folk/ed. Derg, 2020; 26(4):827-838
DOI: 10.22559/folklor.1350

The Heroes Crossing the Line: An Evaluation of Making Enemies in Turkic Epics

Çizgiyi Aşan Kahramanlar: Türk Destanlarında Düşman Yaratma Eylemi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme

Mustafa Duman*

Abstract

This study investigates the origins of making an enemy through examples taken from Turkic epics, and offered personal evaluations on the relationship between epics and real world politics. In order to make a comprehensive evaluation, 30 epic texts selected from different regions of the Turkic world constitute the scope of this study. The similar features of the enemy in these epics were determined through a structuralist analysis. However, the epics included in the present study are merely some containing typical examples of enemy-making: the epic of Oguz Kagan, the epic of Koroghlu (Anatolian version), Manas and Kocacas epics of Kyrgyz, the epic of Koblan Batir of Bashkirs and the Book of Dede Korkut. By analyzing the epics from different perspectives, the aim was to put forward a classification of the enemies in the epic stories. It was also aimed to contribute to the knowledge of better understanding of the causes of the conflict and the relationship between politics and epics as well as their influences upon one another.

Keywords: *making enemy, marginalization, politics, the hero, Turkic epics*

Geliş tarihi (Received): 17.06.2020- Kabul tarihi (Accepted): 10.08.2020

* Dr., Uşak Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Türk Halk Bilimi ABD. m.duman66@gmail.com. ORCID 0000-0001-9689-40340

Öz

Türk dünyası destanları örnekleminde "düşman yaratma" eyleminin kökenlerinin odak noktası olarak belirlendiği bu çalışma, kurgusal dünyadaki düşman yaratma eylemi ile gerçek dünyadaki örnekleri arasındaki ilişki hakkında değerlendirmeler içermektedir. Geniş kapsamlı bir inceleme ortaya koymak için Türk dünyasının çeşitli bölgelerinden 30 destan yapısalcı bir bakış açısıyla incelenmiş ve bu destanlardaki düşman tiplerin ortak özellikleri belirlenmiştir. Tüm örneklere makale içerinde yer vermek mümkün olmadığı için bir seçki yapılmıştır. İncelenen destanlardan düşman yaratmaya dair en tipik örnekleri barındıran; Oğuz Kağan Destanı (Uygur harfli nüsha), Anadolu sahası Köroğlu Destanı (Behçet Mahir varyantı), Kırgızların Manas ve Kocacaş destanları, Başkurtların Koblan Batır Destanı ve Türk dünyasının ortak destanı olarak kabul edilen Dede Korkut Kitabı'ndan örneklere makale içerisinde yer verilmiştir. Türk destanlarını farklı bir bakış açısıyla inceleyerek bir düşman tasnifi ortaya koymak, çatışma olgusunun temellerini daha iyi anlamak, kurgusal dünya ve gerçek hayattaki çatışmanın kökenleri hakkında özgün görüşler sunmak ve bu iki farklı dünyanın birbiri üzerindeki etkilerini değerlendirmek amaçlanmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: *düşman yaratmak, ötekileştirme, siyaset, kahraman, Türk destanları*

Son, the enemy is he whom we kill when we can,

and, if they are able, they kill us.

(The Book of Dede Korkut)

Introduction

In the creation myths of Turks and many other societies, there is primarily chaos and then cosmos. The meaning of the cosmos here is the existence of a functioning order within itself, and the absence of anyone who rebels against the order. Therefore, all characters that disrupt this order are considered evil. In Turkish mythology, one of the most typical examples of these evil characters is Erlik (trickster, demon). Also, Eje, Törüngey and other characters who have a role in the violation of the forbidden are considered negative characters because they have a share in the disruption of the order. The most important point here is that while the cosmos represents a pure and unquestionable order, the characters that break that order were created in the cosmos itself. In other words, the characters that cause chaos are actually children of the cosmos. Thus, the existence of free-will necessary to rebel against the order of the cosmos is an inherent part of it, and therefore evil behavior must be considered a natural variation of the cosmic order.

