ZIYA GÖKALP'S SEPARATION OF RELIGION AND STATE: A COMPARISON WITH AMERICAN AND FRENCH MODELS

By
DAEIL CHUN

Submitted to Faculty of Arts and Social Sciene
In partial fulfillment of
The Requirements of the Degree of
Master of Arts in Political Science

Sabancı University
Spring 2015

Ziya Gökalp's Separation of Religion and State: A Comparison with American and French Models

APPROVED BY:

Nedim Nomer
(Thesis Supervisor) .....

Ates Altınordu .....

Ömer Turan .....

DATE OF APPROVAL: 17.07.2015

Abstract

ZIYA GÖKALP'S SEPARATION OF RELIGION AND STATE:
A COMPARISON WITH AMERICAN AND FRENCH MODELS

Daeil Chun

Political Science M.A. Thesis 2015

Supervisor: Dr. Nedim Nomer

Keywords: separation of religion and state; secularism; Gökalp, Ziya; history of thought

Against the view insisting that separation of religion and state is a Western phenomenon, foreign to Islamic culture, I examine a Turkish case for separation, a case made by Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924), who argued that the Islamic separation model is closer to Protestant separation models than to French secularism. My first conclusion is that Gökalp's separation shows the distinctive philosophical reflection to affirm separation from within his religion, and therefore it is closer to American separation model, which allows religious citizens to translate their religious views into the public language accessible to all parties—either religious or secular—in public sphere. From the first conclusion, a corollary follows: the claim concerning the absence of separation outside the West needs to be questioned insofar as Gökalp's Islamic separation is similar with American separation model. Second, Gökalp's own comparative claim about the Western church-state relations, if it is read with other comparative arguments concerning separation, shows that separation has the multiple fronts of conceptual contestation.

Ö z

Subject: Ziya Gökalp'in din ve devlet ayrımı: Amerikan ve Fransız modelleriyle bir karşılaştırma

Daeil Chun

Siyaset bilimi yüksek lisans tezi 2015

Tez danışmanı: Dr. Nedim Nomer

Anahtar kelimeler: DİN ve devlet ayrımı, laiklik, ZİYA Gökalp, düşünce tarihi

Bu tezde din ve devletin ayrılmasının, İslami kültüre yabancı, bir Batı fenomeni olduğu fikrine karşı Ziya Gökalp'in savunduğu, Fransız modelindense Protestan modeline daha yakın, İslami bir model incelenecektir. Tezde varılan ilk sonuç Gökalp'in bu ayrımı dinin içinde temellendiren, dindar vatandaşlara dini görüşlerini laik veya dindar tüm vatandaşlara açık olan kamu alanında ve kamu dilinde ifade edip duyurma imkanı veren Amerikan modeline yakın olan, felsefi düşünceyi desteklediği şeklindedir. İlk sonucun devamında varılan çıkarım din-devlet ayrımının Batı dışında olmaması iddiası Gökalp'in İslami ayrımının Amerikan modeline yakın olduğu ölçüde sorgulanması gerektiği şeklindedir. Varılan diğer sonuç ise Gökalp'in Batı'daki kilise-devlet ilişkileriyle ilgili karşilaştırmalı iddiasının, eğer ayrımla ilgili diğer karşılaştırmalı iddialarla beraber okunursa, ayrımla ilgili kavramsal tartışmanın çok yönlü olduğunu gösterdiği şeklindedir.

Acknowedgements

My supervisor, Dr. Nedim Nomer, has been patient to me in two senses. He endured when I changed my thesis topic, even though he already had spent a lot of time to discuss my previous project. I basically let him suffer two projects for me! More importantly, Dr. Nomer has been bearing with me when I pour out all kinds of ignorance, prejudice and exaggeration working through this project. I am so grateful to Dr. Nedim for his scholarly patience and cross-cultural friendship for the last three years.

I also appreciate all who contributed to make the fascinating research environment of Sabancı University, in which free and hard-working individuals learn from one another, as iron sharpens iron.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

I want to argue against the thesis asserting that separation of religion and state is a Western phenomenon, foreign to Islamic culture. To be sure, the thesis is addressed by both Western and Islamic scholars, e.g. Bernard Lewis, Samuel Huntington, Tariq Ramadan, Nader Hashemi, among others.[1] So, my concern is not postcolonial but historical and conceptual. My concern arises from the imprecise meaning of the separation due to the multiple models of separation in the West. Furthermore, some non-Western societies, e.g. Islamic or Indian societies, have adopted their own separation ideas to solve their own political problems apart from the Western separation models.[2] In this paper, I present a Turkish case for separation, a case made by Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924), who said, "The separation between religion and state is a goal sought by all civilized nations,"[3] and, weighing several church-state relations, argued that Protestant approaches are better than French secularism[4] because Protestants adopted Islamic social principles.[5] My research

[1] Lewis and Huntington's thesis is well-known, but the other two from Muslim backgrounds may need additional note. Tariq Ramadan in his interview with Al Jazeera said, "we should never ever distinguish or separate, or divorce, politics from ethics. And ethics has to do with religion." Ramadan's comment needs to be read together with his another comment that Israel is not a secular state. Nader Hashemi also notes, "the Muslim experience has been marked by a perception of secularism as an alien ideology imposed from outside first by colonial and imperial invaders and then kept alive by local elites who came to power during the post-colonial period." Bernard Lewis, *The Political Language of Islam*, First Edition (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1991), 2–3; Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 70; Tariq Ramadan, Al Jazeera English Head to Head: Has political Islam failed?, April 3, 2014, http://www.aljazeera.com; Nader Hashemi, "The Multiple Histories of Secularism Muslim Societies in Comparison," *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 36, no. 3–4 (March 1, 2010): 334.

[2] Ira M. Lapidus, "The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6, no. 4 (October 1, 1975): 363–85; Rajeev Bharghava, "The Distinctiveness of Indian Secularism," in *Indian Political Thought: A Reader*, ed. Aakash Singh and Silika Mohapatra, 1st ed. (London: Routledge, 2010).

[3] Ziya Gökalp, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, ed. and trans. Niyazi Berkes, Reprint (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), 102.

[4] Gokalp said that French laicism became "the source of the sickness" for France. Ibid., 220.

[5] Ibid., 214–23.

question is to evaluate this claim of Gökalp, which may help us to reject the thesis. For this evaluation, I reexamine Gökalp's own separation idea, and compare it with American and French separation models, and by so doing, want to contribute for the ongoing debates on separation to be less assertive in cross-cultural conversation.

My first conclusion is that Gökalp's separation idea shows the distinctive philosophical reflection to affirm separation from within his religion, and therefore it is closer to American separation model, which allows religious citizens to translate their religious views into the public language accessible to all parties—either religious or secular—in public sphere. From the first conclusion, a corollary follows: the claim concerning the absence of separation outside the West needs to be questioned insofar as Gökalp's Islamic separation is similar with the American separation model. Second, Gökalp's own comparative claim about the Western church-state relations, if it is read with other comparative arguments concerning separation, shows that separation has the multiple fronts of conceptual contestation.

The paper proceeds as follow. I first review literature on American and French separation models to develop a comparative framework for Gökalp's thought. I also review some secondary literature on Gökalp's view on religion. Then, I read Gökalp's texts to present his separation idea. I depend on the two English translations of his writings, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp* and *The Principles of Turkism*. After the textual survey, I compare his idea with American and French separation models, and develop my thesis and corollaries. In conclusion, I briefly discuss Gökalp's separation in the development of Turkish secularism. In terms of methodology, the paper is largely descriptive, often with reflective commentaries on texts. This descriptive method may not satisfy those who expect a thematically coherent research dealing with Turkish politics. However, this paper centers on Gökalp, so it needs to be faithful to describe his texts themselves. Particularly, the paper avoids secularism or secularization debates in foreground. The reason to avoid secularism debates is because Gökalp himself openly rejects French laicism, although he supports separation. In other words, how to distinguish between secularism and separation beyond lingiuistic difference is a part of the dependent variable of this paper. In the end, Gökalp's argument may sound similar with the recent phase of secularism debates, which is often termed as the post-secular.[6] In these recent debates,

[6] Jürgen Habermas, "Notes on Post-Secular Society," *New Perspectives Quarterly* 25, no. 4 (September 1, 2008): 17–29.

secularization as a scientific prediction is empirically challenged,[7] and secularism as an idea is critically distinguished between a mere statecraft principle and a comprehensive political ideology.[8] However, reading Gökalp with the morphology of the post-secular debates can be anachronistic to neutralize all the textual flavors of Gökalp because he antedates the post-secular society. Conversely, a faithful description of Gökalp's texts would produce a concrete historical and conceptual case to be reusable for both Gökalp studies and secularism debates.

In addition, I use the concept of separation flexibly to include legal, cultural, political or philosophical aspects. I do this because Gökalp as well as other literature addressed in this paper use the concept thus flexibly. Finally, since the phrase 'separation of religion and state' is too long and repetitive, I often use the word 'separation' without definitive article to mean the full phrase.

[7] Philip S. Gorski and Ateş Altınordu, "After Secularization?," *Annual Review of Sociology* 34, no. 1 (2008): 55–85.

[8] For a succinct argument, see José Casanova, "The Secular and Secularisms," *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 1049–66; For an in-depth, comprehensive reivew, see Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 1st ed. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007).

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Separation has multiple shapes across the world. India, for example, has necessitated the secular state to intervene the communal conflicts among numerous religious communities, often without religious institutions as church.[9] In the West, American and French separation models are often compared to show the diversity of separation models. Officially, both American and French models maintain a legal separation: the Law of Separation between Church and State in France and the First Amendment in America. But they also differ. Every US President begins the office after receiving inaugural prayers from famous Christian pastors. This bond between political and religious leaders, though merely symbolic, is rare in France. Nevertheless, according to Jonathan Fox, US is seen as 'the only' country that separates religion and state, if the concept is measured mainly by government expenditures on religious institutions.[10] Although France forbids even merely symbolic bonds between religion and state, she has been supporting many religious institutions by tax, so that Fox's data model depreciates French separation. However, if one presses on to analyze government expenditures to measure separation, US is also culpable of supporting many faith-based organizations by public funds.[11] Moreover, the government budget allocation is too narrow to capture other issues. In US, although the direct government support for church is illegal, the tax-exemption of church-related incomes and properties, which can grow as a big business, often creates disputes. In cultural dimension, while US debates on whether or not to

[9] Bharghava, "The Distinctiveness of Indian Secularism."

[10] Jonathan Fox, "World Separation of Religion and State Into the 21st Century," *Comparative Political Studies* 39, no. 5 (June 1, 2006): 537–69.

[11] Details of such funding can be seen in 'US Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnership' website: http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ofbnp/resources

drop the display of Ten Commandments in some public buildings,[12] France keeps adding on the prohibitive religious symbols in public space, recently adding Muslim veils.

Dennis Mueller, responding to these data (except those on headscarf ban), skpetically concludes that separation is nowhere complete, and exhorts all states to pursue "a complete separation."[13] But what is the complete separation when each state understands separation in their own way and disagree with each other? Perhapes the different attitudes toward France's ban on Muslim headscarf (2011) show a distance between American and French separation models. A global poll shows that 82% French respondents approve of the ban, while 65% Americans disapprove of it, and only 28% American respondents approve of it.[14] Likewise, US Office of International Religious Freedom often comments that the headscarf ban can violate religious freedom, while ECHR upholds that the French ban does not violate religious freedom,[15] agreeing with many public polls in France.[16] In front of Muslim headscarves in public space, French people and Americans not just differ but disapprove each other—headscarf ban is secularism in France, but headscarf freedom is separation in US. Given these multilayerd disagreements between the two separation models, a complete separation seems difficult to be pinpointed, and the comparison needs historical and conceptual analysis, rather than leveraging solely from state finance.

I focus on three scholars for this historical and conceptual comparison between American and French separation models: Alexis de Tocqueville, Cecil Laborde, and Ahmet Kuru. They represent different time and space to enrich this comparison. With Tocqueville, I also cover a brief history of the two separation models. This historiography may seem lengthy for a theory paper, but acquainting some historical data is important for our discussion. Laborde and Kuru exemplify how to use these historical data to theorize the differences of the two. Using their contributions as well as other data, I will gradually develop my own comparative framework to locate Gökalp's separation idea.

---

[12] Jay A. Sekulow and Francis J. Manion, "Supreme Court and the Ten Commandments: Compounding the Establishment Clause Confusion," *William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 14 (2006 2005): 33.

[13] Dennis C. Mueller, "The State and Religion," *Review of Social Economy* 71, no. 1 (March 1, 2013): 1–19.

[14] "Widespread Support for Banning Full Islamic Veil in Western Europe" (Pew Research Center, July 8, 2010), http://pewresearch.org/.

[15] ECHR Case of S.A.S. vs. France (Application no. 43835/11 No), 1 July 2014; for the full text of the decision case, see http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-145466; for a press release brief, see Press Release ECHR 191 (2014) http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/webservices/content/pdf/003-4809142-5861661

[16] For a collection polls, see the link in Penelope Starr, "Understanding the EU Human Rights Court's Big Ruling on France's Headscarf Ban," *UN Dispatch*, accessed March 2, 2015, http://www.undispatch.com/living-together-trumps-freedom-religion-expression-echr-ruling/.

2.1. A Short History of American and French Models

Alexis de Tocqueville is likely to be the earliest among those who compared American and French politics concerning religion's role in public sphere. For Tocqueville, who just experienced French Revolution, in which the French Catholic Church was considered a foe, it was a surprise to see that American democracy thrives with religions. Tocqueville says, "I do not know if all Americans have faith in their religion—for who can read to the bottom of hearts?—but I am sure that *they believe it necessary to the maintenance of republican institutions*."[17] Tocqueville's another surprise on the American 'art of association', i.e. the prolific, vibrant civil society organizations in America, also includes religious associations.[18] Instead of emancipating individuals from old authorities like religion, Americans are making their democracy alongside with religions. Also, these Americans, either clergy or laity, "all attributed the peaceful dominion of religion in their country mainly to *the separation of church and state*."[19] Thus, according to Tocqueville, separation was welcomed or, rather, demanded by religious communities in the early America, where diverse immigrant communities from various religious backgrounds had to live together.

