8

Controlling National Identity and Reshaping Public Taste: The Turkish State's Music Policies in the 1920s and 1930s

Ayhan Erol

This article provides a historical analysis of the Turkish state's music policies with the aim of examining their changing meanings within the general context of the history of modernization in Turkey. Special attention is given to the 1920s and 1930s, a period in which the underlying assumption was that once Turkish musical life was altered through through the activity of state institutions, the musical behavior of individuals could easily be molded and made to fit the requirements of the newly-created circumstances.

As soon as one begins to reflect on musical change, one has to take into account an obvious fact: first, that musical culture is what is permanent; second, that it is what is invented. This dialectic of permanence and change in musical cultures proceeds in part from the relationship that every society is bound to have with its environment. Musical change is often drastic, however, when powerful groups in the society – particularly the state – make decisions affecting music which are based on non-musical values.

On the processes of musical change, Jean During has argued that a distinction could be made between internal change, or that which occurs naturally, such as adapting to new situations or response to public demand (this may be simply aesthetic), and external change which results from the direct intervention of non-musical authorities. The authorities do not only manipulate the changes, they skillfully appropriate the cultural heritage, turn it into an

instrument of power and misappropriate it to their own advantage (During 2005: 144). Power has always interested itself in music and its effect on the psyche, its potential to seduce, to communicate and to unify. Thus, music has always been put under close supervision of the political elite.

Since music derives its social power from its ability to instantiate community, polity, and history, it can be used institutionally to help promote absolute political and social control. As Attali (2003: 20) pointed out,

> music localizes and specifies power, because it marks and regiments the rare noises that cultures, in their normalization of behavior, see fit to authorize. When power wants to make people forget, music is ritual sacrifice, the scapegoat; when it wants them to believe, music is enactment, representation; when it wants to silence them, it is reproduced, normalized, repetition. Thus, it heralds the subversion of both the existing code and power in the making, well before the latter is in place.

Music is intensely involved in the propagation of dominant classifications, and has been a tool in the hands of the new states in the developing world, or rather, of those classes which have the highest stake in these new social formations. This control is principally enacted through state control or influence over universities, conservatories and archives, and is disseminated through its media systems (Stokes 1997: 10). However, the use of music in pragmatic ways varies according to the political and social circumstances within the state itself. It is, therefore, filtered through ever-changing political and social circumstances and is consequently understood, used, and reinterpreted in a multitude of ways. The importance and significance of music in terms of the state and society were discovered and redefined at particular junctures in the history of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. This history is simultaneously Turkey's history of modernization and Westernization, extending back to the institutional reforms of the late Ottoman era and epitomized by the establishment of a secular nation-state in 1923. To understand this relationship it is necessary to look at Turkey's history of modernization, which was parallel to the construction of the state-endorsed music policy.

Modernization under Kemalism

The Ottoman Empire (1299–1922) was a multinational, multi-cultural union while the Republic of Turkey was built as a nation-state in 1923. Most students of the Turkish case agree, however, that there was continuity between Ottoman modernizers and the founders of the Turkish state. Although there had been a change in the legitimating discourse of state authority in the transition from empire to nation–state, the new Turkish state has been built on a structural basis inherited from the Ottoman past. This is a patrimonial state structure based on centre-periphery opposition. Accordingly, as a country that joined the global modernization process quite late, Turkey was incapable of developing a civil society beyond the centre and periphery distinction, the latter cutting across the whole society. In other words, having been dominant in the period of the Turkish Republic as well as in the Ottoman past, the patrimonial state structure based on the centre-periphery opposition was what has prevented Turkey from developing its democracy.

Scholars distinguish between modernization from above and modernization as a self-generating social process. In the case of modernization from above, the modernizers wield state power and act in their own interests. Therefore scholars argue that it is necessary to make a distinction between modernity as a potentially liberating historical condition and its instrumentalization for a political project of domination. Of all the words derivative of the root 'modern', that which applies most readily to the Turkish experience is 'modernization' – defined as a project. The agency behind the project was the modernizing elite, and what they sought to achieve was the imposition of institutions, beliefs, and behavior consonant with their understanding of modernity on the chosen object: the people of Turkey (Keyder 1997: 31). The Republican Project of Westernization was executed 'from above', in a rather authoritarian way, without giving consideration to any social resistance (Tekelioğlu 2001: 106). The Turkish mode of modernization is an unusual example of how indigenous ruling elites have imposed their notions of a Western cultural model, resulting in conversion almost on a civilizational scale (Göle 1997: 70). Such liberal definitions of modernity make the

building of national identity strategies potentially totalitarian. In fact, such explanations are also common among both Marxists and non-Marxists not only in Turkey but also in other so-called 'late-developing' countries. In fact the political cultures, no matter how unique, always recycle foreign representations, theories, or practices, because not all regimes possess the means to realise their ends.

