live shanty towns. It was adapted to cinema by Atıf Yılmaz in 1965. It was also adapted to television as a TV series in 1989, by Genco Erkal and recently in 2011. This play is one of the masterpieces of Turkish theatre.

ideological attitude.[450] Leftist writers had total hegemony over the social realism as a literary movement or trend. Social realist meant being politically and ideologically defenders of the socialist world view. But social realism was not the only trend which adopted by socialist writers. Marxist-affiliated intellectuals differed also in terms of changing political organizations and socialist ideologies. This definition of Marxist-affiliated and social realist intellectual, writer included many different circles.

The relatively independent social realists, Orhan Kemal, Rıfat Ilgaz, Oktay Rifat, Melih Cevdet Anday,[451] and Necati Cumalı had been active before the 1960s, but they became more popular and reached a larger public after the 1960s as their views became the dominant one of the day. In the mid-1960s, as a main ground of this trend, the TLP must be mentioned; Yaşar Kemal, Şükran Kardakul, Fethi Naci, (editor of *Yön* periodical art pages), Ferit Edgü (editor of *Ant* periodical art pages) and Konur Ertop were all members of this party. The social realist movement had also interrelations with the socialist politicians of the TLP, like Behice Boran, one of the leading figures of the Party, who wrote articles about literature in *Adımlar* (Steps) journal, which was published in 1943 and 1944, Sadun Aren and Mehmet Ali Aybar, who were also interested in literature at changing degrees. Çetin Altan (writer and deputy of TLP) deserves to be noted as a politician, but his literary identity was also very significant. His novels were the bestsellers of the period.

---

[450] Svetlana Uturgauri, "Orhan Kemal'in Yapıtları, Türk Gerçekçiliğinin Gelişmesinde Yeni bir Aşama," *Sovyet Türkologlarının Türk Edebiyatı İncelemeleri*, (Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1989), p. 181.

[451]Melih Cevdet Anday, Sabahattin Ali, Kemal Bilbaşar, Orhan Kemal, and Rıfat Ilgaz were also gathered around the journal *Yurt ve Dünya* in 1941, with intellectuals like Meliha and Niyazi Berkes, Behice Boran, Muzaffer Şerif Başoğlu, and Pertev Naili Boratav. This meeting show us the close relation between politicians, academicians ant writers.

İlhan Selçuk who was a proponent of the Nationalist Democratic Revolution (NDR) at the end of the 1970s, was also a novelist and very popular journalist. His identity of journalist went beyond that of novelist. At *Cumhuriyet*, as an editor, he always provided the opportunity to write articles for many writers. The axis of the National Democratic Revolution influenced also many writers. TLP and NDR covered many of the social realist authors.

The social realist movement deserves a longer discussion. The most important writers of the social realist movement were Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal, Aziz Nesin, Rıfat Ilgaz, Oktay Rıfat, Melih Cevdet Anday, Sevgi Soysal,[452] Bekir Yıldız, and Vedat Türkali. They were in the most productive period of their art. According to most of these writers, a rapid change of the political and social system was sine qua non for other changes.

These authors began to express their socialist political identity more freely in the 1960s. Before this period, their political and ideological identity had been more intuitive, but after the emancipation and relative freedom of the leftist ideology they had access to many literary and ideological works, and were able to develop their political vision. In this period, they debated more freely the role of the artist in the political struggles, the problems of representing Turkish society in works of art, the role of the work of art to reach the larger parts of society, and they claimed to produce works of art as a synthesis of native and universal values to be represented on the international public scene. These socialist intellectuals became increasingly popular and they transcended their isolated position to some extent.

[452] Sevgi Soysal was a borderline figure between the affiliated socialist and modernist intellectuals.

Three leading figure of this social realist tradition were[453] Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal and Kemal Tahir.[454] These three produced a significant part of the novels published during all of the 1960s. They were social realist intellectuals and defenders of left-wing movements. Aziz Nesin and Attilâ Ilhan have to be noted as leading intellectuals. Yaşar Kemal and Aziz Nesin[455] were the most symbolic figures for the identification of the socialist writers., after the death of Kemal Tahir and Orhan Kemal, these two authors were active in bringing together all of the leftist authors. For instance, the determination of authors to be TDK members was decided mostly by Aziz Nesin. Yaşar Kemal expressed his political vision in several newspapers and art reviews.

Turkish Labor Party (TLP) was the common forum for these writers in the 1960s, but in the 1970s, after its closure these authors were dispersed to a wide range of different social movements or organizations. In the late 1960s and especially in the 1970s, more young intellectuals became passionately committed to political ideas, and they produced woorks of art in which political and social claims were directly expressed, without any mediation.

In addition to this, during all the late 1960s and early 1970s, different circles of student movement-originated authors, like Ataol Behramoğlu, İsmet Özel, Süreyya

---

[453]These three authors were called as Three Kemals *Üç Kemaller*.

[454]Kemal Tahir was an authentic intelletual who deserves to be considered in the category of unique, or "sui generis." His political attitude was original and attempted to formulate his own realism by especially distinguishing himself from the entire Marxist, affiliated intellectuals. His emphasis on the Oriental nature of Turkey is especially significant. He also criticized the Marxist intellectuals because of their imitation of the Western economic, social and cultural models which were not suitable in the Turkish context.

[455]In the late 1970s, Aziz Nesin, leading socialist author, founded the Union of Turkish Writers (TYS), and also published *Nesin Yıllığı* and this may be defined as a common forum.

Berfe, Hüseyin Cöntürk, Barış Pirhasan, and Turgay Fişekçi published *Yordam, Halkın Dostları, Militan* and *Sanat Emeği*. Nearly all of these young authors were members or sympathizers of legal or illegal left-wing political parties.

Yordam circle was started in 1966 by the formation of new groups from the youth, which were generally Marxist oriented. For instance, in the artistic review *Yordam* which was published in Ankara, the youth analyzed literary articles and they wanted to be part of the literary world.[456] *Yordam* review's leading figure was Hüseyin Cöntürk. He was first influenced by Anglo-American literary criticism, but he adopted a Marxian perspective in the course of time as a literary critic.

Memet Fuat also argues in 1968, that for many years, he had observed that there was a desire for artists who could support social movements by an intellectual agenda. In 1968, as there was no expected step from the young writers, the older ones came to the fore. In 1969, he wrote an acitivity gave us a hope. At the end of the year, some young artists such as Ataol Behramoğlu, İsmet Özel, Süreyya Berfe and Özkan Mert announced that they decided to publish an artistic review *Halkın Dostları*.[457] Murat Belge and Ayhan Gerçeker published articles of literary critics in this review.[458]

Devrimci Savaşımda Sanat Emeği was another Marxist circle. This was edited by Barış Pirhasan and Turgay Fişekçi; Can Yücel, Ataol Behramoğlu and Vedat Türkali were some of the regular writers

---

[456]Ibid., p. 8.

[457]*Halkın Dostları* was an important artistic, intellectual and political review which was published by young writers who were generally university movements originated. This review was started to publish in March 1970, and it was fistly published in Istanbul, but after they passed to Ankara. It was published 18 number and it was closed after the military coup d'état of 1971, and as a director, Behramoglu was arrested for 2 years. Other members of this review were İsmet Özel, Bedrettin Cömert, Murat Belge and Ayhan Gerçeker. Sureya Berfe and Asim Bezirci contributed to this review.

[458]Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı 1971* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1972), p. 5.

The criticism of these journals was always an overestimation of aesthetic values and priority of political positions. Tahsin Yücel wrote:

> I was not also attracted by the literary journals that wanted to situate themselves in politics. There was even a literary journal named *Militan*. Afterwards, we said in those years that some leftist literary people had espoused a quite bigoted attitude, that, for instance, they could not even tolerate the existence of a scientific approach like structuralism, that they critized me just because I had published writings in which I had explained such an approach. The 1970s was a period of childish enthusiasm. There were some people who believed that it was possible to make or at least accelerate a big revolution by way of some actions and demonstrations. But these actions and demonstrations, which we can conveniently regard as impeccable, ultimately quickened their opposites; hence they were used as a very practical means to do away with the freedoms brought about by 27 May.[459]

These young poets may be compared by the European young poets who participated in the 1968 social movements, like the Situationist movement and the circle of *Tel Quel*. In these socialist reviews, topics of art, philosophy of art, history and philosophy of history were treated and their political attitudes were stated clearly. Many young writers, poets changed their political vision in following years. For instance, today's well known journalists in Turkey, Murat Yetkin and Yasemin Çongar published very radical, revolutionary articles, in these journals as a contradiction to their actual political positions.

In the light of the above mentioned facts, it can be said that the socialist left was a common political attitude of many writers. They adopted several versions of the social realism.

---

[459]"*Politikanın içinde yer almak isteyen yazın dergileri de beni pek çekmemiştir. Militan adıyla yayımlanan bir yazın dergisi bile vardı. Sonra o yıllarda kimi sol yazın adamlarının fazla bağnaz bir tutumu benimsediklerini, örneğin yapısalcılık gibi bilimsel bir yaklaşımın varliğina bile katlanamadıklarını, böyle bir yaklaşımı açıklayan yazılar yayımlıyorum diye beni çok eleştirdiklerini söyledik. Şu var ki 70'li yıllar çocuksu bir coşku dönemiydi, birtakım eylem ve gösterilerle büyük bir devrim gerçekleştirmenin en azından onu hızlandırmanın olanaklı olduğuna inananlar vardı. Ama bu rahatlıkla günahsız diye niteleyebileceğimiz eylem ve gösteriler sonuçta karşıtlarını hızlandırdı, 27 Mayısın getirdiği özgürlükleri yok etme yolunda çok elverişli bir araç olarak kullanıldı."* Yücel, p. 220.

Sui Generis (Unique) Intellectuals, Nevi Şahsına Münhasır: Kemal Tahir, Attilâ Ilhan, Oğuz Atay

Kemal Tahir, Attilâ İlhan and Oğuz Atay stressed the peculiarities and particularities of Turkey. In addition to them, directors such as Halit Refiğ, Metin Erksan and other intellectuals like İdris Küçükömer, Sencer Divitçioğlu, Selahattin Hilâv defended a more culturalist, authentic and nativist approach.

These intellectuals were influential in the realm of the social sciences; they also were espoused by some social scientists. Especially, İlhan and Tahir brought about an authentic approach in their works of art. These intellectuals were prominent figures of the leftist literary tradition.

Three of them identified themselves as socialist intellectuals; however, they were in constant conflict with the other socialist intellectuals of the socialist circles and they always criticized them and movements' political stategies and socialist intellectuals for their lack of authenticity. They thought that they were not genuine for Turkish society. As a result of their powerful criticism, they were excluded from the socialist circles. Their originality or peculiarity within a tradition of left-wing authors and their search for a more genuine, more appropriate way of thought for Turkish society made it necessary to discuss these three figures independently.

Oğuz Atay

Oğuz Atay was a very important novelist of the period. His significance was especially felt after the coup d'état period of 1980. His individualistic dimension was mainly underlined, but he has a genuine political attitude, and he was sensitive to many social problems of his period which were generally products of the migration to the big cities and social ineaqualities; cultural differences; and in his works, individual problems were analyzed at the core of the social and political circumstances of the day in a very original and innovative style.

Atay criticized the dominant socialist hegemony and conservative circles in the realm of the literature in the following article of 1975. He said "show semi intellectual gangs and gangsters of culture" (*yarı-aydın çeteleri"ni ve "kültür gangsterleri"ni teşhir edin*):

> A small minority of semi-intellectual gangs who dominate all tendencies be it progressive or reactionary, not feeling for years to rejuvanate themselves, and to not loose their positions, try try to remain standing on their own feet even by making some manipulations. As he underestimated the people and the potential of intellectuals, he does not lift his finger. The places that they occupied have to pass to the real owners. If a genuine collective of intellectuals, who believe in the universal spirit of the people and who try to grasp it deeply, did no replace these cultural gangsters, Turkish literature would fall behind its age. These people who shares prizes between themselves are a single mass, the struggle of progressives and reactionaries was a sperfluous.[460]

Like the other authors under discussion here, Oğuz Atay criticized and was also criticized by the dominant socialist or traditional intellectuals of the period. He thought that there were important problems, in the literary world such as a lack of sincerity, and authenticity, pragmatism, and alienation.

[460]Oğuz Atay, *Günlük* 5 January1975 (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986), p. 134.

Atay influenced many of the Turkish intellectuals, especially after his death in the 1980s. His desire to show the conflicts and dilemmas of the solidarist, corporatist structure of the kemalist régime was approved by many young social scientists. His modernist style in form and the content of his work were also a revolution for the Turkish novel. He also ironically dealt with the most significant debate of the period, the underdevelopment of the Turkish society. He approached this topic with a critique of Turkish intellectuals who were not content with the society in which they lived:

> O my wretched nation, listen! (he halts). Now, we are here together to redeem you. For my nation, there are rumors about you, like that you have been underdeveloped, that you have lagged behind. O my dear nation! Why are you doing this? Why are you lagging behind us? Aren't you ashamed of lagging behind while we are developing that much? Don't you ever think that, just because we keep thinking why you are lagging behind, we cannot advance as much as we want. We empoison ourselves, thinking what will be the situation of this country. For our rich authors who narrate the lives of the poor, the whiskeys they drink at nightclubs become poison. And as for our penniless writers trying to lay bare the lives of the rich just because they think of this poor nation, they cannot drink comfortably in their small bars. O my poor nation! In fact, we are not telling of you. We are telling of the coward darkness of our miserable souls. Which is why we cannot come alongside you. We are living like a parasite near you. Aren't we ever ashamed of ourselves? No, we are never ashamed of ourselves.[461]

Attilâ İlhan

Attilâ İlhan[462] was one of the most popular and spectacular intellectuals of Turkish literature for his intellectual and political identity as well as his poems and novels.

---

[461] Oguz Atay, *Oyunlarla Yasayanlar* (Istanbul: Iletisim Yayınları), p. 69.

[462] He was born in June 15 of 1925, in Menemen, in Western Turkey. İlhan's family was a middle class family, but they reflected a double influence of their region and their epoch, a tradition of land and countryside (kasaba), on the other hand, an imitation of European ways of the age of the

The originality of İlhan was underlined by different author. For instance, Metin And in the *Forum* periodical in 1955, said: "if he had only written novel and poetry, he would not have been so attracive, but he was very determined in his own way and he always tried to determine the views of the others, and so he was widely criticized.[463] According to Konur Ertop,[464] he was a novelist of love and adventure, and according to Asım Bezirci, he was egocentric, although not in a Machiavelian way.[465] In the *Varlık Yıllığı* of 1968, Rauf Mutluay wrote that, "Attilâ İlhan penned writings which were enthusiastic but acrimonious, sincere but egoistic, true but injurious, careful but repetitive, right but quarrelsome, accusatory but unanswered, timely and strong."[466] These all qualitatives perfectly describe the contradictory artistic and political identities of the author.

Constitutional Monarchy and the Republic. He started to write poems when he was very young. He read in a very disorganized way, several authors, like Nazım Hikmet, Şolohov, Gorki, *1001 Novels* and Esat Mahmut Karakurt. The turning point of his life was his arrest in the age of 16, on the grounds accusing of being a communist because of a love letter in which he had talked about Nazım Hikmet. He was set free by the State Council. This event led him to mature early. The police surveillance was continued when he went to study in Istanbul and in reaction, he espoused a socialist worldview, even though he did not really know this worldview. İlhan's first poem was published in *Yeni Edebiyat* review. He won the prize of the Republican People's Party poetry competition in between Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı and Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca. The authors who were most influential in his life were Tornacı Ömer, Nazım Hikmet, Maksim Gorkiy, Reşat Enis, Ömer Faruk Toprak, Hasan Tanrıkut and André Malraux. Malraux's novels *İnsanlık Hali* and *Umut* (Hope) were influential in his artistic progress. He was also influenced by Louis Aragon, and French poetry. In his political thoughts, anti imperialism and support for Third World anti-colonial struggles were also shaped during his university education in Paris. When he returned to Turkey, he became a brillant and attractive figure in the Turkish literary mediums and he started different literary and political debates. His attitude against the Garipçiler and Second New movement was also regarded as strange, because of his exaggerated critiques.

[463]"*İşi şiir, roman yazmakla kalsa belki bu kadar ilgi çekmeyecek, ama dediğinde ayak diremesi, sert tartışmaları, eğilmez, bükülmez kuramları ile çevresini ekilemeye, yöneltmeye kalkışması ona karşı yaygın bir tepkiyi çağırıyor.* Metin And, *Forum*, N. 41, 1955.

[464]Konur Ertop, *Varlık*, n. 623, 1964.

[465]Asım Bezirci, *Okudukça*, p. 38, in Mehmet Seyda, *Edebiyat Dostları* (Kitaş Yayınları, İstanbul: 1970), 265 280.

[466]"*Attilâ İlhan; coşkulu ama hırçın, içten ama bencilce, doğru ama kırıcı, dikkatli ama tekrarlı, haklı ama geçimsiz, suçlayıcı ama cevapsız, vakitli ve güçlü yazılar koydu ortaya."* Rauf Mutluay, *1968 Varlık Yıllığı*, p. 38.

İlhan's novel *Kurtlar Sofrası* (Dinner Table of Wolves) was an important critique of the leftist circles; in all of his novels, he wanted to show the hypocrisy, and lack of authenticity of Turkish leftist intellectuals. Fethi Naci argued that this novel was the most anti-communist novel ever written in Turkish literature.[467] İlhan reflected the anti-imperialist spirit of the age in many of his novels, like *Yaraya Tuz Basmak*, in which he discussed the Korean War by criticizing US imperialism as well as the other side of the War, the North Korean army. İlhan's hostility to the USSR as another kind of imperialism was his distinct approach about socialism.

Attilâ Ilhan's tension between his literary production and his political vision was also mentioned by Gün Zileli. He said that İlhan was a very significant author, but his political views had led to the formation of a conflict when he was young and adventurous, he produced masterpieces, but to be a machevelian in politics was not suitable to his early, artistic existence. [468]

Another critic, Enis Batur, in an article "Sentez Yutturmacası"(A Story of Synthesis)[469] said that İlhan started a movement of elimination or clarification in the literary world by excluding or disregarding many significant authors. He harshly ciriticized other authors and he emphasized the superiority of his own political and literary attitude. For instance, he argued that, İlhan criticized various writers like Cenap Şahabettin, Tevfik Fikret, Edip Cansever, Berna Moran, Hilmi Yavuz, Murat

---

[467]Fethi Naci, *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Roman ve Toplumsal Değişme*, (Istanbul : Gerçek Yayinevi, 1981), p. 245.

[468]Gün Zileli, 8.7.2010 http://www.gomanweb.net/haberler-yorumlar-kategorisindeki-tuem-haberler-g/165-guen-zileli-attila-lhan-selcuk.html.

[469] Enis Batur, *Okuma Lambası* (Istanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, 2004), pp. 75-77.

Belge and many others for not producing a relevant synthesis of realism to represent Turkish art or to be real Turkish artists. He always defended the creation of a synthesis, but the only synthesis considered acceptable was the French authors such as André Malraux and Louis Aragon. Other authors had never formulated a good balance of Western and Anatolian cultures like himself.

İlhan's own style of synthesis was at the core of his literary approach. He always sought for a relevant synthesis for the Turkish art, but according to Batur, this approach of making synthesis between different cultures was an obstacle for the universality of Turkish art. A search for a synthesis always assumes two completely distinct geographical and social entities. İlhan thought that Turkey was an Eastern society and the essence of his artistic culture necessitated a synthesis with Western art and he shared many common points with Tahir about his emphais on nativity and the critique of the imitation of Western culture.

İlhan's original attitude about leftist politics, his critical attitude about the extreme Westernization, his emphasis on the Eastern origins of the Turkish society and especially his very original personality made him a unique author.

Kemal Tahir

Kemal Tahir was the most productive and possibly most popular author of the 1960s. He published many novels, many of them already having been written in the 1940s and 1950s. Similar to the Poems of Nazım Hikmet, Tahir works were also very attractive for the socialists, however his own authentic way of socialism was seriously debated by many people, and in the following years, because of his harsh criticism of

to the socialist movements and intellectuals, he was excluded from the socialist circles, to some extent.

Tahir especially assumed that novels had a central role in literature. Social progress and development and novel had a significant interaction. The novelist was a representative of his society against the world's authors. According to him, the novel had the power to describe society as a whole by showing its conflicts and realities.[470]

He was known for his own special conception of socialism. His political attitude was the main motivation for his literary production. He wrote that: "Sculpture represents Ancient Greece, painting represents Renaissance art, music was the best representation of the French Revolution, and the socialism will be represented by poetry and the novel.[471] Kemal Tahir did not accept the economic or philosophical models of the West that were proposed for the Turkish context. He thinks that Turkish society was an Eastern society and could not be considered or understood by the European models. The Western and Eastern debate was not only presented in a cultural plan, but in his works, the economic backgroud of this duality was especially emphasized. His relationship with a young social scientist, Baykan Sezer, was very important in the development of his approach to the novel. Sezer was a social scientist, like Sencer Divitcioglu, Selahattin Hilav, defending an authentic Marxian approach called the Asiatic Mode of Production, or the authenticity of the Eastern and Ottoman empires. Halit Refiğ, Nejat Özon, Metin Erksan were disciples of Tahir who adapted his ideas to the realm of cinema.

---

[470]Kemal Tahir, *Notlar, Sanat Edebiyat 1* (Istanbul, Baglam Yayincilik, 1989), p. 35-58
.

[471]"*Eski Yunanı heykel, Rönesansı resim, Fransız inkilâbını müzik temsil etmiştir. Sosyalizmi de şiir ve roman temsil edecek.."* Tahir, (1989), p. 408.

In his novels, he also challenged the official version of Turkish history and to the some representations of social facts. For instance, his 1957 novel *Rahmet Yolları Kesti* was in a sharp contradiction to the novel of Yaşar Kemal *İnce Memed*, in the conceptualization of bandits. He was against their heroization. He also was strictly different from the peasant novelitsts. In his 1962 novel *Bozkırdaki Çekirdek*,[472] he criticized the Village Institutes for their insufficiency and the aim of the state institutions to create a closed peasant society.[473] The topic of his novel, *Kurt Kanunu* (Law of the Wolves) published in 1969 was about the İzmir assasination trial,[474] and *Yol Ayrımı*'s (1971) subject was the *Serbest Fırka*[475] experiment in Turkish politics of the 1930s. *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* (1956), and *Esir Şehrin Mahpusu* (1962) were about occupied İstanbul by the British military forces. *Yorgun Savaşçı* (1965) was a search for a new state, a dramatic story of army officiers who had no real goal and their army which had disintegrated. *Yorgun Savasçı* won the Yunus Nadi prize and *Devlet Ana* won the TDK prize.

---

[472] Vedat Günyol, *Yeni Ufuklar*, (July 1968), argues that "*Köy enstitülerini maskara etmek için yazılmış bir roman niteliğini taşımaktadır."*

[473]Ertan Eğribel, "Kemal Tahir 100. Yaşında," in Ertan Eğribel, M Fatih Andı, *Kemal Tahir 100 Yasinda* (T.C. Kultur ve Turizm Bakanligi: Ankara, 2010), p. 21.

[474]This act of assassination was attempted against Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and for being against this act, many opponents of the Kemalist régime were executed. *Kurt Kanunu* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1969).

[475]Serbest Firka, the Liberal Republican Party (sometimes referred to as the Free Republican Party; in Turkish: *Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*) was a political party founded by Ali Fethi Okyar 12 August 1930. Atatürk requested that Okyar create it as an opposition party to confront the ruling Republican People's Party, with the aim of establishing the tradition of multi-party democracy in Turkey. However, the party was quickly embraced by the conservatives, who saw it as an opportunity to reverse the reforms of Atatürk, particularly regarding secularism. The party was dissolved in November 1930 by Okyar who himself was an ardent supporter of the reforms. The closure of the Liberal Republican Party left Turkey as a one-party state until the establishment of the National Development Party (*Milli Kalkınma Partisi*) in 1945 and the Democratic Party in 1946. Kemal Tahir, *Yol Ayrımı* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1971).

Fethi Naci, Murat Belge and many other critics had negative things to say about Tahir's style and content. He was criticized mainly because of his criticisms of the Kemalist heritage, but as Cemal Süreya said to people who criticized Tahir, "is it a crime to not to be Kemalist? If it is necessary, there were too many remarks to say about this subject,"[476] some of the intellectuals defended Tahir as he challenged the Kemalist discourse.

Kemal Tahir like Attilâ İlhan, tried to propose and to develop his own style of literary realism and he argued that reality could be acknowledged in a very difficult manner because the reality was colorful. Concerning the reality, which was dynamic and flexible, there was an endless struggle for the representation of reality. He asserted that reality could not be easily maintained and he criticized other writers who were not able to represent or reflect reality.[477] For instance, he argued that the problems of peasantry were represented by these intellectuals in a static manner. He thought that intellectuals were originated from peasant families and they wanted to see epic stories of heroic bandits. In these works, by excluding the feudal lords, everyone was represented as naive and oppressed, but as he argued, the peasantry was not an homogenous part of society. This part exists also in similar way with the general situation of society, diversified to the sections and varied.[478]

---

[476] *"Suç mu Atatürkçü olmamak? Bu konuda gerekirse söylenecek çok söz var."* Naci Çelik Berksoy, "Kemal Tahir için biyografi çalışması," *Kemal Tahir 100 Yasinda*,.(Ankara:T.C. Kultur ve Turizm Bakanligi: 2010), p. 35.