But how does separation relate with the First Amendment when Tocqueville visited America? To be sure, before Tocqueville's birth (1805), the First Amendment (1791) already had codified to "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Notice that there isn't any word like 'separation' or any ban of religious communities to involve politics in this minimalistic legal code. Nevertheless, the First Amendment has been often debated through Jefferson's presidential letter, which contains the phrase, 'the wall of separation between church and state'.[20] For example, US Supreme Court at least twice quoted Jefferson's letter as an authoritative context to understand the First Amendment.[21] However, these two court decisions connecting Jefferson's wall and the First

---

[17] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 280. emphasis added.

[18] *Democracy in America*, ChV. Although in this chapter Tocqueville distinguishes political associations and non-political associations, he also shows how these non-political associations are leading public opinions and how American government is attentive to those opinions.

[19] *Democracy in America*, Ch XVII.

[20] The full text of the letter can be found in US Library of Congress website. See, *Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists*, URL http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html (accessed 2015.5.29)

[21] E.g. By Chief Justice Morrison Waite, in *Reynolds v. United States* (1879), By Justice Hugo L. Black, in *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947)

Amendment are divided in terms of supporting the secular position of each case: the Mormon argument for bigamy was rejected,[22] but the students of private religious institutions were allowed to use the state-run, public school buses in New Jersey.[23] In other words, the judicial debates with the metaphoric wall of separation have not necessarily affirmed the presumably secular position in any judicial issue involving the First Amendment, although the public debates on the secular-religious divide tend to use the word separation to imply a strong state decision against religious positions in various issues. The same point can be made by other judicial cases of the First Amendment. For example, in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* (1925), the Supreme Court viewed that the Oregon Compulsory Education Act was violating the First Amendment by requiring all Oregon children to attend public school, limiting the religious conscience of some Oregon parents, who would send their children to private religious schools, e.g. Catholic institutions. Kenneth D. Wald and Allison Calhoun-Brown review a fuller judicial record on the First Amendment, and show that many decisions were supportive to the religious communities in each case.[24] Although this data may frustrate some secularists, the First Amendment, for which the Jeffersonian wall offers an interpretive context, seems to show more continuity than discontinuity with Tocqueville: American separation model is religion-friendly.

The concrete historical context of Jefferson's letter itself further clarifies the religious root of American separation. Daniel L. Dreisbach offers a useful historical survey for this purpose. Apparently, the metaphoric phrase, 'the wall of separation', has been around in Anglophone political texts even before Jefferson's time. Looking into a textual genealogy of the wall metaphor, Dreisbach highlights "Mennos Simons, Richard Hooker, James Burgh, and Thomas Jefferson described or proposed different walls of separation, each serving a function distinct from the others."[25] Simons wanted the wall to protect from state's persecution an incipient Anabaptist community, which later becomes the Mennonites. Hooker polemically used the wall metaphor to reject Puritan separatists. James Burgh, a liberal Presbyterian, sounds the most radical, suggesting to "build an impenetrable wall of separation between things sacred and civil." It is difficult to conclude whether and how much these early

[22] *Reynolds v. United States* (1879)

[23] *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947)

[24] Kenneth D. Wald and Allison Calhoun-Brown, *Religion and Politics in the United States* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 80–88.

[25] Daniel Dreisbach, "The Meaning of the Separation of Church and State: Competing Views," in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, ed. Derek H. Davis (Oxford University Press, 2010), 215.

separatists or anti-separatist (i.e. Hooker) rhetoric affected Jefferson, but it's noteworthy that they represent various religious communities in the founding era of America—different groups were gradually approaching toward the wall of separation for different reasons.

Most importantly, the recipient of Jefferson's letter was a Baptist association. He wrote the letter to thank the Danbury Baptists and Ceshire Baptist community, who had sent the Mammoth cheese to Jefferson few days before the letter was written. But thank for what? Dreisbach argues that there was an alliance between Jefferson and these Baptists for electoral and political reasons. In Dreisbach's words, these two Baptist groups were:

> persecuted and marginalized religious and political minorities in New England states firmly controlled by a Congregationalist-Federalist establishment. Both Baptist communities celebrated Jefferson's election as the harbinger of a new dawn of religious liberty. Jefferson, in return, expressed solidarity with the persecuted New England Baptists in their aspirations for political acceptance and religious liberty.[26]

Dreisbach provides other historical data to support this interpretation. For example, Congregationalists were trying to nationalize the National Day of Thanksgiving and Fasting, but other religious communities, e.g. those recipients of Jefferson's letter, despised such nationalizing ideas, and condemned Congregationalists of imitating English Anglican ecclesiology. Congregationalists, who had been separatists themselves vis-à-vis English Monarch and its Anglican Church, were now imitating the nationalizing ecclesiology of Anglican Church with the supports from Federalists. In a sense, Jefferson's letter was to remind Americans of the separatist root of their ancestors. Also, two days after sending out the letter, Jefferson attended a worship service at the House of Representatives, and the preacher of that service was Elder John Leland from anti-Federalist camp, which couldn't send their preachers to the House for a long time because Congregationalists in alliance with Federalists were dominating the worship service at the House.[27] In short, many concrete historical contexts suggest that the Jeffersonian wall had more to do with religious pluralism, in which no particular religious sect dominates public sphere, rather than removing religion out of politics.

To summarize, Jefferson's letter and Tocqueville's text suggest that the early American separation was not against religion per se, but allowed religion[s] to involve

---

[26] Daniel Dreisbach, *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State* (NYU Press, 2002), (the penultimate page of Ch.2).

[27] Ibid., (Ch.2).

political culture, e.g. by associations, prayer services in government buildings, etc. And this religious political culture actively sought out pluralism to ensure the equal distribution of symbolic presence of each community, as Jefferson tried to make a balance between Federalist and anti-Federalists preachers at the podium in the House. Tocqueville and Jefferson thus offer the immediate textual connection between American separation model and the religiously pluralistic political culture, and yet two other historical contexts further specify the relation between religious pluralism and American separation.

First, the American Revolution unfolded in a religious and pluralistic context. By the time of the Revolution, four strongest denominations spread across the thirteen colonies and many other sects were not insignificant in numbers.[28] Furthermore, the thirteen colonies of the Revolution were loosely identified with a certain religious denomination in their historical origin. Massachusetts was initiated by Congregationalists/Puritans. Pennsylvania was the safe heaven for Quakers and other Anabaptist communities, e.g. Amish. Maryland was assigned for Catholics, to commemorate the Queen Mary of England, who protected English Catholics against Anglican Church in the isle, and so on. Under this religiously pluralistic demography, any formal recognition of a particular sect in Federal level was virtually impossible. So, when the Revolution brought together all these colonies, the Federal level neutrality toward different religions would have been presupposed as a necessity to harmonize all communities. Besides, many preachers from different denominations played an important role to mobilize people for the wars through their sermons. Maria Gehrke analyzes these pro-revolution sermons, and highlights the three common themes as "[t]he legitimacy of the colonial cause, oppressive politics of England and the need to preserve colonial rights and liberties."[29] Gehrke also suggests that these sermons could have been more influential to mobilize people than war pamphlets because sermons are delivered to a focused and personal group.[30] Then, competition among religious denominations for the war mobilization was imaginable, as Quakers, which had refused to fight due to their pacifism, continues apologizing,[31] while other denominations commemorate their war participation in 4th of July every year—as if

---

[28] See Table 9.1. Churches in the Thirteen Colonies, 1740 and 1776, in Mark A Noll, *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 162.

[29] Maria Gehrke, *The Revolution of the People: Thoughts and Documents on the Revolutionary Process in North America 1774-1776* (Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2006), 100.

[30] Ibid., 92.

[31] William C. Kashatus, "Quakers' Painful Choice during the American Revolution," *Philly.com*, July 5, 2015, http://www.philly.com/philly/opinion/20150705_Quakers__painful_choice_during_the_American_Revolution.html.

pluralism in competition for patriotism. Thus, the social context of the American Revolution was all but religious and pluralistic. This parallels with that these religious communities who migrated to the new land were separatists themselves in their former homelands. As religious separatists or dissenters escaping from all over the Europe contributed to the state-building, the religious freedom and religious pluralism in the light of separatist rhetoric is deeply embedded with a national birth mythology of America.

Second, many religious intellectuals of the early America were rapidly adopting Scottish commonsense realism for their philosophical languages after the Revolution. The commonsense realism is a tenant of Scottish Enlightenment philosophies, most notably developed by Francis Hutcheson and Thomas Reid. Rejecting Hume's skepticism and affirming the basic epistemological ability of every human being, commonsense realism views that every individual in their natural status has innate or intuitive moral capability. According to Mark Noll, commonsense realism was crucial for both those who want to preserve the significance of Christianity in public and those who want to spread Enlightenment ideas in the post-Revolution America.[32] In fact, American Christians were unwilling to adopt this new philosophy due to their commitment to biblical arguments. But, after the Revolution, Christians began to see the value of commonsense reasoning. Noll says, "the most articulate spokesmen for the commonsense moral reasoning of the American Enlightenment were Protestant educators and ministers . . . [f]or Protestants who wanted to preserve traditional forms of Christianity without having to appeal to traditional religious authorities, commonsense reasoning…was the answer."[33] For the leading intellectuals of the new nation, the philosophy was also a medium to show that the new political system is compatible with the Christianity.[34] Commonsense moral reasoning thus provided a philosophical proxy to realize separation in that different religious and secular philosophies can converse about state affairs without appealing to sectarian moral authorities. And the emphasis must fall on that it's the religious people who led Americans to spread this particular Enlightenment philosophy in the new born nation.

In contrast, the historical development of France's 1905 Separation Law differs from American experience in many points. First off, unlike the prominence of religion in American separation, the French Revolution, the cradle of French secularism, conceived a mutual

[32] Noll, *America's God*, 93–113.

[33] Ibid., 103.

[34] Ibid., 112–3.

hostility between secularists and Catholics. Scholars vary on the degree and order of this hostility, but there were remarkable incidents of aggression against Catholics—priests were sentenced to death, church properties were confiscated, religious symbols were destroyed or replaced by revolutionary images. Most of all, the goddess 'Reason' was celebrated in Notre Dame Cathedral, one of the most important Catholic churches in France.[35] Alongside with the Cathedral, many other churches across France were converted into Temples of Reason. There was something more than anti-Catholicism. Historian Michael Burleigh notes that the French Revolution was the first anti-religious mass murder in history.[36] The revolutionary ideals turned into something like a totalitarian religion to replace the older one.

What were the causes of this anti-religious turn? It might have been partially influenced by some satirical texts of French Enlightenment thinkers, such as, Voltaire's *Candide*. However, as Voltaire himself defended Jean Calas, a French Protestant persecuted by the Catholic Monarchy,[37] the link between French Enlightenment thoughts and the antireligious sentiment of the Revolution seems inconclusive. It is clear, though, that Enlightenment thinkers were hostile to the powerful estates privileged by the institutional church, and, at the same time, Catholic Church considered Descartes or Voltaire as threat by adding their names in the list of prohibited books (*the Index Librorum Prohibitorum*).[38] So, knowing their intellectual heroes are banned by the Catholic Church, the revolutionary citizens would have perceived the Catholic Church as the enemy of their cultural progress, regardless of Voltaire's own nuances about the church and religion in general.

Besides, the anti-religious campaigns were unlikely to be an original intention of the revolution leaders, because they also sought political cooperation from Catholic leaders.[39] The emergence of hostility was rather contingent to the power dynamics among church, king and revolutionaries. Counter-revolutionaries were largely from rural Catholics, who also killed many revolutionary forces in brutal manners. Either way, this mutual hostility may

---

[35] E.h. Gombrich, "The Dream of Reason: Symbolism of the French Revolution," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 2, no. 3 (September 1, 1979): 187–205.

[36] Michael Burleigh, *Earthly Powers: The Clash of Religion and Politics in Europe, from the French Revolution to the Great War* (New York: Harper, 2006), 97.

[37] Shank, J.B., "Voltaire", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2010 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/voltaire/>.

[38] For a French catalogue with English user guide, see Jesús Martínez de Bujanda, Marcella Richter, and Université de Sherbrooke Centre d'études de la Renaissance, *Index Librorum Prohibitorum: 1600-1966 (Index des livres interdits)* (Montreal, Canada: Librairie Droz, 2002).

[39] Latreille, A. (2003). French Revolution. In New Catholic Encyclopedia. The Gale Group. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from Encyclopedia: http://www.encyclopedia.com/article-1G2-3407704295/french-revolution.html

have weakened its physical violence, but its intensity has not disappeared even after French Revolution. Although Napoleon's Concordat agreement (1801) recognized four official religions by state as corporatism, the agreement was mostly seen as the re-establishment of Catholic Church, as Napoleon received his coronation from the Pope Pious VII at Notre Dame Cathedral. Later, in Paris Commune (1871), the Cathedral was burned again, and the bishop of Paris was shot by the charge of supporting royalists. Having exchanged their dead bodies, French Catholics and secularists can't have the same reception of the Law of Separation (1905). Even though the French Law is similar with the First Amendment in their texts, the French code appears as the final blow to Catholics, and the final victory to republican elites.