Turkish modernizers had readily identified modernization with Westernization – with bringing Turkey into the civilization of Europe. Modernity, in their conception, was a total project: one of embracing and internalizing all the cultural dimensions that made Europe modern (Keyder 1997: 29). The main problem underlying these approaches is the tacit presumption that problems which drifted Turkey into statism and authoritarianism (i.e. non-democratic state structures) and/or into an eclectic system consisting of archaic elements that are not entirely capitalist derive from its 'latecomer' or 'late-developing' country status. Due to the centrality of the theory of the time lag in their approach, these theories locate every unique experience of each nation in a historical continuum or a developmental trajectory that is conceived as a single, linear and normative temporality (Yarar 2008: 37). On the contrary, modernization does not consist of an endogenous and universal evolution from the 'traditional' to the 'modern', but instead involves regional or international emulation (Bayart 2005: 67). Within this context, modernization is a historical process of discursive formation constituted (simultaneously) at global and local levels and consisting of ongoing social struggle (Yarar 2008: 41). Ultimately, the invention of political modernity by inventing tradition involves a number of political strategies. In many countries, the elaboration of a national tradition was internally contradictory.

In his book on the inter-war experience of Japan's modern life, Harootunian (2000) has argued that the concept of 'co-existing' or 'co-eval' modernity differs from the more recent appeals to 'alternative' and 'retroactive' modernity. For him, 'co-eval modernity' simply calls attention to the experience of sharing the same temporality, that whatever and however a society develops, it is simply taking place at the same time as other modernities. But the experience also, and necessarily, marks a difference. Hence, the concept of

'co-eval modernity' helps us to understand differences as well as similarities between Turkey's experience of modernity and that of other countries, mainly those in Europe, not in hierarchical-quantitative, but in horizontal-qualitative terms (Yarar 2008: 39). Here, the focus of analysis shifts from the unevenness *within* societies to its appearances *between* societies.

State nobility in France, and no doubt in Japan as well, is a corporate body which, created in the course of the state's creation, had indeed to create the state in order to create itself as holder of a legitimate monopoly on state power (Bourdieu 1998: 22). In the case of the Republic of Turkey, where the invention of a national culture is directly tied to the invention of the state, the political elites such as state nobility attempted to combine progressive-reformism (in terms of anti-imperialism, secularity and individual liberty from the old traditions) with statist corporatism (in terms of disciplining and controlling society through a central power mechanism), with the goal of building an independent nation state.

Kemalism is the name given to the official doctrine guiding the Turkish political establishment in its secular, republican era, particularly during the 1920s and 1930s, following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (Mateescu 2006: 225). The essence of the Kemalist project was the attempt to defeat Western imperialism by adopting Westernization (Gülalp 1997: 50). In this sense political nationalism in Turkey differs from Russian (internationalist), German (imperialist), Asian and Arab (anti-colonialist or anti-imperialist) nationalisms (Yarar 2008: 47). Its principles have successfully endured the challenges of many rivals in history. One by one, consecrated ideologies ranging from extreme left to extreme right were pushed aside by Kemalism as concentrated in the emblematic figure of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, father of modern Turkey and initiator of the reformist current bearing his name (Mateescu 2006: 225). In other words, for the ruling Kemalist elites, the unity of society achieved through 'progress' of a Western sort is the ultimate goal. Thus, throughout republican history, all kinds of differentiation—ethnic, ideological, religious, and economic—have been viewed not as natural components of a pluralistic democracy but as sources of instability and as threats to unity and progress (Göle 1997: 71). In other words, an essential charac-

teristic of Kemalism is that its principles are usually encoded in an official ideology understood here as an ideology of order proclaiming the primacy of the political community over the individual.

Scholars usually tend to associate Kemalism with populism, nationalism, secularism, or statism and portray it as centered on a rather authoritarian image of Atatürk. Biographers, too, take sides in this debate about Kemalism and its central political figure. Patrick Kinross, for instance, portrays Mustafa Kemal as a Turkish hero and attributes his authoritarianism to the historical context in which such political practice was the rule rather than the exception. Andrew Mango, on the other hand, adopts a viewpoint more anchored in our contemporary political values and sheds more light on the authoritarian features of a leader who was 'always right.' However, despite the sometimes naive comparisons between Kemalism and Fascist or Communist dictatorships, there has been no serious examination of the political making of the doctrine from the vantage point of the ideological substance of totalitarianism (Mateescu 2006: 225). It is hardly possible to compare the repression of Kemalist policy to the mass destruction of Fascism or Communism even though it might be argued on behalf of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, that the authoritarianism was a necessary means, rather than an ideal end.

In the 1930s, when there was a strong tendency towards state-centred and authoritarian regimes in other parts of the world including the West, the state corporatist aspect began to dominate the rationality of the political elite in ruling the state and society, and the liberalizing effects of the modern regime began to be limited, with a tendency towards state authoritarianism based on a single party regime (Yarar 2008: 47). The secularizing policies of the Turkish republic have tended to unravel its Islamic moorings. However, some scholars of the Turkish case stress the concepts of 'the sacralization of politics' and 'political religion' as a modern phenomenon whose appearance became possible only after the official separation of the political institutions from the traditional religious institutions.