[477] *"Gerçek kendisini zor teslim eder çünkü canlıdır. Canlı ve değişken olduğu için de bir kere teslim alınınca sürgit elimizde kalmaz.bu sebeple gerçekle girişilecek savaşın sonu yoktur. Bu savaşın zaferi sürekliliğindendir."* Tahir, p. 500.

[478] *"Aydinlarımıza gelince, köyü bilmezden, görmezden gelenlerin hemen hepsi çarıklarını talebe yurtlarında, ağızlarını da talebe kahvelerinde zorla bırakmış köylü, ağa oğullarıdır. Bugün türlü ağıtlarla köyden edebiyatı cedide masalları ve kahraman eşkiyaların destanlarını isteyenler de bunlardır. Köy dün, bugün ne tümüyle karamsardır, ne de tümüyle iyimser. Ne bütün köylüler*

In Turkey, at the beginning of the 1960s, the population of the rural regions was very high, 75 percent of the population. In two decades, this proportion changed to less than the half of the population. The relation between intellectuals and the peasantry was the fundamental reason that Tahir thinks that intellectuals could not represent the colourful reality of their epoch. His main criticism was the lack of genuine works and the superficiality of the extreme Westernized intellectuals who were so unhappy with their past when they had lived in rural regions and they underestimated this life. Another opposite behaviour was the glorification or mystification of this rural life.

Kemal Tahir stated that he did not write his novels for the Western masters. He also focused on the alienation and loneliness of Western society and its people. This was not similar for Turkish society, according to him.[479]

Türkiye Defteri (Papers of Turkey) review was published between 1971 and 1975, by Hulki Aktınç, Taylan Altuğ, and Naci Çelik Berksoy. This review which was described as a literary and political periodical, can be considered as a gathering place for people who espoused the literary and political approaches of Kemal Tahir.

This review focused on the subjects in which Tahir was interested, like the Turkish histor, and the Turkish form of Marxism. For instance, the editors of this journal declared that:

> *Türkiye Defteri*, which adopted the principle of focusing on history and to having a political attitude to maintain knowledge on cultural facts and

---

*bazılarına göre ağalar müstesna olumlu tiplerdir, ne de bütün köyülüler ağalarıyla beraber olumsuzdurlar. Köy de derecesine göre değişmelerden hissesini alır. Bilhassa yekpare, daha doğrusu ağadan öteye yekpare bir toplum parçası değildir. Toplumumuzun genel durumuna tıpatıp uyan, katlara ayrışmış karışık bir toplumun karışık parçasıdır."*Ibid.

[479]Kemal Tahir *Notlar Sanat Edebiyat 1* (Istanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1989), p. 34.

> reflecting the new action in literature, especially in the novel and short story, and intellectual power, was against abstractions, but for concretizations. What we mean by concrete Marxism is a Marxism shaped on a national base, because there is no abstract Marxism, only concret Marxism.[480]

This review was published until its 20th issue. Selim Ileri, Tomris Uyar, Selahattin Hilâv, İlhan Berk, Hilmi Yavuz, Adalet Ağaoglu, and Sezer Tansuğ regularly contributed to this review.

Class Origins of these Unique Authors

These three authors, Atay, İlhan and Tahir were not from the upper class. Their families were educated but middle class. İlhan's family was an old, rural, aristocratic family, but it was not a really rich family. Atay's father was bureaucrate, and Tahir, during all of his youth, seriously suffered from poverty. These authors contemplated the different classes' mutual relations in society and especially about their own class identities as writers.

Kemal Tahir wrote about Orhan Kemal that poverty was not considered to be normal for him by the different Turkish authors, but he thought that it was not abnormal that authors who supported the causes of the people could live like the people or could have some troubles with the state and capital. This was his approach to the class identities of the writers; he said that writers had to live according to their

[480]"*Edebiyattaki özellikle roman ve hikayedeki yeni eylemi, güç birikimini yansıtan, kültürel olgular konusunda siyasal bir tavri ve tarih bilincini ön plana alma ilkesini benimseyen Türkiye Defteri soyutlamalara karşı, somutlamalardan yanadır. Çünkü soyut Marksizm yoktur, somut Marksizm vardır. Somut Marksizmden kasıt, milli bir biçim almiş Marksizmdir."* Türkiye Defteri, "Editöryel yazı," no 2. (1971).

political and class identities; they did not form a privileged section of society above social classes:

> Orhan Kemal was a southerner, he was a man of the abundant lands. If he, with the skill he showed in the realm of literature, had been a middle man for the products of the abundant southern lands, if he had looked for an intermediate trade in big businesses, he would not only have been a millionnaire in 5 to 10 years but also would have been an exemplary fellow southerner. The reason behind our elegies for Orhan Kemal, behind bad straits, behind moanings is this. In fact, I state this proudly: there is no relationship between the very rich personalities of Orhan Kemals and these poverty stories (there is no place here for the exploitation we complain about talking through our hat). Real poverty springs from the fact that our intellectuals are conditioned against their own wealth. Even though realities are completely unclothed, we are all guilty because we show no effort to break from this conditioning because we are still trying to take the easy way out.[481]

These three men deeply influenced social scientists, especially historians; their works and their political visions were developed and debated in many articles.

Modernist - Avant-garde Intellectuals

A modernist trend or many modernist circles made up of writers existed during this interval. They had an intricate but also interrelated relationship with the social realist currents and writers. The individualistic dimensions of the works of art

---

[481] "*Güneyliydi Orhan Kemal, bereketli toprakların adamıydı. yazıcılıkta gösterdiği yetenekle, diyelim bereketli güney topraklarının ürünlerine aracılık etseydi, büyük işletmelerinde ayak komisyonculuğu arasaydı çok değil 5-10 yıl içinde hem milyoner olurdu hem de güneyin örnek hemşehrilerinden sayılırdı. İşte Orhan Kemallerimizin ardından yaktığımız ağıtların, geçim yoksulluğu, iniltilerin kaynağı budur. Aslında Orhan Kemallerin çok zengin kişilikleriyle bu yoksulluk hikayelerinin, gururla söylüyorum hiç, ama hiç mi hiç ilişiği, uzak- yakın ilintisi olamaz. (Burada bilir bilmez yakındığımız sömürünün bile yeri yoktur.) Gerçek yoksulluk, aydınlarımızın kendi zenginliklerine karşı şartlanmış olmalarından ileri geliyor. Gerçekler çırılçıplak ortaya döküldüğü halde, bu şartlanmayı parçalamak için hiçbir gayret göstermediğimizden, hâlâ kolaya kaçmak çabalamasında olduğumuzdan hepimiz suçluyuz*!" Kemal Tahir, (1989), p. 56.

produced by modernist artists or a permanent critique of escapism of these artists was produced by many of the social realist writers, as it will be explained below. A modernist category is necessary to frame appropriately the literary landscape of the 1960s and 1970s.

These modernist writers were generally left-wing authors. They produced increasingly politically engaged works and they followed a social realist tradition which also criticized them by rarely embracing, generally excluding and trying to transform these authors to produce more socially-oriented work. Nevertheless, these avant-garde and politically engaged authors, by adopting surrealist, alternative forms and innovative literary techniques, contributed to the literature of the epoch under discussion.

Modernist intellectuals were mainly poets of the Second New and a circle called the short story writers of the 1950s, and female novelists of the 1970s. Memet Fuat's *Yeni Dergi* was a forum for the modernist artists of Turkey. Foreign modernist art and its debates were also introduced by this review. The circle which is generally called as Second New and short story writers of the 1950s, and female novelists of the 1970s, for instance, Turgut Uyar, Onat Kutlar, Cemal Süreya, Tomris Uyar, Tezer Özlü, Adalet Ağaoğlu, Edip Cansever, İlhan Berk, Demir Özlü, Ferit Edgü created the modernist literary tradition of the country.

This generation of intellectuals expressed themselves through the medium of art reviews. They were active in cinema organizations like the Turkish Cinémathèque association. They reflected a more Westernized tendency and the problems of the urban life were more frequently depicted in their works of art. They were socialist oriented politically but they generally debated the social realist literary approach, and

they were subjects of the significant critique of the day to be individualist, and modernist, avant-garde art was not suitable to the realities of the country. But they declared that a new, innovatory art required also a transformation in the content of the work of art, and they always sought alternative forms, different techniques and styles in their works.

The Modernist Novel and the Short Story

Sevgi Soysal, Adalet Ağaoğlu, Tomris Uyar: Feminist-modernist Sensibility

In the field of the novel and short story, we can mention many female authors who were politically socialist oriented but the form and the content of their work may be described as having been at the frontiers of realist and modernist production. After the coup d'état of 1971, many of these authors focused on the oppression of the state apparatus and represented the melancholy and sympathy of the intellectuals against these young militants.

The coup d'état period, or after the coup d'état, many authors as a part of their intellectual identity attempted to describe the oppression and pain that the youth, university students, and intellectuals faced. Sevgi Soysal, Adalet Ağaoğlu, Tomris Uyar, and Füruzan were important figures. All of them wrote about the social pressures that constricted the individuals, and certainly pressured women. They reflected the individual problems as a result of the social inequalities. These female authors deserve a longer discussion.

Sevgi Soysal was a masterful critic of social injustice, gender inequality, and militarism. Her writings are essential to understanding Turkey since the 1960s.

Asiscussed above, her literary style can be defined as having been a mixture of modernist and social realist approaches. She refused to give into the constricting social demands of her time, most especially those concerning gender. She was against the conformism that she observed in society, including that within the oppositional leftist movement, though she herself took a keen interest in contemporary leftist ideology. Whether within the context of prison or the leftist movement, as a newspaper columnist (she wrote articles in *Politika* newspaper) or as a women, she always criticized the social pressures that limited the individual's freedom, and to reveal the inner workings of daily oppression. Her complete works continue to attract both the Turkish public and the intelligentsia.

Adalet Ağaoğlu was another female author who criticized the state authorities from a historical perspective by employing flashbacks to the early Republican period. Ağaoğlu can be considered as a symbol, who desired to refuse the past of their elders and to resist the complex structure of the political, religious, economic and social forces.

Füruzan also felt that the state pressures on the youth and the social movements led to serious pains. They started to write a requiem for these generations after the military coup d'état of 1971.

Tomris Uyar may be considered one of the avant-gardes of the feminist attitude in Turkish literature. In her short stories and diaries, she reflected a gender sensibility and sharp denial of social and political system as being obstacle against human emancipation.

The Short Story Writers of 1950

The literary movement called the "Short Story Writers of 1950" (*1950 Öykücüleri*) was also represented in the 1960s by Onat Kutlar, Demir Özlü, Tarık Dursun K., Muzaffer Buyrukçu, Muzaffer Erdost, Orhan Duru, Leyla Erbil, Adnan Özyalçıner, Bilge Karasu, and Ferit Edgü.

Onat Kutlar was an important intellectual figure of these years as he was the founder of the Cinemathèque Association, which served as a meeting place for all of the intellectuals of the period. In this atmosphere, the heterogeneous group of Sinematek was affected mainly by the political approaches of *Ant* magazine. Some of its members, such as Onat Kutlar, Hüseyin Baş, and Ferit Edgü were regular writers of this magazine of politics and culture. Many intellectuals and critics who became involved in the Sinematek Association were also members or supporters of the Workers' Party of Turkey.

Ferit Edgü reflects perfectly the political attitude of the most of these modernist intellectuals. He wrote that to stop the exploitation of one individual over another or to achieve equal distribution of food are not the only reasons for me to wish for the realisation/establishment of socialist order. I visualize/see/think socialism as a war to eliminate all the factors that hinders the individual from being himself.

Demir Özlü was an important short story and novel writer, included in the generation of the 1950s short story writers like Onat Kutlar and Ferit Edgü. He participated into the political movements of the period. After the coup d'état of 1980, he was stripped of his citizenship.

Leyla Erbil was another politically engaged, modernist author. She wrote many novels and short stories, and attempted to make a synthesis of the Marxian and Freudian ideas. She was also one of the members of the TLP and TYS. She was known with her distance to the Orthodox Marxism.

All of them espoused a more theoretical approach to Marxism. As they were producers of an existentialist culture in the 1950s, became the leftist militants in the 1960s and 1970s. The mixture of an existentialist artistic production and political commitment produced a very interesting situation. They can be compared to the circle of the *Tel Quel* review and Jean Paul Sartre's attitude in France. Nearly all of them had lived in France for some years, and they were absolutely attracted to this intellectual culture. They were generally criticized as being extremely Westernized intellectuals who imitated or copied Western intellectual and artistic trends. Their individualistic works were also criticized.

Modernist Poetry- *İkinci Yeni* – (Second New)

In the realm of poetry, writers of the genre known as the Second New deserve examination. These people began to produce poetry in the 1950s, and were very productive in the 1960s. The most important figures were Cemal Süreya, Turgut Uyar, Edip Cansever and Ece Ayhan, and Can Yücel, Ülkü Tamer İlhan Berk, Sezai Karakoç, İsmet Özel and Hilmi Yavuz. This name was first introduced by Muzaffer İlhan Erdost in order to identify this poetry movement or to introduce a movement with similar poets who had similar tendencies. Most of these poets, however, did not always accept this definition. Edip Cansever totally rejected this definition by arguing

that there might be a common sensitivity between these poets, but a common definition was not appropriate.

The Second New movement was considered to be a continuation and denial of the *Garip* poetry movement of Orhan Veli Kanık, Melih Cevdat Anday and Oktay Rifat which was considered to have been the *First New* movement. Images which had a power of connotation were used frequently by these poets, and aesthetic quality of their poets was incontestable. These poets, İlhan Berk, Turgut Uyar, Edip Cansever, Cemal Süreya, Ece Ayhan, Sezai Karakoç, Ülkü Tamer, Kemal Özer, Tevfik Akdağ and Yılmaz Gruda started to publish their poems between 1953-1975 in Ankara and later in İstanbul, in reviews such as *Yeditepe, Yenilik, a, İstanbul, Şiir Sanatı, Pazar Postası, Salkım, Kimsecik* (Nobody), *Köprü* (Bridge), *Yeni Dergi* and *Post*. Another common particularity of the most of these poets was their University educations in the Faculty of Political Sciences in Ankara.

Enis Batur stated that the *İkinci Yeni* Movement appeared like an innovative approach and that they had transformed the language of poetry. These poets moulded the face of the Turkish poem between 1955 and 1975, thanks to their personal adventures which followed a close trajectory with some of the prominent representatives of the previous generation. Cemal Süreya, Ece Ayhan, Turgut Uyar, Edip Cansever, Sezai Karakoç with Oktay Rifat, Melih Cevdet, Necatigil, İlhan Berk, even Dağlarca were the main figures who shaped the poetic attitude of the era.[482]

---

[482] "*Başlangıçta 1950'lerin ikinci yarısında topyekun yenilikçi bir hareket, anlayış, ortaklıkları belirgin bir şiir dili dönüştürümü olarak algılanan II. Yeni'nin şairleri, bir önceki kuşağın kimi önemli temsilcileriyle hayli yakın bir güzergah çizen kişisel serüvenleriyle 1955 1975 arası Türk şiirinin çehresini oluşturdular: Cemal Süreya, Ece Ayhan, Turgut Uyar, Edip Cansever, Sezai Karakoç ile Oktay Rifat, Melih Cevdet, Necatigil, İlhan Berk, hatta Dağlarca dönemin poetikasını benim gözümde belirleyen ana figürlerdir."* Enis Batur, *Okuma Lambası* (Istanbul: Alkım, 2004), p. 154.

The Second New movement was considered by many of the critics to be the most modernist and interesting literary movement in Turkish literature: this literary movement in the beginning was against popularism and folkloric elements, but during the 1960s, political and social realist motifs were increasingly visible in their poems. Sezai Karakoç, who was part of this movement, was the only poet who had conservative worldviews.

These poets and their circle led the modernist movement of the period. They produced many works of art and political articles in the important reviews of the time, and *Yeni Dergi* and *Papirüs* provided as voice to these authors. They participated in several literary and political debates in the pages of these reviews. The Second New circle and another circle which was called as the Short story Writers of the 1950s, included Demir Özlü, Ferit Edgü, and Onat Kutlar.[483] This organization provided a meeting place and allowed for the creation of a network between these modernist intellectuals.

This circle generally is described by literary historians as having been a coalition of poets who had rural and lower class origins. Ece Ayhan wrote because, up to the present, poetry has come from the rich families of İstanbul, there has been a transformation in Turkey, and it is normal to see this change in the literature, this richness has been waited from the rich families but it comes from *Parasız Yatılı* (Tuition Free State Boarding School Students), they are people from the country.

The class origins of these poets can be seen ironically as a part of the urban, modernist identity of their circle. On the other hand, Attilâ Ilhan and Asım Bezirci were very critical of this circle because of their abstract and apolitical intentions. İlhan

[483]*Cinémathèque* Institution was the subject of my master thesis.

started a war against them. This polemical attitude continued in several reviews. İlhan published a book s called *İkinci Yeni Savaşı* (War of the Second New) Asım Bezirci also wrote a book, called *İkinci Yeni Olayı* (The Case of the Second New).

These authors criticized the abstractness and indifference of these authors to the political process. In the 1950s, this critique may have been relevant, but after the 1960s, these poets added an escalating political and social content to their works. But this circle, even during this period was always criticized by authors like Selahattin Hilâv, who argues that:

> The Second New could not gain acceptance, I agree with this... Though, the literature and poetry of the educated, except for the realm of oral literature, has borken away from the old anyway. As for Nazım, he is the only poet who has been able to realize the unique and necessary synthesis despite the fact that he is located in this tradition. Poems, just like they had to in the past, have to make their case in our age by availing itself of already presented great opportunities. The Second New is a movement in favor of images, of words... In addition, transforming the specifically historical experience of the West into the content of the poem, unless it exceeds this content, is dangerous and restrictive. It might be asked whether this is the task given to the poet and the poem in an historical moment when the old world is collapsing and a new world is about to emerge. In my opinion, the human content to be a subject matter to the Turkish poem would be the life experience of our people, which is radically different from what is in the West; that is, this would be a native content. And we see this in Nazım.[484]

There was an emphasis on the nativity of Nazım's poetry. The extreme adaptation or imitation of the Western poetry was put up against this nativity. These

---

[484]"*İkinci Yeni kendini kabul ettirememiştir, buna katılıyorum...Gerçi sözlü edebiyat dışında okumuş zümrenin şiiri ve edebiyatı zaten eskiden beri kopuş halindedir. Nazım'a gelince, bu gelenek içinde olduğu halde biricik ve zorunlu sentezi gerçekleştirebilmiş tek şairdir... Şiir, çağımızda eskiden de olduğu gibi, sunulmuş büyük imkanlardan yararlanarak kendini koymak zorundadır. İkinci Yeni imgeci, kelimeci bir şiirdir....Ayrıca batı dünyasının belli bir tarihi anındaki yaşantısını şiirin muhtevası haline getirmek, bu muhtevayı aşmadıkça tehlikeli ve sınırlayıcıdır...Eski bir dünyanın çöktüğü ve yeni bir dünyanın doğmak üzere olduğu bir tarih anında şaire ve şiire düşen görev bu mudur diye sorulabilir. Bence Türk şiirine konu olacak insani muhteva da batıdaki fertten tamamen farklı olan insanımızın yaşantısının muhtevası, yani yerli muhteva olacaktır. Bunu Nazım'da görüyoruz."* Selahattin Hilâv, "Collective Survey," *Ant* no. 14 15, (4 and 11 April 1967), in Rauf Mutluay, "1967'de Şiirmiz," *Varlık Yıllığı 1968* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969), p. 29.

modernist authors can be defined against the unique intellectuals that defended the particularities of Turkey, and they criticized them for being western oriented. These writers reactively criticized the innovative intellectuals who desired to embrace Western or universal values in the form and the content of their works, of being western admirers and for being the producers of the ideology of individualism. “Not being a native,” “disconnection from the country,” and “not setting foot in the land of this country” were among the criticisms that the nativist authors launched at the modernist authors’ hearts and souls, like Kemal Tahir; Attilâ İlhan who harshly criticized Second New circle; directors such as Halit Refiğ, Metin Erksan; and social scientists such as İdris Küçükömer, Sencer Divitçioğlu, and Selahattin Hilâv. These two axes debated in a context of elitist and populist dilemmas.

Cemal Süreya, at a conference in 1967, declared that “if a social realist autors like Orhan Kemal has sold 10 thousands in Turkey, and my works of art have sold 3 thousands, then my works have sold more than Orhan Kemal.” He accepted that two of these authors were not widely read and were understood or suficiently sold. Enis Batur said that Süreya may have not been, aware, but in France, the books of an author like Orhan Kemal sold more than Kemal, but avant-garde poetry like Sureya’s may not have mora than ın Turkey.

Cemal Süreya in 1968, at another conference said that Turkey had 35 million people and 750 000 “educated public” He criticized the mentality of the intellectuals in relation to their public. The rest of the population were people who did not need to follow them. They wanted to reach people, but they had locked themselves into their educated public and perhaps can be said to have been trying “sell snails in the quarter of Muslims.” Their audience was made up of “educated people” who distanced

themselves from the rest of the people. The people were always there but they were never their audience. Süreya contemplated on the distance between his his avant-garde poems and the people, he was attacked by the social realists who defended always the priority of the close relation between author and the people.

This modernist movement may have been part or follower of the humanist, laicisit, Westernized tradition of literature. It has to be noted that there were significant differences, but also a continuity between this tradition that had its origins in the humanist tradition of Nurullah Ataç, Tercüme Odası and Second New circle which were part of the modernist movement of the 1960s. Hilmi Yavuz in 1972 wrote that in Turkey there was a laicist and humanist cultural tradition as a result of the Westernization movements. Acccording to him, what was to be done was not to compromise and to continue this tradition against the attacks of the Ottomanist initiatives towards a religious culture.[485] Bedrettin Cömert, Cavit Orhan Tütengil, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Haldun Taner, Doğan Avcıoğlu were Kemalist intellectuals who defended a universalistic, humanist and Westernized vision.

The Second New circle, however, can be also considered to have been a reaction against this humanist tradition, but a progressive critique which aimed to transcend and to enrich this tradition. The short story writers of the 1950s were people who were not satisfied by the works of the Peasant novelist. İlhan argues that the Second New poets' style was a reaction to the social realist poetry of the 1940s.

---

[485]"*Batılılaşma akımıyla bütünleşen laik ve hümanist bir kültür geleneğimiz var. Bence yapılması gereken iş, bu gelenekten ödün vermemek, din kültürü doğrultusundaki Osmanlı girişimlere karşı bu laik ve hümanist geleneği sürdürmektir*." Hilmi Yavuz, in Adnan Binyazar, "1971'de Deneme, Eleştiri, İnceleme," *Varlık Yıllığı 1972*, p. 82, (answer to the Collective Survey prepared by Refik Durbaş ın January 1971, the art and literature supplement of *Cumhuriyet*.)

The polemical articles of Cansever and Günyol reflect the tension between these two artistic attitudes and a conflict between the different traditions of the Republ ican era.[486] Turgut Uyar criticized the view that defined art as an instrument or opportunity for social and political purposes:

> Anyway, I do not believe in the benefits of works of art. I do not feel to say benefit even to glorify or to educate people by poetry. Therefore, the poetry which is called as Second Poetry does not have benefits or damages for anyone except its producer. I believe that the change and innovation of the by social concerns or forces is related to changes and innovations in society. In our society, there have not been important changes and innovations to motivate poetry for a long time...In a society in which conventional poetry is produced to find new things to say, or to search new forms to be able to say new things was perceived in an sign of depression, even it was a depression, in a process, it will be understood that it was an evolution. I have a one opinion of this subject. I want to make poems what I wrote, what you can do with poetry. All I want to do is to write poetry. That is all [487]

Uyar thinks as such, in the 1957, as the political repression was at an apogee on intellectuals, in the era of the DP government. Cansever's original approach to the debate or to the name of and his definition of the modernist artist's independent identity is significant. He denied this label, saying that all of these poets had different

---

[486]A significant polemic between Vedat Günyol and Edip Cansever can be surveyed in *Yeni Ufuklar* review, in the 1960s...