Second, unlike Anglophone contexts, French society didn't have a meaningful degree of religious pluralism but maintained a homogeneous religiosity with the dominant Catholic Church. If one views Europe as one chunk, Reformation and the subsequent religious wars, e.g. 30 Years War, English Civil War, etc., appear as a historical step toward the pluralistic Europe. But if one isolates France from the rest of Europe, it has been constantly a Catholic society until today, resistant to domestic and foreign Protestants. Although John Calvin, a French theologian, contributed to create Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists and many other Protestant movements across Europe, Calvin's own French disciples, i.e. Huguenots, were persecuted by French Catholics, and had to flee to all over the world including Ottoman Empire, which was maintaining arguably the most tolerant social structure at that time. If Calvinism, which has a French root, was thus persecuted, Lutheranism, a German movement, seemed too foreign to French soil. In fact, Lutheran states were often enemy to France. If Calvinism and Lutheranism constitute Reformation, it thoroughly escaped France. Given the homogenous religiosity maintained by Catholicism, the political debates between secularists and Catholics turns into a duel, i.e. the clash between two majorities, rather than multiple, complex negotiations as in America, where different religious sects and different political parties keep changing alliance partners for electoral reasons. But in France, due to the homogeneous and dominant religiosity, the secular response against it proportionally unfolded with a homogenizing contour. As Leon Gambetta puts, "we only have one religion, namely, intellectual culture for all the French."[40]

Third, in the context of the French Revolution, the privatization of religion was not just a philosophical proposal to strengthen private sphere but also a legal enforcement upon

[40] Requoting from Laborde (2002) p.171-2

Catholic priests. During the process of confiscating churches, the revolutionary authority, i.e. the Convention, offered two options for the priests: either to take the oath of submission or to leave their church to officiate worship in private houses.[41] The memory of forced privatization distorts the debates on the proper position of religion in public sphere because the privatization can be seen as a defeat from the vantage point of the forcibly privatized. This move contrasts with that American religious communities were initially enjoying their private freedom of worship, and then came out to public sphere to contribute for their Revolution against British Monarch. In France, the dominant church was enjoying the royal, public privilege, and then forced into private sphere by the Revolution. Moreover, Catholic theology does not show genuine affinity with private religiosity. Catholicism honors collective human experience, and often polemically engages with the religious individualism of Protestantism, which depends on the individual interpretation of the Bible as the core foundation of their religion.[42] Although this individualistic religiosity of Protestantism doesn't exclude the possibility of the collective actions—as in America—it can provide a genuine theological foundation to support the privatization of religion as far as it is compatible with their confessional core. In contrast, French Catholics have experienced neither a theological support nor an acceptable political process concerning privatization, but, instead, had to bear with the memory of the forced privatization during the French Revolution. Even in the best scenario, the privatization of religion may need complex theological translation to persuade Catholics, but the particular historical context of France made that translation more challenging.

The comparative historiography to show some broader contexts of the two separation models is summarized in Table 1.

	American Separation	French Secularism
Philosophical Context	Commonsense realism (accepted by most religious parties)	French Enlightenment thinkers *vs.* Catholic censorship
Social Context	Religiously pluralistic	Religiously homogeneous

[41] Goyau, G. (1912). French Revolution. In The Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from New Advent: http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13009a.htm

[42] Ryan, J.A. (1910). Individualism. In The Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from New Advent: http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07761a.htm

Revolution Context	Religious communities were revolutionary.	Many Catholics were counter-revolutionary.

Table 1. The Historical Contexts of American and French Separation Models.

If one juxtaposes the legal codes of the First Amendment and French Law of Separation, there is not much difference can be found on the texts. However, the actual legislations and public policies concerning religion very differ in two countries, as I have gathered at the beginning of this chapter: headscarf ban is secularism in France, but headscarf freedom is separation in America. France actively seeks out to remove any religious symbol in public sphere, while America seeks out different pastors from different sects to lead the presidential inauguration prayers. Table 1 can hint about from where these empirical differences originate. In short, American separation model unites but distinguishes between religion and politics in a civil and cordial relationship, while French secularism signifies the fight between two realms. Many scholars have penned these empirical differences between two separation models with different analytical purposes.[43] Notice the strong continuity that prominent scholars have been writing the same observation for the last three centuries: Alexis de Tocqueville wrote it in the 19th century, Robert Bellah distinguished the civil religion of America from the militant secularism of France in the middle of 20th century,[44] and two other influential works, which I am going to review in the next section, compared the same models in the 21st century.

2.2. Comparative Frameworks

Among contemporary scholars on this comparison, Cécile Laborde has been focusing on the theoretic difference between Anglo-American and French separation models.[45] Engaging the French headscarf affair, Laborde begins with a contrast that Anglo-

[43] Other than two scholars whom I am going to elaborate in the next, Salton offers a similar historiography to compare French and US approaches toward secularism. Salton views that French process reflects its strong statism tradition, and also argues about the link between French colonial system and French lacism. Hasehmi also compares two countries in a similar manner, and uses the data to show that both historical contexts are unfit for Muslim experiences. Herman T. Salton, "Nation, Faith and War: The Birth of Freedom in France and the United States," *Journal of Politics and Law* 6, no. 1 (March 1, 2013): 24; Hashemi, "The Multiple Histories of Secularism Muslim Societies in Comparison."

[44] Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," *Daedalus* 96, no. 1 (January 1, 1967): 1–21.

[45] Cécile Laborde, "On Republican Toleration," *Constellations* 9, no. 2 (June 1, 2002): 167–83; Cécile Laborde, "Secular Philosophy and Muslim Headscarves in Schools*," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13, no. 3 (2005): 305–29; Cécile Laborde, "Political Liberalism and Religion: On Separation and Establishment," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 21, no. 1 (March 1, 2013): 67–86.

American theorists tend to neglect the French debates, while French secularists tend to see the non-secular public culture of US "falling short" of secular standards.[46] To explain the difference, Laborde unpacks three concepts underpinning French secularism, i.e. state neutrality, autonomy and community, and compares them with Anglo-American liberal separation. Narrowly defined, neutrality and autonomy may correspond to liberal ideas of institutional separation and individuals' commitment to democratic citizenship. However, the third concept, the notion of community, which demands a kind of "loyalty to a particular historical community", is "the least amenable to liberal thought"[47] because it forces a particular system of idea to all citizens, as if it is "a new civil religion."[48] Often combined with the strong state tradition of France, this communitarian aspect of secularism actually breaks the conceptual coherency of individual autonomy: it's no longer individual choice but a "forcible liberalization."[49]

Empirically speaking, Laborde points out that the three concepts of French secularism are unfit for Muslims in France, although the advocates of Muslim headscarf are ironically appealing to the secular ideals articulated in the three concepts. For example, state neutrality, which originally aims to ensure religious freedom by state's abstention from religious affairs, actually turned into "active neutrality" to support religious institutions, which otherwise would not be self-sustained. However, due to the predominance of Catholic religion in France, according to Laborde, this active neutrality turns into "active partiality", in which Muslim communities are relatively less appreciated than Catholics.[50] Given this unevenness, the wearing headscarf in public sphere is even lesser than demanding a full-blown equality in the active neutrality to protect religious freedom. Likewise, the headscarf is both a way of individual choice and a way to join the pluralistic French community.[51] The secular arguments by the headscarf advocates sound like American liberal separation, while the French secularism understood by the most French citizens still resists their arguments.

Having shown the empirical and conceptual tension between American and French separation models, Laborde does not evaluate which one is better, but provides some useful notes on how to compare them. First, French secularism is broader or more comprehensive

---

[46] Laborde, "On Republican Toleration," 169.

[47] Ibid., 175.

[48] Ibid., 176.

[49] Ibid., 171.

[50] Ibid., 169.

[51] Ibid., 178.

than American liberal separation. If American separation is a "political liberal", French one is a "comprehensive liberal."[52] In her own words, "it would be a mistake to reduce *laïcité* to a conception of the proper relationship between state and religion…*laïcité* is a broader moral and social philosophy, a complex set of ideals and commitments…"[53] Second, French secularism has not developed as an abstract political theory, but remained as a practical slogan for a concrete historical conflict, i.e. liberating modern France from the dominant Catholic church. Historically rooted, time-sensitive idea, French secularism had made sense when the Law of Separation was enacted in 1905, but entered a new era with Muslim communities. The new debate is necessary, but as it always has been, French secularism does not operate with analytical language, although Anglophone liberalism and French Muslims prefer such language. In contrast, French advocates of the ban keep using the language with "a self-referential, rhetorical and particularistic style," according to Laborde.[54] She concludes that Anglophone analytic languages would weaken the conceptual coherency of French secularism,[55] even though it would be "explicitly accepted by all French participants as useful, relevant and reasonably coherent concept."[56] Figuratively speaking, where American and French separation models are compatible to each other, the French headscarf affair would be less problematic, but where French model is bigger than American separation, the ban becomes intelligible to French secularists but inexplicable to Anglophone liberals.

Ahmet Kuru, a Turkish scholar, also elaborates the qualitative difference between American and French separation models.[57] Kuru theorizes from the assumption that the historical conditions during state-building process can influence the course of the development of secularism in each state. The key historical difference between the two is whether to have a strong state married with a hegemonic religion in state-building periods. As France had to deal with such hegemonic power, the country developed "assertive secularism", in which secular principles must be fought against the all-embracing Catholic power. In contrast, American history didn't have such hegemonic power, according to Kuru, but multiple religious and secular communities sought an overlapping consensus. Henceforth,

---

[52] Ibid., 172.

[53] Ibid., 167–8.

[54] Laborde, "Secular Philosophy and Muslim Headscarves in Schools*," 307.

[55] Laborde, "On Republican Toleration," 179.

[56] Ibid., 178.

[57] Ahmet T. Kuru, *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*, 1 edition (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

American case is described as "passive secularism", in which secularists don't necessarily oppose religion per se as long as it follows the rule of overlapping consensus as public reason.

Between assertive and passive secularism, Kuru evaluates that Turkish secularism followed the assertive secularism confronting the heritage of Ottoman Empire and the Sunni majority. I am not making any comment about his conclusion. But, I generally agree with his comparative framework applied to American and French models, and, in comparison with Kuru's view on Turkish secularism, I argue that Gökalp's separation idea—if I use Kuru's term—can be called as passive secularism. A forgotten alternative, a minority report attached to the majority position of Kemalism, Gökalp's separation model may help to understand the diverse spectrum of Turkish secularism.

2.3. Gökalp in Turkish Studies

Before delving into Gökalp's texts, it is in order to review some works of Gökalp. Gökalp appears regularly in various research topics, and his views on religion have been constantly popular. This popularity is due to that Gökalp is famous for his synthesis of Islam, modernity and nationalism, and his view of religion is often discussed as a part of this threefold synthesis. As early as possible, Niyazi Berkes had located Gökalp's Pan-Turansim in tension with both "Pan-Islamism and rugged Westernism."[58] In the twenty first century, Andrew Davison called the same synthesis "trinity", and Ayşe Kadioğlu "the logic of empire".[59] The synthesis literature distinguishes two kinds of Islam, i.e. either compatible or incompatible with modern Turkey, and views that Gökalp's Islam is compatible with modern Turkey.

But how significant is religion in Gökalp's synthesis? Scholars vary on this question. In *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey: A Hermeneutical Reconsideration*,[60] Davison reviews the secondary literature on Gökalp, and highlights, "some see not much weight [of religion] relative to his nationalism (e.g. Heyd); others see too much relative to his nationalism (e.g. Dodd); and others, an overwhelming amount within this nationalism (e.g.,

[58] Niyazi Berkes, "Sociology in Turkey," *American Journal of Sociology* 42, no. 2 (1936): 242–4.

[59] Andrew Davison, "Ziya Gökalp and Provincializing Europe," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 26, no. 3 (2006): 379; Ayşe Kadıoğlu, "The Pathologies of Turkish Republican Laicism," *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 36, no. 3–4 (March 1, 2010): 491, 493f.

[60] Andrew Davison, *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey: A Hermeneutic Reconsideration* (Yale University Press, 1998).

Arai).”[61] Davison explains that scholars vary about the significance of religion in Gökalp because they render Gökalp against researchers’ preconception of Turkish secularism. Instead, Davison suggests that Gökalp was trying to secure both religious heritage and modernity by endorsing separation of religion and state. This last sentence, alongside with all the comparative reviews of American and French separation models in this section, makes a good segue way to Gökalp’s texts.

[61] Ibid., 121.

CHAPTER 3
TEXTS: GÖKALP'S SEPARATION IDEA

On the one hand, Gökalp endorses separation. On the other, Gökalp envisions that state should be united with national culture, which is an Islamic culture in the case of Gökalp. If a particular religious culture is to be united with state legislation, does separation still hold? One can view that two opposing tendencies are fighting in Gökalp. I instead argue that Gökalp is fulfilling the duty of civic translation, i.e. presenting one's religious ideals by a language accessible to all in public sphere. I begin with his separation argument, and move on to another textual strand, which sounds dissonant to his separation argument. After reviewing both textual strands, I try to reconcile them in the last part of this section.

3.1. Separation

To begin with, Gökalp asserts, "The separation between religion and state is a goal sought by all civilized nations."[62] Gökalp offers at least four lines of argument to support this statement: i) Islam precedes the emergence of state legal system; ii) Sufi-idealism shows that legality is not the essential part of religion; iii) nations evolve from theocracy to culture nation; and, finally, iv) the culture-civilization dichotomy changes religion-based internationality into science-based one. The first two can be called Gökalp's religious argument for separation, and the other two his secular argument for separation. I categorize his pro-separation arguments by religious and secular tags because they describe well the contents of each argument, and, more importantly, this division itself shows a proper attitude of those who maintain both religious and secular identities in oneself. If separation is to be acceptable to all citizens including the religious, separation must be genuinely argued from the religious core of the religious citizens. More precisely, separation must be *better and*

[62] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 102.

truer for religion. Otherwise, separation remains as an unwanted or unsolicited concession from the perspective of the religious. Fortunately, Gökalp has both religious and secular arguments to support separation, as if he maintains two distinctive personas agreeing each other in one self.