The process by which a political religion is born is the sacralization of politics, that is, 'the formation of a religious dimension in politics that is distinct from, and autonomous of, traditional religious institutions'. *Political religion*,

on the other hand, is significantly defined by Gentile as 'the sacralization of an *ideology* and an integralist political movement that deifies the mythical secular entity'. Unlike civil religions, political religions refuse to cohabit with ideological alternatives and claim the primacy for the community while denying it to the individual in the Roussean tradition of thought. As concerns the traditional religion, a political religion rather tends to subordinate it by incorporating it into the new, revolutionary cult. Scholars of Turkish modernization could agree that, in the making of the post-Ottoman Turkish political identity, Kemalism tended to act more like a political rather than a civil religion. This essay suggests that such an idea is valid but also points at some civic aspects of Kemalism (Mateescu 2006: 227). Nationalism being or becoming a political religion is indissolubly linked to its own ideology, which in turn is an *ideology of order*. As an ideology of order, Kemalism did impose a rather bizarre understanding of democracy and founded its argument on an even more bizarre version of nationalism. The solidarism and inclusiveness underlying this imposition effort were, however, far from the tendencies manifested in the totalitarian or authoritarian regimes of Europe (Mateescu 2006: 240). Despite the fact that official ideology was based on an authoritarianism that contradicted their ubiquitous libertarian discourse, all regimes resulting from the invention of tradition were not necessarily totalitarian. The case of Turkey seems to be totalitarian, but its realisation hardly got beyond the stage of the authoritarian.

The Universalization of the Official Ideology: 'To Reach the Level of Contemporary Civilization'

The Turkish anti-imperialist movement against the invasion by the Western troops was the main local-global context through which the complex and contradictory structure of Turkish modernization discourse came into being as a combination of modernist progressivism and anti-imperialist nationalism. It has emerged as the strongest alternative project and force that could provide resistance to the colonial imperialist Western powers of the

time. Hence the nation-building project was realized within the context of the modernization process as the main force contributing to the country's independence and to the new level of civilization that was ironically characterised by the Western model of modernization (as a global design) itself (Yarar 2008: 46). The reformers, in particular Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, had envisioned for Turkey an organized, well-articulated, linear process of modernization through which the whole nation was going to move simultaneously and with uniform experience. At the end of this process, there would emerge a militantly secular, ethnically homogeneous republic well on its way to catching up with the civilized nations of the West (Kasaba 1997: 11).

The intention of the reforms was to bring about a radical and thorough revolution, from macrocosmic structural change to far from insignificant details. Within a short space of time, the religious apparatus of the Ottoman state had been dismantled and the new government had endorsed the Gregorian calendar, the employment of metric weights and measures, the compulsory adoption of surnames, reforms of dress codes, language, and every expression of cultural identity (Stokes 1992: 24). The monopoly of the universal can only be obtained at the cost of submission (if only in appearance) to the universal and of a universal recognition of the universalist representation of domination presented as legitimate and disinterested (Bourdieu 1998: 59). Kemalism in Turkey was a paradigmatic model of Third World nationalism in that it perceived and defined Westernization as the attainment of 'universal' civilization (Gülalp 1997: 50). As Mustafa Kemal Atatürk has repeatedly stated, the main objective of reforms is to 'reach the level of contemporary civilization' (*muassir medeniyet seviyesine erismek*), that is, of Western civilization. Westernization, in this framework, is contained in the name of 'universalism'. Technology, rules of conduct, worldview, and everything else that makes the West distinctive and sets it apart from more 'primitive' societies impart to Western civilization a superiority that lends a presumption of universality to its cultural model. Two examples can be given to illustrate this: cultural and linguistic unification.

Cultural and linguistic unification is accompanied by the imposition of the dominant language and culture as legitimate and by the rejection of all other

languages into indignity (thus demoted as patois or local dialects). By rising to universality, a particular culture or language causes all others to fall into particularity. What is more, given that the universalization of requirements thus officially instituted does not come with a universalization of access to the means needed to fulfill them, this fosters both the monopolization of the universal by the few and the dispossession of all others, who are, in a way, thereby mutilated in their humanity (Bourdieu 1998: 46). In the transformation from the defunct Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey, the official imperial language, Ottoman Turkish, represented an undesired past in the eyes of the Turkish nationalists. Just as the Ottoman Empire was an assembly of many ethnic groups, Ottoman Turkish was a conglomeration of Turkish, Arabic and Persian with some Italian, Greek, Armenian and other European elements, and was written using Arabic characters. Ottoman Turkish was not, therefore, palatable for the westernizing, nationalist elite, who wanted to create a nation-state for the Turks and to burn the bridges connecting the nascent republic to its Islamic, oriental predecessor. As part of Atatürk's reform movement, first, the alphabet was romanized in 1928. The establishment of the Turkish Language Institute (Turk Dil Kurumu) followed in 1932 (Aytürk 2004: 10).

Culture is unifying: the state contributes to the unification of the cultural market by unifying all codes, linguistic and juridical, and by effecting a homogenization of all forms of communication (Bourdieu 1998: 45). And it thereby contributes to the construction of what is commonly designated as national identity (or, in a more traditional language, national character). It is especially through the school, with the universal accessibility of elementary education, that the unifying action of the state is exercised in matters of culture. This is a fundamental component in the construction of the nation-state. The creation of a national society goes hand in hand with universal educability (Bourdieu 1998: 62). By universally imposing and inculcating (within the limits of its authority) a dominant culture thus constituted as a *legitimate national* culture, the school system, through the teaching of history (and especially the history of literature), inculcates the foundations of a true 'civic religion' and more precisely, the fundamental presuppositions of the national

self-image (Bourdieu 1998: 46). The culmination of all reforms came in 1929 with the introduction of the National Schools, intended to instill the new nationalistic and pro-Western identity. The reforms were implemented quite rapidly and the literacy level rose from around 8 percent in 1928 to over 20 percent in 1935. In addition to National Schools, the People's House (*Halkevleri*) provided free education to adults (Tekelioğlu 2001: 94).