[487]"*Ben sanat yapıtlarının faydasına inanmıyorum zaten. şiirin, kişiyi eğitmesine, yüceltmesine bile fayda demek gelmiyor içimden. böylece, bu ikinci yeni dediğimiz şiirin de, kimselere, ne zararı vardır, ne de faydası, ozanından başka. Şiirin, toplumsal kaygılarla, zorlarla değişmesi, yenilenmesi sanırım, toplumsal şartların da değişmesine, yenilenmesine bağlıdır. bizim toplumumuzda uzun zamandır böyle şiiri etkileyecek değişiklikler yok... Alışılmış şiirin hazırladığı ortamda, söylenecek yeni şeyler bulmak, söylenecek bu yeni şeyler için yeni biçimler aramak, önce bir bunalım görüntüsü verirse de, hatta hatta düpedüz bir bunalım ise de, bu yeniliğin, ögeleri belirledikçe bir evrim olduğu anlaşılır sanıyorum... şiir bu, başka nereye dayanacak... bu, kelimeye yeniden yeni yüklenmiş bir yük, bir iş değil ki yalnız sık sık kelimeyi anlayışımız değişiyor. bütün mesele, kelimenin macerasını, söz olarak, anlam olarak değerini bilmekte, alabileceği, taşıyabileceği yükleri ölçmektir..... benim bir tek tutumum var bu konuda (şiir yazma), yazdıklarımı 'şiir' etmeye çalışmak. şiirle ne yapmak istenebilir. hiçbir şey yapmak istemiyorum. işte, şiir yazmak istiyorum, yazıyorum o kadar.... ozan, bildiğimiz kelimeleri kullandıkça, ne kadar çabalarsa çabalasın, bize bir şey anlatmaktan, hatırlatmaktan, hiç değilse çağrışımızdan kurtulamayacaktır."* Turgut Uyar, *Yeni Ufuklar*, Şubat 1957.

sensibilities, but even so, all of them, from different points of departure, shared a common feeling to show their individuality which before had been absent.

Finally, it is necessary to analyze the political attitudes of these authors. They were criticized by different political circles but they were an important part of the intellectual movement of the period from a critical distance. For instance, Cemal Süreya emphasized his avant-garde literary identity, discussing matter with social realist tendencies, but his political position was clear. For instance, in 1975, he was the director of the Mint, in Istanbul. Yılmaz Ergenekon, who had been to be the Ministry of Finance, wanted to remove him from office, and he organized an investigation into the Mint. Although he was unable to uncover any malfeasance Süreya was removed from his post on the pretext that the building of Mint was polluted. Sureya replies to this decree, saying that the building of the Mint has become polluted only during two hours in all of its history and this during the visit of the Ministry of Finance.

This modernist movement included the most important geniuses of Turkish poetry like, Turgut Uyar, Cemal Süreya, Edip Cansever, and Can Yücel. After the 1960s, although these poets, as a part of this circle, did not produce a homogenous political attitude, nearly all of them were socialist oriented and political, social, and historical concerns became increasingly the main topics of their works. I think that an internationalist and profound conception of socialism was espoused by them.

These artists were also very important in terms of the relationship between artists and politics. They were interested politically and intellectually in Marxism and in the other political and intellectual trends of their period like surrealism, and

psychoanalysis. They played an important role for the appropriation of these ideas by a large public.

Cemal Süreya translated a book by Lenin, *Emperyalizm: Kapitalizmin en Yüksek Aşaması* (Imperialism: the Highest State of Capitalism) from French. Can Yücel translated many Marxist books in his own original style. Enis Batur wrote that modernist poetry was influenced from the topics of the social scientists, historians, and politicians:

> On the other hand, Turkish poetry's modernist line, after 1960, introduced a close relationship with the Turkish history. This was part of a larger framework. For the sake of going beyond the Kemalism, especially from a socialist perspective, they focused on the Ottoman past Indeed, the poetry produced between 1960 and 1975, was influenced by Kemal Tahir, Sencer Divitçioğlu, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Mustafa Akdağ, Selahattin Hilav, and Hikmet Kıvılcımlı.[488]

Additionally, Mehmet Fuat's *Yeni Dergi* published many of the poems of these authors. This journal introduced avant-garde and innovative trends of thought at the same time as they appeared in Europe. Cemal Süreya, in his reviews *Papirüs* and *Türkiye Yazıları*, attempted to connect literature and social sciences with an intellectual sensitivity. These authors represented an influential and profound intellectual attitude in the relationship between politics and art.

Nationalist-Conservative Intellectuals (Culturalists)

[488]"*Buna karşılık, Türk şiirinin modernist kanadının, 1960 sonrasında Tarih'le geliştirdiği koyu ilişki, daha geniş bir çerçevenin parçasıdır: Kemalizmin ötesine geçiş, özellikle sosyalist perspektifle birlikte ilgiyi Osmanlı üzerinde yoğunlaştırmaya başlamıştır. Aslında, 1960 1975 arası yazılan şiiri Kemal Tahirden Sencer Divitçioğluna, Barkan'dan Mustafa Akdağ'a, Selahattin Hilav'dan Kıvılcımlı'ya halkaları genişleyen bir zincirin gölgesinde de okumak gerekir."* Enis Batur, *Okuma Lambası* (Istanbul: Alkim, 2004), p. 154.

The nationalist-conservative literary circles were, with all of their diversity, had an important political, ideological position in the period, although the leftist circles were at the center of the literary world with undeniable authority. In the 1960s, Erol Güngör, Mehmet Kaplan, Sezai Karakoç, Tarık Buğra, and Necip Fazıl Kısakürek were part of the cultural life. They generally debated with the leftist intellectuals, contested the leftist hegemony in this realm and attracted especially the youth who supported the nationalist, conservative parties. But there was no intellectual like Peyami Safa, who had harshly struggled with Nazım Hikmet in the 1930s about his articles "*Putları Yıkıyoruz*," which were published in the journal *Resimli Ay*.

Nationalist and conservative intellectuals can be considered in three main categories. First, there were the followers of the tradition of the 1930s nationalist-conservative intellectuals. This tradition depended on the common ground of intellectuals gathered around *Dergâh* journal, such as Yahya Kemal, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Nurettin Topçu, İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and Peyami Safa, all conservative intellectuals who died before the 1960s. Nurettin Topçu, İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and their friends during the 1940s were influential in the artistic world. Tanpınar, who was in an academic position at İstanbul University in the 1960s, was a close friend with many leftist authors of the period. The most significant article after his death was written by Haldun Taner.

However, a significant intellectual of the early Republican period, Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, was still very active during the 1970s and his *Büyük Doğu* review attracted many young University students. *Büyük Doğu* was the leading journal of the nationalist-conservative writers. Necip Fazıl Kısakürek started a witch hunting during

the Babeuf trial of Vedat Günyol and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu,[489] and he labeled them as communist. Kısakürek was the most passionate right-wing intellectual who nearly alone struggled with the leftist intellectuals. He was undeniably part of this conservative, nationalist and anti-communist axis, but an increasingly islamist emphasis can be seen as an extension beyond other author's relatively modern, secular attitudes.

Hareket (Action) review of Nurettin Topçu was also an important ground for nationalist and Islamist reviews. This journal defended an amalgam of various political thoughts. This art review defended an anti communist political position.

Finally, the *Hisarcılar* (Hisar was a monument in Bosphorus, and this circle called by the same name.) defined themselves as being outside of the Maviciler, Birinci Yeniciler, Ikinci Yeniciler and Social Realists. The most knozn members of this movement were Mehmet Çınarlı, İlhan Geçer, Mustafa Necati Karaer, Nüzhet Erman, Yavuz Bülent Bâkiler, Sevinç Çokum, Oyhan Hasan Bıldırki, Gültekin Samanoğlu, M. Necati Özsu, Ayla Oral, Şevket Bulut, M. Fahri Oğuz, Arif Nihat Asya, Tarık Buğra, Mehmet Kaplan, Cemil Meriç, Faik Baysal, Metin And, Hilmi Ziya Ülken, Talat Sait Halman, and Rüştü Şardağ. Their commont point was the fact that they were not socialist. They generally defended themselves outside of this left tradition. They considered socialism an extremist position that was not suitable for Turkish society.

This circle continued to exist by publishing *Hisar* review. This journal was a forum for conservative intellectuals. *Hisar* started to be published in the 1950s, in its

[489]A book of Babeuf, one of the significant figures of the French Revolution was translated and published by Çan Yayınları. Eyuboğlu and Günyol were put on trial for communist propoganda. This case was known as Babeuf trial.

75th issue in January 1957, it was closed for a while. It was started to be republished in January 1964. In December 1980, after its 277th issue, it was definitely closed.

Their literary and political attitude can be summarized as artist has to be independent, art has to be produced in a national context. The language of the artist is the living language. They were against the exaggerations of the purification activities in Turkish language. They thought that it was necessary to be against Western imitators, traditions, and art should not be an instrument of politics and that was necessary to find a solution to the anarchy in the realm of the language.

All of these arguments were defended against the hegemony of the leftist authors. The argument of independence was asserted against left-wing committed writers. The emphasis on nationalism was also raised against the Universalist emphasis of the left-wing authors.

Mehmet Kaplan, Erol Güngör, Tarık Buğra, and Sezai Karakoç were significant conservative intellectuals.

Kaplan as a literary critic participated in many debates with left-wing authors. He felt himself like he was the only representative of the conservative axis in the public sphere.

Sezai Karakoç was a poet who was included to the Second New circle which consisted of many avant-garde, left-wing writers, however, he was also known for his conservative worldview. He even became a leader of a conservative political party.

Tarık Buğra was an important representative of the nationalist, conservative line in the realm of the novel. His novel *Gençliğim Eyvah* was a symbolic critique of the movements of the youth, in an anti-communist line. His novel *Küçük Ağa* (Little Agha) was a more conservative interpretation of the War of Independence. *Firavun*

İmanı was his most ideological novel. He tried to show that USSR helped Turkey in the Independence War in order to make it one of its satellite regimes and he tried to delegitimize this intervention. He defended conservative-nationalist politicians or poets like Mehmet Akif, Hüseyin Avni, and Hasan Basri as against others who were described as having been as soviet agents. Anti communist ideology was represented and defended by him.

Nuri Pakdil, who edited *Edebiyat* (Literature) review between 1972 and 1984, defended an anti-communist political worldview as well as making a critique of Western imperialism, mainly of its cultural adaptation or imitation, and of the capitalist economic system of the West. In this journal he used a more pure Turkish language than other conservative authors.

The class origins of these authors varied, but Anatolian born authors were in the majority. Like the social realists and peasant realists, they focused on rural problems, but the cultural traits were more visible in their works than the social, economic issues. They were also against the underestimation of cultural values.

The nationalist-consevative intellectuals generally identified themselves in contradiction to the leftist tradition of the age, but they were not able to undermine the influence of its dominance. For instance, Cemil Meriç accussed the nationalist and consevative youth of not being able to struggle sufficiently against this leftist production. Mehmet Kaplan expressed his feelings of despair that conservative intellectuals had failed to hold sway over the society, and could not produce as many great works as the left-wing intellectual

CHAPTER SIX

A SOCIOLOGICAL DEBATE

A Conceptualization of Intellectual, Literary and Theoretical Debates in the Literary Reviews, and Analysis of Some Novels

In this chapter, I will focus on the reflections of the social and political issues and debates among novelists, poets, and essayists by classifying and conceptualizing the main debates of the literary world, and the main themes of the works of art of the 1960s and 1970s. I will frame and analyze these debates as well as the political and intellectual backgrounds and intentions behind the works of art .The previous two chapters can be considered as a political and social history of literature. This chapter presents a sociological analysis of this world of literature in related subsections.

As I have already defined my theoretical approach, in the first chapter, according to the Marxian approach, as a synthesis of the Goldmannian and Bourdieusian approaches, works of art produced by their authors, and topics debated were conditioned by the economic, social and intellectual structures of their time, and within these structures, there was always room for human agency. Authors took side with some groups or classes of society as a subject or a supporter in their works as against the others. The question is whether chosen topics, social events, and social classes employed in the works of art can really represent the reality of these people or the way the intellectuals saw or imagine them. As discussed above, to represent reality or the claim that a work of art has close ties with reality is a significant topic of literary studies; in these works of art of my research, a realist approach, a capacity of work of art assumed to reflect social realities should be certainly underlined.

Another important topic was the definition of a work of art as a political and social instrument. When the writers said “people,” they meant the popular classes, poor peasantry, and peasants who had migrated to the peripheries of the cities and participated to the labor process, and these people who did not have good, suitable lives. The writers tried to be their voices. Another permenant subject was the desire for greater social, political and individual freedom, which was restricted and which went generally hand in hand with social inequalities. Then works of art were also designed in order to disseminate beliefs, opinions, and ideological and political ideas. Authors aimed at reaching to a larger public to share their political and social visions with them.

Third, another goal of the artist was to produce a genuine Turkish national art with universal characteristics which could represent Turkey in the international arena.

These metatopics were developed as a condition of the existence of literature which was grasped as an instrument of reflection and transformation of social reality, and a relevant instrument to diffuse ideas and to represent country in the international sphere. Literature’s cognitive, communicative, and therefore social and political aspects were emphasized. A self referential, autonomus structure of literature was rejected as a pure object of aesthetics. It was also unquestionably accepted the research of a content of truth in the work of art.

Poems and novels have the capacity to reflect and represent the spirit of their age, but they were also product of a conscious human agency. As I already suggested, these actors were both the producers and products of the social reality, since they offered to a larger public a representation, an image of the real. Real became what they defined at least for many people. In the first chapter, I constructed a theoretical

framework. In the second and third chapters, social, economic and political conditions were largely dicussed to be able to comprehend literature's concerns, and interrelations. In the fourth and sixth chapters, I presented the history of literature, by framing an overview with all of its dimensions. In this chapter, I will provide a sociological framework with the help of some concepts and dualities to understand this two-dimensional relation of the reality and the work of art, in an effort to transform the reality and the universalit concerns of literature.

To represent and transform reality led to tensions, challenges, diversifications and conflicting visions. Elitist and populist intentions, and many dualities, depend on the efforts to represent reality appropriately. Novels about history were also challenges to the official history and they claimed to bring about the proper reality. The topic of class were raised to criticize the inequalities between these classes and in order to transform these relations.

The relation of writers with social movements was another important dimension of the literature of the period which reflected the spirit of the age. These topics and tensions allow us to understand the intellectual climate which was reflected in the works of art and in the literary identities of the public actors, as a product and producer of the social reality. These topics, concerns, and dualities were revealed in the extensive literary research that conducted for this study.

The Main Topics and Tensions of the Literary Production

Elitism and Populism Debate as an Attemot to Change or to Respect the People's Culture by Its Different Representations

Different politico-literary discourses brought about alternative responses to the representation of Turkish society in the works of literature. A Universalist, humanist discourse defending the Enlightenment heritage and especially socialist ideology which was dominant during this period gave rise to the formation of the main concepts and topics that will be discussed below. Nationalist, conservative, left (nativist or nationalist), Turkish-Islamic synthesis were other politico-literary discourses which struggled with the dominant approach.

In all of these approaches, but mainly in the dominant approach, the representation of the people led to the production of different styles oscillating between a more elitist, and another more populist approach. The tension between modernizing ethos and populism was the main dualism that this section takes as its subject. This duality was also nourished by the gap between the people and the intellectuals. The goal was to close or to preserve this gap which was also assumed to be maintained by the state's cultural policies. The state institutions role to create or to preserve this gap also was debated.

Therefore, the tension between elitism, which worked within the modernization ethos and hence which was characterized by the belief in the necessity and the urgency of education and the role of state institutions for progress, also believed in the existence of a more developed high culture which had to be diffused to

the people even if people were not really prepared. Populism, which argues for the priority of the needs and circumstances and basic cultural beliefs of the people which has to be reflected in and defended as a goal of the work of art is the main one this section will discuss.

The first approach led to the creation of an avant-garde minority who criticized the insufficiency of the people, ordinary men, and urban life, and criticized this to influence and to convince many people to change their cultural habits, intellectual system of beliefs and their religious mentalities by pushing a more modern cultural agenda.

However, there was a second approach that sought to show people's culture as something to be preserved, and this approach criticized the people's social and economic conditions and tried to convince people not live in this way and to desire another life. This approach claimed to increase people's economic and social level for a more egalitarian soceity. Some followers of this approach declared themselves more closely to the people than others by underlining the purity, significance of the peoples' values and the necessity to reflect them. According to them, the problem was the reactionary nature of the people, but the politicians and other social forces that deceived them. This approach may be also interpreted as a different form of elitism. Even if they defended an abstract concept of the people, they did not see them as human actors, or conscious people. Then populist and elitist approaches interacted and was a tension not only between the different approaches of different groups, but also was present within the many associations, circles, reviews, and even in the different works of the same artist.

Two of these approaches rested on the duality between the educated intellectuals and the lower classes, and the communication gap between them.

After the 1960s, an important development was an effort to redefine the distinction between urban and rural lives in a new context by showing especially the class distinctions, instead of the Kemalist ideology which aimed to create a classless society with emphasis of the progressive urban forces who were enlightened and reactionary rural forces, who needed to be enlightened.

Therefore, the duality of progressive and reactionary forces was transformed in the literary production during this period into a problem of underdevelopment based on social and economic inequalities as something to be transformed. It was questioned as something to be resolved by proposing models other than the Kemalist constitutive, official ideology. There were always however traces of the Kemalist perception even if an approach based on class differences was developed.

In this period, populist tendencies had more visibility in the speeches and writings of some notable intellectuals, and authors. For example, İdris Küçükömer, in 1974, criticized that they could even argue the principle of *halka rağmen devrimcilik ilkesi*"(The idea of revolution without the desire of people). Tunaya reminds the argument of Lütfi Fikri Bey who says in the nineteenth century that "*Türkiye'de bir umumi efkar yoktur ama bir hassasiyeti umumiye vardır.*" (In Turkey, there is not a public opinion but there is a public sensitivity) He takes the Turkish experience of political democracy as an example of democracy which lacked a social basis. According to him, public opinion had won the status of a constitutional institution, and modern public opinion had started tocome into being. His expression "*Halksız bir devrim yumurtasız omlete benzer*," (A revolution without people resembles to an

omelet without eggs) is very significant to the extent that it attests to the level of populism in that period.

Karaosmanoğlu still thought that, people are living in a degree, they can't promote their levels on their own; someone has to help them. According to him and some others, the revolutions of Atatürk had to be completed and fortified with social and economic measures to be able to prevent aggressions against laicity, education campaigns should be organized, heavy-industry had to be seen as necessary for economic development, and the emerging ultra nationalism has to be stopped.[490] Orhan Hançerlioğlu, in *Varlık Yıllığı* of 1961, wrote: "art will not go to the public; bring the people to art if it's not too much trouble."[491] But as the years passed, the principle of "to bring art to the people" became dominant.

In the 1960s, the conception of *halka rağmenlik* (in spite of people) ceases to be a viable one and a consensus grew on the necessity of closing the gap between the people, the intellectuals and the bureaucratic elites. This can be seen as the reflection of the struggle between bureaucratic elites and the emerging business circles. In this struggle, the intellectuals and bureaucates needed the support of the people. This interpretation may be an underestimation of the romantic intentions of the youth and intellectuals to change the unjust and inequal conditions of the masses.

In this period, intellectuals tried to exceed the problem of isolating themselves from the "public," "mass" and "uncultivated people." But, they tended to think in terms of the antagonism between the intellectuals and the people. The first and the

---

[490] "Milliyet'den Seçmeler Dizisi," 1973 yılı, "*Düşünenlerin Forumu*, Ali Gevgilili, Katılımcılar:Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Tarık Zafer Tunaya, İdris Küçükömer, Mehmet Kaplan. (Istanbul: Milliyet Yayınları:1974), pp: 152-166.

[491]"*Sanat halka gitmeyecektir; zahmet olmazsa halkı sanata getiriniz.*" Orhan Hançerlioğlu, *Varlık Yıllığı 1961* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961), p. 165.

second generation of intellectuals of the Republican period saw themselves as the pioneers and elites of society. For instance, to increase the educational level of the entire society, to augment and to enlarge the cultural institutions were propositions of the 1940s generation intellectuals at the macro level.[492]

Kemal Karpat, a social scientist, focused on this duality between the people and the intellectuals. For instance, in 1962, in the *Varlık Yıllığı*, Yaşar Nabi Nayır raised a question to many authors, in his collective survey, "Why have been we living a crisis of regime in our country in the last years? How we can resolve this problems?"[493]

The answer of Kemal Karpat was focused mainly on the early Republican era on the seperation between intellectuals and people, and the intricate relationship between the state and intellectuals. However, Turkey was still oscillating between the elitist and populist tendencies, and it is in this context that Kemal Karpat emphasized the communication gap between the classes based on cultural differences. According to him: "the gap between the people and intellectuals is more profound.The intellectual who ruled and the people who were ruled continued to exist as two distinct social classes whose tastes, cultural levels, and life styles and standards were completely different."[494] This gap was especially tried to be transcended by the men of

---

[492]"*Toplumun eğitilmesi, kültürel kurumların çoğaltılıp yaygınlaştırılması 1940s entelektüellerinin makro düzeydeki önerileri"* Levent Cantek, *Cumhuriyetin Buluğ Çağı* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008).

[493]"*Ülkemizde neden son yıllarda bir rejim buhranı yaşamaktayız, bu sorunu nasıl aşabiliriz'dir.*" Yaşar Nabi Nayır, " Collective Survey," *Varlık Yıllığı 1961* (Varlık Yayınları: İstanbul, 1962), p. 167-177.

[494]"*Halk ile aydın arasında mesafe çok daha derindir ve idare eden aydın ile idare edilen halkın birbirlerinden tamamen kopuk bir şekilde yetiştiklerini, kültür seviyesi ve anlayışları, hayat standartları birbirinden alabildiğine ayrıştığı iki sosyal grup olarak varolduklarını vurgulamaktadır.*" Kemal Karpat, *Varlık Yıllığı 1961* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961), p. 170, 171.

letters. According to him, they were not completely elitist or they were not estranged from society, like the other state representatives. According to him, these writers tried to convince society to accept Western values, but unlike the others, they interpreted these values in a completely new way so that the people could understand.[495]

Kemal Karpat, in *Social Topics in Turkish Literature,*[496] wrote that there had always been an intention to close the gap between the people and intellectuals in the Turkish literature and social topics had been at the center. In the Ottoman, Islamic tradition, there were two main tendencies, one tradition was Yunus Emre's popular tradition and the literature of *tekke* (Islamic religion's different sects), another one was the tradition adopting French Romanticism after the Tanzimat period unlike the political trend influenced from British hegemony. *Kadro hareketi* (Kadro Movement), *Yedi Meşaleciler* (Seven Torchers, An early Republican literary trend of the 1930s and 1940s), *Köy Romanı* (Peasant Novels) attempted to resolve these problems. The tradition of Nazım Hikmet and Sabahattin Ali were considered by Karpat to be a significant one to resolve this problem but they were considered to be politically extreme by the political authorities.

He also wrote that a new and autonomus generation of intellectuals was coming to the fore and that they sought to go beyond this distinction between intellectuals, artists, and the people. He said that first class authors had come to the fore, like Orhan Kemal, Kemal Tahir, Yaşar Kemal, Samim Kocagöz and İlhan Tarus,

---

[495] Kemal Karpat, *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular*, (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1971, pp 30-58.

[496]Kemal Karpat's article "Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatında Konular" was first presented in Harvard University, in June 1959. This article was published in the first number of the *Middle East Journal*. Later, this artıcle was translated in the Türkish by the help of Ülkü Tamer. In December 1962, Kemal Tahir wrote an introduction about the events of 27 May, to the book titled *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular*.

and the most important particularity of them was their objective, realist narratives depending on observations about the everyday lives of the ordinary people. He thought that they had created a new world in the literature, and they had begun to shape the reality of the country. They supported the political struggles for the democratization of the country.[497]

This generation, very different from the earlier one was the generation of Turkish intellectuals who had been educated by the early Republican institutions and became politically engaged during their university education, and the social events of the 1960s. They became the artists and intellectuals of the 1960s and 1970s.

These intellectuals, who are the main focus of this dissertation, had a very different relationship with the state. They achieved more autonomy from the state authority. They were open-minded intellectuals. A considerable number of them came from poor, peasant families, and thus were able to distance themselves from elitism. The intellectuals of the early years of the Republic who had been born at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth centuries were labeled as *vesayetçi* and *velayetçi* (constitutive and supervisor), but the new generation played a totally different role. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, the new generation was aware of the failures of the earlier generation, and sought alternative solutions.

[497]Ibid.

The Reactions of the Four Main Categories of Writers

First, the followers of the first generation of foundators, disciples of İsmail Hakkı Tonguç, Hasan Ali Yucel, Nurullah Ataç, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, and Şevket Süreya Aydemir, were intellectuals like Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Azra Erhat, Vedat Günyol, who were defenders of *Mavi Anadoluculuk* (Blue Anatolianism) and, Yaşar Nabi Nayır and Orhan Hançerlioğlu, who were prone to the approach that suggests revolutions should be accepted by the people, by the way of education and cultural production.

This approach was very important and influential for many intellectuals, but this left Kemalist, humanist, universalist discourse was criticized for its elitist conception and insufficient consequences in the early decades, yet it remained forceful. The synthesis of *Mavi Anadoluculuk* can be defined as a more populist approach from this ideological world. Other figures like Orhan Hançerlioğlu andYaşar Nabi Nayır were more strictly elitist and conventional and they worked for the formation of an avant-garde intellectual minority who would raise the country's common level.

These authors produced cultural instruments such as journals and books in order to enlighten Turkish society. Nayır's journal and publishing house *Varlık* may be defined as one of the most successful and durable cultural forums for the introduction of new ideas. Hançerlioğlu wrote many reference books and dictionaries as a modern Ahmet Mithat Efendi who was mentioned above.

