# The "Teachers' Army" and Its Miniature Republican Society: Educators' Traits and School Dynamics in Turkish Pedagogical Prescriptions, 1923-1950

Barak Salmoni

Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East, Volume 21, Number 1&2, 2001, pp. 61-72 (Article)

Published by Duke University Press

# The "Teachers' Army" and Its Miniature Republican Society: Educators' Traits and School Dynamics in Turkish Pedagogical Prescriptions, 1923-1950

Barak A. Salmoni

During the first half of the twentieth century "modern" educators in Europe and the U.S. evinced a fervid belief that the classroom and larger school environment should form a truly functioning social, cultural, and even political society-in-miniature. Illustrating a shift from nineteenth-century pedagogical thinking that espoused learning *for* life *after* school, twentieth-century educators advocated learning *through* life *in* school. Accordingly, school dynamics were to mirror, if not create, the conditions of "grown-up" life through teacher-student interactions in and out of class. Student-student cooperation in the form of interactive learning, clubs, and extra-curricular activities would provide emerging citizens with firsthand experience in healthy, productive forms of self-reliance, trust, and societal organization. Allowing children comparatively broad scope for decision-making, while teachers hovered protectively yet unabtrusively nearby, would cultivate a practical understanding of democracy and all that it entailed in terms of rights and duties. Thus, instead of passively receiving dry lessons in these matters, students could actively become motivated citizens.[1]

Such conceptions of school dynamics were not the preserve of Western pedagogy. With a sizeable pedagogical corps, many of whose leading members read European languages and had even traveled to Euro-American pedagogical centers, Turkey between 1923-1950 illustrates a Middle Eastern environment in which the teaching cadres championed this same understanding of schooling's central role in socializing individuals into liberated and empowered citizens. Indeed, late Ottoman teachers such as Ismail Hakki Baltacioglu—called the "father of republican Turkish educational thought"—envisioned a kind of school dynamic in the pre-World War I years similar to the European "school-as-society" conception. This, of course, reflected the overall platform of political and cultural reform entertained by particular intellectuals of the Second Constitutional, "Young Turk," era (1908-1918)—Baltacioglu chief among them.[2] In the post-1923 years, it was a natural progression to consider the school the environment in which the most essential processes of socialization would occur for the first generation of emerging Turkish citizens. Acculturation of students to particular kinds of sociopolitical interactions and assumptions would provide the new nationalist Republic with active members ready to guarantee the future of a sociopolitical order in the making.

Most often, teachers themselves, along with experienced administrators, penned the works depicting schools in such a manner. They began by prescribing the qualities and role of the teacher, after which education itself as a broad, all-encompassing phenomenon received sustained consideration. Having recourse to traditional Islamic distinctions phrased in secular nationalist terms, rather than mere informational and skill instruction, or *talim* (based on the Arabic *'allama*, to make known), the new Republic's schools were to be animated by *terbiye* (from Arabic *rabbaya*), entailing the purposeful cultivation of intellectual and social refinement in youth and the formation of proper Turkish citizens through coherent educative efforts. Teachers perceived themselves to be peerlessly integral to this process, with the scope of the true educator (*mürebbi*, and not the mere *muallim*-instructor) passing beyond the school grounds to mentor children even in their homes. Here, teachers would display exemplary conduct worthy of emulation. All this was not, however, merely a matter of pedagogical rumination. Because the school was indeed envisioned as its own properly regulated society, its dynamics were to eventually radiate out into the larger sociopolitical domain. As key advocates for state-driven national(ist) modernization projects articulated both in and outside the pedagogical realm, the Turkish teaching corps prescribed school dynamics, which provide us with a rich understanding of how those animating a key Kemalist ideological state apparatus—education—viewed the workings of their nation.[3]

In the following pages we will examine what self-perceptions Turkish educators nurtured from 1923-1950 and how they identified the necessary traits of Republican teachers. This will serve as a prelude to a detailed analysis of evolving conceptions of teacher-student interactions and in-school dynamics during these years. We will see that in the first case, assertions regarding the "proper teacher" in effect set forth the kind of citizen that Turkish schools should form for the Republic. At the same time, laudatory discussions of teachers and their nationalist contributions contained claims for higher societal and official esteem.