The terms 'Westernization' and 'Europeanization', which were widely used by nineteenth- and twentieth-century reformers, overtly express the willing participation that underlies the borrowing of institutions, ideas, and manners from the West. The history of modernization in Turkey can be considered the most radical example of such a voluntary cultural shift. Kemalist reformers' efforts went far beyond modernizing the state apparatus as the country changed from a multiethnic Ottoman empire to a secular republican nation-state; they also attempted to penetrate into the lifestyles, manners, behavior, and daily customs of the people (Göle 1997: 69). Altogether, then, Islam was an important component of the old system before its gradual demise during the republican era, when secular reforms abolished the caliphate, established a state monopoly over education, disestablished the institution of the ulama (doctors of Islamic law), rejected Islamic law and adopted a modified version of the Swiss Civil Code, latinized the alphabet, and, in 1928, struck out the sentence in the Constitution of 1924 which stated that Turks were of the Islamic faith (Mardin 1997: 59). It is in the realm of symbolic production that the grip of the state is felt most powerfully (Bourdieu 1998: 38). The paradigm example of Atatürk's exquisite understanding of the power of the manipulation of symbols was the Hat Law, enacted in 1925. This replaced that emblem of Ottomanism, the fez, with a 'civilized' Western-style peaked or brimmed hat (Stokes 1992: 25). To sum it up, in order to be a modern society Turks had to free themselves from this burden and make a clean start by cutting their ties to their recent (i.e., Ottoman) history. The old establishment was associated with corruption while the new was portrayed as the right one for the nation. Atatürk's ideal was to build up a 'nation' from the ashes of the empire. The state tried to construct an official (westernized) culture which underestimated the cultural needs of the Turk-

ish people. Among the cultural and artistic policies carried out by the state, music took a pride of place.

The Music Reform as a 'Symbolic Violence'

The state molds mental structures and imposes common principles of vision and division, forms of thinking. From the Marxist models which tend to treat the state as a mere organ of coercion to Max Weber's classical definition, or from Norbert Elias's to Charles Tilly's formulations, most models of the genesis of the state have privileged the concentration of the capital of physical force. Using a variation of Weber's famous formula, Bourdieu defines the state as an X, which successfully claims the monopoly of legitimate use of physical and symbolic violence over a definite territory and over the totality of the corresponding population. If the state is able to exert symbolic violence, that is because it incarnates itself simultaneously in objectivity, in the form of specific organizational structures and mechanisms, and in subjectivity, in the form of mental structures and categories of perception and thought (Bourdieu 1998: 40).

For Atatürk, the revolution had to be an all-encompassing undertaking, affecting every aspect of life in Turkey. Thus all kinds of reforms implemented by the state were perceived as a revolution. There is no doubt that music had an important place within the reforms Atatürk wanted to realise. It was an example of the most important symbolic violence aimed at imposing a particular vision of the state. Just as with other reforms, the main objective of the music reform was to 'reach the level of contemporary civilization'. Western music, in this framework, was embraced in the name of 'universalism'. In other words, by accepting the historical superiority of the West as the producer of modernity, the political elite eagerly embraced European classical music.

All the reforms in the field of music during the establishment of the nation-state and national identity originated from the nationalism of Ziya Gokalp, a sociologist who was considerably influenced by Durkheim, the main ideolo-

gist of the time. Gökalp believed that only one music could exist as the true, national music of Turkey, and this was to be achieved through a synthesis of Turkish folk music and the musical techniques of Western civilization. In his book, The Principles of Turkism (*Türkçülüğün Esasları*), first published in 1923, he summarized his propositions on the issue of national music: there are today three musical genre in our country: Eastern music, Western music, and folk music. Which one of them is national for us? We have seen that Eastern music is morbid and non-national. Since folk music represents culture and Western music is the music of our new civilization, neither should be foreign to us. Therefore our national music will be born out of the welding of folk and Western music. Our folk music provides us with a rich treasury of melodies. If we collect and rearrange them in accordance with the Western musical style, we shall have one both national and European" (Gökalp 1970: 147). In describing 'Eastern' music as morbid, Gökalp is clearly speaking the language of the Western orientalist (Stokes 1992: 34).

The new state's cultural project of modernization formulated by Ziya Gökalp depended on the distinction between culture and civilization. In this way, societies have both cultures and civilizations, but the two are quite different things. From this perspective, the culture of modern Turkey had to be based on Turkish peasants of Anatolia looking back to Central Asia for roots. 'Real' musical heritage for the Turkish nation was to be found in the music of Anatolian people in rural areas. Thus, folk music was reinvented by the intelligentsia of the new state because of the pre-islamic roots and cultural origin. Since civilization was synonymous with 'progress', the outdated Arab civilization representing resistance to the possibility of change had to be abandoned, and Western civilization, having progressed with philosophy, science, technology and art, had to be adopted as the new preference of civilization for the Turkish nation. There was, therefore, no contradiction involved in the adaptation of Western music because of the artifact of Western civilization. Gökalp was in favour of the technique of synthesizing monophonic folk music and polyphonic Western music. The latter represents 'civilization' while the former belongs to 'culture'. From this viewpoint, the Western music was seen in technicist terms, just as was the Latin alpha-

bet. In order to create a national music culture, the state began to collect folk songs from Anatolia.