A notable member of the Blue Anatolians circle, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, produced many articles about the concept of the people. He contemplated the

representation of the people in works of art. He disapproved of the intellectual attitude which underestimated the wealth of the popular classes and peasantry. Another issue was to communicate with people through art. He wrote:

> O People Mother, Beatiful Mother, Generous Mother, Blind Mother, all your delusions have not made you collapse because they always deluded you for the sake of right, for the sake of truthfulness. The happy world which you missed in the swamps you'd fallen into, always stood before you like the venus. We would not praise you just because you have been deluded but we have no right to decry you either. Ugly delusion, filthy delusion is the delusion of those who suppose that they would arrive at happiness by deluding you. It is those exploitative, reptilian, reactionary delusions which fall abundantly and continuously from your back as you awake. The unhappiness of being deluded for the sake of people is preferable to the happiness of those delude for the sake of right.[498]

Eyuboğlu glorified the people's values in many of his articles. He was criticized for proposing an abstract concept of people that did not disintegrate the classes and interest groups. His abstraction can be seen as a folkloric and optimist attempt to balance Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's and Reşat Nuri Güntekin's (leading novelist of the Early Republican period) perceptions of the ignorant and reactionary masses of people.

Second, as is discussed above, although Sabahattin Ali, Nazım Hikmet and Zekeriya Sertel were under repression in the early decades, their followers in the 1960s were at the core of the intellectual life and their Marxist, populist, egalitarian discourse was even hegemonic. In this approach, populist admirations of the people,

---

[498] "*Ey Halk Ana, Güzel Ana, Cömert Ana, Kör Ana, bütün aldanışların yıkmadı seni; çünkü hep hak uğruna, doğruluk adına aldattılar seni. Düştüğün bataklarda özlediğin mutlu dünya hep kaldı önünde çoban yıldızı gibi. Aldandığın için seni övecek değiliz ama yermeye da hakkımız yok. Çirkin aldanış, iğrenç aldanış, seni aldatmakla mutluluğa ereceğini sananların aldanışıdır. Sen uyandıkça sırtından sapır sapır dökülen o sömürgen, o sürüngen, o gerici aldanışlardır. Halk uğruna aldanmanın mutsuzluğu, hak adına aldatanın mutluluğuna yeğdir."* Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, "Halka Güven," *Yeni Ufuklar Dergisi*, no.134 (July), *Türk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1966), p. 10.

in order to convince them of the left politics were visible. Yaşar Kemal as an important representative of this circle shared a very similar approach to that of Eyuboğlu: "The most considerable, the most creative thing is the people. It is possible that he goes in the contrary direction. The mission of the socialists is not to say that the 'people are ignorant, bad, they cannot succeed anything, only evil'."[499]

The discourse of Aziz Nesin however differed from that of Kemal. In his satiric short-stories, he severely criticized the people's attitude as going along with the right wing politicians,. He also criticized the egoism and conformism of the large masses of people, but he also underlined the roles of some social actors, state officers as deceivers of the masses. But it is not possible to observe a superficial appreciation of the people's values. For socialist authors, the most important fact was to create a work which presented relevant information about the reality of society which was divided into social classes. To show this reality could lead to the awakening of the social classes. They also propagated principles such as equality and freedom. It was impossible to criticize them as being elitist, but also as they argued that they know the truth about the reality they define themselves above society. To defend the people's values as pure and unchangeable was also unacceptable for them, but to be able to have relations with the masses, they had to acknowledge their beliefs.

Third, modernist authors like Cemal Süreya, Edip Cansever and Memet Fuat defended an avant-garde, modernist literature. They argued that their products were not obstacles to going to the people, but they stressed the aesthetic, individual dimensions of works of art. They emphasize the role of art in the personal

[499] "*En büyük, en güzel yaratıcı halktır. Ters yollara gittiği, aldatıldığı da çok olmuştur. Sosyalistin işi halk kötüdür, cahildir, o hiçbir şeyi beceremez kötülükten başka demek değildir."* Yaşar Kemal, "Halk, Sanat, Politika," *Ant*, no 123, (6 May1969), p. 15.

emancipation of the writer and they resisted the approach that reduced works of art to social projects. For instance, Cemal Süreya was a defender of a modernist, avant-garde art. He criticized social realist, populist writer for underestimating their work and the autonomous and aesthetic dimensions of art.

Last, Kemal Tahir, as a result of his unique approach, had a very original attitude concerning this subject. According to him, for instance, the people were not consulted on land reform; this was a project of the middle class intellectuals. If there was no such demand, this project would only have been some kind of benevolence or a temporary reward. These reforms could only be the result of the accumulations of the socio-economic life which had come into existence as a result of the rational, real powers.[500]

Tahir argued that intellectuals sought to force this transformation through their works, but the economic and social structures of the country were not ready. He criticized the role of intellectuals as substitutes for the social classes, and their project, which was not dependent on social powers. He also criticized authors who represent the people as pure, uncorrupted, precious actors, but this does not conform to the reality because as other social classes, people, peasants or workers were also heterogenous and could not be exaggerated.

Like Pierre Bourdieu who held that to accept the superiority or purity of the culture of the popular classes is no less dangerous than to aim at the negation of all

[500] "*Köy reformunda halkın fikri sorulmuyor, bir kısım orta sınıftan gelan aydınımızın projesidir, boyle bir talep yokken, böyle bir adım sadakadan bahşişten öteye geçmez…Kaldı kim tarihte genel olarak reformlarm sosyo ekonomik hayatın temelinde biriken, sonra yize çıkan isteklerin, rasyonel, gerçek güçlerin sonuçlarıdır...*" Kemal Tahir, "Survey," *Yeni Ufuklar*, (Octobre, Novembre 1960).

popular cultures,[501] popular cultures could not be defended instead of a "high culture," and vice versa. This different approch argued for a more suitable synthesis of popular and high culture elements.

The Limits of High Culture

The role and limits of high culture in society may be debated, but the aim of the modernist, left-wing intellectuals was to build a more common level to be shared by a larger number of people. In this process of creating a more common level of cultural life in Turkey, can be seen a synthesis of the increasing populist motivations and elitist tendencies of the early Republican period, which were questioned during these years.

As mentioned, the main goal of the writers was to represent the reality in which society was living, to reach to the people through their works of art and to produce universal and significant works of art which would be part of the universal culture, to make Turkish art part of the universal or high culture and to create a Turkish audience who would be capable of understanding high culture's works of art. These all claims may produce conflicts in populist motivations and elitist tendencies. Efforts to reflect society's reality or to reach to people may conflict with the claims to produce works with undeniable aesthetic qualities, to be part of universal, international cultural world, and to support a minority which would be only capable

---

[501] *"La tentation de preter la coherence d'une esthetique systematique aux prises de position objectivement esthetiques des classes populaires n'est pas moins dangereuse la representation strictement negative de la vision populaire…"* Pierre Bourdieu, *Les Règles de l'art. Genèse et Structure du Champ Littéraire* (Paris: Seuil, 1992).

of understanding the quality of modernist works.

Different circles of the period reflected these tensions to changing degrees. They debated these differences between them. Four writers, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Yaşar Kemal, Cemal Süreya, and Kemal Tahir were all part of these debates and their differences and their agendas on these topics show us the richness of the period. Their common point was to consider works of art as a tool capable of transmitting reality. Even Süreya, the most modernist author believed this. They wanted to be read by a larger public, but their methods were different, they also debated the ways to attain international popularity. But all of them seriously contemplated these topics and they oscillated between ways to be read by a larger public and to produce works of universal quality. They generally proposed different synthesis to resolve this problem.

This debate was closely related to another debate about Turkish society's definition as a political, social and cultural totality and its relations to foreign cultures, especially that of the West. There was always assumed a real tension between the national, native culture and Western colonialist, imperialist culture.

Dualities in the Evolution of the Turkish Literature

Many dualities, like the universality vs. nativity, the Eastern-Western debate; the problems of underdevelopment (the differences between developed and underdeveloped countries) and the actual mode of production of the country (capitalism, socialism); individualism and social realism all interrelatedly affected the evolution of the Turkish literature. In the 1960s, public political debates were largely determined by two principal axes, with the nationalists and conservatives on the one

hand with their emphasis on the particularities of Turkey, on its internal dynamics thereby focusing on issues of identity, or culture in general and a subsequent will to derive of the social from the cultural, and the modernists (including all four categories of the dominant literary trends of the time) on the other hand, with their emphasis on social progress, economic development and equality and the subsequent derivation of the cultural from the social. In tune with these frameworks, the modernists sided with universal values, generally equated with Western culture as the more universally taken sphere of cultural be related to further progress, whereas nationalists or traditionalists in general worked with a more determinate set of values unique to the nation's, or the community's context, as the search for identity would necessitate such a delimited cultural understanding.

Nationalist or nativist and modernist or universalistic conceptions cannot be considered in isolation. They define themselves to a certain extent in opposition, and in relation to each other. In the light of these definitions, we can analyze the status of Turkey. The concept of universalism has always been the total determination and the hegemony of Western civilization, especially for the most Turkish intellectuals. Moreover, internationalization is not antithetical to "Turkish culture"; rather, it is both a product of and central to the ongoing (since the Tanzimat period) formation of a national cultural identity. On the other hand, the main theme of this process was the differences between Eastern and Western ethics and culture, an issue that had been the subject of an intense controversy among Turkish intellectuals since the Tanzimat period.

A cultural, conservative axis was always part of this modernization process. Throughout the history of Republican Turkey, thinkers of nationalist, conservative

ideology like Peyami Safa, İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and Yahya Kemal defended moral and national values in line with the Republican modernization to show the handicaps of this process. Some of them also sought for a synthesis of the Western and Eastern cultures, like Hilmi Ziya Ülken and Yahya Kemal who proposed a synthesis of *Anadoluculuk* (Anatolianism).[502]

The Duality of East and West, and Universalism and Nativism in the Context of the 1960s

However, in the 1960s, although this conflict was felt in politics, this confrontation did not have too much impact on the literary realm where the socialist hegemony was the main trend. Socialist authors focused on the unjust and unequal organizations of social life and the social classes. They always argued that Turkey was an underdeveloped society and its problems depended on this fact.

Some leftist thinkers produced a similar tension between Eastern and Western societies and they defended a more nationalistic vision than that of the Universalist hegemony of the day. For instance, Kemal Tahir, who had been accused of being a communist, and who had been held in prison for several years, represented a culturalist approach different from that of the political conservatives or nationalist intellectuals but sharing some common points with them. The particularity of Turkish society and its culture, based on its tradition was the main argument of culturalist position that stressed the incompatibility of the two different paths; that is, the

[502]There were two circles who defended the sythesis of Anadoluculuk; Yahya Kemal's line was a more conservative line, and the other line was Eyuboğlu's modernist line.

defender and producer of the universal and material culture, namely, the West, and the East, which defined itself at the same time as the West desired to identify with the East and its concepts, but according to him, the East should identify itself with its own set of values, not those of the West.

Attilâ İlhan was another author who sought for a synthesis for Turkish society and one against the concept of cultural imperialism; he defended a national, native culture which has its roots in the Eastern cultural world to which Turkey belonged. In his works and articles, it is also possible to observe a political vision of Thirld Worldism.

In the "leftist" intellectual atmosphere of the 1960s, Kemal Tahir and Attila İlhan were the main defenders of nativity and nationalism from a left-wing position. However, even if Tahir's and İlhan's position were nativist, social and economic factors were at the center of their works. For instance, Tahir, in his famous book *Devlet Ana*, (Mother State) defended a genuine mode of production for Turkey. Unlike nationalist and conservative intellectuals, Tahir attempted to deepen his analysis of nativity by basing it on the differences in the mode of production. However, he criticized universalist, humanist, and westernized intellectuals. He answered to a Collective Survey in 1960 about the fundamentalism:

> The useful knowledge for our country is not to use at random what we learn from foreign languages, but to render them national in order to identify the qualities of our nation. Today the majority of our intellectuals are trying to assimilate or fit the knowledge acquired from outside.[503]

[503] *"Memleketimiz için faydalı bilgi yabancı dillerden öğrendiklerimizi gelişigüzel bir şekilde kullanmak değil, milletimizin özelliklerini tespit için milli kılabilmektir. Bugün aydınlarımızın çoğunluğu dışardan edinilmiş bilgileri benzetmeye, yakıştırmaya çalışıyorlar."* Kemal Tahir, "Survey," *Yeni Ufuklar* (January 1960).

He wanted to create a mosaic of the Turkish and Anatolian spirit. He wrote that this was the most important point, and that the sociologists and historians of Turkey had not yet produced the research and the novelist had to be interested in the history of his country in order to create this mosaic.[504] He resisted the leftist intellectuals who argued that the problem was the underdevelopment of Turkey. He argues that there was no underdevelopment. Even if there were, the Anatolian people were not underdeveloped. He insisted on the particularities of Turkish society which had not to be categorized as underdeveloped in comparison with the Western countries.

In the most important examples of the Turkish novels, the actual problems stemming from the Western imitation and the conflicts of the Western values with Turkish customs and traditions were represented. But as argued:

> Especially after the 1960s, this problem was considered in a completely different manner. The differences between the moral values of the Turkish intellectuals and Western ones were not contradicted in this period. On the contrary, the problem was based on an economic plan. They wanted to change the system of exploitation of Western imperialism. Some writers argued the superiority of the Ottoman system over the West, as in *Devlet Ana* of Kemal Tahir.[505]

Devlet Ana may be considered the best example of these debates. But İlhan's works were also based on the Turkish and Eastern countries differences from the Western societies.

---

[504] Kemal Tahir, Orhan Kemal, Fakir Baykurt, Mahmut Makal, Talip Apaydın, *Beş Romancı Tartışıyor* (Istanbul: Düşün Yayınevi, 1960). A conference held in 1959 by the review *Pazar Postası*.

[505]"*Özellikle 1960'lardan sonra sorun değişik bir yaklaşımla ele alınmaktadır. Türk toplumunun ahlaksal değerleriyle Batınınkiler arasındaki ayrımlar üzerinde durulmuyor. Bunun yerine konu ekonomik düzlemde ele alınıyor. Batının sömürü düzenini değiştirmek istiyorlar. Kimi yazarlar Batı karşısında Osmanlı toplumunun yapısının üstünlüğünü belirtiyorlar: Kemal Tahir'in Devlet Ana romanında olduğu gibi*." Osman Türkay*, Edebiyat, Eleştiri ve Dil Üzerine Düşünceler* (Kıbrıs: KKTC Milli Eğitim ve Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1993), pp: 180 181.

There were other intellectuals who defended this approach of nativity, for instance, Osman Arolat asked to Sencer Divitçioglu to define the actual circumstances of Turkish art. Sencer Divitçioglu replied that the main tendencies in Turkish art was first a tendency to reduce Turkish society's reality to the reality of Western bourgeois society. Another tendency is to find the essential traces of the Turkish society. According to him, to produce a socialist work of art was only possible by reflecting the realities of Turkey. He said that the works of art produced by Robbe Grillet, Ionesco and Alain Resnais were not suitable for Turkey.[506]

The debate which was a product of this duality was called the National Culture debate and the influences of the West in Turkish literature. These debates were mentioned in the article of Memet Fuat in the almanacs of Turkish literature, with the title of Turkish Literature in 1965. In this almanac, this debate was carried out by severel writers.[507] For instance, Mehmet Fuat, on 4 january 1967, made a speech which made every year about poetry, short story and essay, focusing on the debate about cultural imperialism in the Cultural Center of Germany.[508] He insisted on the need for a moderate approach. He said that to imitate or to deny Western culture were both extreme approaches.

An article by Mihri Belli, "Ulusal Devrimci Kültür" (National revolutionary culture) reflected the spirit of the age. An important figure of the left, and the socialist movement, Mihri Belli, synthesized three main elements: anti-imperialism, social

---

[506]Sencer Divitçioglu, *Ant*, no. 63 (12 March 1968), p 15.

[507]Memet Fuat, " 1965'de Türk Edebiyatı," in *Mehmet Fuat'ın seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1965* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1966).

[508]Mehmet Fuat, "1967'de Türk Edebiyatı," in *Mehmet Fuat'in sectikleri Turk Edebiyati 1967* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1966).

realism and nativity. In addition to a literature which was prone to Marxist-Leninist principles, a nationalist emphasis was added. He thought that a nationalist concern had to be at the center of the socialist struggle as a part of his strategy of revolution, which was called MDD. (National Democratic Revolution) [509]

Sabahattin Eyuboğlu was very critical of these debates of National Culture. He thought that this debate led to an attack and an underestimation of the Western cultures. He said that it was not plausible to argue that Western countries were economically exploitative, but they were also imperialists in a cultural manner. He thought that the hostility against imperialism led to the hostility to Western culture. The entire culture of the West could not be reduced to the concept of imperialism. He certainly appreciated Western culture as a source of a high, universal, profound artistic culture.

There was also a search for a synthesis between Western and national cultures along Eyuboğlu's line. These efforts for a native and universal synthesis are known as Blue Anatolians, a radical modernist synthesis already discussed. They emphasized the significance of Ancient Anatolian civilizations and they provided an anti-chuvinist intellectual line. The philosophy of *Anadoluculuk* of these intellectuals investigated ways to transform Anatolian peasantry into progressive and dynamic citizens. They also invented or constructed an ideal figure of the Turkish people as a part and defender of the Western or Enlightenment cultural heritage.

As discussed above, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu was an important intellectual who supported the TLP. He was arrested druing the coup d'état regime of 12 March 1971.

---

[509]Mihri Belli, "Ulusal Devrimci Kültür," in *Yazılar 1965 1970* (İstanbul: Sol Yayınları, 1970), pp. 257, 273.

He had problems with the political authorities. He represented the attitude of the left-wing Kemalist intellectual who wanted to transform Turkey's educational and intellectual systems as a need to reach to the level of Westen Universal civilization. He was fervently against the attitude that considered works of art of the Western authors as a product of Western imperialism.

Sabahattin Eyüboğlu's book *Mavi ve Kara* (Blue and Black)'s first edition in 1967 was a collection of his essays which reflects his humanist and populist approach.[510] This book represents the humanist, populist style of the circle on this subject. The debates about Western Imperialism continued during all these years, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu and the other humanist authors of the period were always against the tendency which denied Western culture as a part of Western imperialism. Eyuboğlu makes distinctions between Western Universal culture and Western exploitation over the underdeveloped countries.[511] According to him, culture was always dominated by critical artists and intellectuals. When they talked about the western culture, they always talked about this culture produced by writers, not the culture of the kings, sultans and business men. For instance, the prominent intellectual of France, Jean Paul Sartre, or Russel, who was a British author, served the Western imperialism. Even to ask this question, according to him, was not acceptable. He

[510]Sabahattin Eyuboglu, *Mavi ve Kara*, (1940-1973, Essays), (Istanbul: Ataç Kitabevi, 1967).

[511] "*Madem Batı sömürgendir, Batı kültürü de sömürgenliğin buyruğundadır; emperyalistlerin kılıcı ve kültürü aynı şeydir; ikisi aynı yıkılası gücün iki ayrı belirtisidir, diyor, demek istiyor Kültür emperyalizmi kavramını ciddiye alan aydınlarımız. A kardeş, madem öyle niçin oğlunu, kızını Batılı okullara, hem de Batının en geri papaz okullarına verirsin, Fransızca, İngilizce öğrenmeye çalışırsın, Arapça, Farsça öğrenecek yerde? Üstelik Batı kültürünün çiçeği, şanı, şerefi olan Karl Marx'ın da hayranısın. Ya o da haklı görünüp dolambaçlı yollardan emperyalizme hizmet ediyorsa?"*Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 186 (November 1968), p. 13, in Memet Fuat, *Türk Edebiyatı 1968* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi 1967), p. 10.

criticized authors who transformed hostility against imperialism to the hostility against the culture of Western countries.[512]

Onat Kutlar, Güzin Dino and Pertev Naili Boratav also said that,

> Nazım Hikmet once said that "I see myself as a heir not only of the Turkish culture, but all the cultures of humanity." When I say culture, I mean not only Greek and Reneissance culture, but also the cultures of Asia, Africa, and America. Openness to all experiments, settling account with all experiments is the duty of great and courageous artists….True artists do not accept the narration of either the West and the East or of the dead traditions, and they do not dance to their pipe. These are the fears and nightmares of those who cannot be artists.[513]
>
> If we oppose the West in the cultural field, that means we oppose many things. We should be very careful in this regard. We not only oppose Hegel and Descartes, but also Marx and Engels…. If these figures are not opposed, if they are not going to be opposed, then who is going to be opposed? Are not they an indispensable part of Western culture?[514]
>
> Not to fear the West, to resist its culture, politics and imperialist coercion. But on the other hand, not to avoid the values of the Western culture, the values of Descartes, Hegel and Marx. Secondly, we should look without fear not only into the Western culture, but also into our own. [515]

---

[512]"*Hayır, diyeceksin, onun gibi Batılı filozoflar, bilginler emperyalizmin karşısındadırlar. Peki, Batı kültürünün asıl temsilcileri onlar değil de, emperyalizme uşaklık etmiş filozoflar, bilginler, sanatçılar mıdır? Kültür dediğimiz şey Batıda olsun, Doğu'da olsun krallara, sultanlara, para babalarına inat doğruluktan, insanlıktan yana olan, bu uğurda canlarını bile verebilen insanların yarattıkları değer değil midir? Bugünkü Fransa'nın en büyük kültür adamı Sartre, bugünkü İngiltere'nin en büyük kültür adamı Russel emperyalizme mi hizmet etmekteler? Sorulması bile ayıp sorular bunlar; ama sormak zorunda kalıyor insan, emperyalizm düşmanlığının kültür düşmanlığına çevrilmesini önlemek için."*Ibid.

[513]*"Kendini sadece Türk kültürünün değil, insanlığın tüm kültürlerinin mirasçısı bir kimse gibi görüyorum" diyordu Nazım Hikmet. Kültürden söz ettiğim zaman sadece Grek ya da Rönesans kültürünü değil, Asyanın, Afrikanın ve Amerikanın da kültürlerini kastediyorum. Bütün deneylere açıklık, bütün deneylerle hesaplaşma büyük ve yürekli sanatçıların harcıdır…Gerçek sanatçılar için ne batının, ne doğunun, ne de ölü geleneklerin anlatımını benimsemek, onların dümen suyunda eser vermek söz konusu değildir. Bunlar sanatçı olmayanların korkuları, karabasanlarıdır."* Onat Kutlar, "Ulusal Türk Sineması ve Çıkış Yolları Üzerine Soruşturma," *Ant*, no. 80, (9 July 1968), p.14.

[514]*"Biz Batı'ya karşı kültür alanında cephe alacaksak çok şeye karşı cephe alıyoruz. Bu konuda çok dikkatli olmak gerek. Yalnız Hegel'e, Descartes'a karşı cephe almıyoruz, Marx'a, Engels'e karşı da cephe alıyoruz... Eğer bunlara karşı cephe alınmıyorsa, alınmayacaksa kime karşı cephe alınacak, Batı kültürünün bunlar ayrılmaz birer parçası değil mi?"* Güzin Dino, "Emperyalist Niteliği Olmayan Kültür," *Ant*, no. 23, (6 June 1967), p.15.

[515]*"Batı'dan korkmamak, kültürüne karşı olsun, politikasına karşı olsun emperyalist baskısına direnmek. Ama beri taraftan, batı kültürünün değerlerinden, Descartes'ından, Hegel'inden,*

Statements by the notable intellectuals such as Onat Kutlar, Güzin Dino and Pertev Nail Boratav reflect the search for a synthesis between Western and national cultures, and an awareness about the socialist thinkers of the West. These socialist intellectuals were defenders of the humanist and socialist heritage of the Western cultural world, and they thought that Turkey had become permanently distanced from its traditional ties. They did not see Turkish society distinct from the Western countries as a result of its heritage, religion or autonomous culture, and they make distinctions between countries as they existed at different levels of development and indifferent modes of productions.

The Problems of Underdevelopment in a Modern Country

In addition to the East-West debate, the problems of the underdevelopment of Turkish society were regularly discussed. Severel writers asserted that Turkey was an underdeveloped and capitalist society, and this underdevelopment led also to the underdevelopment of Turkish art and literature.

For instance, Doğan Hızlan in his article "Gelişme Döneminde bir Ülkede Yazar" (A Writer in a Developing Country) said that, "In an underdeveloped country, the most important handicape of the writer is the difficulty of making connections with the literature that he was trying to produce, and the tradition of literature created before himself." His important critique adressed the insufficiency of the academic

---

Marx'ından çekinmemek İkincisi yanlız Batı kültürüne değil, kendi geçmiş kültürümüze de korkmadan, ürkmeden eğilmek gerek." Pertev Naili Boratav, "Kültür eksikliğimizi Nasıl Tamamlarız?" *Ant*, no. 24 (13 June 1967), p.15.

institutions. According to him, Turkey was neither like Asian countries which continued an old, taditional and static regime, nor like African post colonial countries which were constructing their nation states. This was a hopeless and a very conflicted situation. In Turkey, writers did not know why, how and what they wrote. They wrote unconsciously like a dervish who was ecstatic. But in developed countries, there were more determinate circles which had many common points.[516]

Hızlan conceptualized the most fundemantal complex of the inferiority of Turkish art to Western art, which was admired, followed, and envied as a problem resulting from economic factors, instead of defining it as a story of cultural difference between two civilizations or, simply individual failure.