As regards school dynamics, we will encounter a tension during the 1920s-1930s between a concern for order and obedience and a desire for freedom and student activism. This tension reflected ongoing political dynamics. On the one hand, Turkey possessed a self-declared modernizing and westernizing regime striving to form active, mobilized citizens ready to animate a political space possessing the trappings of European parliamentarism. On the other hand, recollections of late Ottoman political disintegration and political factionalism, in addition to experiences with ongoing opposition to the Republic's secular, nationalist program in the form of sporadic uprisings in Central Anatolia through the 1930s, inclined educators at all levels to fear anything that might open the door to political factionalism and territorial disintegration or to atavistic religious obscurantism and reaction (*irtica*). Though renewed interest in democracy reflecting global trends at the end of the 1940s lent added vigor to calls for

liberty within the "miniature society," this overriding tension persisted, suggesting that in the Republican pedagogical vision, Turkey's sociopolitical order was to resemble a tutelary democracy.

**The Ideal Symbol for Exemplary Teachers**

In December of 1930 a small group of rural Turks gathered around Dervis Mehmed in the town of Manisa, near Izmir in western Anatolia. Perhaps reacting to Mustafa Kemal's recent closing of the short-lived Free Republican Party led by Fethi Okyar, the Naksibendi sufi Mehmed led this group from the mosque in Menemen to the town square after prayers one morning. There they began to agitate for the restoration of the Caliphate and the Islamic *Seriat*, the elimination of both of which had been high on the Kemalist agenda from the start. Inciting the crowd even more, Dervis Mehmed claimed he was a messianic savior. In response to this obvious affront to the new Republican order, the local gendarmerie dispatched two separate officers to the town center, who subsequently departed the scene in search of reinforcements. A little while later, Mustafa Fehmi Kubilay, a reserve officer in the force, arrived and publicly challenged Dervis Mehmed. Confronting a large agitated crowd, Kubilay was unsuccessful in his attempts to quell the disturbance. In a tragic show of violence, which shocked the regime, Dervis Mehmed's supporters seized Kubilay, shot him, and mounted his severed head on a flagpole, which they then paraded around the town in a macabre counterimage to the new Republic's patriotism.

The leadership of the young Kemalist Republic took the Menemen Olayi event very seriously, seeing it as the volatile combination of atavistic Islamic symbols with an unruly, unreformed rural mob, in the form of a brewing Naksibendi plot to undo the Turkish revolution. In what may have been an overreaction and an exaggerated reading of the incident's resonance with the rural masses' inclinations, authorities dispatched an armored unit to the region, which quickly subdued the opposition.[4] Additionally, Kubilay immediately became an example of the young Turkish Republican prepared to martyr himself in the cause of secular, modernizing enlightenment.

Beyond adding a powerful element to the overall Turkish commemorative narrative, this event contains extreme importance for us; for while Fehmi Kubilay was a reserve officer, his primary profession was as a teacher. As a result, in addition to his lasting power as a symbol of Turkish martyrdom in the face of religious obscurantism and reaction, Kubilay took on a special, poignant, and identifying meaning for the Republic's educators. In eulogizing him, therefore, educational writers went a considerable distance to identify those qualities they perceived as most reflective of the ideal Turkish teacher. At the same time, in celebrating Kubilay, teachers prescribed a unique societal role to themselves and staked out a special claim for the centrality of the teaching corps as a whole to the survival of modern, secular, and civilized Turkey.

For those writing about him, Kubilay was the archetypal teacher. He was young—only twenty-four at the time of his murder—and "like every man," in the sense of being in touch with normal, decent Turkish desires and sensibilities. In this respect, a picture accompanying a piece about him portrays him as serious yet serene, attractive, well dressed in contemporary clothing, and clean shaven. He is also quite youthful, yet not bashful, as he looks directly at the camera.[5] Some key traits, however distinguished Kubilay—and by implication, all teachers—from other citizens. First, he was imbued with a total commitment to Turkish Republicanism as identified with Mustafa Kemal; because of Kubilay it was clear that "the most faithful idealist of the regime [consisting] of the people's republic is the young Turkish teacher."[6] As a result of his superior idealism, Kubilay and teachers like him demonstrated extreme courage and strength of will, in addition to a gravity allowing them to always perceive and undertake the necessary responsibilities in a manner commensurate with the unrivaled honor attaining to the call of teaching. As a result then, "in no other vocation could one be able to search for [someone who is] republican as much as a teacher, or who is the Republic's natural and true defender as much as is he."[7]