This fictive world continues to exist in epics after the creation myths with the emergence of an epic hero acting as a representative or guard of cosmic order. For this reason, whatever the epic hero does, their actions – whether or not these actions follow or contradict contemporary universal ethical rules - are unquestionably considered necessary and thus positive. Consider that basic perspective in the epic world is that the cosmos persists independently of ethical

analysis by those who share its creation. Thus, the actions of the hero - the guardian created by the cosmos in the perseverance of its natural order – naturally must also persevere independently of ethical analysis. However, this gives rise to an interesting phenomenon occurring in the mythological world as well as the real world. Specifically, the actions of the hero also serve to create a new enemy.

Moreover, mythical understandings such as these do not only appear in epics, but also in the real-world civil order of the Turks throughout history. One example of this is the cultural belief that the blood of the Khan is holy. Effectively, this cultural mythical thought was grounds for not questioning the actions of those with noble blood in Turkish culture. This also provides context for the real-world order influencing the creation of epics, as there have been some epics created under influence of the khans (the kings) throughout history. This was likely done with the intention of strengthening public belief in divine regard for the khan. This is an example of the argument that there is a circular relationship between the mythical thought which is reflected in literary works and that which influences everyday life: real life shapes literary works, literary works shape real life.

This brief perspective on mythical thought, imbued from epics and reality, is essential in order to trace the influences of thoughts and actions associated with people's perception of enemies and evil, and the impact they have on the world, and is the basic foundation of the present study. For this reason, the epic-reality relationship needs to be sampled and analyzed. This study is being carried out in order to investigate the dynamics of the interactions among epics, creation of enemies, and politics. Therefore, the study first deals with the unquestionableness of the epic hero's actions and then the types of enemies that emerged at the conclusion of these unquestionable actions of the epic hero.

Why are epic heroes always good?

The thought process in the creation of an epic, unconditionally considers the hero's actions as positive and necessary. Within the texts, however, certain justifications are provided to allow negative actions by the hero. One such justification is the attribution of sacredness to the hero. The hero's belonging to a noble family, or the hero's close relationship with the gods, is a demonstration of his divineness in the epics, and immunity from ethical judgment. This common hero design does not only appear in Turkic epics but also in the epics from the Western world and in epics throughout Asian history as well.[1] It is known that in the epics such as Gilgamesh, Mahabharata, and Shahnama the hero has sacred or divine characteristics such as the hero in the Epic of Oguz Kagan. There are, of course, textual necessities in designing a sacred hero, such as fighting characters with extraordinary traits and enemies from other worlds. However, the concept of the hero as sacred and divine is also nothing more than a reflection of a strong king or important leader in real life. Hence, it is a strong possibility that the perception of a sacred king in people's minds has spread to many epics. This leads to the fact that the actions of the epic hero are not to be questioned because the hero is sacred. A couple concrete examples of this phenomenon are exemplified in stories

about Ancient Egyptian pharaohs, and even the today's North Korean leaders being regarded by their people as divine in nature.

Secondly, the fact that the hero is formed as a source of absolute goodness and that his actions are not questionable is also related to the non-objective style of the epic narrator who regards the hero as the center point (the source of absolute goodness) of the epic. The dialogue between Joseph Campbell and Bill Moyers in *The Power of Myth* (2013) directly supports the idea of the narrator's non-objective attitude. In the interview, Moyers wonders what the "hero" means, and questions whether Napoleon is a hero or a cruel leader. As an answer to this question, Campbell states that he is a hero for his people but an enemy for the people he invades. According to Campbell, in determining whether someone is a hero or an enemy, it is the determinant of where the focus of our consciousness is located (Campbell et al. 2013: 167-168). The subjective attitude in forming of epics determines the hero as the center of focus within the consciousness. Thus, the audience or reader facing a biased text does not attempt to question the hero's actions.