On the same topic, Demir Özlü wrote another article, *"Az Gelişmiş Ülkelerde Hikaye Roman Sorunu."* (The Problem of Short Story and Novel in the Underdeveloped Countries).[517] He insisted that, "The tradition on which we are based is collapsed a long time ago."[518] He insisted that the old tradition had lost its freshness. A new tradition has to be created. Orhan Duru also wrote an article about this subject. A dichotomy between tradition and modern civilization was underlined

---

[516] "*Gelişme çağındaki bir ülke yazarının başlıca elverişsizliği; yazdığı, yaratma çabasında bukunduğu edebiyatla kendinden önceki sanat geleneği arasında bir ilgi kuramayışıdır. Türkiye ne Asya ülkeleri gibi eski ve belli bir düzeni sürdürmekte, ne de Afrika ülkeleri gibi bir sömürge dönemimden bağımsız ulus durumuna geçmektedir. Bunun sonucunda durum bir bakıma daha umut verici ama bir bakıma da daha açmazlarla doludur. Ülkemizde bir yazarın kendine sorun niçin, niye, kimin için yazdığıdır. Çoğunlukla geri kalmış bir ülkede yazar bilinçle yazmak yerine cezbeye tutulmuş bir derviş gibi yazmaktadır. Gelişkin bir edebiyatta beliren uçlar, aynı eğilimde ortak noktaları çok, birçok özellikleri birbirine benzer yazar kümelerine rastlanır."* Doğan Hızlan, "*Gelişme Döneminde bir Ülkede Yazar* - A Writer in a Developing Country," *Yapraklar,* No. 64 (October) p. 3. In *Turk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayinevi, 1965), p. 172.

[517] *"Bizim bağlı bulunduğumuz eski kültür yıkılıdı çoktan"*, Demir Özlü, *Yapraklar*, no. 64, (September) in *Türk Edebiyatı 1964*, (Istanbul: De Yayinevi, 1965), p. 176.

[518] "*Gelenek diriğiliğini yitirmiştir*." Ibid., p. 184.

by many authors.[519] These authors generally defended the values of civilization (European culture) and agreed that the old tradition lost its liveliness. They also believed that Turkey had transformed into a modern but undeveloped society and got rid of the traces of a traditional, religious culture. This modern society's main duality was not a cultural, but a social one, the problems based on the underdeveopment of economic and social system. This approach, in 1967, was proposed by Behramoğlu, a young poet:

> The problems of literature, there was a linguistic and cultural problem which is peculiar to the Turkish society. It is difficult to have real ties with the past. We read Halit Ziya, Tevfik Fikret with a dictionary. The government is the enemy of culture; it is in the control of a comprador bourgeoisie. Intellectuals have not given up their habits from the pre-1960s. Our intellectuals' conception of literature is very poor because of the insufficiency of their instruction and a lack of a literary tradition.[520]

Behramoğlu was a good example of social realist author who thought that the problems stemmed from the capitalist system and that the main problem was not that of nativity, but a result of the inequalities between classes.

In 1964, Melih Cevdet Anday reflected the spirit of the period in his article which focused on a need for the creation of a new tradition in respect to the historical evolution of the society:

> I argue that in literature, if we are against tradition, or we are part of this tradition, it is not a gift. A tradition is created by the artists of society. The first condition for the creation of a tradition is to consider art as something existing outside of us, but a common structure that we are also existing only within. A

---

[519] *"Değişen dünya anlayışı, değişen günlük yaşama biçimi, değişen toplum yapısı, değişen ekonomi koşulları içinde insanımız gözlerini kendini besleyen kaynaktan ayırmayacaktır. Bu kaynak da gelenek değil çağdaş hayattır."* Konur Ertop, "Gelenekten Yararlanma" *Yapraklar*, no. 64, (December), p. 5, in *Turk Edebiyatı 1964* (Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1965), pp. 203, 206, p. 206.

[520] "*Edebiyatın sorunları. Türk toplumuna özgü bir dil kültür sorunu var. Geçmişle bağ kurmak zor, Halit Ziya, Tevfik Fikreti bile sozlukle okuyoruz... İktidar kültür dusmani, komprador bir burjuvazinin elinde. Aydinlar 60 oncesinin alışkanlıklarından vazgeçemedi… Aydınlarımızın edebiyat anlayışları zayıf, edebiyat konusundaki yertersiz öğrenim ve geleneksizlik.*" Ataol Behramoglu, *Ant* No. 1 (3 January 1967), p. 15.

> thought may be an historical thought which has to emerge from the belief in society and in history. If the individualism of the West goes beyond our social realism, this is because of our deficiency of scientific knowledge.[521]

Anday was an important literary authority of the age. He seriously thought about the actual state of the Turkish literature in relation with the actual social and economic state of the society. He also participated in debates about the priorities of the writers in an underdeveloped country.

Social Realism and Individualism

Another debate arose out of the conflict between social realism and individualism. It was assumed that there was tension between abstract, closed avant-garde art and social realist art. It was argued that Western individualist works of art were not suitable for Turkish society, which was an underdeveloped (more emphasis on social) or eastern (more emphasis on cultural) society. The writer of the individualistic and modernist art was also accused to escape from political responsibilities.

For instance, Ali Gevgilili argues that the underdeveloped countries means, needs were completely different form the developed countries"[522] Çetin Özek

---

[521]"*Diyeceğim ki edebiyatta gelenek ister ona karşı olalım, ister onunla birlik olalım, tanrı vergisi bir şey değildir; onu bir toplumun sanatçıları kurarlar. Bunun için de ilk koşul edebiyatı, sanatı bizim dışımızda var olan, bizim de ancak kendisiyle var olabildiğimiz ortak bir yapı gibi görme düşüncesidir. Bir düşünce, topluma ve tarihe inanmakla beliren tarihsel bir düşüncedir. Batının bireyciliği bile kimi yerde bizim toplumculuğumuzu aşıyorsa bunun nedeni, bizdeki bilimsel düşünme eksikliğindendir."* Anday (1964), p. 70.

[522]"*Bugünün Türk sanatçılarının kavraması gereken en temel gercek, Batı'nın çok ileri toplumlarının kendi özel yapıları içinde sanatın girdiği serüven ile azgelişmiş Turkiye'nin sanata açtığı olanakların, gereksinimin bütünüyle birbirinden ayrı oldugunu kavrayabilmesidir. Yeni kurulmakta olan Turkiye'de sanat bir lüks değildir."* Ali Gevgilili, *Ant* no. 64 (19 Mart 1968), p. 15.

similarly argues: "I certainly believe that the artist of any underdeveloped countries artists do not have right to say: 'I am an artist; I can only produce my own work of art.'"[523]

In the 1960s, many Turkish intellectuals did not voluntarily reflect on individual problems. Egoism and individualism were deemed to be products of the wholesale importation of Western style learning and culture. The avant-garde individualism was frowned upon by collective missions defined as a result of leftist aspirations as follows:

> Today, our intellectuals and youth, while dwelling on such issues imperialism, new colonialism, liberation wars and waging their war, will naturally regard the inclination to abstract literature outside these issues as a sheer waste of time…. I certainly believe that no artist from any underdeveloped country has the right to say that "I am an artist and I make art." Of course, if they want to be true artists and assume to have responsibility to the contemporary social life. An opposite attitude would mean escaping responsibility and would lead to social reactions and lack of interest.[524]

These statements underestimate the aesthetic dimensions of the works of art and they absolutely define art as an instrument for social struggles. This excessive engagement of Turkish literature in the social problems was an unchangeable topic of criticism. For instance, Semih Gümüş said that: "It is generally accepted that the Turkish literature has to perform its social responsabilities, but this critique is

---

[523]"*Şuna kesin olarak inancim var ki, ben sanatçıyım, sanat yaparım demeye hiçbir az gelişmiş ülke sanatçısının hakkı yoktur."* Çetin Özek, *Ant*, no. 66, (2 Nisan 1968), pp. 14 15.

[524]"*Bugünki aydınlarımız ve genç kuşaklar emperyalizm, yeni sömürgecilik, kurtuluş savaşları gibi konular üzerine eğilip bunların savaşını verirken elbetteki bu sorunların dışında kalan soyut edebiyata eğilimi bir zaman israfı olarak görecektir… Şuna kesin olarak inancım var ki, ben sanatçıyım, sanat yaparım demeye hiçbir az gelişmiş ülke sanatçısının hakkı yoktur. Tabii, gerçek sanatçı olunmak, çağdaş sorumluluk yüklenilmek isteniyorsa. Aksine davranış, sorumluluktan kaçma anlamı taşır ve toplumsal tepki ve ilgisizlikle karşılanır."* Çetin Özek, "Türkiye'de Sanat Görevini yapıyor mu?" *Ant*, no. 63 (12 March 1968), p.15.

meaningless because Turkish literature, since the beginning dealed always even excessively with social problems."[525]

In 1962, Ahmet Oktay said that *Güdümlü Yazın* (committed art) or the originally French concept of "literature engagé" debates began in Turkey. He also thought that social struggles had started in Turkey. Literature in Turkey focuses on the problems which were the consequences of the urbanization, rapid migration from the villages to the cities and rapid modernization. Conflicts depending on the new, modern life styles were depicted in the works of Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Kemal Tahir and Fakir Baykurt.

On the other hand, angst, escapism and annoyance were experiences that can be resumed in the works of the modernist and avant-garde literature, in the 1950s. This literature was defended or criticized by some intellectuals, but Ahmet Oktay said that in these works, the dictatorship of the Democrat Party and the whole system with its social and economic institutions had been negated.[526] He also mentioned that the young authors who lived in a dictatoship and who reacted against this regime identified themselves inevitably, but also sharply, with an absurdity, a loneliness, and

---

[525]"*Zaman zaman edebiyatın bir derdi olmalıdır ya da toplumsal yükümlülükleri vardır denir, aslında bu eleştirinin hiçbir zaman söz konusu edilmemesi gerekir. Çünkü başından bugüne öylesine yüksek bir sorumluluk duygusuyla yaşamıştır ki edebiyatımız, onda bu düzeyde değil bir eksiklik bulmak; fazlalık olduğunu söylemek daha doğru olur. Taşıdığı ağır yükün kuşaktan kuşağa aktarılması çağdaş Türk edebiyatının yeterince zengin bir çeşitlilik ve sürekili yenilikler içinde yaşamasına engel teşkil eder. Çeşitli dönemlerde yükselen Modernleşme güdüsünü tanımlamakta bile güçlük çekmiş edebiyatımız hiç kuşkusuz asıl yarayı toplumsal ve siyasal hayatımızın her zaman sıcak ve sert oluşundan aldı. Yazınsal değerler bireylerin yazınsal kişilik kazanması, yazarın tutulması gibi modernist değerler, hemen hiç bir dönemde öne çıkmayı başaramadı. Kendi modernizmini hem bilincinde olmadan yaşadığı, hem de hep toplumsal değerlerin baskısı altında kaldığı için, yazarların özgünlükleri de içinde bulundukları ortamın ideolojik değerlerince sınandı."* Semih Gümüş, *Modernizm ve Postmodernizm Edebiyatın Dünü ve Yarını* (Istanbul: Can Yayınları, 2010), p. 33.

[526]Ahmet Oktay, "Yazar ve Siyasa," in *Türk Edebiyatı 1963* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1964) (*Değişim Dergisi* no. 8), p. 26.

they reflected a despair in a corrupted, defeated society.[527] In one article, Oktay defined these two groups as on the one hand, social realists and on the other hand modernists. They were different in their methods, but they had departed from the same point. They all depicted similar social problems in their works of art from different points of view, and with different styles. He wrote that: "A writer who is scared of politics is also scared of the realities and he is scaring to be part of a social struggle. The all other statements, against the attitude of the real authors, may not be interpreted as others, other than a self-defeating action."[528]

Oktay thought that both avant-garde and social realist authors were interested in the politics and to the problems of their country. In these years, it is possible to observing a debate about this subject. The differences between and common topics of these two trends were compared.

Fethi Naci argued in his article *Vurun İlgisizliğe* that: "the escapism of the Turkish intellectuals and writers from the realities of their country is the main issue. He assumes that,

> Only in underdeveloped countries in which the relationship between intellectuals and people can not be built can the intellectuals' knowledge be used as an instrument which was used not to attain to the realities and to change them, but to escape from realities. Thus, most of theconception of the intellectuals of the underdeveloped countries, is in reality, an actual form of their powerful individualism."[529]

---

[527]"*Öte yandan bir dikta rejimi altında yaşayan ve buna tepki duyan genç yazarlar ister istemez bu bozulan, çürüyen toplum içinde gelişen saçmalığı, yalnızlığı ve aydının umutsuzluğunu en keskin, en acı çizgileriyle saptama ve duyurma yoluna gittiler*." Ibid., p. 27.

[528] "*Ahlaka bağlanan yazarın siyasadan korkması, bir noktada gerçeklerden ve savaşmaktan korkması anlamına gelir. Bunun dışındaki her yargı, tarihin açıklığı ve gerçek yazarların tutumu karşısında, bir kendini aldatmadan başka türlü yorumlanamaz."*Ibid., p. 25.

[529]"*Yalnız aydın halk ilşkisinin kurulamadığı az gelişmiş ülkelerin aydınlarında bilgi, gerçeklere yaklaşmak ve gerçekleri değiştirmek için değil, gerçeklerden kaçmak için bir araç olarak kullanılıyor. Bunun için az gelişmiş ülkelerin çoğu aydınlarının toplumculuğu, aslında, azılı bir*

Fethi Naci who was a leading figure among the socialist intellectuals linked the problems that assumed to exist in the Turkish intellectuals to the underdevelopment of the country. The criticism of individualism and the belief in the resolution of every problems of the country by a developmentalist approach reflected the socialist author's standard prescription.

Ferit Edgü wrote an article, "Halk için Yazmak Halk Üstüne Yazmak" (To Write for the People, to Write about the People) in which he said that the conflict between social realist art and modernist art were at the center of the intellectuals' debate. The main problem was the problem of bread, but according to Ferit Edgü, the modernist writer had to think about individual problems and the problem of human emancipation.[530] According to him, demands of equality, or problems depending on poverty, were confrontated with demands of human emancipation and freedom.

Vedat Günyol wrote an article titled "Yeni Türkiye Ardında" (In Search of a New Turkey) in which he said that he thought or he hoped that Turkey would be another country in which social and cultural transformations could be realized. This intention was shared by many authors and it shows the validity of my argument that authors were absolutely the missionaries of political projects to shape the future of their country.

In the 1967 *Varlık Yıllığı*, the notes of a symposium which was organized in 1966 by Yaşar Nabi Nayır between intellectuals and men of letters was published. In this meeting, writers debated the actual problems of the literature (*Edebiyatımızın*

---

*bireyciliğin günümüze özgü bir biçiminden başka birşey olmuyor. Vurun ilgisizliğe!"*Fethi Naci, "Vurun İlgisizliğe," *Yön* no 78, (25 Eylül 1964).

[530]Ferit Edgü, "Toplum Sanat İlişkileri Üstüne," *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 160, (September 1964), pp. 187 199.

Bugünki Sorunları). The participants were: Oktay Akbal, Sabahattin Kudret Aksal, Tahir Alangu, M. Sunullah Arısoy, Hüsamettin Bozok, Asım Bezirci, Necati Cumalı, Refik Erduran, Azra Erhat, Konur Ertop, Mehmet Fuat, Vedat Günyol, Orhan Hançerlioğlu, Doğan Hızlan, Şükran Kurdakul, Rauf Mutluay, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Behçet Necatigil, Mehmet Seyda, Cemal Süreya, and Ülkü Tamer.[531] There were representatives of the literary circles of the period that categorized above. People from all different tendencies came together they debated the actual situation and and what they saw as the "responsibilities" of the Turkish literature in Turkish society.

They debated the role of avant-garde art in the circumstances in which the social realist art had become dominant. In the debate, Şükran Kurdakul and Yaşar Nabi Nayır were against Cemal Süreya, who defended avant-garde art. The realist vs. modernist debate has been the core debate of this meeting. For instance, Cemal Süreya said that if avant-garde works of art had sold 3,000 and the other had sold 10,000, the avant-garde had sold more or was interested in by the public. This was not the reality, because the works of Orhan Kemal and other social realist authors had sold more than ten thousands. In the 1960s, the best-selling authors and their works were Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Aziz Nesin, Kemal Tahir, and Necati Cumali. The sales of the books were also indicated: Books by Orhan Veli Kanık had sold more than hundreds of thousands; Fakir Baykurt's *Yılanlarn Öcü* had sold 50,000. Necati Cumalı's *Susuz Yaz* had also sold 50,000. Two of these bookshad also been made into movies. The movies may have contributed to the sales of these books. *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde* and other books by Orhan Kemal were also appreciated and

[531]See Yaşar Nabi Nayır "Açık Oturum," *Edebiyatımızın Bugünki Sorunları*, 13 and 20 November 1966, in *1967 Varlık Yıllığı* (Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 147, 230.

bought by the reading public. Two other significant authors who were most sold were Yaşar Kemal and Kemal Tahir.

They (authors and publishers) debated which books had sold the most. This was a common debate between the young and the older authors, who were Kemalists, Marxists, and humanists. They shared a common cultural agenda, and the distinctions between these different political identities were ambiguous. But a modernist tendency was in conflict with a more traditionalist, social realist and pragmatist one. Other distinctions would become more evident in the following years.

The critique of individualism was also related to the importation of the Western works and trends. For instance, in France, under the leadership of the *Tel Quel*, there was a debate about the *Nouveau Roman* (New Novel). *Yeni Dergi* review brought this debate to Turkey. Another European oriented debate was about Humanism and Structuralism.[532] Many debates, trends, schools of thought were introduced to the Turkish public. This tradition of the importation of Western cultural trends had deeper roots reaching back to the Tanzimat period. But, beginning in this period, philosophical, sociological and theoretical research was increasingly developed and their autonomies were created independent from literature and politics.

People who related directly literature to social engagements neglected the role of the writers' relative autonomy to produce works of art with aesthetic and fictive notions. Literature was followed by educated or at least by literate people, and populist intentions did not have to shadow the intellectualist dimension of the works of art. Literature was always an important part of the intellectualism, and this culture

[532]Hilmi Yavuz, "İnsancıllık, Yapısalcılık Tartışması,"*Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 268, (1976).

had connections with sociological abstractions, philosphical ideas, and the over-simplification of literature as the only defender of social causes was inacceptable. To close the gap between intellectual and people it was not necessary to destroy profoundity. This criticism of individualist, alienated intellectuals was transformed into a total negation of intellectuals after the coup d'état of 1980, and art increasingly became the subject of diversification for different social classes.

This distinction between abstract and individualistic art, and realist and political art may be described as the significant duality of the age as it was shown. Traditional, modernist, and social realist intellectuals debated between themselves to determine a relevant art for Turkish society reflecting its reality, but they also aimed at catching up to Western high culture, and becoming part of this cultural tradition. This had always been problematic, and this interdependent relation had been a tension that had determined the whole Western art. These tensions had led to the troublesome relation between thefields of politics and art. On the one hand, creativity, articulated as a distinctive quality supposed to define the producer of a creation, the independence and autonomy of the artist; and on the other, his social responsibilities, which he ascribes to himself, and his will to intervene into the political field.

These two sets of aspects represent the extreme positions between which most artists frequently oscillate. This imaginary distinction, the autonomy of art, or the determination of the social field over the artistic field (artistic products being regarded as the periodical representations of the social context) gave rise to these consequences: first, the isolation of the artistic field from other aspects of life as a survival strategy for artists; second, seeing art as an outcome of social relations.

In my opinion, the collective consciousness of the social agents should be conceived as a central factor. The role of art can be reduced neither to social relations, though it is itself a social relation, nor to the aesthetic creativity of some "genius" artists, though again it is a creative product. I posit that art emerged as a result of the tension between commitment and the endeavor for self-realization in an individualistic manner, which is determined on the final stage according to whether the artist has any collective, that is social, identity or not

Different Social Classes, Inequalities and Their Representations

Social classes and the differences between these classes were important topics of poetry and novels of the 1960s and 1970s. As discussed by Zafer Toprak, the 1960s was the period in which the reality of social classes was first brought to the attention of public thanks to the intellectuals and political actors.

First, the peasantry started to be represented as a heteregenous entity which consisted of different social classes (the Republican perception of them had always oscillatied between ignorant, reactionary forces and their motto of "the villagers are the masters of the nation" (*köylü milletin efendisidir*). This section of society was defined by its social and economic inequalities. Then, in the 1970s, the peripheries of the cities which had been created as a result of the migration also began to be represented in literature as social classes living in miserable conditions.

In the early 1970s, urban classes were also depicted in many works. A social realist approach focused on class differences. The upper classes, feudal lords, and

aghas were heavily criticized. The dichotomy between poor and rich was an important topic of these novels and short-stories.

Urban Classes

I first will focus on the social classes which were part of urban life, the workers, bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeoisie. Second, peasantry and rural life were also extremely important in Turkish literature while the tradition of peasant realism was transformed into a more social realist position.

Novels about the working class were also written by masters of the social realist movement, like Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal, Fakir Baykurt, Samim Kocagöz, Tarık Dursun K., and many others. Yaşar Kemal is certainly known for his peasant novels, but he also produced many short-stories about urban poverty. These authors were always interested in the lives of urban poor families, the difficulties they faced in the everyday life of the urban centers. During the 1970s, many novels and short-stories were written to describe the urban popular classes.

Orhan Kemal undoubtely can be considered the prominent figure of working class history. In many of his novels Turkish lower classes, factory workers, and workers who worked in very difficult conditions of Çukurova region, in agriculture.

He may be considered to be the most important figure of Turkish literature focusing on the urban poverty, and the economic and social problems lower classes. For instance, Orhan Kemal's *Bir Filiz Vardı* (Once upon a time, Filiz) was about the difficulties of being a honest working person for a women under sexual harrassment and abuses of the men's world. He always was interested in the humiliation,

deprivation, and poverty of the lower classes. A gender perspective also can be observed in these novels.

There were not many novels about the workers struggles as a class, however, Aziz Nesin's short story *Büyük Grev* (Great Strike) in March 1978 was an important exception. This book was a critique of a strike and also the most powerful family in Turkey. This strike, which was started by a union of workers of metallurgy (MESS MADEN İŞ), was criticized by Nesin for not being a meaningful struggle, but even a useful attempt at the interest of the capital as it would be able to be rescued from its surplus production. This shortstory led to the reaction of the Union, left wing movements and their newspaper. In *Politika*, many workers wrote articles against Nesin, and called him a defender of the capital. Another significant work of art about the working class was the 1965 movie *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* of Ertem Göreç and Vedat Türkali, in 1965.

Attilâ İlhan's novels, *Fena Halde Leman* (Too much Leman), *Sırtlan Payı* (Share of the Hyenas), and *Kurtlar Sofrası* (Dinner Table of Wolves) were critical accounts of the upper classes who became rich and privileged after the foundation of the Republic. İlhan criticized other social realist authors for not producing works of urban life or political problems. He declared that he alone tried to produce political and realist works to represent the inner conflicts of the bourgeois class by also using the psychological profoundity of his novels'characters. But, at the end of the 1970s, many political novels were produced that criticized some rich, capitalist families. For instance, Erol Toy's significant novel *İmparator* (Emperor) published in 1974 was a novel about the foundation of the most powerful capaitalist family of Turkey.

Aziz Nesin's collective essays, *Bir Sürgünün Anıları*, *Sosyalizm Geliyor Savulun* and many of his short stories were criticisms of the injustices and inequalities. Aziz Nesin may have been the most important critique of the social injustices and inequalities between the different social classes with his very original satiric style as he was also a politicaly significant public intellectual of the period.

Many other young authors were harshly criticized of confusing to think about political problems and writing novels. Demirtaş Ceyhun's novels were criticized for being propogandative, artistically poor and politically oriented. Another novel *Gözbağı* (Band of Eyes) by Erol Toy, which was written as a working class novel was also considered to be an unsuccesful by Fethi Naci.[533] He thought that a novelist's responsibility was to reflect the social reality in which different social classes lived in a society, but not to resolve the problems of the people like a politician. In Turkey, some novelists tried to awaken the masses and to contribute to the formation of an egalitarian society without mediation, then they did not respect the rules of writing and necessities of a novel.[534]

The world of the petit-bourgeoisie or middle classes were also an important topic for writers. Many of them were also belonged to these social classes or to a professional status as middle class. In some of these novels, such as Oğuz Atay's *Tutunamayanlar* (Disconnectus Erectus), Demir Özlü's *Boğuntulu Sokaklar* (Short story, 1966), *Bir Uzun Sonbahar* (*A long Autumn* - Novel, 1976), *Bir Küçükburjuvanın Gençlik Yılları* (The youth of a Petit-Bourgeois Person - Novel, 1979), Selim Ileri's many novels, Aysel Özakın's *Alnında Mavi Kuşlar*, Vedat

[533]Naci, p. 349.

[534]Ibid., p. 470.

Türkali's *Mavi Karanlık* were all critics of the middle class and their hypocritical life.

The loneliness of the Turkish intellectual and his alienation from his own country and from the people was another topic addressed. In many novels, educated and modern intellectuals were described as they had an important communication gap with their own country. Ferit Edgü's works *Kimse* (Nobody) , *O* (He-She) and *Hakkaride Bir Mevsim* (A Season in Hakkari) describe the loneliness of the Turkish intellectual in the rural life as he did not really know their lives or customs. A season in Hakkari was also about the discovery of the Kurdish people of the region.