Approaching the question of religion-state relation as a religious person, Gökalp's main concern is to ask what is good for his religion, an independent question from what is good for his state. He begins by recalling that the Islam has non-state root, and argues that the non-state root of Islam can positively harmonize separation and Islam in two ways. First, Gökalp distinguishes two eras of Islam by *Hijra*, i.e. Prophet Muhammad's journey from Mecca to Medina. And he points out, "the religion that the state recognizes officially today…is nothing but *fiqh* [i.e. Islamic jurisprudence] But the *fiqh* did not exist until one and a half centuries after the *Hijra*."[63] Call this the argument 'older is better'. As many European reformers, e.g. Martin Luther or John Calvin, challenged the Papal system by appealing to the ancient church fathers, e.g. St. Augustine, etc., religious people often claim that the older form of their religion is not just more aged but more pristine, while the contemporary religion has been compromised by institutional problems to the extent of necessitating a reform, a radical return to the root. A reformer Gökalp similarly reminds his readers of that the religious core of Islam precedes the institutional peripheries of Islam and the emergence of modern state. This reminder sets a genuine religious ground for separation because Muslims can be assured about that separation doesn't harm their religion, but rather purify it: pre-*hijra* Islam and the separation principle of modernity together can help the contemporary Islam to be more pristine.

Similarly, Gökalp makes a 'smaller is better' argument. He compares Ottoman Empire and other Islamic communities in different times and spaces, and argues that the other communities show "the power of the religion of Islam",[64] but the Islam of Ottoman Empire is relatively weak because "the attachment of religion to the state in our country [i.e. Ottoman Empire] has not been to its advantage, but rather to the extreme detriment of religion."[65] While Gökalp thus argues that integration weakens the religiosity of Islam, he goes on to say, "religion has begun to fulfill its function more effectively as it has demarcated its private

[63] The transliteration of Arabic letters are adjusted from Gökalp's texts, which are anyway an English translation. Ibid., 103.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

sphere."[66] The private sphere of religion, Gökalp argues, is the source of strengthening religion. To supplement this view, Gökalp provides some examples of the powerful Muslim communities living in Russia, China, India, or Egypt.[67] Unfortunately, Gökalp does not go in detail to connect these communities with his emphasis on the private religion. However, the link is deducible from what he said. Notice that these communities are either a minority (as Muslims in Russia, India or China) or a majority but with a substantial competition with another religious community (as in Egypt, having Muslim & Coptic). Being a minority or a majority with competition, their default position on religion-state relation must be separation regardless of their preference because they can't integrate state and religion due to the strength of other communities in public sphere. Therefore, their religiosity tends to focus more on private sphere than public sphere. In contrast, the Sunni Muslims in Ottoman Empire enjoy the dominant position protected by the imperial power. In such imperial setting, the relative emphasis would fall on the public, external manifestation of Islam, rather than on private reflection. Ironically, Gökalp finds that the power of Islam is stronger with the Muslim communities in a weaker position, which can't unite religion and state. The imperial Islam looks powerful in public, but, in fact, Gökalp concludes, "Islam has not been a power in our country simply because it could not perform its private function independently within the framework of the state."[68]

The religiosity that finds its source from private sphere provides a genuine religious ground to support separation. The external influence of Islam may seem decreasing by separation, but the inward-looking change does not necessarily mean the decline of Islam per se. Separation can actually strengthen the power of Islam by sorting out the religious core shared by all the minority Muslim communities, i.e. private religion. To be sure, it is unclear what is strong or weak concerning the power of religion. This is a theological question, which is less relevant for the purpose of this section. Likewise, historians would vary on whether and how much the Ottoman Empire integrated Islam and politics. Rather, the goal of this section is to highlight Gökalp's separation idea as understood by himself. For this purpose, it is fair to summarize that Gökalp supports separation because he thinks that the source of Islam is older and more essential than modern state and its institutional interfaces with Islam.

---

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

Separation also benefits Islam because it strengthens the power of religion by foregrounding the private aspect of religion.

In a similar but more abstract manner, Gökalp develops a religious philosophy of anti-legalism. For Gökalp, religion seeks to transcend the limits of laws, while state promotes all kinds of laws. As far as state and religion are getting tightly integrated, religion moves away from its core function of transcending the boundary of legal fixity. Gökalp makes the same argument with various textual strands: anti-legalism, anti-formalism and Sufi-idealism. All three strands are pro-separation.

Anti-legalism as a religious call pervades in his texts. To begin with, Gökalp says, "[t]he state is a legal machinery; it tends to legalize and formalize any social force upon which it touches. It is because of this fact that Islam started to lose its vitality from the moment it began to be fused with the political organization…"[69] Reflecting upon his text, notice an asymmetrical effect: state aims for legality, while religion for vitality. If both qualities are required to maintain a healthy society, the two ought not be mixed, because as soon as ("from the moment") they are mixed, only religion loses its quality, although the state doesn't lose anything but instead strengthens itself. In other words, integration follows the logic of state, which mechanizes all things including religion, but separation follows the logic of religion, which vitalizes all things including state. Thus the outcome of integration is the death of religion, while the outcome of separation is the revival of both. Given this asymmetry, religion must proactively pursue the attitude of anti-legalism.

Elsewhere Gökalp criticizes formalism, a synonym of legalism.[70] He argues that both conservatism and radicalism are the outgrown symptom of formalism, which reduces everything into a rule-based system. Conservatism is a formalism that sticks to old rules, while radicalism is another formalism that sticks to a new set of rules. Of course, Gökalp views that any formalism, either conservatism or radicalism, is powerless to bring any efficacious social change because the formal rules are merely the product (but not the source) of social change. Hoping to escape the swindling between the two types of formalism, Gökalp redirects our attention from outward rules to deeper sources of social change, and suggests that religion is one of such sources. Religion therefore should inspire the society to bring a deeper change than the superficial rule-makings. Integration between religion and state can be understood as a typical error of formalism because it certainly focuses on legal

[69] Ibid.

[70] Ibid., 92–6.

enforcement both from and to religion. More importantly, integration is not just erroneous formalism but depreciates the high calling of religion to be a source of social change.

Sufism as understood by Gökalp also shows that separation is truer to his religion than integration. To be sure, his discussion on Sufism does not deal with particular Islamic sects but with a metaphysical philosophy in which religion is conceptually intertwined. In particular, Gökalp says, "It is erroneous to equate sufism with that school of thought called mysticism in Western philosophy. Sufism corresponds, in its general meaning, to idealism."[71] Gökalp argues that sufi-idealism is more advanced than Western idealism because it precedes and perfects the Western counterpart. Either way, in our separation debates, Gökalp's sufi-idealism must be distinguished from actual sufi orders, who can be either mystics or fighters.[72]

In short, Gökalp's sufi-idealism argues that, although science is conquering almost all spheres of human life, it still cannot penetrate certain areas, such as, consciousness, ideals, values, ethics, aesthetics, and so on. Sufi-idealism works in these areas, and provides tentative answers to create a future, for which science cannot imagine due to its own logic. This future creating force of sufi-ideals vis-à-vis scientific optimization is, according to Gökalp, analogous to the research methods of sufic theologians and Kantian idealists in that they accept the inaccessibility of God or ideas, but still work out to draw meaningful conclusions from the unknowable divine essence or transcendental ideals in order to give impact to phenomenal world, where science is already exhausted.[73]

Although Gökalp does not himself explicitly connect his understanding of Sufism with separation, we can see the relation between two. State or anything that is going to be integrated into state's legal machinery belongs to the domain of the known (i.e. science), the past or the present. If any idea was unknown to us here and now, it cannot be written into legal codes. Conversely, Religion or anything for which religion struggles comes from the domain of the unknown or the future or the transcendent. If any idea is already fully known to us, state can actually lock it by a law to avoid any error or inefficiency. However, both Gökalp's sufi-idealism and our common sense suggest that there is always an unexplored area of knowledge. So, religion as a pursuit of unknown ideals has a place to work alongside

---

[71] Ibid., 50.

[72] The mystic aspect of sufism is well known. For a recent study on the militant aspect of sufism, see Manuela Ceballos, "Sufi Lovers as Sufi Fighters: Militant Piety in Muhammad ibn Yaggabsh al-Tāzī's Book of Jihād:," *Journal of Religion and Violence* 2, no. 2 (2014): 333–51.

[73] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 46–55.

with state as a science. This dichotomy does not make religion unscientific or unrealistic, but, rather, acknowledges that state as a scientific project alone cannot solve every human problem, and there are always new questions emerging from the past political arrangements embedded in state, the questions that science cannot immediately answer but somebody should try to solve. In this view, the separation between religion and state must be a constant attitude of any self-claimed religious person, lest all things will be reduced into state system, and religion will lose its significance in the society. Fortunately to the religious, Gökalp's sufi-idealism suggests that there is a place for religion, i.e. future creating ideals, rather than integrating civic laws with religious traditions.

Gökalp's religious persona is not only sufic but also dealing with concrete institutional issues as an advocate of separation. Speaking of the necessity of establishing Ministry of Pious Affairs, Gökalp argues that piety and jurisprudence are two different functions. Piety deals with the sacred aspect of life, which transcends 'earthly considerations', but jurisprudence must be subjected to positivistic science.[74] Mixing these two functions in one individual is harmful for his religion, because religious teachers cannot receive the proper training to serve their core values of piety, especially so in an advanced society in which division of labor has already applied to religion.[75] Fully convinced of the necessity of the separation, Gökalp even prays to God for this separation, calling it a blessing.[76] Similarly, Gökalp separates Caliphate and Sultanate, and argues that the two supreme titles do not compete for power as in Roman Catholic countries, but works for different spheres: one for piety, and the other for law. Given this proper distinction, any attempt to maintain a dual legal system—one by Caliphate/religion, the other by Sultanate/state—is viewed as a vice. The Caliphate-initiated law must be abolished, and the entire legal function must be exclusively owned by the proper legal institution, i.e. state. Again, separation produces not only a better legal service but also a better piety.[77] These two institutional arguments are

---

[74] In this passage, he does use the word jurisprudence (p.200), but by the word he means a judicial judgement in general. Concerning positivistic sceince, I paraphrased from his arguments. E.g. one text reads, "The piety has to do with that aspect of life that is sacred, and it is not permissible to mix earthly considerations with it, such as expediency, concession, and casuistry. *The legal aspect of life, on the other hand, has to be subjected to economic, hygienic, technical, and many other secular considerations*." Ibid., 201.

[75] Ibid., 199–202.

[76] The text reads, "'the differences in my community are a blessing to it' (ikhtilaf ummati rahmatuhu) implied division of labor and specialization, and it seems to be a justifiable interpretation. If it is so, let us pray to God to bestow that blessing upon us." Here the division of labor denotes that between piety and jurisprudence. Ibid., 202.

[77] Ibid., 202–14.

interesting in that they are often referred to show the absence of separation of religion and state because they are officially established by state. However, Gökalp views that these religious institutions are the products of separation.

So far I have discussed how Gökalp as a religious reformer genuinely argues for separation. He believes that it is empirically better and conceptually truer to his religion, which has a non-state root, and promotes anti-legalism and future creating ideals from within his religious philosophy. And by so doing, Gökalp exemplifies how a religious person can search out the possibility of both maintaining the significance of religion and upholding the separation principle according to one's own religious philosophy. Alongside with these religious arguments, Gökalp also develops secular arguments for separation. In these secular arguments, Gökalp does not apologetically argue for the cause of his religion, but scientifically shows that human society in general has been evolving to separate religion and state, making integration an old phenomenon, a less evolved stage than separation.

For example, Gökalp shows the progress of human society by a simple two stages model: primitive and organic.[78] In the primitive society, there is only one kind of *mores*—a term that Gökalp heavily uses to describe social consciousness—and that is religious *mores*. In the organic society, however, political and cultural *mores* are differentiated from the religious *mores*, and each of them oversees the corresponding institutions in the society: the religious *mores* oversees religious institutions, and the political *mores* does political institutions, and so on.[79] In this distinction, Gökalp is concerned with the intervention of the religious *mores* over non-religious institutions, saying, "[the power of religious *mores*] becomes harmful when it is extended to worldly or secular, and especially to material, institutions because it prevents these institutions from adapting themselves to the expediencies of life. Therefore, the predominance of religious *mores* over all institutions is not something to be desired for organic society."[80] In short, the old ways of life in a new kind of society is inconvenient to the point of being dangerous like new wine in old wineskins.

[78] This seems to be a customization from Durkheim's mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. The word mechanical in Durkheim means a primitive, simple, monistic social structure, in which all parts run tightly together. See Emile Durkheim, *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings*, ed. Anthony Giddens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 141ff.

[79] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 184–5.

[80] Ibid., 185.

Similarly, Gökalp defines the four subtypes of nation: theocratic nation, legislative nation, culture-nation, and nation without independence.[81] Treating the fourth type as an outlier, the former three make an evolution process: theocratic nation, the oldest type, evolves to legislative nation, and legislative nation to culture-nation. The differentiation of authority is one of the defining features in this process. Religious and political authorities are unified in theocratic nation but differentiated in legislative nation. Culture-nation further differentiates several cultural authorities from both religious and political heads. Interestingly, Gökalp views that no nation actually has reached the last stage of culture-nation in his time.[82] It is because Gökalp's culture-nation, the final evolutionary stage of nations, leaves its end open with transcendent ideals.[83] Although the future may be open, the past is not. Concerning religion-state relation, Gökalp clearly views that integration is older than separation in human history. Theocratic Medieval era has gone away.

Gökalp's culture-civilization dichotomy expands the historical movement embedded in his nation-types theory to international level. To give a simple account for this dichotomy, culture is a totality of domestic phenomena, while civilization is a rationality that penetrates several cultures in international level. Although Gökalp intensely uses these two words with various contents, he is consistent to use them as a dynamic category to define the flexible distance between something national and something international.[84] With this dichotomy, Gökalp views that the internationality based on religion is an old phenomenon, though not older than religious tribal communities, in which no internationality exist.[85] Both Christianity and Islam had innovated human societies by showing an internationality, in which diverse linguistic and cultural groups joined together under the banner of each religion. Applying the four nation-types, theocratic nations were synchronizing with religious internationality in past. However, a new era has emerged. The new internationality is based on science,[86] and the new nation types likewise are based on either the legislative or culture-nation, in which the

---

[81] Ibid., 119–23.