Redefinition of the 'popular' (via folklore and history) is a common feature of all nationalisms and is expected to proceed from the assimilation of various decontextualized elements of mass culture to the totalizing semiotics of the national project. In the Turkish case, this redefinition could take place with more than the usual liberty because the freshly constituted elements of a popular 'tradition' were represented to the masses as the authentic (and official) version, without much concern for preexisting versions (Keyder 1997: 36). Moreover, previous European movements had already provided answers to this problem. As in Herder's Germany, the other European countries also saw folklore (or folk music) as the basis upon which to construct their own musical tradition (Reily 1997: 79). The same could be said of the case of Turkey. The idea that Turkish folk music represents the true music of the Turkish nation came into being with the founding of the Turkish Republic as a modern nation-state in 1923. Many folk/rural songs from Anatolia were collected as a result of the desire to identify the national characteristics of the 'invented culture'. Thus, collecting folk songs was one of the important ways of discovering and disseminating Turkish national culture (Erol 2008: 110). Of course, all songs belonging to the different communities identifying themselves specifically in terms of their ethnic, religious, regional, and local origins were considered by the state to be Turkish Folk Music. The political elites of the Republic of Turkey who have invented Turkish Folk Music have often unquestioningly assumed either that the composers of folk music were unknown, or that instead of being composed, the music developed as a result of a group process. This preference is based on the homogenization of different musical cultures living in Anatolia in order to create a national culture. This is also, of course, a policy of constructing and controlling the representations of ethnic identities. Turkish folk music is seen in terms of regional, not ethnic division since the state has divided Anatolia into seven regions.

The construction of the state monopoly over physical and symbolic violence is inseparable from the construction of the field of struggles for the

monopoly over the advantages attached to this monopoly (Bourdieu 1998: 58). One of the most far-reaching social structuring apparatuses, the state broadcasting monopoly, was perceived by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his colleagues as a means of promoting modernization and nationalism. In Turkey, the first radio station sponsored and controlled by the state began its activities in 1927. In 1964, the state established the Turkish Radio and Television Corporation (TRT) to expand radio facilities and develop public television, and its monopoly continued until 1990 by banning free media. As the official institutional agent of the state's music policy, TRT tried to mould public taste. Thus, the state-endorsed 'authentic' performance of music and the media policy of the state became tightly interconnected. It was not until 1948, however, with the formation of Muzaffer Sarısözen's famous 'Voices from the Homeland Chorus' ('*Yurttan Sesler Korosu*'), that a new folk music was 'reinvented' on the basis of what had been collected (Stokes 2000: 221). When the executives of TRT were confronted with the problem that the peasant culture had also changed ('become decadent' in the words of Mustafa Sarısözen, one of the most important collectors who was a bağlama player and an artist of TRT) and that their song repertoire consisted of new and old pieces, they formulated a set of criteria for the authentic folk song: authentic folk songs must be old and anonymous, they must exist in oral tradition, they must have variant forms, and they must come from uneducated rural people. In fact, Sarısözen has used folk music archives collected by state institutions as material for his teaching and performing repertory at the state radio in Ankara since the 1930s. Also, it is important to note that although Sarısözen and his colleagues attempted to conserve 'authentic folk music', they stripped folk songs of their local nuances and those characteristics that signify regional variations in order to arrive at a 'standard'.

As a matter of ideological principle, the aim of the music reforms was the creation of a national cultural identity. Turkish pupils went to Europe in order to learn Western music. Upon returning to Turkey they began to construct 'Contemporary Turkish Art Music' combining folk music and western musical techniques. So, rural melodies 'invented' by the state as Turkish Folk Music were used by musicians educated on Western music in order to create

a completely new national musical culture. However, the musical revolution in Turkey came at a time when European composers were experimenting with forms of musical style that no longer relied on the system of key relationships that had guided Western music for three centuries. Although Turkish composers tried not to stray from the prescribed criteria, most of their works were based on 'modern' composition techniques. In other words, their compositional styles were based on the music of the particular European style that they had learned. It might be useful here to note that 'the Contemporary Turkish Art Music' was a kind of musical syncretism which combines Turkish folk tunes with the harmonies of European classical music. The new generation of national composers included prominent musicians such as Adnan Saygun, Ulvi Cemal Erkin, Cemal Resit Rey, Necil Kazim Akses, and Hasan Ferid Alnar. They were called the 'Turkish Five' as a version of the Russian 'Five', a group of composers in Russia in the 19^{th} century. Also, the state invited European music specialists to Turkey. In 1936, Béla Bartók travelled at the invitation of the Ankar a People's House (*Halkevi*) to Ystanbul, Ankara and Adana in order to conduct field research in Turkey. Adnan Saygun accompanied Bartok during his trip in Turkey. Paul Hindemith was invited by the Turkish government in order to supervise the foundation of the Ankara State Conservatory in 1935, even though the state had founded a music teachers' school (*Musiki Muallim Mektebi*) in Ankara as early as in 1924.