Sevgi Soysal criticized the middle classes indifferences to the working classes and state oppression of intellectuals after the 12 March military intervention in her books *Yenişehir'de Bir Öğle Vakti, Şafak,* and *Yürümek*. In all of her works, she focused on the relations between the different social classes, and the role of leftist people in relationship with people from different social classes were also described.

Adalet Ağaoğlu was an important critic of the inner conflicts of the educated middle classes. In her novels, *Ölmeye Yatmak* and *Düğün Gecesi* criticized the insincerity or ingenuinety of the lives of these people.

In all of these modernist masterpieces, the lack of and search for authenticity of Turkish society's educated people and also in their own lives were discussed as that they belonged to these classes was obvious. They criticized the Westernized upper classes inner conflicts, but this critical approach was not restricted to a culturalist critique of Westernization, but was also a serious critique of a bourgeois life style was done.

This approach transcended the famous satire of Felatun Bey by Ahmet Mithat Efendi, in his emblamatic novel published in 1875 *Felatun Bey and Rakım Efendi*

(Mr. Felatun and Rakım Efendi) as well as he criticized the extremely Westernized Turkish, snobbish people. This very early figure was repeatedly produced in many Turkish novels, in a similar way; but in the 1970s, this alienated and Westernized, Turkish intellectual became this time an object of the Turkish novel, in a political approach centering class distinctions.

Melih Cevdet Anday, in his novel *Aylaklar* narrated the tragedy of the people of the late Ottoman empire during the Republican Period. They lost their social status, cultural heritage, and economic privilleges. The new social classes that emerged in the Republican period replaced the Ottoman bureaucracy and these people fell into a feeling of emptiness. They could not adapt themselves to the new conditions. The novel can be seen as an account of the formation of new social classes and the emerging bourgeois class against the Ottoman aristocracy.

Peasantry

The peasants were also a frequent topic of the Turkish literature in the 1960s and 1970s. For instance, the writers who also came from the Village Institutes, like Mahmut Makal, Talip Apaydın, Fakir Baykurt, and Adnan Binyazar, produced many novels and short stories about peasantry and rural life. The leading author was Mahmut Makal and his novels *Bizim Köy* and *Memleketin Sahipleri* were symbolic works of art. Mahmut Makal, Fakir Baykurt and many others, focused on the numerous problems of the peasantry. They argued that the main problems were based on underdeveloped economic structures and insufficient or reactionary social organizations. Religious myths, social pressures, illiteracy, and extreme ignorance

were all subjects of their works. Corrupted and irresponsible state officials were also harshly criticized. All of these authors had been born to peasant families. They had been educated in the Village Institutes or in the Universities of Ankara and İstanbul. They were alienated from their families' lives or they wanted to transform or to intervene into this undeveloped rural life by showing the problems of this life to the educated peasants like themselves, and by the multiplication of positive characters, like instructors, and young educated people. They wanted to create an educated avant-garde minority who would motivate other peasants by showing their poverty, and miserable conditions in which they lived and their ignorance as a result of their religious beliefs and their traditional lives, to change their lives.

As already discussed, these writers can be considered in the category of left-Kemalist authors and they reflected the symbiotic relation of their populist and elitist intentions. They did not always glorify peasant values. On the contrary, they even underestimated or ridiculed their habits, and their cultural and religious beliefs. These authors shared some common points, but there were also many differences in their works. The sterotype of ignorant, but ingenuous peasantry and the exploitation of their labor by the agas and idealist instructors struggling with them, and some corrupted state officials were criticized. They were also criticized for not producing aesthetic products, but documentary works. Novels about the peasantry were also ciriticized for replacing the reality, to be presenting as a reality, and to reflecting the prejudices of the intellectuals.

However, Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Yılmaz Güney, Necati Cumalı and Kemal Tahir were socialist authors. I define them as members of a social realist

tradition. They were different from the Peasant Institute originated, left Kemalist authors and there were also differences among them.

Necati Cumalı's in his novel, *Yağmurlar ve Topraklar*, narrates a love story in a small town, in which the instructors, doctors and lawyers were subjugated to the oppression of the reactionary powers. These educated people had significant problems with their environment and felt in an uncany and lonely situation. He also thought about the necessity of land reform and the relationship of peasants with nature.

Social inequalities and injustices were at the center of Cumalı's works of art. His masterpiece *Susuz Yaz* (Dry Summer), a collection of short-stories, a best-seller was adapted by Metin Erksan, into a movie by the same title *Susuz Yaz*. In a similar way, in this novel, there were also stories about small towns, villages and naive people who were victims of the egoism which was a product of unequal property relations. Sexual impuses were also existent in his works, especially in his short story book, *Ay Büyürken Uyuyamam* (I can not sleep when the moon rises) narrates stories of several forms of sexual reations that were natural parts of the social life even if they were considered to be taboos. Thıs famous work was one of the first books directly about sexuality and its diverse practices in the rural life. This work can be seen as a contradiction to the Western intellectual approach that held that in Third World countries, there were not libidinal motivations in literary works of art.

Social realist author Yaşar Kemal wrote several novels about the rural life of Çukurova where he was also grown up. *İnce Memed* and *Orta Direk* were his masterpieces. In his novel, *Akçasazın Ağaları*, he criticized mainly the sovereignity of land owners over the pesantry, mainly over the nomads who were forced to live in a settled way. Developing capitalist relationships, the monopolization of the land

ownership in some rich people, by the feudal lords (ağa), the insufficiency of the basic social services were described in this novel. The panturkist and ultra nationalist ideologies were stated as against the leftist ideology of the period with these land owners. The ultra-nationalism and anti-communism of the ruling classes was revealed.

Kemal Tahir's short-stories *Göl İnsanları* (People of Lake) was also a significant work which reflected rural life. As mentioned, his vision about the peasantry was very different from that of the other authors and he criticized other authors for reflecting their own beliefs and visions as they were the demands of the peasantry and the clichés in which peasants were always naives.

Works of art about raising the underdeveloped South east region which was also significant for the Kurdish ethnic identity started to be produced during this period, like Bekir Yıldız's *Kaçakçı Şahan*, (Şahan the Smuggler), Ahmed Arif's poems, and Ferit Edgü's *Hakkari'de Bir Mevsim* (One Season in Hakkari). They were significant works of art for the recognition of this ethnically different region of Turkey which was extremely poor and which was neglected by the governments. In the realm of cinema, Yılmaz Güney was first to represent the miserable conditions of this region in his film *Yol* (*Permission*), in 1980.

Historical Debates, and Challenges to the Official History of Turkey

During the 1960s and 1970s, one of the most popular topics of the novelists was historical events, especially topics like the atmosphere of the late Ottoman Empire, the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the War of Independence, the role of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) members in the First World War and in

the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. Writers created many novels about social and political history. I argue that in the 1960s and 1970s, novel was considered to provide historical knowledge, and works of art were seen as a possible instrument to propose alternative histories.

These novels generally attempted to represent alternative approaches to the official history writing and they reflected also the political attitudes of their writers; for instance, a more critical comment about the official historiography of the Turkish history, about the early or late Ottoman Empire were elaborated by Kemal Tahir and a left-wing interpretation of the War of Independence was defended in several novels by Erol Toy, Samim Kocagöz and Hasan İzzettin Dinamo. These novels conformed to the anti-imperialistic ideology and spirit of the age which was proliferated in all of these two decades, as discussed.

As a result of the realist tradition of the period, there was always an expectation that writers would reflect reality and produce scientific knowledge. For instance as argued by Hilmi Yavuz, according to these writers, there was a lack of a scientific tradition which might be capable of profoundly analyzing the changing structure of Turkish society and specificities of its human beings; and scientific research about history was also not realized, as a result. It is argued that the Turkish novel has to deal with these two realms.[535] This approach led to the formation of an important conflict which understimated the fictious and aesthetic dimensions of the literature. Works of art were designed to fulfill sublime missions and the social and political dimensions of these works shadowed their aesthetic and fictive notions.

[535]Ibid., p. 188, Hilmi Yavuz defends Kemal Tahir's theoretical approach which was also espoused by many other intellectuals.

Kemal Tahir was the most significant author of these novels. His novels were always considered to be important literary events. They triggered debates about social, economic and historical structures of Turkey.

His novels such as *Esir Şehrin Mahpusu* and *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* (People of the captive city) describe the atmosphere of İstanbul when it was under British occupation after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I. But his most polemical novel about the War of Independence was his novel *Yorgun Savaşçı*. This novel, which was later adapted as a television serial by Halit Refiğ was censored and even destroyed after the military intervention, and it was the most debated novel about the War. In this novel, the heroic narrative of the participation in the struggle was challenged. Kemal Tahir's novels *Kurt Kanunu, Yol Ayrımı* and *Devlet Ana* also introduced important historical debates about CUP members, the foundation of the Serbest Fırka Party and the foundation process of the Ottoman Empire.

Devlet Ana, a novel mentioned above many times, attempted to assert something about the actual conditions of Turkey and the strategy which had to be taken by the leftist groups by using, remembering, or in other words imagining the historical atmosphere of the 1290s when the Ottoman Empire had not yet founded. The ultimate aim of the novel was not to narrate the historical events, but to debate the actual conditions with the help of these historical events; however it was always debated whether his stories were inventions, fictions, or reality.

Many scholars criticizes Kemal Tahir for benefiting from history arbitrarily or by fabricating necessary claims to justify his own claims about actual Turkish politics. He idealized or sought for a pure Turkish, Ottoman identity which had not yet been corrupted by the Western influences which would be destructive in the following

centuries. His nationalistic, idealist and romantic abstractions were harshly criticized by literary critics, such as Ahmet Oktay, Fethi Naci and many others. Kemal Tahir elaborated his own nativist, ideological position by arguing that there had been a utopic past which had been corrupted and needed to be reestablished. Many authors considered that he abused the historical events for his own sake.[536]

Attila İlhan's novel *Yaraya Tuz Basmak* was the only novel about the Korean War and a very important critique of the Democrat Party government which caused the deaths of many Turkish soldiers. This book was also an important critique of US imperialism as was relevant to the spirit of the age. His novel *Sırtlan Payı* (Share of the Hyenas) can be considered as an historical novel of the early Republican era and the conditions before the 27 May coup d'état. His other novel, *Bıçağın Ucu*, was also a criticial description of the DP government.

Fakir Baykurt's novel, *Amerikan Sargısı* was also about the US help which is a favorite subject of the leftist intellectuals. He criticized the absurdity of the US help which only did not really work but even disturbed these peasants' ordinary lives. This anti-US tendency was very suitable to the actual political discourse of the leftist movements.

Erol Toy's novel *Toprak Acıkınca*, and İlhan Tarus's novels, *Var Olmak* (1957), *Hükümet Meydanı* (1962), *Vatan Tutkusu* (1967), Samim Kocagöz's *Kalpaklılar* (1962), *Doludizgin* (1963), and Hasan İzzettin Dinamo's *Kutsal İsyan* (1966) were all about the War of Independence. In these novels, the role of the ordinary people or idealist officiers were emphasized.

[536]Svetlana Uturguari, "Kemal Tahir'in Devlet Ana Romanı" in *Sovyet Türkologların Türk Edebiyatı İncelemeleri*, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınları, 1980), pp. 164-168.

On the other hand, Tarık Buğra, in his novel *Küçük Ağa* defended a more conservative interpretation of the War of Independence. His novel, *Firavun İmanı*, however, was his most ideological novel and in this novel. He tried to show that URSS helped Turkey in the War of Independence in order to make it one of its satellite regimes and he tried to delegitimize this intervention. Throughout the book, he defended conservative, nationalist politician or poets like Mehmet Akif, Hüseyin Avni, and Hasan Basri as against others who were defined like Soviet agents. This novel can be considered as a right-wing challenge to the escalating left-wing interpretations of Turkish history.

Many other novelists, like Yaşar Kemal in *Akçasazın Ağaları*, and many poets represented the specificities of the near history of their countries, to be able to make politics as a part of their public intellectual existences.

As was discussed, the novel was designed as an instrument to transmit historical, social and actual reality to a larger public. These novels were all politically committed, and they represent the close relationship between writers and politics. They used also historical elements to say something about the actuality. This relation with history also can be seen as their effort to create an historical consciousness as a part of their Marxist identities.

The Relation of Artists with Social and Political Movements

Oppressions and Melancholy

One of the most important topics of the Turkish novel, especially after the military coup d'état of 1971, was the ascending social movements of the late 1960s

and the relation of the intellectuals with these movement and activities. These movements were increasingly discussed by many writers.

An interesting debate about the relationship between author and politcs was produced in the form of literature engagé (committed art). This debate brought about the conflict between the freedom of the artist and his/her political and social engagements. These debates were considered as eurocentric and they were criticized by the nativist intellectuals. However, many committed young writers produced novels and poems as a result of their support. There were also more critical and hostile works about this movement of youth from the nationalist-conservative axis.

The process after the 12 March 1971 military intervention was described and contemplated by many authors in their novels. Some of them participated in these movements. In all of these novels, political topics were debated. Most of these novels were written by novelists who supported the developing social movements before the coup. Novelists such as as Çetin Altan, Sevgi Soysal and Erdal Öz were arrested or tortured after this intervention. In these novels, the state oppressions, left-wing militants sufferings, their problems to defend their political vision, and their lack of authenticity were debated.

Erdal Öz's novel *Yaralısın* (You are Wounded) in1974 described the imprisonment and torture to which he himself was subjected after the 12 March military intervention. This novel had autobiographic elements. There were very hard conditions for the young intellectuals. Yaşar Kemal declared that the novel of Erdal Öz, *Yaralısın* would be one of the master pieces of Turkish Literature. He said,

> Turkey is a country in trouble. There is such pessimism that one can let it just go. But in Turkey there are such novels that are written this way. This novel and its novelist are in resistance and protest through and through. Humanly, friendly, full of love, which resists evil with all these. Which strikes us from

> our heart, with friendship, with mercy. Perhaps Turkey is experiencing its most beatiful age in all this complication. If you ask why this is so, look at Erdal Öz, look at the young novelist of recent years. If its word is as true as a national epic, if its word is as true as a national novel.[537]

Different novels about these topics were produced by the social realist and modernist authors. For instance, Vedat Türkali's book *Birgün Tek Başına* narrated the atmosphere of Turkey before the coup d'état of 1960, and a love between a young female University student and a middle age intellectual. He harshly criticized the egoism and loneliness of the Turkish intellectuals by using this personality. Çetin Altan's novel *Büyük Gözaltı* described the emprisonment of a person who escaped to his childhood in his dreams during his emprisonment.

Sevgi Soysal's *Şafak* was an important novel about the tortured, emprisoned left-wing militants. Firuzan's *47'liler* was a symbolic novel that described the university youth who participated to the social movements of the 1968, and they were killed or tortured. Adalet Ağaoğlu's work *Ölmeye Yatmak*, and *Bir Düğün Gecesi* were criticisms of the conditions of society. Her plots were described in a difficult state of mind, as a kind of nihilism. This is a reaction to the oppressions of the state of the intellectuals and leftist ideologies. The inner contradictions of the leftist intellectuals and movements were visible in her works. They were not satisfied in a society to which they could not conform.

---

[537]"*Türkiye başı belada bir ülke. Ortaya bir karamsarlık çökmüş ki olmaya gitsin. Ama Türkiye'de böyle romanlar yazılıyor. Bu roman ve romancısı tepeden tırnağa bir karşı koyma, bir protestodur. İnsanca, dostça, sevgi dolu.. Kötülüğe bunlarla karşı koyan. Bizi yüreğimizden vuran, dostlukla, acımayla. Türkiye bu karmaşıklık içinde belki de en güzel çağını yaşıyor. Neden ki derseniz, işte bir Erdal Öz, işte son yılların en genç romancıları...Bir ulus destanı kadar sözü gerçekse eğer bir ulus romanı kadar sözü gerçekse."* Yaşar Kemal's opinion on the back cover, in Erdal Öz, *Yaralısın* (Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1974).

Pınar Kür, in his novel *Yarın Yarın* related the relationship of different classes, bourgeoisie, working classes and the struggles of the youth and all of the social movements. She described perfectly the life conditions of the upper classes, everyday lives as she belonged to these classes. She was not similarly capable of describing the working classes, but Kür, like Sevgi Soysal described upper class young people who try to transcend their social class identity. She politically identified with the struggle of the leftist movement and she contemplated the problems of the leftist movement and also inner conflicts of the petit-bourgeois intellectuals.

Demir Özlü's many short stories were also about the conditions after the military intervention. His existentialist approach was transfomed into a more political and socially engaged one in these works. Melih Cevdet Anday's *Gizli Emir* (Confidential Directive) was considered as a sign of the 12 March military intervention. In this abstract novel with its modernist perspective, the people who were under pressure were depicted. Tarık Buğra's *Gençliğim Eyvah* was a conservative critique of the left-wing movements as he was anti-communist. He harshly accused the youth and its anarchic intentions.

After the military coup d'état of 12 September 1980, another wave of novels about the defeats of left-wing movements was started. After the defeat of these movements, a melancholic attitude emerged. This narration of melancholy and disappointment made its marks on the modern Turkish literature. For instance, Vedat Turkali's *Tek Kişilik Ölüm* (A Lonely Death) can be cited as an important novel.

Turkish literature and its keen interest in the realm of politics was the main subject of this thesis. Turkish writers who supported social movements tried to support these movements with these works, showing many of the atrocities carried out

against the left-wing militants; however, they also criticized the leftist organizations' inner problems, conflicts and debates. I argue that these novels may be seen as clear evidence of the hegemony of the left-wing authors in the realm of literature. This close relationship between author and political movements led to the production of these many novels and poems.

These writers' pessimistic and melancholic attitude, which was reflected in their works, represents the disappointments of these dissident intellectuals as well as they were not able to fulfill their political visions, utopias, and to not achieve their alternative Republic, which was imagined as different than real political powers. This alternative country, which was designed as a product of the imaginations, thoughts and dreams of these authors, could not be founded and created during these two decades.

CHAPTER

CONCLUSION

One of my motivations to study this subject was the personal libraries of my parents and their friends. I read many of the novels and authors in these libraries. One of these inspiring libraries was that of the wealthiest man in my hometown Bolu, İzzet Baysal, who also founded the university of the city. I visited his library in the museum of this university, which was especially meaningful for me, because many works of Orhan Kemal, Yaşar Kemal, Kemal Tahir and Aziz Nesin were present in this library, which suggested that these public intellectuals were read by very different kind of people, even by the bourgeoisie, who were generally criticized by them.

I believe that these cultural objects were especially valuable for the middle classes and educated people. During their university educations, they began to read these social realist and avant-garde writers; they participated in the screenings of Western art movies in the hall of the Sinematek asssociation and many other popular Yesilçam movies in many movie theatres, they followed plays, in the Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, Dostlar and Kenter theatre. These cultural works, and places were significant in the shaping of their opinions about politics and society. They were attracted by these works and these works left imprints on them. That is why I wanted to analyze these authors and their works of art.

In addition, I think that the literary identities and debates discussed in this dissertation were functional in forming an opinion about the intellectual atmosphere of the 1960s and 1970s. Literature as a part of this atmosphere influenced a wide array of ordinary, but educated, people's lives. The literary world attracted a larger public that

went beyond of a small, privileged minority.

In my dissertation, I focused on the social history and the intellectual, political attitudes of many selected Turkish writers between the 1960s and 1980s. The intense relation between literature and politics, ideologies and social structures was attempted to be demonstrated. The result was an account of conclusions drawn from the selective and subjective research on the literary production of the age, but I think that the main arguments of this dissertation were supported by rich and diversified materials and sources obtained from the most popular journals and works of art of the relevant period.

As I already mentioned, my research focused on the main-stream, hegemonic, influential trends ("marginal" or politically radical trends also can be influential) as well as they were an aggregation of the "left-wing" approaches. I also paid great attention not to ignore nationalistic, conservative, in other words, "right-wing" political ideologies, but I argued that in the realm of literature, leftist ideologies overshadowed all other ideologies during these two decades when leftist, revolutionary and radical intentions were also influential in the political realm. A right-wing or conservative literary tradition was also existent during these years. Especially noteworthy was the oral literary tradition that gathered around the Kubbealtı Association. Some literary figures like Mehmet Kaplan, Tarık Buğra and especially Necip Fazıl Kısakürek were also important public figures. Necip Fazıl Kısakürek recently has been rediscovered and appropriated in Turkey by the political authorities and many cultural associations were founded by its name to commemorate its heritage.

At the same time, they were repressed and marginalized by the government. I

tried to show that, in these decades, intellectuals had a very problematic, but rich and multi-faceted relation with many issues and dualities to define their political and cultural agenda. In the 1960s, the ideological and literary debates on which I focused, were restricted to mainly the intellectual world. In the 1970s, however, literature and political ideas reached a larger part of the population.

I would like to conclude my dissertation by stating again the considerable influence of literature on the social and cultural life of Turkish society. It was a fertile period for literature as a tool of public communication. This golden age was the culmination of the combination of productivity and diversity of realist, modernist and popular intentions. Some of the masterpieces, and lesser but significant works of Turkish literature were written in these decades. Many mediocre works also written as a result of over politicization. These years are also called as the golden years of the theatre and cinema by art historians like Metin And and Nilgün Abisel.

I argued that many public intellectuals of the period were writers who also worked as journalists and eventually became political actors. Literature was not a domain completely separated from other artistic, political and intellectual pursuits. Intellectuals, artists, and writers came together in the reviews, associations, and in other public spacesas discussed. This common culture was illustrated in this dissertation from the perspective of literature, but in relation with other forms of art and other intellectual areas, especially journalism. Therefore, literature gives us many insights into the intellectual climate of the period. These individuals were politically oriented, and they strived to create a “Republic of Letters,” as an alternative to the “real” Republic of Turkey, a place where they hoped their beliefs, ideas, and dreams would be more influential. This Republic of Letters can be seen as a romantic, utopian

vision. Here, it should be noted that although it is not easy for us to understand this phenomenon from the perspective today, intellectuals and ideas were more influential and diverse in previous decades than today.

The relationship of the works of art with reality and their fictive, imaginative, and subjective role to change that reality were all discussed in the dissertation. Works of art were defined as a possible instrument to transmit reality by writers to the broader public. The authors discussed in the dissertation wanted at the same time, to transform this reality with their works. Many authors passionately desired to close the gap between themselves and the "people" by criticizing and reconstructing their reality or the circumstances in which they lived. They always wanted to create a more developed, rich cultural world for Turkey that could be shared or appreciated by the larger part of the population. They wanted to produce valuable works of which may be also popular. They think that to be popular do not exclude to produce art with higher quality. They wanted to develop the cultural average of the entire society.

This dissertation covered a very extensive subject. There were many sources from which I was unable to benefit. However, I argue that this work is a synthetic research embracing the main problematics, conflicts and complexities of Turkish literary life which completely devoted itself to understanding the social, cultural, and economic system of the country throughout these two decades. Literature evolved as a major part of the intellectual discussions, if we use the concept of intellectual as a person who makes a constant effort for the betterment of the social system of his country. The bulk of literature nearly functioned to realize this goal; the world of literature and its ideological vision were also followed by many intellectuals from other domains.

This research may be criticized for its extensive breadth, but there was a need for a macro study to frame the characteristic of this particular period. This work can be considered as a contribution to the Turkish literary history, an area where it is almost impossible to find a similar study that embraces such a wide range of literary products, actors and debates.

Another critical assessment may be based on its apparent subjectivity. Works of literature always have fictive, subjective dimensions, and a study of literary history and sociology of literature reflects this subjectivity to some extent. Such personal subjectivity might have arisen as a result of reading the vast bulk of the literary journals and works of these decades, and I maintain that my arguments are based on the knowledge gained from these materials shared in the dissertation.

In a conclusion, although there are some deficiencies in this dissertation, I present a broad picture in which I examined and discussed major works, and several journals. I identified this literary culture by three elements: I argue that to represent reality, to transform it with the help of the works of art, and to make it part of the universalist canon, the international world of literature, by preseving its national claims and its essential traces were the main motivations of writers to produce many of their works of literature. These efforts made them public intellectuals, and political actors. Turkish social and economic modernization, its cultural agenda, and the special international and interior conditions makes this period of history an epoch in which literature and politics were in intense and diverse relations.

Another more individualistic, modernist tendency was apparent during all of these decades. Many more abstract and personal works were produced by their authors by resisting the critiques. A feminist production, sensitive to the gender inequalities

was also started during this decade, however, after the 1980s, this consciousness became more influential in the public scene. Studies on psychoanalysis were also started in these years in Turkey, but unlike Western literature which was deeply influenced by these researches, Turkish artist were not leager to use these technics in their works.

Another particularity of many of these left-wing writers was their denial of the Ottoman literary heritage. They argued that after the foundation of the Republic, a new, secular and modern approach had emerged, and that a traditionalist, culturalist approach was directed against them by the conservative movement. But some secular and humanist historical figures were discovered like Yunus Emre and Aşıks' (troubadour) oral literature by these left-wing writers.