The relationship between epics and real life also forms a basis for the hero's actions not to be questioned. Although epics are considered as romantic texts containing fantastic elements, they are realistic at the same time. This realism manifests itself not in the way the themes are presented within the epics, but in the way that epics reflect the general acceptable behavior and everyday-life of the society. In other words, the events which occurred in an epic's plot may have extraordinary characteristics but these extraordinary events are due to the exaggeration of events in real life. This can be exemplified by the looting tradition among the Turks: the looting activities, which are frequently presented in Turkic epics, are not just an action that appears in the fictional world. Among Turks, the looting activities in question in the real world were performed in two ways: 1. Booty sharing after a battle and, 2. Khan's (or rich people's) willingly being looted of their own goods by people (potlaç, kençliyü) (Duymaz, 2005: 37-60).[2] The looting tradition can be seen either in a realistic way or, adorned with extraordinary features in Turkic epics. Therefore, the looting tradition, which was a cultural element in the lifestyle of the Turks, is presented as an ordinary act in the epics. For this reason, it is not open to discussion that heroes' looting activities could be considered evil behavior by the narrator and audience.

Besides the contextual reasons as an answer to the question "why is the epic hero always good?", there are substantial textual creation circumstances which (by natural course are required to make the hero absolute good) are as important as the contextual reasons. One such reason is the character types of the epics. These character types are commonly referred to as flat characters and their actions comprise almost all of the content in epics and other folk narratives. Since flat characters are two-dimensional characters, they represent either good disposition or the evil one (those used as background characters have generally a neutral feature). In the era when epics were created and preserved (heroic era), it was very important that the narratives consisted of flat characters in terms of the recallability and the transferability of the text. This system did not lend itself to accommodating such complications, which would also likely not serve the epic's inspirational value. This is the main reason why the

epics generally do not contain round characters with changeable features. In addition, an epic is composed of narrative patterns (episodes) arranged one after the other, poetic themes, and artistic references, all of which function collectively to support the image of the hero as the representative of goodness. Therefore, even negative actions of the hero are presented with positive affirmation within the flat character framework, and in conjunction with the other epic patterns, to support the hero's image of goodness and promoted immunity to ethical judgment.

The theme and content features of the epics are also one of the reasons why the action of the epic hero is not questioned. It is a common opinion that the period of formation of the epics begins with the emergence of the organized states. It is also the common opinion that epics are representative of the social structures of the time period of their original creation. One common thread throughout history and geographical location is the important ideals within the social circumstances of the time and place which motivated the creation of that epic. Naturally, this will often involve a real-life leader or leaders within a power struggle, viewed by those within, as them fighting against the enemy, and with an ideal outcome from the participants' perspectives. The motivating circumstances of the epic's creation would, therefore, be inspiring by nature and based upon such real-life events and achievements. These events/achievements would then be arranged ideally within the patterns of the epic, resulting in an ideal portrayal of the hero's actions within the narrated epic. This ideal perspective was likely a factor in what motivated the initial creation of the epic, and therefore that idealism will be represented within the patterns of the epic. Hence, the basic theme of epics formed at such a time consists of a leader and his/her achievements that emphasize the national unity. Considering this reality, epics can be accurately regarded as stories of achievements. The alleged opinion here is not that all of the epics are life adventures of the leaders who live in the real world, but whoever the epic hero is, s/he is a symbol of an ideal associated with real life. This ideal is embodied in the real world as the king (ruler) and in the fictional world as the epic hero. Thus, whether s/he is a historical personage or not, a hero is presented by being idealized in the epics.[3] Congruent with the narrator's perspective, it emerges as a natural tendency that the hero's negative actions are not mentioned in the epics.

Making an enemy – politics - timeless story

Whether art reflects the reality or the ideal is a matter that has been debated since Plato and Aristotle. Instead of re-opening this subject, suffice to say that the relationship between reality and idealization is indistinguishably intricate. Epics are a strong medium for examining this relationship because, on the one hand, epics reflect the lifestyle of the period they were formed; on the other hand, they also undertake the task of idealizing some characters or events in everyday life, and are always confined within the context of perception and perspective, which will eventually become the narrator's perspective. Of course, this task of idealization is not reserved especially for the hero; naturally, it is also applied to the portrayal of the enemy.