As mentioned earlier, political religions feel uncomfortable with other ideologies since they would naturally propose alternative interpretations of reality. A political religion evolves around the image of a charismatic leader whose name and image become associated with the deification of the state as defined by the revolutionary political establishment. Atatürk was a charismatic and ambitious leader as well, and there were so many passions to be managed. For him, what was important was action. In his interview with a journalist for *Vossicce Zeitung*, Emile Ludwig, Atatürk asked in 1930: 'how long has it taken you to reach the current status of Western music'?, Atatürk immediately answered his own question, 'It has been some one hundred years. We don't have time to wait this long' (Oransay 1985: 33). As Atatürk

repeatedly declared, his intention was 'to realize great issues within a short space of time'. He commissioned a special opera composition from Ahmed Adnan Saygun, a young composer of the Republic, for the 1934 visit of the Iranian president, Shah Riza Pehlevi. The content of the opera, *the Özsoy*, based on the brotherhood between Turkish and Iranian people, was determined by Atatürk himself (Saygun 1987: 37). Atatürk's aim was to show that among Eastern countries the Turks who was the most sophisticated nation, which appreciated and absorbed the Western culture and art.

Bourdieu (1998: 42) argued that the state could not have succeeded in progressively establishing its monopoly over violence without dispossessing its domestic competitors of their instruments of physical violence and the right to use them, thereby contributing to the emergence of one of the most essential dimensions of the 'civilizing process'. The same syllogism is applicable to symbolic violence operated by the Turkish state. I am not sure whether the Turkish state has contributed to the emergence of one of the most essential dimensions of the 'civilizing process'. However it is obvious that the Turkish state tried to succeed in progressively establishing its monopoly over symbolic violence by dispossessing its domestic competitors of instruments of expressive culture and of the right to use them. According to the political elite, the Traditional Turkish Art Music symbolized the backwardness of the old Ottoman Empire, and it was not a suitable national symbol since it was 'alien' to the 'innate character' of the Turks. Many types of music, particularly the traditional Turkish art music and the Sufi music, were condemned as decadent Ottoman heritage. Incidentally, it would be useful to say that the term of traditional Turkish art music (*geleneksel Türk sanat müziği*) sometimes appears in Turkish as classical Turkish music (*klasik Türk müziği*), Turkish Art Music (*Türk Sanat Müziği*), Turkish music (*Türk müziği*), or Fasıl music (*Fasıl müziği*). In fact, each of these serves as an authenticity marker of a hierarchical discursive formation in terms of their musicians and audience's discursive and practical consciousness because of the validating criterion of musical value.

The political elites of the Republic of Turkey freely used categories such as 'old' and 'new' or 'traditional' and 'Western' in order to reduce the di-

mensions of their task to manageable proportions and represent themselves as the sole bearers of progress. They regarded reform strictly as a top-down process (Kasaba 1997: 17). In order to guarantee the desired outcome, they imposed restrictions and outright bans on the traditional Turkish art music and its organizations, and they labeled the art music of the previous state as 'remnants' of an old order. When the Ottoman dervish lodges were closed by the state in 1925 during secularization, the second most vital arena for the production of traditional music, after the Ottoman court itself, was eliminated (Özbek 1997: 178). In the Republic of Turkey, the Ottoman court orchestra became the presidential orchestra of the Turkish Republic in 1924, Eastern music branches of the conservatories were removed in 1926. Education in traditional Turkish art music could not been provided in the state conservatories in Turkey until 1976.

Official Legitimation of Western Music

One of the most important goals of the music reform was to enable the Turkish Republic to break away from the cultural domination of the Ottoman period. The political elite not only forbade traditional Turkish art music practices but also declared themselves against these kinds of musical practices. This approach means that traditional Turkish art music has not been legitimized by the political elite.

The concept of legitimacy does not necessarily mean that certain kinds of activity are forbidden, but simply that some forms of expression are valued more highly than others. In relation to music, legitimacy means that some musical activities will be considered very important, and others will hardly be recognized. Legitimacy is basically the result of processes involving the gradual acceptance of particular types of music by various groups in a society. When the leaders in a society adopt a music complex or a musical style to enhance their prestige or strengthen their position, legitimacy usually follows their influence (Keammer 1993: 65). Traditional Turkish Art Music that has not been legitimized by the political elites of the Republic

of Turkey might still have been found to contain intrinsic qualities that are highly valued by many people including Atatürk and his friends. In fact, Atatürk's musical choice was guided by his own taste. It was common knowledge that he loved to listen to traditional Turkish art music. Basically he just distinguished between the emotional and the rational because for him, unlike Eastern music, Western music was logical and rational.

Since the Ottoman elite, for its part, identified with an Ottoman culture that was open to Byzantine, Arabic, Persian, Jewish, and Armenian influences, and that was out of step with the demotic culture of the countryside, Atatürk made a statement to Emil Ludwig, a journalist for *Vossicce Zeitung*, in 1930, by declaring against Eastern music: 'these are residues from the Byzantine. Our real music can only be heard among Anatolian people' (Oransay 1985: 33). Atatürk's most important statements on music were raised to a higher level by his speech in parliament dated 1^{st} November 1934.

> The index of the change undergone by a nation is its capacity to absorb and perceive change in music. The music that they would dare to have us listen to today does not belong to us. Thus this music is far from something to take pride in. We have to know this well. It is necessary to collect the high sentiments and statements belonging to our nation expressing fine emotions and ideas, and to operate on them within the contemporary rules of music. Only in this way can Turkish national music evolve and take its place within the universal music (Oransay 1985: 27).

A short time after this speech of Atatürk in parliament, the traditional Turkish art music – though not folk music – was banned from the radio stations in 1934 for fifteen months.