Second, Kubilay was exceptional to the degree in which he took the initiative in a manifestly unselfish and lone manner in order to perform his duty unflinchingly: "He did not stop, and did not consider his loneliness, and for the path the righteousness of which he had committed to memory, he rushed to duty all by himself."[8] Such a commitment, then was to be emblematic of all teachers, "because the teacher is a person living for someone else, loving someone else, and as if forgetting himself, thinking of someone else."[9] In essence then, the teacher was endowed with an extraordinary ability to understand his (or her) duty (*vazife*, the love of which was "the greatest virtue") without being told, and to carry it out with total self-disregard, as a solitary warrior for modern rationalism focused on the Republican ideal.[10]

Third, as suggested by these two sets of traits, Kubilay was the consummate martyr, sacrificing himself for the sake of Turkey. Indeed, terms such as self-sacrifice (*fedakar*), self-denial (*fedakarlik*), sacrificial offering (*kurban*), martyr and martyrdom (*sehit*, and *sehadet*) pervade articles composed about Kubilay. To demonstrate the extent to which this was integral to being a teacher, writers recalled the fate of Zeki Dündar, who perished in the opening phases of the Seyh Sait Revolt in 1925. He too was a teacher, in the small town of Genç. In the pedagogical eulogy, he was portrayed as struggling against the growing antagonism of peasants blinded by tribalism and religion. In spite of repeated appeals to the local governor for armed protection, the government did not respond, and he spent his last *kurus* on schoolbooks for his needy students. His final telegraph read: "my life is in danger, but may the homeland be saved." Furthermore, "in spite of his torture by a cowardly governor, [Dündar] by himself believed in the Republic and so that it could live he sacrificed his life."[11] Thus, not only did Kubilay and Dündar personify self-sacrifice, they demonstrated their total comprehension of the "exalted speech... of the Great Guide [Atatürk]... with the lesson of sacrifice to us."[12]

Teachers were thus to be self-sacrificing emissaries of the new Turkey. Indeed, a certain reversed, or recasted religious imagery and ambiance illuminated this attitude. Istanbul Teachers' College instructor and regional educational official H. Rasit (Öymen) illustrated this well through a suggestive rhetorical reversal. Putting words into the mouth of Dervis Mehmed, he wrote: "You, then [Kubilay], are the infidel [*kafir*] we've been looking for. You are the one who has taught the new [Latin] letters. You are the one who has thrown the turbaned *hocas* out of the schools. You are the one who has struggled to make [us] forget our feelings for the sultanate

and Caliphate, [and you] are the one who has raised our children for the Republic."[13] All these statements were tantamount to the Republic's creed (*amentü*, a term with previously religious uses) and as a result, such terms, in addition to those connected with martyrdom, combined to invest the Republican teacher's activities with a spiritual aura as he fought to root out those representatives of Kemalist religion's diametric opposites.[14] Against a teacher's *fedakarlik*, *kurban*, and *Şehadet* were Dervis Mehmed and Seyh Sait's fanaticism, reactionism, and hypocrisy (*taassüp*, *irtica*, and *riyakarlik*).[15] Explicitly then, "teachers are the *aziz*s traveling the path of the prophets and leaders saving a nation."[16] As single, lonely, *Dervis*-like emissaries of the secular Turkish Republic, they were even to mount the rostrum of mosques to preach the virtues of the new order.[17] Further, there was a tangible immediacy to the teacher's mission, as individuals such as Dervis Mehmed "remain[ed] bound to the sultanate, and [were] always waiting in ambush to retake the power they [had] lost."[18]

Not only was Kubilay significant for his didactic value towards teachers themselves, but he also served to highlight the kind of esteem in which educators wanted the teaching corps as a whole to be held. By discussing Kubilay, teachers could lobby for their own higher social status. Thus, a very immediate concern perhaps motivated statements such as "the first sacrifice [*kurban*] a teacher made and the first heroism [*kahramanlik*] a teacher demonstrated. The honor of this heroism before everyone else belongs to our great martyrs Kubilay and Zeki Dündar, to their generation, to you [teachers] and a little bit to us [teachers] as well."[19] Put quite directly, "we should be able to want Kubilay's generation and profession to be seen with much greater esteem than is now the case in the Republican people's government."[20] Indeed, a major theme running throughout educational writing of these years was the parity between the army and the teachers in defending Turkey. Here, educational writers often quoted Mustafa Kemal's assertion from 1920,that "while the army is struggling with Greece on the fronts, in Ankara the teachers' army [*muallimler ordusu*] is preparing the program of defense against ignorance."[21] In discussing Kubilay and Dündar, though, writers suggested that "the army of thought"—the teachers—was *more* central to the preservation of the Republic than was the military.[22]

In this respect it must be remembered that during these same years (from the late 1920s to the 1940s), professional educational periodicals were replete with articles emphasizing the need for higher teacher salaries and occupational conditions commensurate with those of other state officials. At a time when the Kemalist regime was bringing teachers' organizations under the state's control and permeating society with the state's organs, teachers were at pains to demonstrate that "it [was] impossible to compare the burden and responsibility undertaken by teachers with that of the function of other groups of officials." Rather than any resistance to encapsulation by the state, such sentiment conveyed teachers' desire to be perceived as an elite with a special function to defend the young Republic through schooling.