For the idealization of the epic heroes and their actions, an enemy is presented against them. The "classic" enemy, also referred to as "natural enemy" or "old-fashioned enemy", emerges at this point and acts aggressively against the hero with an ideally evil agenda. However, there are still other enemies besides the classical enemy concept mentioned below in the epics. These enemies do not have any negative attitude; on the contrary, it is the actions of the epic's hero which cause them to appear as an enemy. Examining these types of enemies provides an opportunity to see the events from the enemies' perspective. Therefore, under this subheading of the present study, the enemies that are outside the definition of the classical enemy are investigated. In order to clarify these evaluations, certain examples from Turkic epics are utilized. Moreover, through the examples from the historical events and the politics, the intricate relationship between reality and idealization is emphasized. Evaluating events from enemy's point of view, or at least trying to objectively evaluate events, is a futile attempt in terms of construction of the text but this empathy developed with the enemy will provide a better understanding of the process of making an enemy.

Old-fashioned enemy

In epics, the enemy is simply presented in three steps: showing up, performing hostile acts, and being punished. Therefore, the audience/reader cannot find an opportunity to empathize with the enemy because just as the hero is the source of absolute goodness, the enemy is the source of pure evil. Circumstantially, this is similar to the reality that an individual who grows up within a traditional belief system (or religion) is very unlikely to develop an empathy with the devil because the belief system does not give the individual such an opportunity.

Myths and stories such as the *Tree of Knowledge* and the Altaic creation myth, can be used to show how concepts such as betrayal lead to separation of oneself as being distinctly different from the other(s) who are the betrayers. This stark difference in perception is theoretically the means by which people identify others as an enemy. This also involves the perception of others as foreign or unlike oneself, and unworthy of trust. In the *Tree of Knowledge* myth, this is the serpent (Satan), in the Altaic creation myth, it is Erlik (Satan) who is recognized as a source of pure evil only after his first betrayal. It is not to advise one to become more familiar with the devil, as it is to recognize the extension of those who are perceived as different, as presumably being evil due to being foreign. This is exemplified in Richard Kearny's book *Strangers, Gods and Monsters*, as "evil is alienation, bad is alien" and he states that ever since the early Western world equated goodness with the concepts of "self-identity" and "lightness", evil has often been associated with concepts of foreignness. This prejudice against exteriority has never been shed even in today's world (Kearney, 2012: 87). Due to early perceptions in mythical thinking such as these, the "old-fashioned enemy" design appears in the epics accordingly: an enemy who cannot be understood, empathized with, and is untrustworthy. Moreover, epic creators are aware that they have designed such an enemy**.** They sometimes transmit their definitions of the enemy to the audience/reader through the characters they create. The dialogue about the enemy between Kazan and his son in *the Book of Dede Korkut* is a fundamental example for this:

"The son asked, 'What does enemy mean, Father?'

'Son, the enemy is he whom we kill when we can, and, if they are able, they kill us,' replied Kazan.

Uruz asked, 'Father, if one kills their princes, is one held to account for it?'

'Even if you kill a thousand infidels, no one will ask you a question. But this infidel with a savage religion now puts us in an awkward situation.'" (Sümer et al. 1991: 73-74; Ergin, 1997: 158).

This dialogue in *the Book of Dede Korkut* is a summary of the enemy design in the Turkic epics: an enemy whose nature of being good or evil is not questioned, and whose basic motivation is to kill the hero, and therefore must be destroyed. In fact, this perception of common (old-fashioned) enemies is not only in Turkic epics but also in epics belonging to other societies. There are also enemies outside of this classical enemy concept in the Turkic epics which can be classified as follows: those being looted, rebels, and even passive ones.

The victim enemy/ Those being looted

Booty sharing after a battle is one of the elements related to a war in the Turkic epics. As previously mentioned, in reality, the looting activities in the epics are a reflection of real-life wartime practices of the Turks. Therefore, it is ordinary to see a character whose land or herd of horses is looted by the hero when conceived of as an enemy. Thus, there is a common thread of cultural normalcy between looting in the epics and real-life lootings. Before further evaluations of the issue, it is advantageous to first look closer at some of the looting activities in the Turkic epics:

Koroghlu (Köroğlu) is visited by a dervish (holy man) in the epic of Koroghlu, which is widely known among Turkic communities (Kaplan et al. 1973). After the dervish praises Koroghlu and all his soldiers, he mentions that only Ayvaz, the adopted child of Koroghlu who is also one of his soldiers, is missing something which all the other soldiers have. He is lacking a ciga. Ciga is a feather that only demoiselle cranes have. Koroghlu assigns some of his troops to find a ciga for Ayvaz. The soldiers hunt demoiselle cranes, which are banned to hunt in Baghdad. In response to this, the king of Baghdad commands the capturing of troops hunting birds. A war begins between Koroghlu and the king's army. In brief, the war ends up against the king of Baghdad.