The existence of discourse is one criterion of determining legitimacy; skill in a legitimate musical idiom also provides coveted recognition, whereas skill in non-legitimate music tends to go unnoticed (Keammer 1993: 68). In 1928, Atatürk made his first public assessment against Eastern music. He attended a concert held in the park casino in Sarayburnu, Istanbul, where groups – one performing Turkish music and the other Western- played in succession. After the concert he said (see Oransay 1985: 27):

> Muniret-ul Mehdiye Hanim, a prominent singer of Egypt, would be successful during her performance as an artist. This unsophisticated music, however, cannot feed the needs of the creative Turkish soul. We have just heard music of the civilized world and

> the people, who gave a rather anemic reaction to the murmurings known as Eastern music, immediately came to life. [...] Turks are, indeed, naturally vivacious and high-spirited, and if these admirable characteristics were for a time not perceived, it was not their fault.

That is to say, to be successful in Western music was considered more prestigious than achieving success in Turkish music.

The changing patterns of legitimacy in the Republic of Turkey following the reform of music in the 1920s and 1930s show how legitimacy operates. Before the Republic traditional Turkish art music artists worked at the Ottoman court, the Mevlevi lodges (*Mevlevihane*) and in the conservatories, receiving their support from those institutions. The sultan had the power to control the performance of music. The newly established pattern of legitimacy radically altered the status of traditional Turkish art music in terms of the new state. This change meant that the kinds of music that had been encouraged under the Sultans, such as traditional Turkish art music and Sufi music, were no longer permitted; instead 'European classical music' was encouraged as long as it supported the state's cultural project of modernization. Yet despite some scholars' claims (Behar et al 1994: 7), the history of the tension between Western and Eastern music in Turkey did not originally begin with the policies of the Turkish Republic.

Basically, the origins of the debates on the tension between *alaturka* and *alafranga* music go back to the closing of the traditional military music band of the Janissary army, the *Mehterhane*, abolished by Sultan Mahmut II. The Ottoman state provided bands based on the European model for the first time in 1826. Central authority provided for the inclusion of Western music in the educational system. Thereafter, traditional musicians were obliged to share their power arena with the musicians performing Western music in the Ottoman court. Thus many prominent musicians including Ismail Dede Efendi spoke out against the policy of the Ottoman Sultans, who had appreciated and embraced Western music since the early 19^{th} century (Erol 1998: 204). Although there was conflict between Western music and the traditional musical practices of the Ottoman court, the interaction between them should not be underestimated. By the mid-19^{th} century, there were a lot of popular

music styles which closely resembled contemporary Turkish popular music, including *arabesk*, though it was not referred to as such (Erol 2004: 192).

It is important to note that there is clearly a similarity between the ideas of Ziya Gokalp on traditional Turkish art music and the view of Sultan Abdulhamit II, even though it is true that while some of the Ottoman Sultans gave great support to both Western musical practices at their courts and musical performances such as concerts and opera outside of the court, others were only interested in traditional expressive cultural practices at the court. Western classical music was accepted and encouraged by the state because it was considered to be one of the most important aspects of the Westernization proccess in the Ottoman state. As a consequence of the bureaucratization and rationalization of the Ottoman state structure in the nineteenth century, music became a cultural paradigm of the state, not the society, during Westernization. The organization of Western classical music by the Ottoman state was a means to prove to Europeans that it was a Western state. That is to say, the Ottoman state tried to Westernize for the state, not the society. The Republic of Turkey's project of modernization was not only for the state but also for the society.

Conclusion

The Kemalist reform of music was an important part of the state's cultural project of modernization and was a building block to be used in the reconstruction of Turkish society. Music during the reforms has been used not only to symbolize ideological differences, but also to help perpetuate them. The aim of the music reform was to build a national music culture. According to Atatürk, the requirement to communicate the goals of nationalism in music was much more difficult to implement than it was in literature, theater, and art because the latter could represent verbal or visual images and the former could not. Thus, 'the most difficult one was music reform'. Having ignored traditional Turkish art music because of its Ottoman heritage, the political elite of the Republic of Turkey approved of folk music and Euro-

pean classical music to create a national musical culture, and strictly limited the institutions and the instruction of traditional art music.

Symbolic violence is the violence which extorts submission, which is not perceived as such, based on 'collective expectations' or socially inculcated beliefs (Bourdieu 1998: 103). The musical values of the people and their popular experiences were simply ignored by the Kemalist reform of music, and this caused a great deal of unrest and discussion. Given the definition made by Bourdieu, who extended Weber's definition of state, it might be argued that the reform of music is a paradigm example of 'symbolic violence' operated by the state. Why should music be worth this trouble to the modernising state? There are a number of answers to this question. But it is obvious that music has always been an ideological tool in the hands of new states in the developing world; this is not peculiar to Turkey. Moreover, this shows that a modernist political elite in non-Western countries sharing a supposedly similar socio-political history believes in the supremacy of Western art, and therefore also in the supremacy of its civilization or mentality.

Were they insensitive or fanciful to the point of thinking that people who had just carried out one of the most astonishing independent struggles in history would let themselves be led in such crude and rigid ways? I do not think so. The political elite just imagined that once Turkish musical life was altered through state policy, the musical behavior of individuals could be easily molded and made to fit the requirements of the newly-created circumstances. They believed that rather than just being the expression of a culture buried in the depths of society the new musical practices were the future of a new society, but something more as well.