[82] In his words, "[T]he most advanced nations are evolving toward this stage, although none has reached it." Ibid., 122.

[83] Ibid., 121.

[84] Ersin Kalaycıoğlu also sees Gökalp's culture-civilization distinction as national-international distinction. Ersin Kalaycıoğlu, *Turkish Dynamics: Bridge across Troubled Lands*, 1st Ed. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 26.

[85] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 71–6.

[86] The full text reads, "[C]ontemporary civilization, which has been coming into existence for some time through the development of modern machines and techniques, is in the process of creating a new internationality. A true internationality based on science is taking the place of the internationality based on religion." Ibid., 76.

separation of religion and state was accomplished as a minimum requirement of the science applied to politics. So, separation in each nation becomes an interface for all the other nations from different religious and cultural backgrounds to create a common, homogenous internationality, which can be seen as an evolved stage from the two-fold, half internationality of the religious eras.

To be sure, the new internationality based on science does not undermine the significance of religion in both international and national levels, but creates a proper sphere for religion in both levels. In national level, as I already have argued, Gökalp views that the scientific mechanization can never complete domestic political enterprise, and his religion can serve with future-creating ideals that science cannot conceive due to its own logic. Likewise, although the new internationality evolves from the religiously divided civilizations to the scientifically homogeneous world, this homogeneity in international level never means cosmopolitanism, as Gökalp makes it clear, "Turkism…is against cosmopolitanism."[87] One way to join the homogeneous internationality without accepting cosmopolitanism is to differentiate national cultures. This harmonizes with his nation-types theory, in which nations evolve toward culture nation. So, his nation theory and international theories move toward in the same direction, so that Gökalp can manage the homogeneous internationality without accepting cosmopolitanism. And as religion is a part of culture,[88] it plays a shared role with other social spheres in differentiating each national culture and preventing cosmopolitanism. Although the relative importance of religion in this shared role is to be discussed, but it seems established that Gökalp's secular argument acknowledges that religion, properly understood, still works to do in the new internationality of science.

To summarize, Gökalp's pro-separation argument is very systematic and comprehensive. It is argued from both religious and secular positions. And each position cordially embraces the other: the secular argument recognizes the proper function of religion as the source of inspiration or the source of transcendent values, and the religious argument ensures the exclusive role of state, particularly the exclusivity of legislative power. Also, both arguments deal with different levels of analysis: private and public, national and international, historical and futuristic, philosophical and institutional. That Gökalp approaches separation from multiple directions further evinces that he is a genuine proponent of separation, who worked it out as far as his intellectual terrain could extend.

---

[87] Ibid., 74.

[88] Ibid., 121.

3.2. Integration

To be fair, Gökalp has another textual strand, which may sound dissonant with his pro-separation argument. Particularly, he intends to integrate national culture and state legislation. The integration of culture and state can mean many different things, but when the culture is excessively religious, it is possible to speculate on whether to bring religion into state legislation through cultural arguments. For example, the requirement of Ottoman Turkish courses in public schools in Turkey can be argued as cultural legislation by proponents, but can be criticized as religious legislation by opponents. In US, 'culture war' is a popular phrase to describe the secular-religious division. Culture thus often emerges as an ambiguous sphere in which religion and state can't easily draw their border. Gökalp also has the cultural arguments, which seems to promote Islam in state legislation. I first present this textual strand critically, but later argue that Gökalp is still a genuine separatist, as far as we consider American separation model genuine.

Since the question asks how three components—religion, culture and state—are integrated, it is convenient to work through a twofold process: between culture and state; and between culture and religion. For the first integration, Gökalp says, "[t]he state, which is the sum total of the institutions of law, should in its ideal form be national, like culture. But this ideal form has scarcely materialized up to our time."[89] Elsewhere Gökalp argues that, although Turkism is not a political party movement but a cultural movement, it can't remain apolitical, but should be political in partner with populism to materialize cultural ideals.[90] Here Gökalp doesn't deals with political culture, which operates outside formal institutions, but speaks of legislating cultural taste in national level. Apparently, this move reverses his argument on the evolution of *mores*—that cultural *mores* should be separated from political *mores*.[91] When culture is thus charged by politics, it can turn into an enforced culture, in which the line between censorship and sponsorship becomes blurred. For example, in North Korea, all cultural activities are state-controlled, meaning both fully censored and fully funded by the state. The enforced national culture also becomes problematic for our subject when it lacks pluralistic consideration especially when multicultural social blocks, which

[89] Ibid., 248.

[90] Ibid., 305–6.

[91] Ibid., 184–5.

often involve religious minorities, contend for symbolic presence in public sphere. If the enforced national culture unevenly favors any particular position, the rest of society would dissatisfy.

The dissatisfaction would worsen by that Gökalp integrates national culture with Islamic religion, which constitutes the second part of the twofold process. If a national culture is to be legislated, and if the national culture is too religious with Islam, the final cultural legislation would end up being like integrating religion and state. To be sure, since the cultural influence of Islam has been immense throughout the centuries of the Ottoman Empire, it is inevitable to embrace some degree of Islamic components in Turkish national culture. The question is a matter of degree. And, relatively speaking, Gökalp integrates religion and culture too tightly. When an argument explicitly mentions a 'one-to-one' relation or a coterminous, superposed identity between two spheres, we can say that the degree of integration goes stronger than a merely mutual influence. There are three textual points to show such strong integration.

First, Gökalp sees too much overlap between cultural and religious spheres. Before reading the text, let's first recall that Gökalp distinguishes the eight major social spheres: religious, aesthetic, linguistic, among others.[92] Gökalp relates some of these social spheres:

> [L]anguage is the carrier of ideas and sentiments…hence, those who speak the *same* language share the *same* aspirations, the *same* consciousness, and the *same* mentality. Individuals thus sharing common and homogeneous sentiments are also naturally prone to profess the *same* faith. It is because of this that language groups in many cases are of the *same* religion."[93]

The text relates linguistic, aesthetic and religious spheres. Notice that the adjective 'same' repeats too many times, and ultimately creates a kind of identity between language and religion. Although Gökalp provides a list of language-religion groups as empirical data,[94] the list involves the sampling problem that Gökalp excludes important counterevidence like Arabic-speaking Copts or German-speaking Jews. As the data includes the more eastward countries, like India or China, this identity between language and religion is getting more weakened.

---

[92] The other five include moral, legal, intellectual, economic and technological aspects. The eight major spheres are to define both cultures and civilizations. Ibid., 104.

[93] Ibid., 80 emphases added.

[94] Ibid., 80–1.

Second, Gökalp maintains the dominant influence of religion over national culture. "Religion is the most important factor in the creation of national consciousness as it unites men through common sentiments and beliefs. It is because of this that genuinely religious men are those who have national fervor, and that genuine nationalists are those who believe in the eternity of faith."[95] The text shows a two-way identity between religion and national culture: religion decides culture, and culture decides religion. But apparently religion takes a leading or uniting role. How does religion become such the superlative class among the eight major social spheres of Gökalp? In the immediate context of the quote, Gökalp argues that religion removes individuality through negative rituals, e.g. purification, and creates collectivity through positive rituals, e.g. public prayers.[96] In other words, the function of religion is not only to be a player within the religious sphere but also to contribute for collectivity itself, so that it can promote the collectivity itself for all the other social spheres.

Third, Gökalp homogenizes Turkish national culture with Islamic civilization. Gökalp says, "the first dogma of our social catechism must be: I am a member of the Turkish nation, the Islamic community and Western civilization."[97] This dogma actually separates religion and state, if it is read by an individual Muslim. The three social spheres of religion, culture and state are more or less distinguished in the threefold structure of the dogma. But, if it is collectively applied to Turkish people, it homogenizes Turkish culture with Islam—all Turks should be the members of the Islamic community. Furthermore, the dogma puts Islam above Turkish nation by subjecting it under 'the Islamic community', *ümmet*. The notion of *ümmet* is to be received as a proper noun, rather than a general description of a loosely united confederation of Muslim communities across the world. It is a kind of religious internationality, which takes nations as its member unit, rather than taking Muslim communities in each nation. Gökalp envisions, "[a]ll the Muslim *nations* would be united into a great religious community under the name of Muhammadan *ümmet*."[98] Gökalp can't accept such pseudo internationality because he already made the religion-based internationality obsolete. To be sure, the idea of *ümmet* liberates the Caliphate from each ruler of Muslim nations, so that a sort of separation of religion and state is implemented in the

[95] Ibid., 192–3.

[96] Ibid., 186–193.

[97] Ziya Gökalp, *The Principles of Turkism*, trans. Robert Devereux (E. J. Brill, 1968), 48.

[98] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 227.

level of the international body of Muslims.[99] However, when Gökalp imports the idea of *ümmet* to his dogma for Turkism, he domestically homogenizes the national culture with Islam, and thus gives up the cultural authority to this particular historical application of Islamic internationality.

So far I have cast as skeptically as possible how Gökalp integrates—identifies, dominates, and homogenizes—culture with Islam. This reverses Gökalp's trajectory in which cultural spheres are to be separated from religious and political authorities. More importantly, in connection with his intention for cultural legislation, one can speculate whether Gökalp wants Islamic legislation through cultural arguments. The skeptical reading certainly contrasts with his pro-separation arguments. To be sure, his pro-separation arguments also include religious components, which make his position genuine. In the skeptical reading, however, religion doesn't separate but integrates all the other social spheres. How do we reconcile his pro-separation arguments with his integrative approach to all three social spheres?

3.3. Reconciliation

A minimalistic approach simply encapsulates his pro-separation arguments from all the other texts. This approach is valid if the study aims to collect non-Western philosophical works supporting separation. Gökalp's pro-separation arguments themselves are important data for those who want to find non-Western thinkers who sought out separation. A thinker may change one's own thoughts during his or her lifespan, but tracing such change is another project, which is distinctive from collecting non-Western thoughts for separation. In fact, it is likely to be a fallacious ad hominem to reject his pro-separation arguments all together simply because he has expressed his personal hope on Islam and Turkish national culture in other essays. Gökalp was a prolific writer, who wrote all kinds of genres from poems to positivistic social science. Alongside with his genre spectrum, the degree of integration (or separation) among the three social spheres, i.e. culture, religion and politics, also varies. His poems often integrate all the three as a call for religious war, while his social science can be as secular as Emile Durkheim's sociology. In-between two extremes, his expository essays on religion and culture may vary in the degree of separation based on different audiences. Among all these texts with different audiences and genres, it is absurd to evaluate his

[99] Ibid., 223–7.

separation position by his religious poems; and it's also relatively absurd to judge his separation idea by his other essays blending religion, culture and politics. In short, if we want to figure out Gökalp's separation position, we need to focus on what he said about separation instead of what he said about something else.

The minimalistic approach suits the purpose of this paper, but it is indifferent to the troubling textual strand, which homogenizes Turkey with Islamic culture. However, given that the Western separation thesis overemphasizes the influence of Islamic religiosity in the regional politics and that the culture wars between Islamists and secularists recur in Turkish politics, the textual strand seems too remarkable to be ignored for separation debates. To solve this strand, I offer two other approaches. First, taking his homogenizing intention as original to his thought, I try a liberal defense for his pro-separation position. Second, the crisis context of Balkan war can explain the change in his thought from pluralism to nationalism.

First, the liberal defense begins with the particular distinction between public reason and comprehensive doctrines, as presented by John Rawls, and argues that the sort of secularism which accepts Rawls' distinction between public reason and comprehensive doctrine cannot criticize Gökalp's pro-integration arguments. By comprehensive doctrines Rawls means many irreconcilable philosophical systems held by different citizens of a democratic society. Being comprehensive, such doctrines must include a certain position on personal, interpersonal and political issues. If any doctrine has no political position at all, it is not comprehensive, and therefore escapes political debates. By public reason Rawls means many complex concepts, but the most salient features for our discussion are straightforward. First, public reason must be specific—dealing with specific legislative or institutional questions. Second, public reason must use the public language accessible to all parties, rather than reasoning solely from each doctrinal position. Third, public reason must press on to the extent of building up civic friendship, meaning, any solution proposed by public reason should be not just agreeable to but also acceptable by all comprehensive doctrines involved.[100] The proper relation between comprehensive doctrine and public reason is therefore that the former embeds in the latter, but neither that two become completely united, nor that either of the two fully exhausts the other. Public reason and comprehensive doctrines can be completely united only in a totalitarian society, where there is no doctrinal difference

[100] John Rawls, "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited," *The University of Chicago Law Review* 64, no. 3 (1997): 765–71.

on any issue. But when a comprehensive doctrine embeds in public reason, the doctrine becomes compatible with a democratic polity by the virtue of its embedding into public reason. In Rawls' own words, "public reason neither criticizes nor attacks any comprehensive doctrine, religious or nonreligious, except insofar as that doctrine is incompatible with the essentials of public reason and a democratic polity."[101] In other words, if Gökalp's entire thoughts, including both pro-separation and pro-integration arguments, can meet the requirements of the comprehensive doctrine that is compatible with the particular notion of public reason, any secularist who accepts the sort of political liberalism presented by John Rawls doesn't need to criticize Gökalp's pro-integration thoughts, which would then become a part of the compatible comprehensive doctrine.