As it can be seen from the example, the king of Baghdad, at first, does not have a bad attitude against Koroghlu. On the contrary, the hero causes the war to begin by poaching (a form of looting) the birds in the king's country. The hero thus makes an enemy. However, the narrator takes on another task at this point: legitimizing the king as an enemy. In doing this, the narrator adds some extra information that the king is trying to win this war by employing underhanded tactics, such as violating peace contracts. Without this evil behavior, the king is doing nothing more than his kingly duties of enforcing the law of the kingdom. As such, this serves to legitimize the king's character as an enemy. In a different chapter of the same epic, Koroghlu and his friend Kiziroghlu fight against Georgia and Afghanistan kings because of similar looting activities. Besides the looting in the epic of Koroghlu, in the epic of Manas of Kyrgyz, it is seen that Manas, after becoming a hero, lands troops on against the Kitays (a Mongolian tribe), the Calmucks, and other communities and seizes women and goods

from them (Yıldız, 1995; Koenalıyev et al. 2017). Similarly, in the epic of Koblan Batir of Bashkir, after Koblan beats Kazan Khan, an unnamed khan is looted of a herd of horses merely because Koblan's friend, Karaman, encourages Koblan to do so on their journey back to their country (Suleymanov et al. 1994).

The looting of the conquered country among Turks is regarded by many researchers as a kind of "war reparations". This has been one of the major incomes in the economic life of nomadic societies.[4] Therefore, the looting activities in the Turkic epics should be regarded as a fictive reflection of real life, and justification for acceptability by heroes.

These examples and evaluations about the looting in the Turkic epics are not, in fact, far from the realities of today's world. Looting is obviously regarded as a primitive or barbarous behavior that contradicts the contemporary ethical values of today's world. However, although the above assessments and examples about looting have been made in the context of the Turkic epics, it is justifiable to claim that today's modern man also has a hypocritical attitude towards looting. It is common knowledge that many of the wars in today's world result in the victor's control of valuable natural resources. However, the victor of the war does not admit that the purpose of this war is looting. Instead, the victor draws attention to the different causes of the war through media reports and movies, which one could even consider the epic texts of the modern day. The only difference between the epics of yore and the present day's epics (media) is that while the looting is a normal action in the epic poetry, the contemporary media attributes propagandist reasons for the waging of wars in order to control natural resources. When analogizing the media as a form of modern day epics, it is noteworthy that they also serve some of the same traditional purposes; creating enemies, supporting heroes, and in doing so, continue blurring the line between reality and fiction. Therefore, the evaluation of the process of normalization of the looting made in the sample of Turkic epics emphasizes that the facts of today's world should be looked at from a different point of view.

Rebels/ Obey or die

One of the most important reasons for a war in the epics is the disobeying of the hero. The epic hero expects an unconditional obedience from those living under his protection, and those in surrounding states, and punishes those who do not obey him. In the epic of Oguz Kagan (Oğuz Kağan) the words of Oguz are like the manifesto of the epic hero demanding unconditional obedience:

"I am an Uyghur king, and I must be king of the world's four corners. I expect you all to obey. If anyone obeys my orders, accepting his gifts I will regard him as an ally. If anyone does not, I will become wrathful to him; regarding him as an enemy I will land troops on his country; carrying out a raid, I will have him hanged and destroyed." (Bang et al. 1936: 7).[5]

Oguz Kagan regards the Uyghur state as the center of the world and himself as the leader of the world. Therefore, anyone who does not obey him in his hegemony must be punished because they are rebels. In the present epic, Altun Kagan and Uruz Kagan are saved from Oguz's wrath because they obey him but Urum Kagan does not obey him and he is punished. There is a gray wolf, a divine being that guides Oguz during the wars he has made, which emphasizes the sanctity of the actions of Oguz. This sacred being should be accepted as a

symbol that legitimizes the struggle of Oguz. Similarly, in the epic of Manas, Kırk Coro (forty of the soldiers), Alman Bet, and Acıbay are killed because they do not want to serve and obey Manas's son Semetey, after Manas died (Yıldız, 1995).