The new process which heralded every man's conversion from being a subject (*tebaa*) of the Empire to a free and equal citizen of the Republic required that the people conform to the new republican ideology. During the early decades of the twentieth century, Anatolian people were enthusiastic in supporting the national leader in his determination to remake the Turkish state. Even those who supported and appreciated the Kemalist reforms consider these to have in fact contributed to the shaping of the very divisions between the emotional and the rational, and the inner self, popular cultural practices

and high culture. After a short time, the situation changed completely. Instead of making further sacrifices for a future that kept eluding them, Turkish people were starting to inquire about the histories, institutions, beliefs, identities, and cultures from which they had been forcefully separated. Tendencies toward the deconstruction of symbolic hierarchies have occurred.

Now, people publicly debate and criticize the Kemalist doctrine as a patriarchal and antidemocratic imposition from above that has negated the historical and cultural experience of the people in Turkey. The tendency towards centralization that accompanied the nation-state formation process, in which attempts were made to eliminate differences in order to create a unified integrating culture for the nation, has given way to de-centralization and the acknowledgement of popular experiences. The Turkish state has adopted an increasingly open attitude towards poly-culturalism and a pluralistic stance towards the variability of taste over the last two decades. Although this acknowledgement of poly-culturalism might be linked to a change in the social role of intellectuals in Turkey, the fact that today's Turkish state, like many states, needs legitimation to reproduce its own structure of domination and legitimacy should not be underestimated.

Works cited

Attali J. 2003. *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*. Translated by B. Massumi, Eighth print. Minneapolis/London, University of Minnesota Press.

Ayturk I. 2004 'Turkish Linguists against the West: The Origins of Linguistic Nationalism in Atatürk's Turkey'. *Middle Eastern Studies* No. 40:6, pp.1–25.

Bayart J-F. 2005. *The Illusion of Cultural Identity*. Translated by S. Rendall, J. Roitman and J. Derrick. London, Hurts&Company.

Behar C.; Ayvazoglu B.; Savasır I.; Sökmen S. 1994. 'Müzik ve Cumhuriyet', *Defter* No. 7:22, pp. 7–30.

Bourdieu P. 1998. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Blackwell and Polity Press.

During J. 2005. 'Power, Authority and Music in the Cultures of Inner Asia', *Ethnomusicology Forum* NO. 14:2, pp. 143–164.

Erol A. 2008. 'Change and Continuity in Alevi Musical Identity'. *The Human World and Musical Diversity*. R. Statelova, A.Rodel, L. Peycheva, I. Vlaeva, and V.

Dimov (eds). Bulgarian Musicology Studies. Sofia: Institute of Art Studies, pp. 109–117.

Erol A. 2004. 'The Arabesk and its Significance in Terms of Bittersweet Feelings'. In: M. Demeuldre (ed.). *Sentiment doux-amer dans les musique du monde*. Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 190–200.

Erol A. 1998. 'Siyasal Bir Eylem Olarak Osmanlı Devletinde Batı Müziği'. *Tarih ve Toplum* No. 178, pp. 4–17.

Gökalp Z. 1970. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Milli Egitim Basımevi, Istanbul.

Göle N. 1997. 'The Quest for the Islamic Self within the Context of Modernity'. In: S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press, pp. 69–81.

Gülalp H. 1997. 'Modernization Policies and Islamist Politics in Turkey'. In: S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press, pp. 44–54.

Kasaba R. 1997. 'Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities'. In: S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press, pp. 10–29.

Keammer J. E. 1993. *Music in Human Life, Anthropological Perspective on Music*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Keyder Ç. 1997. 'Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s'. In: S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press, pp. 30–43.

Mardin S. 1997. 'Projects as Methodology: Some Thoughts on Modern Turkish Social Science'. In: S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press, pp. 55–69.

Mateescu D. C. 2006. 'Kemalism in the Era of Totalitarianism: A conceptual Analysis'. *Turkish Studies* No. 7:2, pp. 225–241.

Oransay G. 1985. *Atatürk ile Küğ.* Izmir, Küğ Yayını.

Özbek M. 1997. 'Arabesk Culture: A Case of Modernization and Popular Identity'. In: S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press, pp. 166–187.

Reily S. A. 1997. 'Macunaima's Music: National Identitiy and Ethnomusicological Research in Brazil'. In: M. Stokes (ed.). *Ethnicity, Identity, and Music*. Oxford, pp. 71–97.

Saygun A. A. 1987. *Atatürk ve Musiki, Ankara, Sevda Cenap And Müzik Vakfı Yayınları.*

Stokes M. 1992. *Arabesk Debate: Music and Musicians in Modern Turkey.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokes M. 1997. 'Introduction'. In: M. Stokes (ed.). *Ethnicity, Identity, and Culture in Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 1–27.

Stokes M. 2000. 'East, West, and Arabesk', *Western Music and Its Others*. G. Born and D. Hesmondhalgh (eds). Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press, pp. 213–234.

Tekelioğlu O. 2001. 'Modernizing Reforms and Turkish Music in the 1930s'. *Turkish Studies* No. 2:1, pp. 93–108.

Yarar B. 2008. 'Politics of/and Popular Music: An analysis of the history of arabesk music from the 1960s to the 1990s in Turkey'. *Cultural Studies* No. 22:1, pp. 35–79.