Gökalp's pro-separation argument meets the three features of public reason. First, it deals with the specific institutional issues of Caliphate and Minister of Religious Affairs. Second, its language is not esoteric based on Quran or Sharia, but commonly accessible to all. To be sure, Gökalp deals with Quran or Sharia as a problem domain, but when he does, he speaks as sociology of religion, rather than filling up his arguments with religious jargons. Finally, his pro-separation argument is argued from both Muslim and secular positions in a way to be acceptable by both positions. The actual acceptance rate would depend on many factors, but it would suffice to point out that his arguments are presented in a way toward both Muslims and secularists. Having the pro-separation argument embedded in public reason, his comprehensive doctrine becomes compatible with the democratic polity specified by Rawls. Then, any secularist who accepts this particular notion of liberal philosophy doesn't need to criticize the rest of his thoughts, regardless of how much they are religiously propagating in non-public reason.

The liberal defense has another layer focusing on Gökalp as an individual. I think we should see Gökalp fulfilling the civic duty of translating one's religious arguments into public reason. By this civic duty of translation I mean that democratic citizens may freely have religious or secular philosophies, but when they speak in public sphere, they must translate their ideas in a way to be accessible to all. This civic duty contains more or less the same content with the previous argument, but focuses on individual ethic concerning public reason. John Rawls called the use of public reason to achieve the overlapping consensus among diverse comprehensive philosophies or background cultures as the 'duty of civility' for all

[101] Ibid., 766.

democratic citizens.[102] Audi argues that the institutional principle of separation must be accompanied by individual citizens' commitment to that principle, and these commitments include not only secular rationale, i.e. formal compatibility with the separation principles, but also secular motivation to enhance the separation principle.[103] It is actually Habermas who picks up the word 'translation' for the same civic duty.[104] I like the word translation because it captures the coexistence of both secular and religious arguments. It also implies a substantial intellectual effort to translate between two different philosophical systems, so that it deserves to be called a duty, i.e. a cost. Being an intellectual work, the civic duty of the translation may let scholars vary about the expected quality of translation. Habermas even argues that, when the religious don't have any alternative secular translation but believe that they have a certain moral content which would benefit society, they should be allowed to utter religious expression.[105] Audi would not accept this argument, as he demands secular rational as the least commitment of citizen. While two scholars thus differ in their expectation on the quality of the translation, they all expect that the religious should at least try their best to translate their ideals into public reason.

Applying this civic duty of translation to Gökalp, I don't mean that Gökalp was self-conscious of this duty as liberalism articulates after his death. I just evaluate what Gökalp is doing can be seen as the example of fulfilling this civic duty. This is not an anachronistic reflection. A search for exemplary figures fulfilling the civic translation doesn't have to limit its search period to post-Habermas era. There could have been many political communicators, who fulfilled this duty, trying to interface the religious reasoning and secular reasoning in public sphere earlier than the emergence of liberalism. I think Gökalp is one of such candidates who exemplify how to actually do this civic duty.

So, from the perspective of this civic duty, we can see that Gökalp's pro-separation arguments are the outcome of the civic translation, while the bluntly pro-Islamic arguments in his poems or cultural expositions are not translated. Having both the translated and untranslated texts never makes his civic translation less genuine. In contrast, it proves that he has worked out to translate because we all know that Gökalp is openly religious. When a

---

[102] Ibid., 769.

[103] Robert Audi, "The Separation of Church and State and the Obligations of Citizenship," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 18, no. 3 (1989): 259–96.

[104] He actually picks up the word from Forst, a german writer. See footnote 43 in Jürgen Habermas, "Religion in the Public Sphere," *European Journal of Philosophy* 14, no. 1 (April 1, 2006): 1–25.

[105] Ibid., 10.

person writes only secular arguments, there is no way for us to know that any intellectual, civic translation took place in his or her mind. But when a person is openly religious in a verifiable manner, e.g. publishing religious texts, we can test and critique this individual writer on whether fulfilling the civic duty of translation. Every religious writer is vulnerable in this sense to involve public sphere because his or her political arguments will be continuously compared and contrasted with one's own religious opinions uttered in different contexts. Nevertheless, Gökalp passes the test by contributing his public reason to endorse separation. Regarding the quality of his civic translation, recall that Gökalp preceded those liberal thinkers. This certainly adjusts our expectation on the quality of his civic translation. There could be some discrepancy between Gökalp and the 20th century liberal theorists, but, in their thrusts, Gökalp's civic translation can exemplify for those who want to communicate between secularity and religiosity in liberal tradition.

But the parallel between liberalism and Gökalp's ideas should not be exaggerated because the latter are not pluralistic. Even though Gökalp shows the civic friendship between two doctrines, i.e. secularism and Islam, it seems that there is no room for Christian, Jewish or other religious communities in his theory. This leads us to the last approach to reconcile between his pro-separation and pro-integration arguments. The last approach applies the crisis context of Balkan wars to his thoughts, and argues that his religious homogenization was not the direct outcome of philosophical reflection but a response to the Balkan crisis. I begin with historical context, and move on to Gökalp's own texts to show how he himself reflects the historical crisis.

First, the Ottoman Empire maintained the millet system, in which, not only Muslims but also the persecuted French Protestants, known as Huguenots, or Anatolian Jewish communities were protected. The millet system was not perfect, and it often functioned as a communal segregation. However, situated in its own time when there was no Muslim community at all in any part of Western European states, it was a quite pluralistic and tolerating institution to embrace Christianity, Judaism and Islam. It could evolve as American separation model, in which diverse religious communities coexist based on the principle of separation. The composition of the first parliament of the second Constitutional era shows this possibility: it was multi-religious, including Armenian, Greek and Jewish deputies.[106] However, a further step toward pluralism became inconceivable due to the dissolution

[106] Myron Weiner, Ergun Özbudun, and Ergun Özbudun, eds., "Turkey," in *Competitive Elections in Developing Countries* (Duke University Press, 1987), 334.

process of Ottoman Empire, the process which is largely initiated by a series of wars in the Balkan region with the political entities identified as Christians, i.e. Russians and other Balkan Christians, etc. Ersin Kalaycıoğlu notes, "they [Turkish population in Balkan] learnt about nationalism from their Greek and Slav Christian neighbors the hard way," and provides the data on the massive casualties, refuges and forced migration during the Russom-Ottoman war and the Balkan wars.[107] In short, the pluralistic Ottoman structure was dissolved into a homogenous Muslim Turkish nation by the domestic and international crises largely led by Christian entities, rather than purely by the will of Turks.[108] Contrast to the Anglophone context, in which diverse religious communities contested to *live* together, Gökalp had to deal with the different context in which Christian communities wanted to *leave* the Empire through the wars. In Rawlsian terms, Gökalp had begun his life with the polity of *modus vivendi,* i.e. the unwilling concession among diverse religious groups under the Ottoman millet system, but unfortunately, he could not enter a *proviso,* a friendly coexistence of diverse groups, and had to retreat to a nation with a single religion.

Notice that this historical speculation vividly appears in Gökalp's own mind. Gökalp says, "[w]hen Turkish thinkers entertained the idea of Ottoman *nationality composed of different religious communities*, they did not feel the necessity of Islamization, but as soon as the ideal of Turkism arose, the need for Islamization made itself felt."[109] Apparently, there was a transition from pluralism to nationalism. The immediate cause of this transition, according to Gökalp, is of course the Balkan wars.[110] Yet, understanding some characteristics of this transition would be more important than knowing its cause. First, it was a crisis theory for an abnormal situation. Gökalp, expounding the philosophical structure of the ideal of Turkism, argues that "the time of crisis" is "the period of germination of the ideals."[111] Gökalp goes on, "[w]hen a nation experiences a great disaster or when it is

---

[107] During the Russo-Ottoman war (1877-78), about 250,000 to 300,000 Muslims, mostly ethnic Turks, were killed by Russian troops, and 1.5 million were forced to refuge in Ottoman territories. Likewise, during the Balkan wars, more than a million Muslim Turks had to migrate to Anatolia. Kalaycıoğlu, *Turkish Dynamics*, 21.

[108] Benjamin Fortna also describes, "[f]or the Ottoman Empire...with its seemingly endless procession of confessional, ethnic, and linguistic groups, the innovation of states based on national identity represented a mortal threat . . . What set the Ottoman case apart from the others [i.e. the dissolution of the Romanov and the Hapsburg] was the direct involvment of the Western powers in the process of imperial dismemberment." Benjamin C. Fortna, "The Ottoman Empire and after: From a State of 'Nations' to 'Nation-States,'" in *State-Nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire, Greece and Turkey: Orthodox and Muslims, 1830-1945*, ed. Benjamin C. Fortna et al. (London: Routledge, 2013), 1.

[109] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 75 emphasis mine.

[110] Ibid.

[111] Ibid., 67.

confronted with grave danger, individual personality disappears and becomes immersed in society. In such times it is only the national personality which lives in the soul of the individual."[112] Thus, Gökalp self-consciously justifies the nationalistic transition by pointing out that it is not the outcome of individual reflection but that of national crisis. That he had to justify this transition presupposes that he considered nationalism not as a norm but as abnormality. Likewise, the nationalistic turn was a reluctant transition. Gökalp explains,

> "[T]he Turks were reluctant, in the beginning, to endanger a reality [i.e. Ottoman state] for the sake of an ideal [i.e. nationalism]. Thus, Turkish thinkers believed not in Turkism but in Ottomanism . . . The Turks' avoidance of the idea of nationalism was not only harmful for the state and irritating to the diverse nationalities, but it was fatal for the Turks themselves."[113]

In other words, Turks reluctantly waited as long as possible to adopt homogeneous nationalism until their reluctance hurt themselves. For many ethnic Turks, nationalism as a new political philosophy doesn't make sense because they already have been running their own state for centuries.[114] Nationalism appears as a novel idea and an opportunity only to those who didn't have their own nation-state. But for those who already have their own state consisting of multiple ethnic groups, nationalism is not just an academic idea but a threat. Thus when Gökalp records this transition with the word 'reluctance', his word choice reflects both unwillingness and necessity felt by Turkish thinkers concerning this homogeneous transition.

Bernard Lewis also notes that Ottoman elites were more interested in Western European-style heterogeneous patriotism, while the Christian communities in Ottoman Empire were applying Eastern European-style homogeneous nationalism to have independence from the Empire. Although Ottoman elites were thus conscious of the possibility of forming a heterogeneous modern society, after the wars with Christian communities, the idea of homogeneous nationalism gained more influence in Turkish intellectuals, according to Lewis.[115] Ebru Boyar also notes that Turkish historians including Gökalp were searching for 'a common soul' amid chaotic intellectual terrains after the Balkan disaster, and therefore it is unfair to suppose, according to Boyar, that Turkish

---

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid., 72.

[114] This point is also made by Gokalp. Ibid.

[115] Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong?: Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response* (Oxford University Press, 2002), 47–8.

nationalism already has emerged as a systematic and dominant ideology during Gökalp's period.[116] In short, there was self-conscious, reluctant and painful transition from pluralism to homogeneous nationalism in Gökalp as well as other contemporaries. This transition must provide an interpretive layer to adjust Gökalp's homogenizing voice in the changing context. Although we don't have any detailed theory from Gökalp to stipulate a pluralistic separation model, it is possible to speculate that the millet system and the first multi-religious parliament could have evolved toward the liberal notion of overlapping consensus. This speculation is not overstretched because Gökalp's context prior to the Balkan crisis was the unique place in which three Abrahamic religions and diverse Islamic sects were actually rubbing their shoulders together. A search for a better political framework to embrace diverse communities was hardly an ivory tower imagination but a very local question, with which Gökalp and others were struggling to answer, although the question itself disappeared through the unfolding crisis even before articulating their answers.

So far I have attempted to reconcile Gökalp's religiously homogenizing texts with his pro-separation arguments in three different ways. However, these reconciliation efforts neither need to be apologetic to defend Gökalp, nor eclipse the main purpose of this chapter, which systematically presents Gökalp's separation idea from his texts. Solving all these puzzling textual strands by the theme of separation is just one way to aid us to learn his separation idea. As opposing views often refine one's arguments, confronting his pro-integration texts can refine our understanding of his pro-separation arguments. Some readers may still consider Gökalp an Islamist, if they believe his pro-integration texts are more significant than his pro-separation arguments. However, having all these textual and contextual surveys, I cannot help but concluding that Gökalp shows the strong textual consistency to support separation, particularly in that his arguments are multifaceted to cover religious, secular, institutional and individual aspects to support separation. Among these contributions, the most distinctive point is to mediate secularity and religiosity through Sufi-idealism, which elevates the role of religion ironically by delegating the exclusive legislative power to state.

In lieu of summary, Gökalp's separation is comparable with Kant, as Gökalp himself compares sufism with idealism. Both thinkers separate legality from religious morality. Yet, their separation does not mean the extinction of morality or religion. Although Kant rejects

[116] Ebru Boyar, "The Impact of the Balkan Wars on Ottoman History Writing: Searching for a Soul," *Middle East Critique* 23, no. 2 (April 3, 2014): 147–56.

Biblical revelation as the source of legality, he still maintains the absolute moral standard, namely, categorical imperatives, which stem from self-legislation. Richard Bernstein thus argues that Kant became the champion for both the secular and the religious because the separation provides a neutral platform for moral reasoning.[117] By this separation of legality and religious morality, Kant, according to Bernstein, encourages the religious not to fear the Enlightenment but to engage their religion with the language of the Enlightenment. At the same time, Kant warns the secular elites not to suppose that they already know everything but to open their minds for transcendental possibilities. Berstein's reading of Kant is similar with my reading of Gökalp's sufi-idealism. Although Gökalp affirms the exclusive legislative power of state, he maintains that religion should guide society with transcendent ideals exploring unknown areas of human knowledge. The comparison between Gökalp and Kant also reminds us of one important feature of American separation model. There was an efficient philosophical proxy between secularity and religiosity in American case, namely, commonsense moral reasoning. As this commonsense reasoning was widely accepted by the religious intellectuals in America, Gökalp's sufi-idealism also appears as a good candidate for the philosophical proxy, by which both the secular and the religious in Turkey can converse each other in public sphere without appealing to Quranic verses. Furthermore, reading the history of separation concept through the three philosophical systems, which encouraged separation in three different contexts, can prevent the whole debates from collapsing into historical contingency.