It is clear that the epics are narratives emphasizing the national integrity. The most important way of ensuring national unity was the construction of an authoritarian regime at the time when epics are first formed. The authoritarian regime is in need of unconditional obedience. It is an undeniable fact that the countries that have an authoritarian regime in whatever form of government, even today, have a similar political tendency. This authoritarian perspective has not changed since the first days when such states existed. Dolkun Kamberi's opinion about Oguz Kagan's manifesto is noteworthy on this point: "Back then, every strong leader had the same foreign policy: expand and conquer. This is what we have learned throughout history from great conquerors such as Alexander the Great and Genghis Khan." (Kamberi, 2016: 7). Considering the examples and evaluations above, it is suitable to say that epics can play an important role for a better understanding of today's authoritarian regimes and the paradox of "obey or die" that many countries and opposition groups within those scenarios are forced into.

Innocent or passive enemy

Some of the characters in the epics are described as enemies because of their behavior which conflicts with social values, or some other reasons such as not making sacrifices, or in some manner not conforming to demands or expectation. The characters acting in these behaviors in the epics are marginalized. Thus, these characters, who become an "other", do not even need to be committing negative actions directly affecting the hero. They are inherently enemies.

In the epic of Manas, Kongur Bay and Ürbü are regarded as enemies because they are from other nations, and Afghanistan's king Mus Buçak is considered an enemy without any reason. These characters have no hostile attitude towards Manas in practice. Forming these characters as enemies certainly has a functional purpose in terms of text, such as making an epic more inspiring. However, it includes a connotation about what the fate of those who prefer the wrong side or those who choose to live in their own way, as it is in the slogan "bitaraf olan bertaraf olur (inferred *the one who is impartial is to be defeated*)" used among Turkish people.

In the epic of Kocacash (Kocacaş) of Kyrgyz, the enemy is an anthropomorphic goat named Sureçki. She does not have any hostile attitude towards the hero, Kocacash. The thing that makes her an enemy is her resistance to death and sense of revenge. The expression of the hero in the epic, "the God creates me as a nemesis to you"(Köse, 2002: 290) indicates that the enmity originates from the law of nature. This quote shows that sometimes there is actually no need for any reason for making enemies. Also, in the epic of Koroghlu, most of the hero's enemies take no negative action against the hero. Besides this, the hero of this epic resorts to trickery while fighting against the enemy, which is presented by the narrator as a sign of intelligence. Contrary to this, the trickster enemy is portrayed as evil and punished because of his tricks. This is a typical example of the fact that the ethical fundamentals of the actions within the epic change according to the person performing it, and are attributed with subjective bias.

This structure of making an enemy in the epics shows that there is, in fact, no need for any reason in order to marginalize a character and to make him an enemy. Forms of marginalizing or demonizing of a group, belief, political movement or a country are actually one of the foreign policies seen in every period of history. Throughout history, many political leaders have demonized or villainized adversaries to create enemies for the purpose of rallying allies against them and empowering control over the adversaries.[6] In doing this, enemies in the epics may be created by narrators in order to influence the audience, not unlike modern war propaganda. According to the scholar Philip Cole, the border between fictional work and narratives of the real world can be made unclear, so it is possible that people might not distinguish an imaginary fear from a real one. (Cole, 2006: 101-102).

In this context, Cole's claims support the assumption about marginalizing in order to create an enemy:

"The boundary between fiction and reality is blurred, or rather our awareness of where that boundary line is blurred, and everyday life itself is framed within the fictional constructs of our imagination or the imagination of our political and cultural leaders." (2006: 101).

To give an example of political propaganda in a major motion picture; many critiques of Invasion of the Body Snatchers (1956), directed by Don Siegel, identify the film as an allegoric work which supports anti-communist propaganda during the Cold War period (Dodd, 2014; Sanders, 2008: 55-72; Wood, 2001). Therefore, it is possible to claim that while these marginalization attempts were carried out through the epics until a certain period of the history, the media sector satisfies these needs today (Duman, 2020: 363).