Such an effort extended into the last mono-party years. Implying equity with or perhaps superiority to the military, one author in 1949 referred to the retired American general Eisenhower's portrayal of teachers as society's leaders, without whom political leaders could not hope to transmit ideals to citizens. Indeed, the "only power which kneads society as dough and is able to give [society] content and form as it wishes is the teacher's power." Thus, just as Eisenhower had noted in the U.S., Turks needed to pay more attention to teachers, and "demonstrate an unshakeable respect for [their] moral authority and conscientious conviction [*vicdani kanaat*]." Part of this included increasing wages and limiting inspectors' meddling, in order to reflect teachers' desired status as educational specialists, though not autonomous from the state. Beyond this, though, "rather than simply a functionary who draws a salary and performs a duty, we must introduce the teacher to students as a personality [*sahsiyet*] and even a little bit as a sacred entity [*kutsal bir varlik*]." Ultimately then, depictions of Kubilay and Dündar acted as a springboard to a sustained effort to focus society and the regime's attention on teachers and raise their nationalist esteem.[23]

## A Republican Teacher Typology

Discussions of Kubilay were not the only venue for putting forward the necessary qualities of a teacher. From the early 1920s until well into the 1940s, educationalists repeatedly described those traits of a proper educator. A content analysis-based survey yielded the following clusters as reflecting most closely the teaching corps' conception of necessary teacher traits: well-centeredness, balance, and order; sacrifice, hard work, and patience; professional knowledge and skills; friendship, kindness, and care; morality; and representativeness of the Turkish national revolution.[24] Table 1 presents the results.

*Table 1: Turkish Teachers' Traits*

| Category | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Balance, Order | 46 | 23.7 |
| Self-Sacrifice | 40 | 21 |
| Knowledge, Skills | 36 | 18.5 |
| Friendship; Kindness | 28 | 14.4 |
| Morality | 18 | 9.2 |
| Representing Turkish Nationalism | 16 | 8.2 |

**Terms Located: 194**

The most valued cluster of traits involves the fortitude, self-control, and strong character of the teacher, what in English may be termed "well-centeredness" or being a "solid individual."[25] In 1925-1926 writers were calling for "control of one's nerves," "moderation and endurance," "security and solidity [tenacity or fortitude; *metanet*]," and "determined resoluteness [*azm-i sebat*]."[26] Similarly, educators writing in the 1940s felt that teachers needed to be "disciplined," "firm [*sabit*]," "ordered," "controlled," "patient," and "resolute [*azimli*]."[27] Also prominent in this cluster is the insistence that teachers be exemplary. Baltacioglu felt the teacher should represent all ideals; secondary-school specialist M. Tevfik Ararat went so far as to claim that they should be the "epitome of all humanity."[28]

As could have been expected from the discussion of Kubilay, across the board both self-sacrifice and material self-denial were highly esteemed by educational writers. Throughout the period this quality maintained currency, with its use

being spread evenly over three decades, each of which exhibited a third of the instances. In this vein, writers called for educators to be self-sacrificingly "Apostle-spirited" (*havari ruhlu*) with "the mentality of [a] missionary" who could work alone in far-off places to spread the new Republican gospel.[29] Perhaps representing this attitude best was Baltacioglu, the experienced teacher and doyen of pedagogical thinkers in late Ottoman and Republican Turkey. He put the following advice into the mouth of the aged "unknown teacher," who, just like the unknown soldier struggles for no personal gain and until dying:

> You will perish for [the sake of] your homeland, your native land—know how to die! Look, I'm not lying: I too am dying on this path. A full sixty years I have walked upon this path, without personal interests or any grudges. I have become used up [exhausted; *tükendim*], and shall die, but even so I am pleased [satisfied; *memnun*]. You too be like me, die![30]