Different literary critics compare actual circumstances of the Turkish literature with the conditions of the 1960s. Actually, in Turkey, a high number of novels were being published, more than the 1960s, but the quantity of literary production in these years was even greater than today. There were many novels which sold more than ten thousand copies in the 1970s.

This instrumentalization of art during this period was severely criticized after the 1990s and this time, this trend was completely changed by going to another extreme position, to detach art from politics. There is a big difference in the choices of topics during these decades and today. Hasan Bülent Kahraman writes that: "Today in Turkey, literature was shaped by an approach that I critique; literature is totally esoteric, there was a lack of utopian, libertarian perspective."[538] Ahmet Oktay says:

[538]"*Bugün Türkiye'de gördüğüm edebiyat yaklaşımı tam da benim şu eleştirdiğim noktada biçimleniyor. Edebiyat tamamen içe dönük, herşeyden kopuk bir anlayışla ele alınıyor. Edebiyatın öldüğü söylenen bir dönemde Türkiye'de nasıl bir yılda 300 civarında roman yazılırken nasıl oluyor da*

"Once upon a time, our novelists depicted their everyday life experiences, the experiences of the others in their novels, they described the poverty of these people and they wrote about the problems of the ordinary man. These problems were defined like problems based on social inequalities."[539]

Ahmet Oktay cites many examples from the works of different novelists like Orhan Kemal, Sait Faik Abasıyanık and Oğuz Atay, and he argues that all of these novelists, by using different styles and representing literature from the 1940s to 1980, espoused very socially and politically engaged literary approach and they were interested especially in the lower classes and their problems.[540] This tradition believed in the power and possibility of the representation of the reality, and possibility to change it through literary works. In my dissertation, I made a big effort to discuss and present this culture.

---

bu romanlar toplumsal zihinde belli bir yer edinmiyor... Günümüz Türk edebiyatının herhangi bir gelecek tasavvuru, ütopizm perspektifinin olamadığını, Türk edebiyatının kurtarıcılık, kahramanlık ekseninin kurulmadığını belirtmek gerekir. Böyle bir edebiyatın insanı olmaz. O vakit insanın da böyle bir edebiyata uzak duracağını baştan belirtmek gerekir." Hasan Bülent Kahraman, *Postentelektüel Dönem ve Edebiyat* (Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2009), p. 19.

[539] Ahmet Oktay *Romanımıza ne Oldu?* (İstanbul: Dünya Kitapları, 2003), pp. 11, 15.

[540] Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abisel, Nilgün. *Türk Sineması Üzerine Yazılar*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1994.

Acaroğlu, M. Türker. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1968*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969:159.

Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: New York: Verso, 1992.

Ahmad, Feroz. *Demokrasi Sürecinde Türkiye.* Istanbul: Hil Yayınları, 1996.

Akagündüz, Ümit. *Yeni Ufuklar Dergisi Perspektifinde Türkiye'de Düşünce Hayatı,* (*1952 1965*). MAThesis, University of Ankara, 2007.

Akalın, Ayperi. "Sanat ve Politika ilşkisi," *Yön*, no. 74 (15 May 1963): 127-132.

Akbal, Oktay. "Collective Survey." *Varlık Yıllığı 1968*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969: 161.

Akçam Taner. "68'den Geriye Ne Kaldı?," *Birikim*, no. 109, (May 1998): 46.

Ali, Tariq, Susan Watkins. *1968 Marching in the Streets*. London: Bloomsbury, 1998.

Alangu, Tahir. "1963'de Roman ve Hikayemiz." *Varlık Yıllığı 1963*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1964: 36 49.

Alangu, Tahir. "1964'de Roman ve Hikayemiz." *Varlık Yıllığı 1963*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1965: 40-41.

Alangu, Tahir."1965'de Roman ve Hikayemiz." *Varlık Yıllığı 1966*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1966: 40 74.

Alangu, Tahir. "1966'da Roman ve Hikayemiz." *Varlık Yıllığı 1967*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1966: 52 - 84.

Alangu, Tahir. "1967 yılında Türk Romanı." In *Varlık Yıllığı* 1968, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1968: 44-75.

Alper, Emin. *Student Movemet in Turkey form a Global Perspective, 1960-1971*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Boğaziçi University, 2009.

Alper Emin."An Indigineous Social Democracy: The Democratic Left Thought in Turkish Politics, 1972-1975" Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History, 2003.

Alper, Emin. “Milliyetçilik-Modernleşme Geriliminde ‘Ortanın Solu’ ve Ecevit.” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 93 (2002).

And, Metin. *Geleneksel Türk Tiyatrosu: Köylü ve Halk Tiyatrosu Gelenekleri*. Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1985.

And, Metin. “Çağdaş Tiyatro Açısından Karagöz ve Orta Oyunu” In Abdulkadir Emeksiz, ed., *Orta Oyunu Kitabı*. Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2001.

And, Metin.“Collective Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlik Yayinevi: 1969: 143-144.

And, Metin. *Başlangıcından 1983’e Türk Tiyatro Tarihi*. Istanbul: İletişim, 2004.

And, Metin. “Interview.” *Forum*, no. 41 (1955).

Andak, Selmi. “1965-1975 Arası Türkiye’de Tiyatro.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1975*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1976.

Anday, Melih Cevdet. *Aylaklar*. İstanbul: Remzi Yayınevi, 1965.

Anday, Melih Cevdet. “Sanatta Gelenekçiliğin Önemi.” *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 141 (February 1964): 66 70.

Anday, Melih Cevdet.“ Sanatın ve Politikanın Özü.” *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 134 (July 1963): 143-147.

Anders, Jentri. *Beyond Counterculture*. Washington: Washington State University Press, 1990.

Atay, Oğuz. *Günlük*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998.

Atay, Oğuz. *Tutunamayanlar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997.

Atılgan, Gökhan. *Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar: Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Araştırma*. İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Araştırma Vakfı, 2002.

Apaydın, Talip. “Collective Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1978*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1979: 185.

Apaydın Talip. “Collective Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, ed.Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1977: 216.

Apaydın Talip “Collective Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 246.

Armes, Roy. “Twelve Positions on the Inaccessibility of Third World Cinema,” In

Turkish Cinema: an Introduction. London: Centre of Near & Middle Eastern Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1989.

Arslan, Savaş. (2005), Hollywood Alla Turca: A History of Cinema in Turkey, Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

Avcı, Artun. "Toplumsal Eleştiri Söylemi Olarak Mizah ve Gülmece," *Birikim Dergisi*, no. 166 (February 2003): 80-96.

Avcı, Zeynep. "Onat Kutlar ve Şakir Eczacıbaşı Sinematek Dönemini Anlatıyor, Interview" Onat Kutlar Kitabı, ed. Turgut Çeviker. İstanbul: Türsak Yayınları, 2006.

Avcıoğlu, Doğan. *Türkiye'nin Düzeni*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968.

Aybar, Mehmet Ali. *TİP Tarihi*. *Vol. 3*. Istanbul: BDS Yayınları, 1988.

Aydınoğlu Ergün. *Türkiye Solu: 1960-1980: Bir Amneziğin Anıları*. İstanbul: Versus Kitap, 2007.

Aydınoğlu, Ergin. *Söylenmese de Olurdu*. Istanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1996.

Aytaç, Gürsel. *Çağdaş Türk Romanı Üzerine İncelemeler*. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları,1990.

Ayhan, Ece. *Ortodoksluklar*. Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1968.

Ayhan Ece. *Yort Savul Şiirleri*. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1977.

Bakırcıoğlu, N. Ziya. *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türk Romanı*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1973.

Bali, Rıfat N. *Turkish Students' Movements and the Turkish Left in the 1950's-1960's*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 2006.

Barker, Francis. *1936: The Sociology of Literature - Practice of Literature and Politics*. Essex: University of Essex, 1979.

Baykam, Bedri. *68'li Yıllar: Tanıklar*. Istanbul: İmge Yayınları, 1999.

Baykam, Bedri. *68'li Yıllar: Eylemciler*. Istanbul: İmge Yayınları, 1999.

Baş, Muhammed Fazıl. *Power or the People: a Comparison of the Thoughts of Doğan Avcıoğlu and İdris Küçükömer Regarding the Intellectual Climate of the 1960s*. MA. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2008.

Başaran, A. "Collective Survey". *Varlik Yıllığı 1976*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1977: 218.

Batur, Enis. *Alternatif Aydın.* Istanbul, Hil Yayınları, 1985.

Batur, Enis. Conference in Moderation of Semih Gümüş and Ömer Türkeş, Istanbul Modern Museum, (20 March 2012).

Batur, Enis. *Okuma Lambası*. Istanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, 2004.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Yasakoyucular ile Yorumcular.* Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1996.

Baykurt, Fakir. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1978,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1979: 190.

Baykurt, Fakir. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1977: 219.

Baykurt, Fakir. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1968*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969: 192.

Beckerton, Emilie. *"Adieu To Cahiers." New Left Review*, no. 42 (2006): 69-97.

Behramoğlu, Ataol. "Art in 1960s." Conference moderated by Hasan Bülent Kahraman at Aksanat Kültür Merkezi (7 March 2007).

Behramoğlu, Ataol. "Collective Survey." *Ant*, no. 1 (3 January 1967): 15.

Behramoğlu, Ataol. *Kendin Olmak ya da Olmamak*. Istanbul: İnkilap Yayınları: 2003.

Belge, Murat. *Türkiye Dünyanın Neresinde*. Istanbul: Birikim Yayınları, 1993.

Belge, Murat. "Ana Çizgiler." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce vol 8: Sol*, ed. Murat Gültekin. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları: 2007.

Belge, Murat. *Edebiyat Üstüne Yazıla*r. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Author as Producer." In *Reflections* ed. Jovanovich Brace. New York: Harcourt, 1978.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, 1969: 217-253.

Benjamin, Walter. *Son Bakışta Aşk*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2006.

Benjamin, Walter. *One-Way Street and Other Writings*. London: Verso, 1979.

Belli, Mihri. *İnsanlar Tanıdım II*. Istanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 1999.

Belli, Mihri. “Ulusal Devrimci Kültür.” In *Yazılar 1965 1970*. Ankara: Sol Yayınları, 1970: 257-273.

Berger, John. *About Looking*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Beris, Hamit Emrah. “Kemalist-Liberal Sentez Çabası: Forum Dergisi.” *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düsünce: Liberalism* 7, eds. Murat Gültekingil, Tanıl Bora. İstanbul: İletisim Yayınları, 2005.

Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Yapı-Kredi Yayınları, 2002.

Berksoy, Naci Çelik. “Kemal Tahir için Biyografi Çalışması.” In *Kemal Tahir 100 Yaşında*, ed. Ertan Eğribel. Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2010.

Bezirci, Asım. *Okudukça*. Ankara: İzlem Yayınları, 1967.

Bilbaşar, Kemal. “Collective Survey.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 248.

Binyazar, Adnan. “1978’de Deneme Eleştiri İnceleme Araştırma.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1979*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972.

Binyazar, Adnan. “1972’de Eleştiri, Deneme, İnceleme.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972.

Binyazar, Adnan. “1971’de Deneme, Eleştiri, Inceleme.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1972*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972.

Binyazar, Adnan. “1970’de Deneme, Eleştirme, İnceleme.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1971,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972: 72 102.

Binyazar, Adnan. “1968’de Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In*Varlık Yıllığı 1969*, ed.Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972: 49- 82.

Birchall, Ian H. “Practices of Literature and Politics, The Novel and the Party.” In *Sociology of Literature, Drama* (eds.) Elizabeth and Tom Burns. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973.

Bloom, Alexander (eds.) *Long Time Gone: Sixties America Then and Now*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Boggs, Carl. *Intellectual and the Crisis of the Modernity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Bora, Tanıl. “Sol ve Yerlilik Meselesi.” *Birikim,* no. 111-112 (July- August 1998): 47-55.

Bora Tanıl. “İkinci Eleme.” *Birikim*, no. 109 (May 1998).

Bora Tanıl. “Introduction.” In *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Milliyetçilik,* ed. Tanıl Bora. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Boratav, Pertev Naili. “Kültür eksikliğimizi Nasıl Tamamlarız?” *Ant*, no. 24 (13 June 1967): 14-5.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Les Règles de l’art. Genèse et Structure du Champ Littéraire.* Paris: Seuil, 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. London: Routledge, 1986.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Champ de Pouvoir, Champ Intellectuel et Habitus de Classe*. Paris: Minuit, 1971.

Bozdağ, İsmet. *Kemal Tahirin Sohbetleri*. Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınları, 1980.

Buck-Morss, Susan. *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.

Burns, Elizabeth (eds.) *Sociology of Literature, Drama*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973.

Calinescu, Matei. “Literature and Politics.” In *Interrelations of Littérature*, eds. Jean Pierre Barricelli and Joseph Gibaldi. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1982.

Cansever, Edip. “Sanatçı ile Politikacı.” *Yeni İnsan*, no.5, (4 May 1965) in *Türk Edebiyatı,* ed. Memet Fuat. Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1966: 139-142.

Cantek, Levent. *Cumhuriyetin Buluğ Çağı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Cem, Ismail. *Türkiye’de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1970.

Cimcoz, Adalet. “Collective Survey.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1969,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1975: 175.

Clark, Priscilla B. P. “Literature and Sociology.” In *Interrelations of Littérature*, Jean Pierre Barricelli and Joseph Gibaldi, New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1982.

Cohen, Robert and Reginald E. Zelnik (eds.). *The Free Speech Movement: Reflections*

on Berkeley in the 1960s. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Colby, Vineta (ed.) *American Culture in the Sixties*. New York: Wilson, 1964.

Crow, Thomas E. *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Cumalı, Necati. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969: 150.

Cumalı, Necati. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1966*, ed. Yşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi: 1965: 162.

Cumalı, Necati. "Kısmeti Kapalı Gençlik." *Yeni Dergi*, no. 9 (1966).

Cumalı, Necati. *Susuz Yaz*. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Yayınları, 2004.

Cumalı, Necati. *Ay Büyürken Uyuyamam*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1978.

Çavdar, Tevfik. *Türkiye'nin Yüzyılına Romanın Tanıklığı*. Istanbul: Yazılama Yayınları, 2009.

Çeviker, Turgut, ed. *Onat Kutlar Kitabı*. Istanbul: TÜRSAK, 2006.

Damar, Arif. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1964,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1965: 105,

Daldal, Aslı. "The New Middle Class as a Progressive Urban Coalition: The 1960 Coup d'état in Turkey." *Turkish Studies* 5, no.3 (Fall 2004): 75-102.

Daldal, Aslı. *Art, Politics and Society: Social Realism in Italian and Turkish Cinemas*. İstanbul: Isis Press, 2003.

Daldal, Aslı. *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik*. Istanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2005.

Dağlarca Fazıl Hüsnü "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1977: 223.

Debord, Guy. (1957) *Report on the Construction of Situations and on the International Situationist Tendency's Conditions of Organization and Action*. Paris, June 1957.

Diez Ernst. *Başlangıcından Günümüze Dek "Türk Sanatı."* Istanbul: Istanbul Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1946.

Dino, Güzin. "Emperyalist Niteliği Olmayan Kültür." *Ant*, no. 23 (6 June 1967): 14-5.

Dirlik, Arif. “The Third World in 1968.” In*1968 The World Transformed,* eds. Carole Fink, Detlef Junker and Phillip Gassert, Washington DC: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.

Divitçioglu, Sencer. “Interview.” *Ant* no. 63 (12 March 1968): 15.

Doğan, Mehmet H. *Tekrarın Tekrarı*. Istanbul: Yapi-Kredi Yayınları, 1999.

Doğan, Mehmet H. “Interview.” *Yeni Dergi* no. 73. Istanbul: (October 1969): 178-185.

Dumont, Paul. “Le Modèle Economique Islamique dans la Presse Islamiste Turque.” In Gisela Prochazka-Eisl and Martin Strohmeier (eds.), *The Economy as an Issue in the Middle Eastern Press*. Vienne: Neue Beihefte zur Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 2008.

Dumont, Paul. “Littérature et Sous-développement : 'les Romans Paysans' en Turquie.” *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations 28,* no. 3 (1978): 745-764.

Eagleton, Terry. *Edebiyat Kuramı: Giriş*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 2004.

Eagleton, Terry. *Edebiyat Eleştirisi Üzerine*. İstanbul: Eleştiri Yayınevi, 1970.

Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London: Verso, 1978.

Eagleton, Terry. *New Statesman* (13 September 2010).

Edgü Ferit. “Interview: Kültür Emperyalizmi Üzerine Konuşmalar.” *Ant*, no. 17 (1967):14-5.

Edgü Ferit. “Kültür Emperyalizmine Nasıl Karşı Çıkılır?” *Ant*, no.19 (1967): 14-5.

Edgü Ferit. “Toplum Sanat İlişkileri Üstüne.” *Yeni Ufuklar*, no.160 (September 1965): 187-199.

Ertan, Eğribel, “Kemal Tahir 100. Yaşında.” In *Kemal Tahir 100 Yaşında* Ertan Eğribel, M Fatih Andı (eds.)Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanligi, 2010.

Elias, Norbert. *La Civilisation des Moeurs*. Paris: Agora, 1969.

Emre, Yunus “The Genesis of The Left of Center in Turkey: 1965-1967.” Bogaziçi University: MA Thesis, 2007.

Erten, Bağış. *A Comparative Analysis of the 1968 Movement in Turkey*. Boğaziçi University: MA Thesis, 2004.

Ertop, Konur. “Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1966* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık, 1966.

Ertop, Konur. *“*Gelenekten Yararlanma.” *Yapraklar,* no. 5 (December 1964): 203-6.

Ecevit, Bülent. *Bu Düzen Değişmelidir*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1974.

Ecevit Bülent. *Ortanın Solu*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1968.

Enginün, İnci. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2007.

Erdoğan, Necmi. “Demokratik Soldan Devrimci Yol’a: 1970’lerde Sol Popülizm Üzerine.” *Toplum ve Bilim,* no. 78 (1998).

Erdoğan, Necmi. “Narratives of Resistance: National Identity and the Ambivalance in the Turkish Melodrama between 1965 and 1975.” *Screen* no. 39 (1998): 259-271.

Eyuboğlu, Sabahattin. “Halka Güven.” *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 134 (July 1963). In *Türk Edebiyatı, 1964*, ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1968: 10–16.

Eyuboğlu, Sabahattin. *Yeni Ufuklar* no.192 (May 1967). In *Türk Edebiyatı 1968,* ed. Memet Fuat, İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1968, 12-16.

Eyuboğlu, Sabahattin. *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 186 (November 1966). In *Türk Edebiyatı 1967* ed. Memet Fuat, İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1967: 12-17.

Eyuboğlu, Sabahattin. *Mavi ve Kara* (1940-1973, Essays). Istanbul: Ataç Kitabevi, 1967.

Escarpit, Robert. *Edebiyat Sosyolojisi.* Istanbul: *Remzi Kıtabevi,* 1968.

Esen, Nüket. *Modern Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Okumalar*. Istanbul: İletişim, 2006.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967.

Fanon, Frantz. *A Dying Colonialism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.

Felski, Rita. *Uses of Literature*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Pub., 2008.

Fink, C. , P. Gassert and D. Junker, “Introduction.” In *1968 – The World Transformed*, Fink, Carole, Gassert, Philipp and Junker, Detlef, (ed). Cambridge University Press, 1999: 1-27.

Frey, Frederic. *The Turkish Political Elite.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1965.

Fuat, Memet. “Kaynaklara Yönelen Kuşak.” *Yeditepe* (16 January1962).

Fuat, Memet. “1965’de Türk Edebiyatı.” In *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1965*, ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1966.

Fuat, Memet. “1966’de Türk Edebiyatı.” In *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1966,* ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi,1967.

Fuat, Memet. “1967’de Türk Edebiyatı.” In *Mehmet Fuat’in Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyati 1967,* ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1968.

Fuat, Memet. “1967'de Şiir, Kısa Hikaye, Eleştiri.” In *Mehmet Fuat’in Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1968,* ed. Memet Fuat. Istanbul: De Yayınevi, 1968.

Fuat, Memet. “1968’de Türk Edebiyatı.” In *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1968,* ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1969.

Fuat, Memet. “1969’de Türk Edebiyatı.” In *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1969*, ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1970.

Fuat, Memet. “1970’de TürkEdebiyatı.” *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1970*, ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1971.

Fuat, Memet. “ 1971’de Türk Edebiyatı” *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1971*, ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1972.

Fuat, Memet. “ 1972’de Türk Edebiyatı.” *Mehmet Fuat’ın Seçtikleri Türk Edebiyatı 1972*, ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1973.

Fuat, Memet. "Sanat Politika İlişkisi.” *Yön,* no. 75 (23 May 1964): 133-138.

Furedi, Frank. *Nereye Gitti Bu Entelektüeller?* Ankara: Birleşik Yayınevi, 2010.

Gella, Alexander. *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals*. Califormia: SAGE Publications, 1976.

Gevgili, Ali. “Çağdaş Sinema Karşısında Türk Sineması.” *Yeni Sinema,* no. 3 (1966):13-5.

Gevgili, Ali. *Türkiye’de 1971 Rejimi: Tarım Toplumundan Sanayi Toplumuna Geçiş Aşaması*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1973.

Gevgili, Ali. *Yükseliş ve Düşüş*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1987.

Gittlin Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.

Goldmann, Lucien. *Method in the Sociology of Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1980.

Goldmann, Lucien. *The Hidden God: A Study of Tragic Vision in the Pénsées of Pascal and the Tragedies of Racine*. London: Routledge, 1964.

Goodman, Dena. *The Republic of Letters: a Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Gouldner Alvin. *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class.* New York: Continuum, 1979.

Gramsci Antonio. *Prisons Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Günyol, Vedat. "Burjuvalık Özentisi.*" Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 169 (June 1967).

Günyol, Vedat. "Köy Enstitüleri ve bir Roman." *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 194 (July1968).

Gümüş, Semih. *Modernizm ve Postmodernizm Edebiyatın Dünü ve Yarını*. Istanbul: Can Yayınları, 2010.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. *Vitrinde Yaşamak*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001.

Habermas, Jurgen. *Legitimation Crisis.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

Habermas, Jurgen. *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science and Politics.* London: Heinemann Educational, 1971.

Halman, Talat. "Collective Survey." In*Varlık Yıllığı 1977*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1977.

Halman, Talat "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1978,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1979: 205.

Hançerlioğlu, Orhan. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1961,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961.

Hançerlioğlu, Orhan. "Collective Survey, 'Attacks against Kemalism - Atatürkçülüğe Saldırılar'." *Varlık Yıllığı 1971,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1971: 196 - 214.

Harris, Nigel. *The End of the Third World.* Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1987.

Harootunian, Harry. "In the Tiger's Lair: Socialist Everydayness Enters Post-Mao China (Review essay on *Streetlife China* by Michael Dutton)." *Postcolonial Studies* 3, no. 3 (2000).

Harootunian, Harry. "The Benjamin Effect: Modernism, Repetition, and the Path to Different Cultural Imaginaries." In *Walter Benjamin and the Demands of History*, ed. Michael P. Steinberg. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Harootunian, Harry. *The Empire's New Clothes: Paradigm Lost and Regained* Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004.

Halman, Talat. "Interview." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1977*. ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1977.

Halman, Talat. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 251.

Hayward John. "The Populist Challenge to Elitist Democracy in Europe." In *Elitism, Populism, and European Politics*, ed. John Hayward. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1996.

Heinich, Natalie. *La Sociologie de l'Art*. Paris: La Découverte, 2004.

Heincih, Natalie. *Ce Que l'Art Fait à la Sociologie*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1998.

Hızlan, Doğan. *Edebiyat Daima*. Istanbul: Doğan Kıtap, 2006.

Hızlan, Doğan. "1969'da Şiirimiz." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul, Varlık Yayınları, 1971: 46- 64.

Hızlan, Doğan. "1970'de Şiirimiz." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1971*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul, Varlık Yayınları, 1971: 19 41.

Hızlan, Doğan. "Interview." *Kültür*, no 1 (November, 2010) http://kultur.sol.org.tr/haberler/turk-edebiyatindan-solu-ceksek-geriye-bir-sey-kalmiyor-357

Hızlan, Doğan. "Gelişme Döneminde bir Ülkede Yazar - A Writer in a Developing Country." *Yapraklar 64* no.2 (October 1964). In *Turk Edebiyati 1964*, ed. Memet Fuat, İstanbul: De Yayınevi 1965: 166 172.

Hilav, Selahattin. *Entelektueller ve Eylem Düşünceler-Tartışmalar-Söyleşiler*. Istanbul: Yapı- Kredi Yayınları: 2008.

Hilav, Selahattin. *Yön*, no. 100 (20 Subat 1965).

Hilav, Selahattin. *Yön*, no. 101 (27 Şubat 1965).

Hilav, Selahattin "Collective Survey." *Ant* (11 Nisan 1967): 14 15.

Hillier, Jim. ed. *Cahiers du cinema: 1960-1968--New Wave, New Cinema, Reevaluating Hollywood*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Hobsbawn, Eric J. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*. London: Abacus, 1995.

Horn, Gerd Rainer. "The Changing Nature of the European Working Class: The Rise and Fall of the 'New Middle Classes (France, Italy, Spain, Czechoslovakia)." In Carole Fink et al., 1968. *The World Transformed*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press, 1998: 351- 371.