Conclusion

This study, which deals with the "reasons for not questioning the negative actions of the epic hero" and "how to work the enemy making process in epics", reveals two important claims: The first of these is that there is a strong relationship between not questioning of the actions of the epic hero and not questioning of the actions of the king in real-life authoritarian regimes. Analyzing this relationship comprehensively is crucial to better understand the causes of wars and even today's politics because, in the historical process, even if the ethical perceptions have varied depending upon the lifestyles of the societies, the perception of political leaders is often the same. Being told extraordinary stories (in order to attribute godlikeness to him) about North Korea leader Kim Il Sung (1912),[7] who appeared after 4,000 years of ancient Egyptian pharaohs attributed to God or semi-god might be one of the most obvious examples to show that perceptions and practices of some political leaders remains the same as in the epics even in today's modern world. Epics are one of the resources that helps us to closely understand this perception. Therefore, it is a very strong assertion can be made that although the period of composing an epic for most nations in the world has come to an end, the understanding of a hero who cannot be questioned and the policy of enemy-making still exists similarly in real life. Accordingly, re-examining the epics with different perspectives is very important for understanding these things happening in today's world.

The second important claim of this study is that empathy with the enemy is very important in the struggle against evil. For this, it may be advantageous to consider the enemies in the fictional world as a sample. In doing so, we may find that many of our perceived enemies are not truly evil, but perceived as such because they are merely foreign to us. Accordingly, ignorance leads to acquiescence and acquiescence accompanies insensitivity. The war, the massacre, or the attacks which are the embodiment of radical evil have been experienced in all periods of history, but acquiescence and, most importantly, insensitivity to evil has made it difficult to overcome radical evil. Humanity acknowledging the occurrences of radical evil in the world with honesty among ourselves must be the catalyst for peace. Examining the enemies that are fictional reflections of evil in the real world from a different point of view will contribute to our understanding of whom and what is evil in the real world, and who is really needed to be regarded as an enemy.

Endnotes

1 see Miller 2000: 70-73

2 Turkish folklorist Ali Duymaz investigates the types of looting in Turkish culture and how they reflect on epics in his article examining the festival traditions in Turkish culture (Duymaz, 2005: 37-60).

3 In contact with a similar subject, Bowra questioned the reality of the Kyrgyz's Manas and the Kalmuks' Dzangar. Expressing that these characters are not directly related to history and real life, Bowra emphasizes that they are ideal heroes reflecting national consciousness but that does not completely mean they are not based on historical personages. Secondly, a historical personage is presented by being idealized to his people, which results in the design of a historical personage as an ideal epic hero. Vladimir of the Russians and Marko Kraljevic of the Serbs are such characters (Bowra, 1952: 534). Even if some epics take its source from historical personages and events it is possible to claim that these characters and events can be reshaped according to the event pattern in the epics and relationship between storyteller and audience (see Bowra, 1952: 534-535).

4 (see Karataş, 2017; Yereli, 2010)

5 Dolkun Kamberi makes an evaluation on this manifest, which corroborates our opinion, in his work titled Ancient Heritage of Täklimakan: Uyghur Urbiculture: "This medieval Uyghur king's declaration at his coronation amounts to only eight lines of verse, plus another line giving the king's order to send the eight lines out to all other states. But its content is so rich that it includes everything important to a state. In my opinion, this is the shortest and best speech by any khan, king, emperor, chairman, or president throughout world history. Its implied concerns include strengthening the military, developing animal husbandry and the irrigation system for agriculture, faith, the environment, politics, and the Uyghur kingdom's foreign policy." (2016: 7).

The process and types of enemy making is defined in The Sage encyclopedia of war: Social science perspectives as follows: "Enemy making or enmification is a process through which people dehumanize their adversaries. Three types of explanations can be discerned for why people need enemies. One theory is that people psychologically need enemies as suitable targets for the displacement of their personal fears and hostilities (Volkan, 1985, 1988). The second explanation is political: leaders create enemies to mobilize the nation around common aims or to profit from the arms industry (Murray and Meyers, 1999). The third explanation is that enemy making is a natural and crucial factor in combat because it helps to construct a distance between soldiers and their enemies which is crucial in order to be able to kill adversaries (Grossman, 1995)". (Sion, 2018).