Evinced by Gökalp's contributions, we can now reject the popular thesis that separation of religion and state is a Western phenomenon, foreign to Islamic culture. The next section further deconstructs the popular thesis by cross-cultural comparison.

[117] Richard J. Bernstein, "The Secular-Religious Divide: Kant's Legacy," *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 1035–48.

CHAPTER 4
COMPARISON

This section has two focal points. First, it compares Gökalp's separation with American and French models. To be sure, this comparison is suggested by Gökalp himself, as he argues that French secularism is problematic, while Islamic and Protestant models are similar with each other to reconcile themselves with modernity.[118] To be sure, America and Protestant are not synonym, but the former can function as an ideal-typical case of Protestant-majority culture in this comparison, and Gökalp also cites America as a Protestant nation. The second focus of this section falls on the meta-comparison on many comparative claims made by Gökalp and others in this paper.

By now the proximity between Gökalp and American separation has been suggested in many ways. For example, the previous section interpreted Gökalp in comparison with Anglophone liberal thinkers such as John Rawls. In the earlier literature review, I also have addressed many comparative data on American and French models, and the affinity between Gökalp and American separation would have echoed by far. Table 2 summarizes those data by three ideal-typical categories:

American Separation	**French Separation**
・ Religion-friendly	・ Secularism-friendly
・ Pluralistic	・ Homogeneous
・ Translating	・ Transforming

Table 2. American and French Separation Models

By religion-friendly I mean that American separation model is both demanded by and favorable to religious communities. It's not unusual to meet American scholars who argue

[118] Gokalp said that French laicism became "the source of the sickness" for France. Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 220.

that secularity itself has religious origin.[119] In contrast, French secularism was initiated by secularists, not by the Catholic majority, and often targets the religious communities. Pluralistic and homogenous capture not only the religious-demographic context of the two models but also their contents: French model, when it goes militant, aims to secularize the whole country, while American model aims to ensure pluralism. The last column, which compares the discursive style, is extended from the previous discussion on the civic duty of translation, which is more discussed in Anglophone liberal tradition. The widespread of commonsense moral reasoning in the early America is also analogues to this point. On the transformative style of French secularism, I depend on Laborde, who argues that French secularism, as a comprehensive moral system, sought to transform all the non-secular citizens, e.g. the religious, peasants, etc. to be a perfect secular citizen mainly through education.[120]

With this frame, Gökalp's separation idea can be qualified as religion-friendly, homogenous and translating, which makes Gökalp closer to America than France. However, since this comparison only describes the relative distance among the three separation models, researchers should not judge Gökalp's idea exclusively based on a particular model. For example, if an observer measures Gökalp's separation idea through the French model, it falls short because it allows religious transcendence in public sphere. And if another does it through the American model, Gökalp now falls short by the lack of religious pluralism.[121] Combining these two types of observation, Western observers would mingle between American and French models, and want to assert that Gökalp's idea is neither secular nor pluralistic, therefore, falling short to either standard. However, such eclecticism is unfair because there is no clear ground to decide which separation model is superior to the other. Does the American separation model satisfy the requirements of French secularism, or does French secularism do vice versa? These questions are unknowable in the sense that America doesn't have the Catholic majority as France, and France doesn't have Protestant majority as America. Unless we have a linear standard to evaluate diverse separation models on this globe, the comparative conclusion only reflects the relativity embedded in different separation models, the relativity which illuminates the complexity of the concept and the historical contingency in various regional contexts.

---

[119] Noah Feldman, "Religion and the Earthly City," *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 989–1000.

[120] Laborde, "On Republican Toleration," 173, 176; Laborde, "Secular Philosophy and Muslim Headscarves in Schools*," 319, 320.

[121] Assuming this observer is ignorant of my previous defense on Gökalp's unwilling nationalistic move in the crisis context.

So, relatively speaking, Gökalp's separation is somewhere in the middle of American and French cases, but slightly leans toward the American model. His proposal to separate—but not abolish—the Caliphate from the supreme sovereignty certainly sounds like American separation, but the establishment of Director of Religious Affair is similar with that French state has been supporting Catholic institutions even after 1905 Separation Laws. This comparative conclusion must sound redundant by now, but the point is that my independent review of Gökalp's separation idea and two representative Western models indeed turns out to show the strong affinity between Sufi-Islamic and American separation models. As far as the American separation model is acceptable in scholarly debates, Gökalp's Sufi-Islamic separation can refute again the widely held claim that separation is only a Western phenomenon, foreign to Islam. It's not.

Apart from this affinity between Gökalp and American model, there is a meta-comparison problem, which appears when all the other comparative claims of this paper face at each other. Two other comparative claims can be distinguished within the popular thesis, i.e. the absence of separation outside the West. Although both Western and Islamic scholars maintain the popular thesis, they actually differ in what they presuppose. Western scholars, e.g. Lewis, Huntington, etc., usually hold social differentiation theory or other notions of social progress to explain their separation thesis. Arguing from such premises, they actually implicate that Islamic society is less progressed when they assert that separation is absent in Islamic societies. On the other hand, some Islamic scholars, e.g. Tariq Ramadan, agree with the absence of separation in the Islamic societies, but they do so because they perceive separation primarily as the absence of moral foundation in the society.[122] So, when Islamic scholars reject the separation thesis because of its seemingly foreign origin, they actually implicate that the Western societies have lost moral foundation by separation, and therefore are less moral than Islamic societies. In short, the popular thesis, though widely held by both Western and Islamic scholars, reveals two competing views of other—'the Islamic society is less progressed' versus 'the Western society is immoral.'

Gökalp's separation argument rejects both comparative claims in the popular thesis. Using social differentiation, he argues that Islamic societies have progressed enough to distinguish different spheres of life, and even traces back to the earliest phase of Islam to show that the distinction between legal periphery and religious core was one of the first

[122] Ramadan, Al Jazeera English Head to Head: Has political Islam failed?

differentiations that Islam had made. Using sufi-idealsim, he also argues that separation is better for Islamic moral reasoning.

Gökalp's antithetical relation to two contentious comparative claims in the popular thesis should be marked as an important contribution for separation debates, but the meta-comparison also unpacks Gökalp's own comparative claim that Protestant approaches are better than French secularism because Protestant states adopted Islamic social principles.[123] Apparently, it is difficult to affirm the diffusion of the separation concept from Islam to the West.[124] But the rest of Gökalp's comparative analysis on church-state models of the West still holds, and provides another meta-comparative point.

Gökalp argues that French laicism is the culmination of an inherent instability of Christianity, while Protestant separation model is the culmination of Islamic influence, which had begun by the Crusaders and gradually transformed the Catholic-dominant European society. His argument stands on the comparative theological analysis that Islam embraces but distinguishes law and state, and by so doing, creates no tension between two spheres within its religiosity. In contrast, Christianity has an inherent dualistic tension between sacred and secular because it had begun as a religious movement under Roman Empire. From the beginning, Christianity had to conflict with political power, but even after it finally acquired the political power, the incipient dualism continued to distort the proper relation between church and state. Gökalp concludes that, even though French laicism is the best possible outcome of Christianity in its attempt to reconcile with modern state, it certainly falls short, and becomes "a grave source of sickness for French nation."[125] But Protestants, thanks to the

---

[123] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 214–23.

[124] Gökalp's argument about the diffusion of idea is wrong in many ways. First, many Westerners find the religious root of secular state from St. Augustine's City of God., a text which dates far earlier than the emergence of Islam. Second, it is difficult to argue that Protestant Reformers, e.g. Luther and Calvin, themselves have separated church and state as we conceive, although they might have influenced Early Modern philosophers to develop various liberal concepts. Third, many Early Modern philosophers from Protestant background maintained negative attitudes against Islamic civilization, which makes it nonsensical to say that Protestant elites adopted and culminated Islamic principles. For example, John Milton said that Sultan is Satan in his *Paradise Lost*. James Harrington also used Constantinople to illustrate the servitude under Sultan. Why not using European Monarchs? To be sure, I don't deny that Islamic science and culture flew into European civilization especially during the Medieval Age. However, there is no immediate link between European Reformation and Islamic influence. Martin Luther, the direct cause of European Reformation, didn't intend to divorce with the Vatican when he first nailed the 95 theses. The Reformation process abruptly had begun when Pope decided to persecute Luther. And, since post-Reformation until now, a negative perspective on Islam has been a constant. All things considered, Protestantism seems to have developed separation ideas through their own historical process, as English Civil Wars or 30 Years Wars, rather than taking lessons from Islam. See Feldman, "Religion and the Earthly City," 989–94; John Milton, Paradise Lost, 1.348; The note on Harrington is from Skinner's summary. See Quentin Skinner, *Liberty Before Liberalism* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), 86.

[125] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 220.

Islamic influence initiated by the Crusaders, were able to build a better relation between church and state.

Conceptually speaking, Gökalp sounds correct to say that Protestantism opposes the dualism between sacred and secular, as Islam does so. For Gökalp, the rejection of this dualism is important to build his separation idea from within his religious conviction. If state exists totally outside religion, Gökalp cannot say much of it from within his religion. Besides, the way to embrace state under religion doesn't have to be legislative. Sufi-idealism can embrace state into religion by non-legal, transcendent approaches. Similarly, Protestantism, particularly, Calvinism, opposes the dualistic division between the sacred and secular, and thus teaches the priesthood of all believers and the sacredness of all vocations. If a politician is equally sacred with a priest, this Calvinist politician doesn't have to use religious language in public sphere to be a full politician as God's call. Using secular reasoning in court room is equally sacred with using biblical reasoning in church for Calvinist politicians. Sufi-idealistic and Calvinistic politicians in public sphere thus may end up with speaking the same language, i.e. secular language, although their motivations would differ.

Historically speaking, the direction of diffusing the separation concept is hard to know, but Gökalp still sounds correct in that Christianity had experienced violent sectarian conflicts, often involving political authorities. However, Gökalp interprets the meaning of these religious conflicts differently from John Rawls, who argues that the religious conflicts became the source of conceiving pluralistic society in Europe.[126] In contrast, Gökalp interprets them as the outcome of the inherent defect of Christianity. How can we understand this difference? I think the comparative claim of Gökalp should be understood as his polemical engagement against the popular thesis, which was already presented to Gökalp in his own time. According to Gökalp, Europeans often compared Christianity and Islam, and argued that Islam lacks of separation, calling it 'a defect'.[127] Gökalp, in a response this charge, shows the existence of Islamic separation model, but also polemically presses on to demonstrate that the most chapters of Christian history actually has not separated church and state, but integrated them to the point of exploding religious conflicts. To repeat, while John Rawls takes these religious conflicts as the source of conceiving European pluralism, Gökalp takes them as the evidence of the long absence of separation in Europe. Polemics thus come out even between two civilizations, but there is something more, I think, in Gökalp's mind.

---

[126] John Rawls, "The Idea Of An Overlapping Consensus," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 7, no. 1 (1987): 4.

[127] Gökalp, *Selected Essays*, 215.

Gökalp's polemical subversion to put Islamic separation above the most Western models can bring a pedagogical impact to some Muslims who still view that separation is foreign. Gökalp would say, "It's actually ours, and ours are better," to persuade some Muslim folks to embrace the political change of separation.

So far I have gathered four comparative claims concerning separation. Let's put them all together for a meta-comparison. The popular Western thesis (e.g. Lewis, Huntington) says that Islam has no separation, and, in so doing, implies that Islamic societies have less progressed. The popular Islamic thesis (e.g. Ramadan) says that Islam has no separation, and implies that the West has lost moral foundation for their society. Gökalp refutes the popular Western thesis by showing that Islam has separation, and even counters it saying that the West doesn't have what they claim to have. Gökalp also refutes the popular Islamic thesis by saying that separation is not foreign, and Islam has its own separation, in which Islamic moral reasoning, e.g. sufi-idealism, is still effectual. Finally, add-on to this meta-view the different attitudes of American and French citizens about other's separation, as revealed in the poll about the French ban of headscarf. Concerning this ban, they not just disagree but disapprove each other about what is secular state. This extended meta-view shows that, like many other political concepts, separation is the essentially contested notion; and others (i.e. foreigners) often see better any area lacking separation than self-reflection does. Furthermore, people from different backgrounds can easily misunderstand terms and scopes when they discuss separation, and this miscommunication easily turns into a mutual demeaning against each other. Knowing this possible miscommunication, a researcher is warned to be careful in evaluating the degree of separation in different cultures, as revealed in this meta-comparison. To that end, studying Gökalp's separation idea, which covers so many aspects of the topic, certainly helps researchers to capture the multiple fronts of conceptual contestation across different cultures.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

Gökalp's separation idea relays between the Tanzimat and Atatürk's reform. Niyazi Berkes and Halil İnalcık highlight that the Tanzimat period (1839-1876) conceived the dualistic secularism,[128] against which Gökalp's idea particularly reflects. By the dualistic secularism they mean two things. First, the Tanzimat reform applied French legal codes to create the first secular court for commercial affairs and codify Islamic laws for religious affairs. The reform was certainly one step forward to secularization, but it resulted in a dual legal system, i.e. the coexistence of secular and religious laws. The boundary between two laws was often unclear to cause a great confusion. Second, in parallel with the dual legal system, a social division between Western-secularists and Muslims worsened because Ottoman Muslims suffered a relatively disadvantageous position compared to non-Muslim millets. By the new secular law of the Tanzimat, non-Muslims were able to enjoy more freedom from their own religious authority, while Muslims had not benefited themselves under the same Ottoman state but with the dual laws.[129] This unevenness practically favored non-Muslims to expand commercial activities with Europe, which was now demanding Ottoman Empire to secularize millets for their economic interest.[130] Muslims, on the other hand, had to wait for their adaptation in new markets due to the tight control of the Ottoman state.[131] The dualistic secularism, i.e. legal and social divisions caused by the new secular laws, according to Berkes, was not the original intention of the Tanzimat reform, which tried

---

[128] Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, Reissue (Routledge, 1999), chap. 6; Halil İnalcık, "Turkey Between Europe and the Middle East," *Journal of International Affairs* Volume III, no. 1 (May 1998).