Ignatieff Michael. *The Needs of Strangers.* New-York: Penguin Books, 1986.

İnsel Ahmet "Demokrasinin Sancılı Yılları." In *Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, eds. Ahmet Kuyaş. Yapı-Kredi Yayınları.

İlhan, Attilâ. "Hangi Edebiyat." İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002.

İlhan, Attilâ. "Edebiyat Çeteleri." *Cumhuriyet* (27 April 1995).

İlhan, Attilâ."Ve Devlet ve Holdingler ve de Sanatçının Özgürlüğü." *Cumhuriyet* (28 April 1995).

İlhan, Attilâ. "Soğuk Savaşın Çeteleri Nasıl Oluştu?" *Cumhuriyet* (29 April1995).

İlhan, Attilâ. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 253.

İlhan, Attilâ. "Gerçekçiliğin İç Sorunları." Ataç 2 (1962): 38 40.

Irving Terry and Sean Scalmer, "Labour Intellectuals in Australia: Modes, Traditions, Generations, Transformations." *International Review of Social History*, forthcoming.

Jameson, Frederic. "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism." In *The Jameson Reader*, ed. Michael Hardt and Kathi Weeks. Oxford, UK; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2000.

Jusdanis, Gregory. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature*. Minneapolis and Oxford: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

K. Tarık Dursun "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 254-255.

Kahraman, Hasan Bülent. *Postentelektüel Dönem ve Edebiyat*. Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2004.

Kahyaoğlu, Orhan. "Türkiye'de Pop ve Rock Müziğinin Doğuşu." In *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986.

Kaplan, Yusuf. “Turkish Cinema.” In *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.) Oxford: New-York University Press, 1997

Kara, Muzaffer Ayhan. *Yön’ün Devrimi Devrim’in Yönü*. Istanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları, 2006.

Karabel, Jerome. “Towards a Theory of Intellectuals and Politics.” *Theory and Society* 25, no. 2 (Apr.1966): 205-233.

Karadeniz, Harun. *Olaylı Yıllar ve Gençlik.* Istanbul: May Yayınları, 1969.

Karaömerlioğlu, Asım. *Orada bir Köy var Uzakta : Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Köycü Söylem*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006.

Karpat, Kemal. *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Karpat, Kemal. “Interview.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1961*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961.

Karpat, Kemal. *Türk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular*. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1962.

Karpat, Kemal. “Turkish Left.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 1, no. 2 (1966): 169-186.

Karpat, Kemal. “The Military and Politics in Turkey, 1960-1964: A Socio-Cultural Analysis of a Revolution.” *The American Historical Review* 75, no.6 (Oct., 1970): 1654-1683.

Karpat, Kemal. “Collective Survey.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1961*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961.

Kauppi, Niilo. *Radicalism in French Culture, a Sociology of French Theory in the 1960s*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010.

Kayalı, Kurtuluş. *Türk Kültür Dünyasından Portreler*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Kayra, Cahit. 3*8 Kuşağı: Anılar*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002.

Kemal Orhan, *Bir Filiz Vardı*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1965.

Kemal, Orhan. *Murtaza*. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1969.

Kemal, Yaşar. “Halk, Sanat, Politika.” *Ant*, no. 123, (6 May 1969): 15.

Kemal, Yaşar. *İnce Memed II*. İstanbul: Ant Yayınları, 1969.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1984.

Keyder Çağlar. "Modernizm ve Kimlik Sorunu." In *Ulusal Kalkınmacılığın İflası*, ed. Semih Sökmen.İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1996.

Kılıç, M. Bülent. *Saklı Rönesans/Türkiye Sol Edebiyat Hareketleri İçin Bir Hatırlatma*. Istanbul: Kült Sanat Yayıncılık, 2007.

Kırel, Serpil. *Yeşilçam Öykü Sineması*. Istanbul: Babil Yayınları, 2005.

Kocagöz, Samim. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 257, 258.

Koçak, Orhan."Ataç, Meriç, Caliban, Bandung: Evrensellik ve Kısmilik Üzerine bir Taslak." In *Türk Aydını ve Kimlik Sorunu* ed. Sabahattin Şen. Istanbul: Bağlam, 1995.

Kongar, Emre. *İmparatorluktan Günümüze Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Yapısı*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1997.

Kozaklı, Süreyya Tamer. "Türkiye'nin Kendi Kaderini Tayin Hakkı." *Birikim* no. 111-112 (1998): 70-75.

Köksal, Duygu. "Attila Ilhan." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düsünce*, vol.2, *Kemalizm*, ed. Ahmet İnsel. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001: 488-495.

Kuban, Doğan. *Türk ve İslâm Sanatı Üzerine Denemeler*. İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 1982.

Kuban, Doğan. "Türkiye'de İdeolojiler." *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 253 (October 1974).

Kurlansky, Mark. *1968: The Year That Rocked the World*. New York: Random House, 2005.

Kutlar, Onat. *Sinema Bir Şenliktir: Sinema Yazıları*. İstanbul, Can Yayınları, 1991.

Kutlar, Onat. "Türk Sineması Niçin Olumlu Çıkış Yapamıyor." *Ant*, no. 11, (1967): 14-5.

Kutlar, Onat. "Ulusal Türk Sineması ve Çıkış Yolları Üzerine Soruşturma."*Ant*, no. 80 (9 July 1968):14.

Kutlar, Onat. " Karmaşıklığın Kavranmasına Doğru." *Yeni Dergi*, no. 10 (1965): 173-186.

Kulebi, Cahit. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi: 1969: 155- 157.

Kuyaş, Ahmet (ed.) *Gençler için Çağdaş Tarih*. İstanbul: Epsilon Yayınevi, 2004.

Küçük, Yalçın. *Bilim ve Edebiyat*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınları, 1985.

Küçük, Yalçın. *Aydın Üzerine Tezler*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınları, 1990.

Küçükömer, İdris. *Düzenin Yabancılaşması*. Istanbul: Ant Yayınları, 1969.

Kürkçü, Ertuğrul. "Kapitalizm ile Komünizm Arasında 'Geleneksel Aydınlar': Yön Hareketi." In *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986.

Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford University Press 1995.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe, "Post-Marxism without Apologies." *New Left Review* 166 (1987)

Laclau, Ernesto. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 1985.

Laclau, Ernesto. "Towards a Theory of Populism." In *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*. London: NLB, 1977.

Landau, Jacob M. *Radical Politics in Modern Turkey*. Lieden: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1974.

Larkin, Maurice. *Man and Society in the Nineteenth Century Realism, Determinism and Literature*. Totowa, N.J. : Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.

Lefebvre, Henri. *Key Writings.* New York: Continuum, 2003.

Lukacs, Georg. *Essays on Realism*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1981.

Lukacs, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness*, London: Merlin Press, 1967.

Macherey, Pierre. *Theory of Literary Production*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Mann Michael. "The Ideology of Intellectuals and Other People in the Development of Capitalism." In *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, eds. Leon Lindberg, et al. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975.

Makal, Mahmut. *Bizim Köy.* İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1950.

Makal, Mahmut. *Köyümden.* İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1952.

Makal, Mahmut. *Memleketin Sahipleri*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1954.

Mardin Şerif. “Sosyal Yapımız ve Öğrenci Eylemleri.” In *Milliyet’den Seçmeler Dizisi, 1975 yılı*, ed. Abdi İpekçi. Istanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1975.

Mater, Nadire. *Sokak Güzeldir: 68’de Ne Oldu?* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2009.

Meriç, Cemil. “Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973.

Milas, Herkül. “Milli Türk Kimliği ve Öteki, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce.” *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Milliyetçilik*. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Milli Türk Talebe Birliği, Sinema Kulübü. *Milli sinema: Açık oturum*. Istanbul: Milli Türk Talebe Birliği, 1973.

Yıllığı of Milliyet, (Milliyet’den Seçmeler Dizisi, 1973.) “Düşünenlerin Forumu.” ed. Ali Gevgilili, Participants: Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Tarık Zafer Tunaya, İdris Küçükömer, Mehmet Kaplan. Istanbul: Milliyet Yayınevi, 1973: 152-166.

Montagu, Ivor. *Film World: A Guide to Cinema*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964.

Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 1*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994.

Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 2*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995.

Moran, Berna. *Edebiyat Kuramları ve Eleştiri*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1977’de Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1978*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1978: 23-49.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1975’de Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1976: 26-50.

Mutluay Rauf. “1973’de Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1974*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1974 : 27-51.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1972’de Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972 : 35.

Mutluay Rauf. “1969’da Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1970* : ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1970: 23-45.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1968’de Roman ve Hikayemiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1969*: ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1970: 31-51.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1967’de Şiirimiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1968,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1968: 23-43.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1965’de Şiirimiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1966,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1966: 24 39.

Mutluay, Rauf. “1963’de Şiirimiz.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1964*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1964.

Mutluay, Rauf. “Interview.” *Yeni Dergi* no 1 (13 Octobre 1965).

Mutluay, Rauf. *100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1973.

Naci, Fethi. (İsmail Naci Kalpakçıoğlu) *100 Soruda Türkiye’de Roman ve Toplumsal Değişme*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınları, 1981.

Naci, Fethi. *100 Yılın Yüz Romanı*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları, 2002.

Naci Fethi. *Türkiye’de Yüz Soruda Roman ve Toplumsal Gelişme.* Istanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi 1981.

Naci Fethi “Collective Survey.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1968,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1968: 205.

Naci Fethi. “Vurun İlgisizliğe.” *Yön,* no.78 (25 Septembre 1964).

Nayır, Yaşar Nabi “ Collective Survey.”In *Varlık Yıllığı*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1961: 167-177.

Nayır, Yaşar Nabi “Açık Oturum, *Edebiyatımızın Bugünki Sorunları*, 13 and 20 November 1966.” In Varlık *Yıllığı* 1967 ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Varlık Yayınları İstanbul, 1967: 147-230.

Nayır, Yaşar Nabi. “Collective Survey.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1964,* İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1964.

Nayır, Yaşar Nabi. “Collective Survey.”in *Varlık Yıllığı 1961*. Varlık Yayınları: İstanbul, 1960.

Nayır, Yaşar Nabi. “Collective Survey.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1962*, Varlık Yayınları: İstanbul, 1961.

Nesin, Aziz. “Collective Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, Istanbul: Varlık Yayinlari, 1973: 260 261.

Nesin, Aziz. *Bir Sürgünün Anıları*. İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1973.

Nesin, Aziz. *Büyük Grev.* İstanbul: Adam Yayınları 1996.

Noiriel, Gérard. *Dire la Vérité au Pouvoir: Les Intellectuels en Question*. Marseille: Agone, 2010.

Nutku, Özdemir. "Tanzimat'ın Getirdiği bir Tür: Tuluat Tiyatrosu" 2000. Available online at http://www.tiyatronline.com/Tuluat.htm.

Oktay, Ahmet. *Romanımıza ne oldu?* İstanbul: Dünya Kitapları, 2003.

Oktay, Ahmet. "*Toplumculuk, Yabancılasma ve Şiir*:" In *1967 Türk Edebiyatı,* ed. Memet Fuat. İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1968: 180 206.

Oktay, Ahmet. "Yazar ve Siyasa." *Değişim* no. *8.* In *Türk Edebiyatı 1963,* ed. Memet Fuat, İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1964: 25.

Oral, Zeynep. *O Güzel İnsanlar*. İstanbul: Sevda Cenap And Müzik Vakfı Yayınları, Kasım 1995.

Ozankaya, Özer. *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Siyasal Yönelimleri.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1966.

Ozouf Mona. 'Public Opinion' at the End of the Old Regime." *Journal of Modern History* 60, suppl. (September 1988).

Öz, Erdal. *Yaralısın*. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1974.

Özbek Nadir. "Alternatif Tarih Tahayyülleri: Siyaset, İdeoloji ve Osmanlı-Türkiye Tarihi." *Toplum ve Bilim,* no. 98 (Fall 2003): 234-257.

Özdemir, Hikmet. "Yön'ün Tarihe Bakışı." In*Yön Hareketi*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1986: 69-123.

Özdemir, Emin. *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı, Kavramlar, Dönemler, Yönelim*ler. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasi Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1980.

Özek, Çetin. "Türkiye'de Sanat Görevini Yapıyor mu?" *Ant*, no. 63 (12 March 1968).

Özgüç Agah. *Türk Sineması'nda Sansür*. Ankara: Kitle Yayıncılık, 2000.

Özkırımlı Atilla. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. *Vol. 1–2*. İstanbul: İnkılâp Yay., 2004.

Özlü, Demir. "Türk Edebiyatı ve Azgelişmişlik." In *Yapraklar*, no. 64 (September 1964), in *Türk Edebiyatı*, ed. Memet Fuat, İstanbul: De Yayınevi, 1965: 173 184.

Özon, Nijat. *Türk Sinema Tarihi.* Istanbul: Artist Yayınları, 1962.

Özon, Nijat. *Karagöz'den Sinemaya, Türk Sineması ve Sorunları I: Tarih, Sanat, Estetik, Endüstri, Ekonomi.* Ankara: Kitle Yayınları, 1995.

Özon, Nijat. *Karagöz'den Sinemaya, Türk Sineması ve Sorunları II: Eleştirme, Eleştiri Yazıları, Sinema ve Toplum, Denetleme, Sinema ve TV.* Ankara: Kitle Yayınları, 1995.

Pamuk, Şevket ve Toprak Zafer (eds.) *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınevi, 1988.

Pipes, Richard. *The Russian Intelligentsia*. New York: Columbia University Press,1961.

Porta Donatella della. "Protest, Protesters and Protest Policy: Public Discourses in Italy and Germany from the 1960s to the 1980s." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, Charles Tilly, How Social Movements Matter, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Portelli, Alessandro. *The Death of Luigi Trastulli, and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Rancière, Jacques. *Özgürleşen Seyirci.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2010.

Reed, T. V. *The Art of Protest: Culture and Activism from the Civil Rights Movement to the Streets of Seattle*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Refiğ, Halit. *Ulusal Sinema Kavgası*. Istanbul: Hareket Yayınları, 1971.

Ringer, Fritz. "The Intellectual Field, Intellectual History, and the Sociology of Knowledge." *Theory and Society* 19, no. 3 (June 1990).

Roberts, John. *Philosophizing the Everyday*. London: Pluto Press, 2006.

Sapiro, Gisèle. *La guerre des ecrivains 1940 1953*. Paris: Fayard, 1999.

Tahsin, Saraç. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1969: 150.

Sartre, Jean Paul. *Qu'est ce que la Literature*. Paris: Gallimard, 2005.

Saundres, Frances Stoner. *Parayı Veren Düdüğü Çaldı*. Istanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık, 2004.

Savaşır İskender, and Atılgan Bayar. "1960'larda Sosyalizm ve Edebiyat." In *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986.

Sayın, Aylin. *Türk Sinemasında Edebiyat Uyarlamaları ve Bu Uyarlamaların Toplumsal Yapıyla Etkileşimi.* MA Thesis, Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2005.

Schildt, Axel, and Detlef Siegfried. *Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960-1980*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.

Sezer, Sennur. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1976*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1977: 212.

Sezer, Sennur. Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1974.

Sezer, Sennur. "Collective Survey." In*Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, ed. Yaşar Nabir Nayır. Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi, 1969: 141

Sezer Sennur. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1968*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1968: 158.

Sezer Sennur. "Collective Survey." *Varlık Yıllığı 1966*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1967: 141 142.

Seyda, Mehmet "Collective Survey." *Varlık Yıllığı 1973*. ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1973: 262, 263.

Seyda, Mehmet. *Edebiyat Dostları*. Kitaş Yayınları, İstanbul: 1970.

Seymour Martin Lipset, Asoke Basu, "The Roles of the Intellectual and Political Roles." In *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals: Theory, Method and Case Study*, ed. Aleksander Gella. London: SAGE, 1976.

Shils, Edward. "The Intellectuals in the Political Development of the New States." *World Politics* 12, no.3 (April 1960): 329-368.

Small, Helen. *The Public Intellectual*. Malden, MA : Blackwell Pub., 2002.

Solok, Cevdet Kudret. "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi: 1969: 154-15..

Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, vol. 8. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986.

Solonas Fernando and Octavio Gettino. "Towards A Third Cinema" In *Film and Theory: An Anthology*.Edited by Robert Stam and Toby Miller, 265-287. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2000.

Soule Sarah A, and Jennifer Earl. "A Movement Society Evaluated: Collective Protest in The United States, 1960-1986." *Mobilization 10*, no. 3, October 2005: 345-364.

Soysal Mümtaz. "Sosyalist Kültür Derneği." *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 8. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları: 1986.

Soysal, Sevgi. *Tante Rosa*. Istanbul: Dost Yayınları, 1968.

Stephens, Julie. *Anti-Disciplinary Protest: Sixties Radicalism and Postmodernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Swartz, David. *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Şener, Mustafa. "Türkiye İşçi Partisi." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düsünce, Sol,*vol 8, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Steiner, Georg. "Marxism and Literary Critic." In *Sociology of Literature, Drama* ed.Elizabeth and Tom Burns, Middlesex Penguin Books: 1973.

Süreya, Cemal. *Şapkam Dolu Çiçekle*. İstanbul: Yön Yayıncılık, 1981.

Tahir Kemal (Demir). Orhan Kemal, Fakir Baykurt, Mahmut Makal, Talip Apaydın. *Beş Romancı Tartışıyor*, 1959'da Pazar Postasının düzenlediği açıkoturum, Istanbul : Düşün Yayınevi, 1960.

Tahir, Kemal. (Demir) "Survey." *Yeni Ufuklar* no. 92. (January 1960).

Tahir, Kemal. "Survey." *Yeni Ufuklar* no. 101 (October, Novembre 1960).

Tahir, Kemal. *Kurt Kanunu*. Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1969.

Tahir, Kemal. *Edebiyat Sanat Notlar I*. Istanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1989.

Tahir, Kemal. *1968, Notlar Sanat Edebiyat, II.* (Istanbul : Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1989.

Tahir, Kemal. *Yol Ayrımı*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1971.

Tamer, Ülkü. *Yaşamak Hatırlamaktır*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2011.

Tansuğ, Sezer. *Çağdaş Türk Sanatı*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1996.

Tanzimat'tan Bugüne Edebiyatçılar Ansiklopedisi. Vol. 1. İstanbul: YKY, 2001.

Taşkın, Yüksel. *Milliyetçi Muhafazakar Entelijansiya*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Tekeli, İlhan. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan Günümüze Eğitim Kurumlarının Gelisimi.” In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 3. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1983.

The 60s [videorecording] A Visnews/Lamancha Production, a video illustrating political and cultural events, trends, and popular culture of the 1960s, London : Visnews Video, 1988.

“The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture.” London: Routledge, 2008.

Tilly, Charles. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: Mc Grow Hill, 1978.

Tilly, Charles. *Social Movements 1768-2004.* London: Paradigm Publishers, 2004.

Toprak Zafer. “1968’i Yargılamak ya da 68 Kuşağına Mersiye.” *Cogito*, no.14, Spring 1998: 154-159.

Tör, Vedat Nedim. “Collective Survey.” *Varlık Yıllığı 1970*, Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi: 1969, p. 165

Tucker, Robert C. *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972.

Türkali, Vedat. *Yeşilçam Dedikleri Türkiye*. İstanbul: Gendaş, 2001.

Tütengil, Cavit Orhan. “*Varlık* Dergisi’nde Toplu Soruşturma.” In *Varlık Yıllığı* 1970, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1970: 166.

Tütengil, Cavit Orhan. “Sayılarla Türkiye’nin Bazı Toplumsal Görüntüleri.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1972,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1972: 195- 209.

Tütengil, Cavit Orhan “Cumhuriyet’in 50. Yılında Sosyo-ekonomik ve Kültürel Göstergeler." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1973,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1973: 199-211.

Tütengil, Cavit Orhan. “Sayılarla Türkiye’nin Sosyo-ekonomik ve Kültürel Durumu.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1974* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1974: 209-225.

Tütengil, Cavit Orhan. “Sayılarla Türkiye’nin Sosyo-ekonomik ve Kültürel Durumu.”*Varlık Yıllıkları 1976,* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1977.

Türkay Osman. *Edebiyat, Eleştiri ve Dil Üzerine Düşünceler*. Kıbrıs : KKTC Milli Eğitim ve Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1993.

Türkeş, A Ömer. “Sol’un Romanı.” In *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce Tarihi*, Vol: 8, Sol, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul: 2007.

Uslu, Mehmet Fatih. *Resimli Ay Magazine (1929-1931) The Emergence of an Oppositional Focus Between Socialism and Avant-Gardism."* MA Thesis, Bogaziçi University, 2004.

Uturgauri, Svetlana. *Sovyet Türkologlarının Türk Edebiyatı İncelemeleri*. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1989.

Uyar, Tomris. "Millyet Yayınlarının Roman Yarışması Neler Getirdi." *Milliyet Sanat*, no. 130, (2 May1975?.

Uyar, Tomris. *Kitapla Direniş, Yazılar, Söyleşiler, Soruşturmalar*. Istanbul: YKY, 2011.

Uyar Tomris. "Elleri Var Özgürlüğün!" *Papirüs*, no. 1 (June 1966).

Uyar, Turgut "Collective Survey." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1968* ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1968: 213.

Uyar, Turgut. "Collective Survey." *Dönem*, no. 2, (October 1964): 90-92.

Uyar, Turgut. *Divan.* Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1970.

Uyar, Turgut. *Toplandılar*: Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1974.

Uyguner, Muzaffer. "1971'de Şiirmiz." In *Varlık Yıllığı 1972*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1972: 48 79.

Ünsal, Artun. *Umuttan Yalnızlığa: Türkiye İsçi Partisi 1961-1971*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2002.

Ünal, Erkal. *Invited Sojourners: A Survey of Translations into Turkish of Non Fiction Left Books between 1960 and 1971*. Boğaziçi University, M.A. Thesis, 2006.

Ünal, Erkal. "Sol Düsüncenin Ortasında ve Kıyısında: Çeviri Kitaplar." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düsünce. Sol,* Vol. 8. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Ünüvar, Kerem. "Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu (1965-1969)." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düsünce, Sol,* Vol. 8. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Ünüvar, Kerem. *"*Türkiye Devrimci Gençlik Federasyonu" (1970-1971)." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düsünce, Sol,* Vol. 8. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Yaman, Zeynep Yasa. "1950'lerin Sanatsal Ortamı ve Temsil Sorunu.*" Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 79 (1998): 94-137.

Yalman, Galip. "Popülizm, Bürokratik Otoriter Devlet ve Türkiye." *11. Tez,* no 1 (1985).

Yalman, Galip. “Türkiye’de Devlet ve Burjuvazi: Alternatif Bir Okuma Denemesi.” In *Sürekli Kriz Politikaları: Türkiye’de Sınıf, İdeoloji ve Devlet*, eds. Neşecan Balkan and Sungur Savran, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2002.

Yavuz, Hilmi “İnsancıllık, Yapısalcılık Tartışması.” *Yeni Ufuklar*, no. 268 (1976).

Yavuz Hilmi in Adnan Binyazar, “1971’de Deneme, Eleştiri, İnceleme.” In *Varlık Yıllığı 1972*, ed. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1972: 82, Collective Survey prepared by Refik Durbaş ın January 1971, the art and literature supplement of *Cumhuriyet*.

Yetkin Suut Kemal. “Köy Romanı.” *Türk Dili*, no. 126 (1962): 108-111.

Yiyen, Emel. *Yeditepe Dergisi Etrafında Gelişen Sanat Faaliyetleri, 1970 1983*. MA Thesis, Gazi Üniversitesi, 2007.

Walder, Dennis. “Reading Fathers and Sons.” In *The Realist Novel*. London, New York: Routledge, 1995.

White, Hayden *Topics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 1978, p. 121.

Widdowson, Peter. *What is Literature*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Wolff, Janet. *The Social Production of Art*. New York: New York University Press, 1984.

Zarakoğlu, Ragıp. “68’in Mirası.” In *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, Vol.8. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1986.

Zeraffa, Michel. “The Novel as Literary Form and Social Institutions.” In *Sociology of Literature – Drama*. eds. Elizabeth and Tom Burns. London: Penguin Books, 1973.

Zima, Peter. V. *Critique Littéraire et Esthetique, Les Fondements Esthetique des Theories de le Litterarure.* Paris : L'Harmattan, 2003.

Zileli, Gün. *Yarılma: 1954-1972*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Zileli, Gün. “68’in İdeolojik Kaynakları.” *Birikim*, no. 109 (May 1998): 96-105.

Zryd, Michael. “The Academy and the Avant-Garde: A Relationship of Dependence and Resistance.” *Cinema Journal* 45, no. 2 (2006): 17-41.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris and Co Ltd. Publishers, 1994.

Interviews:

Interview with Giovanni Scognamillo, (May 2007, Istanbul).

Interview with Jak Şalom, (May 2007, via internet.)

Magazines

Forum (1957-1960)

Akis (1959-1960)

Türk Solu (1967-1969)

Yön (1962-1965)

Ant (1965-1970)

Varlık Yıllığı (1960-1980)

Milliyet Sanat (1960-1980)

Milliyet'den Seçmeler (1974-1979)

Yeni Dergi (1960- 1970)

Varlık (1960- 1980)

Nesin *Yıllığı* (1976- 1980)