7 (see Andrei, 2013).

References

Bang, W. and Rahmeti, R. G. (1936). *Oğuz Kağan destanı*. İstanbul: Burhaneddin.

Bowra, C. M. (1952). *Heroic poetry*. London: MacMillan.

Campbell, J. and Moyers, B. (2013). *Mitolojinin gücü: Kutsal kitaplardan Hollywood filmlerine mitoloji ve hikâyeler.* Z. Yaman (Trans.). İstanbul: MediaCat.

Cole, P. (2006). *The myth of evil*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.

Duymaz, A. (2014). Oğuz Kağan Destanı'ndan Dede Korkut'a toy geleneğinin simgesel anlamı ve Türk paylaşım modeli. *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*, *5 (5)*, pp. 37-60.

Duman, M. (2020). *Türk halk anlatmalarında olumsuz tipler –Mit, destan, halk hikâyesi-*. Ankara: Karakum.

Ergin, M. (1997). *Dede Korkut Kitabı giriş-metin-faksimile*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (2007). *Kısa 20. yüzyıl: Aşırılıklar çağı 1914*-1991. Y. Alogan (Trans.). İstanbul: Everest.

Kaplan, M. et al. (Eds.) (1973). *Köroğlu Destanı*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

Karataş, M. (2017). Göçerevlilik ve yerleşiklilik bağlamında Selçuknâme'deki kültür unsurları. *TÜBAR, XLII*, pp. 127-170.

Kearney, R. (2012). *Yabancılar, tanrılar ve canavarlar: Ötekiliği yorumlamak.* B. Özkul, (Trans.). İstanbul: Metis.

İsakov, A. et al. (2017). *Manas: Soghimboĭ Ŭrozbek ŭghli varianti bŭĭicha: Manas destanı: Sagımbay Orozbak Uulu varyantı*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Belediyeler Birliği.

Köse, N. (2002). *Kocacaş Destanı Üsönbayev, Konokbayev ve Ceentayev varyantları inceleme-metin*. Ankara: Milli Folklor.

Lankov, A. (2013). *The real North Korea: Life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Miller, D. A. (2000). *The epic hero*. Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Sanders, S. M. (2008). Picturing paranoia: Interpreting Invasion of the Body Snatchers. In S. M. Sanders (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Science Fiction Film* (pp. 55-72). Lexington KY: University of Kentucky.

Sion, L. (2018). Enemy making. In P. I. Joseph (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of war: Social science perspectives*. Thousand Oaks CA: SAGE.

Suleymanov, A. et al. (2014). *Başkurt destanları IV: Tarihi destanlar, kahramanlar hakkında destanlar, ozanlar (sesenler)*. M. Ergun, G. İbrahimov, F. Aetbaeva and M. Y. Kaya, (Trans.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Sümer, F. et al. (Eds. & Trans.) (1991). *The Book of Dede Korkut: A Turkish epic*. Austin TX: Univ. of Texas.

Yereli, A. B. (2010). Yağma kültürüyle üretim kültürü arasında Türklerin devlet ideali. *Orhon Yazıtlarının Bulunuşundan 120 Yıl Sonra Türklük Bilimi ve 21. Yüzyıl Konulu 3. Uluslararası Türkiyat Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, pp. 941-949.

Yıldız, N. (1995). *Manas Destanı (W. Radloff) ve Kırgız kültürü ile ilgili tespit ve tahliller*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

References (Online)

Dodd, M. (2014). Safe Scares: How 9/11 caused the American horror remake trend (Part one). *The Missing Slate*. http://themissingslate.com/2014/08/31/safe-scares-how-911-caused-the-american-horror-remake-trend-part-one/#.VARTBvldUgs. (Retrieved September 2, 2018)

Kamberi, D. (2016). *Ancient heritage of Täklimakan: Uyghur urbiculture.* https://www.rfa.org/english/bookshelf/uygpdf.pdf. (Retrieved September 1, 2018)

Wood, D. (2001). Invasion of the Body Snatchers (1956). *BBC Home*. http://www.bbc.co.uk/films/2001/05/01/invasion_of_the_body_snatchers_1956_review.shtml. (Retrieved September 2, 2018)