[129] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, 158–9.

[130] Ibid., 147.

[131] For another economic history on how non-Muslisms took the first-mover advantages in European trade and how Muslims had to wait until Turkish state created Muslim bourgeois, see Çağlar Keyder, "The Agrarian Background and the Origins of the Turkish Bourgeoisie," in *Developmentalism and Beyond: Society and Politics in Egypt and Turkey*, ed. Ayşe Öncü and Çağlar Keyder (Amer Univ in Cairo Press, 1994).

to avoid the dualism of power as in Western church-state separation but applied a functional distinction between temporal and religious affairs within the one polity consisting of multiple religious communities.[132] Yet, it ended up with creating a new kind of dualism between Western-secularists and Muslim-traditionalists. Suffering this failure of the dualistic secularism, anti-Tanzimat movements arose. Among them, the Young Ottomans, e.g. Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa, argued that the unchecked westernization must be resisted, and the dual legal system must be repealed—but by fully modernizing Islamic law.[133]

It is unnecessary to work through the historical detail of two Constitutional eras, in which the dualistic tension mutates its shape in different ways. Instead, the separation debates around the Tanzimat and the post-Tanzimat periods show how Gökalp elevated the debates into a new level. Like Namık Kemal and Ziya Paşa, Gökalp rejects the dual legal system. However, unlike these two, Gökalp rejects to modernize Islamic laws to repeal the dual system. For Gökalp, it must be only secular law to be implemented in state, and the monopoly of secular law is the best way for Gökalp to strengthen the Islamic heritage of Turkey. Like the Tanzimat, Gökalp avoids the dualistic church-state relation of the West. Unlike the Tanzimat, however, Gökalp sees the inner complexity within Western church-state relations, and shows the four different ways of interfacing religion and state in the West. Knowing this inner diversity, Gökalp argues that French legal codes somehow intensify the dualistic tension concerning religion, while Protestant models look compatible with his Islamic understanding of religion-state relation. If the West is conceived as a chunk, the failure of the Tanzimat also appears as the problem of the Westernization in its totality, and the critical response to the Tanzimat also turns into a dualistic contestation against the West as a whole, as many Young Ottomans did so. However, if the West is internally distinguished as in Gökalp's arguments, the critical response can narrow down deeper problems in the reform process. It's not the West in general, but the dualistic tendency of legalism is to be resisted not only for Turks but also for Europeans, Gökalp argues.[134] Similarly, Gökalp distinguishes the different species of Islam—not in sectarian but in sociological category—to argue that the imperial Islam is weaker than the private-focused Islam. In short, against the backdrop of the Tanzimat and anti-Tanzimat arguments, Gökalp engaged both Islam and the West by avoiding both Occidentalism and Orientalism, so that he could particularize the

---

[132] Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, 147, 154, 161.

[133] İnalcık, "Turkey Between Europe and the Middle East."

[134] Since he views that French laicism is a problem for France.

deeper problems of the reform, and generalize the separation debates into an abstract, conceptual interplay between legality and non-legality.

Finally, what can Gökalp's separation idea say about modern Turkish politics? Concerning Atatürk's reform and the early republican elites, it is often suggested that Turkish secularism followed the similar step with French laicism. Kuru calls this as 'assertive secularism' against Catholic and Sunni majorities in each country respectively. I don't comment about Kuru's qualification on Turkish secularism, but simply add that Gökalp's separation idea suggests that any assertive turn was not necessary but contingent to historical context. If we locate ourselves in Gökalp's time, various nationalist thinkers including Gökalp were proposing all kinds of arguments for the coming era. As Gökalp was one of the influential voices, it was at least an intellectual possibility that Turkish secularism would have developed as the American separation model, which allows religious pluralism and religious symbols in public sphere. However, the Balkan War removed the possibility of pluralism, and a series of Caliphate-Islamists rebels against Atatürk's liberation movement, a series of events which Kalaycıoğlu calls "the fourth front of the War of Liberation,"[135] lowered the desirability of the public presence of religion at all.[136] I don't suggest that Gökalp's separation idea is better than Kemalism, or that Gökalp and Kemalists had shown a radical break against each other. Actually, one can find both continuity and discontinuity between Gökalp and Kemalists: Caliphate was abolished, but Directorate of Religious Affairs was established. Rather, I suggest that the existence of Gökalp's separation idea provides a thick background to understand why Kemalists had turned assertive if they had to turn. It's unlikely that they wanted to be assertive because they liked to be so as the militant secularists in France, but the unique, concrete historical context seems to compel them to be so. Gökalp can, in other words, attest the unwillingness to become assertive of the so-called militant secularists in the early Republic.

Finishing my paper on Gökalp, I want to revisit that President Erdoğan recited the religious poems of Gökalp during a political rally in his early political career.[137] I think Erdoğan's recitation in this way damages Gökalp's contribution. Among the many different genres of Gökalp, his poem is the most religious, often with hostility. Yet, a religious

---

[135] Kalaycıoğlu, *Turkish Dynamics*, 40.

[136] This contrasts with American preachers, who offered sermons to mobilize people to participate the revolutionary war, as I have mentioned in the literature review (Table 1).

[137] "TURKEY - Erdogan Goes to Prison," *Hurriyet Daily News*, March 27, 1999, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/.

politician, who would otherwise want to exemplify how to translate one's religious opinions into public reason, ignored the important lesson from Gökalp, but picked up the opposite end of Gökalp's contribution. To worsen the situation, the court decided to imprison Erdoğan for reciting Gökalp's poems, a decision which also ignores the secular aspect of Gökalp but portrays him as a passionate religious poet. Had Gökalp been understood by all parties, would have Erdoğan recited him at all, and would have the court imprisoned anyone for reciting Gökalp in public sphere? Furthermore, Gökalp's Islam and Erdoğan's Islam seem very different from each other. For one thing, Gökalp's religion is futuristic or transcendent, while Erdoğan's emphasizes traditions and old fames. Also, Gökalp differentiates the degree of his religiosity according to different literature types, but Erdoğan seems to mingle his speech contexts, and uses religious expressions wherever and whenever, even in the critical diplomatic situation dealing with the terror group Islamic State.[138] These contrasts between two individuals suggest that, even though Erdoğan was imprisoned for reciting Gökalp, he actually misquoted, so that the real contribution of Gökalp would be forgotten by both secularists and thoughtful Muslims, who view the separation principle being true to their religion as Gökalp. This is a sad loss.

[138] When 49 Turkish consulate staffs in Mosul had been taken hostage by Islamic State in 2014, Erdogan said, "A Muslim cannot do such a cruelty to his Muslim brother", according to AK Party website. See "Erdogan Calls on ISIL to Release Turkish Hostages," *AK PARTi*, accessed July 13, 2015, https://www.akparti.org.tr/english/haberler/erdogan-calls-on-isil-to-release-turkish-hostages/64950#1.

Bibliography

Audi, Robert. “The Separation of Church and State and the Obligations of Citizenship.” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 18, no. 3 (1989): 259–96.

Bellah, Robert N. “Civil Religion in America.” *Daedalus* 96, no. 1 (January 1, 1967): 1–21.

Berkes, Niyazi. “Sociology in Turkey.” *American Journal of Sociology* 42, no. 2 (1936): 238.

———. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Reissue. Routledge, 1999.

Bernstein, Richard J. “The Secular-Religious Divide: Kant’s Legacy.” *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 1035–48.

Bharghava, Rajeev. “The Distinctiveness of Indian Secularism.” In *Indian Political Thought: A Reader*, edited by Aakash Singh and Silika Mohapatra, 1st ed. London: Routledge, 2010.

Boyar, Ebru. “The Impact of the Balkan Wars on Ottoman History Writing: Searching for a Soul.” *Middle East Critique* 23, no. 2 (April 3, 2014): 147–56.

Bujanda, Jesús Martínez de, Marcella Richter, and Université de Sherbrooke Centre d’études de la Renaissance. *Index Librorum Prohibitorum: 1600-1966 (Index des livres interdits)*. Montreal, Canada: Librairie Droz, 2002.

Burleigh, Michael. *Earthly Powers: The Clash of Religion and Politics in Europe, from the French Revolution to the Great War*. New York: Harper, 2006.

Casanova, José. “The Secular and Secularisms.” *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 1049–66.

Ceballos, Manuela. “Sufi Lovers as Sufi Fighters: Militant Piety in Muhammad ibn Yaggabsh al-Tāzī’s Book of Jihād:” *Journal of Religion and Violence* 2, no. 2 (2014): 333–51.

Davison, Andrew. *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey: A Hermeneutic Reconsideration*. Yale University Press, 1998.

———. “Ziya Gökalp and Provincializing Europe.” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 26, no. 3 (2006): 377–90.

Dreisbach, Daniel. “The Meaning of the Separation of Church and State: Competing Views.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, edited by Derek H. Davis, 207–26. Oxford University Press, 2010.

———. *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State*. NYU Press, 2002.

Durkheim, Emile. *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings*. Edited by Anthony Giddens. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Feldman, Noah. "Religion and the Earthly City." *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 989–1000.

Fortna, Benjamin C. "The Ottoman Empire and after: From a State of 'Nations' to 'Nation-States.'" In *State-Nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire, Greece and Turkey: Orthodox and Muslims, 1830-1945*, edited by Benjamin C. Fortna, Stefanos Katsikas, Dimitris Kamouzis, and Paraskevas Konortas, 1–12. London: Routledge, 2013.

Fox, Jonathan. "World Separation of Religion and State Into the 21st Century." *Comparative Political Studies* 39, no. 5 (June 1, 2006): 537–69.

Gehrke, Maria. *The Revolution of the People: Thoughts and Documents on the Revolutionary Process in North America 1774-1776*. Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2006.

Gökalp, Ziya. *The Principles of Turkism*. Translated by Robert Devereux. E. J. Brill, 1968.

———. *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*. Edited and translated by Niyazi Berkes. Reprint. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Gombrich, E.h. "The Dream of Reason: Symbolism of the French Revolution." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 2, no. 3 (September 1, 1979): 187–205.

Gorski, Philip S., and Ateş Altınordu. "After Secularization?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 34, no. 1 (2008): 55–85.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Notes on Post-Secular Society." *New Perspectives Quarterly* 25, no. 4 (September 1, 2008): 17–29.

———. "Religion in the Public Sphere." *European Journal of Philosophy* 14, no. 1 (April 1, 2006): 1–25.

Hashemi, Nader. "The Multiple Histories of Secularism Muslim Societies in Comparison." *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 36, no. 3–4 (March 1, 2010): 325–38.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

İnalcık, Halil. "Turkey Between Europe and the Middle East." *Journal of International Affairs* Volume III, no. 1 (May 1998).

Kadıoğlu, Ayşe. "The Pathologies of Turkish Republican Laicism." *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 36, no. 3–4 (March 1, 2010): 489–504.

Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin. *Turkish Dynamics: Bridge across Troubled Lands*. 1st Ed. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Kashatus, William C. "Quakers' Painful Choice during the American Revolution." *Philly.com*, July 5, 2015.

http://www.philly.com/philly/opinion/20150705_Quakers__painful_choice_during_the_American_Revolution.html.

Keyder, Çağlar. “The Agrarian Background and the Origins of the Turkish Bourgeoisie.” In *Developmentalism and Beyond: Society and Politics in Egypt and Turkey*, edited by Ayşe Öncü and Çağlar Keyder. Amer Univ in Cairo Press, 1994.

Kuru, Ahmet T. *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*. 1 edition. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Laborde, Cécile. “On Republican Toleration.” *Constellations* 9, no. 2 (June 1, 2002): 167–83.

———. “Political Liberalism and Religion: On Separation and Establishment.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 21, no. 1 (March 1, 2013): 67–86.

———. “Secular Philosophy and Muslim Headscarves in Schools*.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13, no. 3 (2005): 305–29.

Lapidus, Ira M. “The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6, no. 4 (October 1, 1975): 363–85.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Political Language of Islam*. First Edition. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1991.

———. *What Went Wrong?: Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mueller, Dennis C. “The State and Religion.” *Review of Social Economy* 71, no. 1 (March 1, 2013): 1–19.

Noll, Mark A. *America’s God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Ramadan, Tariq. Al Jazeera English Head to Head: Has political Islam failed?, April 3, 2014. http://www.aljazeera.com.

Rawls, John. “The Idea Of An Overlapping Consensus.” *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 7, no. 1 (1987): 1–25.

———. “The Idea of Public Reason Revisited.” *The University of Chicago Law Review* 64, no. 3 (1997): 765.

Salton, Herman T. “Nation, Faith and War: The Birth of Freedom in France and the United States.” *Journal of Politics and Law* 6, no. 1 (March 1, 2013): 24.

Sekulow, Jay A., and Francis J. Manion. “Supreme Court and the Ten Commandments: Compounding the Establishment Clause Confusion.” *William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 14 (2006 2005): 33.

Skinner, Quentin. *Liberty Before Liberalism*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Starr, Penelope. “Understanding the EU Human Rights Court’s Big Ruling on France’s Headscarf Ban.” *UN Dispatch*. Accessed March 2, 2015. http://www.undispatch.com/living-together-trumps-freedom-religion-expression-echr-ruling/.

Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. 1st ed. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Wald, Kenneth D., and Allison Calhoun-Brown. *Religion and Politics in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

Weiner, Myron, Ergun Özbudun, and Ergun Özbudun, eds. “Turkey.” In *Competitive Elections in Developing Countries*. Duke University Press, 1987.

“Widespread Support for Banning Full Islamic Veil in Western Europe.” Pew Research Center, July 8, 2010. http://pewresearch.org/.