General intelligence and professional knowledge represent just under a fifth of the descriptive terms in this sample of writing, with frequency remaining constant from the 1920s to the 1940s. Discussion of such qualities appears to have been concentrated in the works of particular educationalists, such as Abdülfeyyaz Tevfik, Sadrettin Celal Antel, Selim Sirri Tarcan, and Baltacioglu. The latter three underwent pedagogical training and were quite versed in international educational trends and thus valued such skills. By contrast, it is instructive to note that there was no significant increase in the proportion of educational writers who had professional pedagogical training during the period under consideration, thus accounting for the midlevel ranking of professional skills.[31] Prescriptions for pedagogical expertness emerged in two ways. While teachers were supposed to possess "firm and secure general knowledge," they were also to have "mastered the bases of psychology, pedagogy, and methods of instruction."[32] This need for general and specific knowledge is ubiquitous in this cluster, with terms such as specialty (*ihtisas*) appearing regularly. In a sense, though, the teacher was hopelessly overburdened by the need to embody these traits. Baltacioglu, for example, wished teachers to possess the ability of perception (*sezme kudreti*) and intuition, so as to be "the same as a wizard [*sihirbazin kendisi*]," able to work educational wonders.[33] Just as important yet more weighty a responsibility, some writers expected the teaching corps to form Turkey's "intellectual aristocracy," in the sense of a secular though still sanctified group taking up the role of the now socially and pedagogically marginalized ulama. Possessing the societal esteem once accorded to the latter, Turkish teachers would now spread a modernizing, Republican piety. This conception of teachers was of course consonant with the Kemalist regime's efforts to displace religion while sacralizing the secular state's functions.[34]

The fourth largest cluster portrays the teacher as a kind, loving friend to his or her society and group of students. One article translated from German and appearing in a government organ in 1926, drove this home by focusing on the teacher as a friend, close companion, aid, and sibling of students, who always displayed reverence and affection towards them. This piece, originally written by German Hermann Lietz, contains the highest concentration of terms to this effect, which suggests that this may not have been a home-grown value.[35] Still Turks themselves referred to "affection and tenderness towards youth," being an "earnest friend," and "kindheartedness."[36] The frequency of terms in this cluster declined markedly from the mid-1930s, however, with only five instances encountered from 1935.[37] To a certain extent, teachers had come to internalize these notions. Just as important, the threat of renewed European-Mediterranean war—in conjunction with an increasingly authoritarian domestic environment where the ruling party had aborted two experiments in competitive politics while identifying itself completely with the state—may have militated against such continued popularity of these teacher traits.

It is quite significant that representing Turkish nationalism appears as the smallest cluster in quantitative terms. Rather than any sort of deprioritization of this trait, it actually highlights the degree to which all educators implicitly accepted that the Teacher Army would personify and propagate the Republic of Turkey. As discussions of Kubilay and Dündar suggest, teachers welcomed and internalized a seamless identity with the state, Republicanism, and Turkish nationalism. In effect, all the other clusters of traits in effect defined Turkishness, particularly as regards balance, self-sacrifice, and morality. The "moral educator" who was "bound to the true and good," and possessed "spotless ethics" and "high character," was in effect representing the new Turkey.[38] The particularly nationalist contribution of teachers was also highlighted at the highest official and rhetorical level. The state-published *Primary Education* featured on its title page the well-known statement by Ataturk: "Teachers! You, the new republic's self-sacrificing [*fedakar*] teachers and educators, will raise the new generation. The new generation will be your work of art." Similarly, this periodical's first issue featured the following quote from President Inönü as a headline to its lead article: "you are the workers who will elevate this nation with its culture, social life, and all its knowledge and science, to the highest civilized plane." These statements by regime leaders brought together several themes seen in the clusters of traits, including the teacher as a self-denying nationalist who worked with total diligence and was thus deserving of societal esteem. Just as important, the "National Chief" evidenced the equation of nation with civilization and knowledge that educational thinking had always expressed, as a further support for teachers' centrality to Republican survival.[39]

Career educators echoed the regime leaders' words, in more explicitly ideological terms. M. Rauf Inan, an experienced teacher whose work began in late Ottoman times, summed up the teaching corps' nationalist mission by saying "in the big division of labor made in modern nations, the work and art of turning people into citizens [*vatandaslastirma*] was given to a group of people called teachers." Only the latter could "make the new generations strong citizens of good character, by passing on to them national culture."[40] Yet, just as important, Turkish educational thinkers definitely did want teachers to be mobilized for defense of the Republic and the diffusion of its values, while it was essential that they not become otherwise politicized. In this respect, "the politics of factionalization [*firkacilik siyasetleri*] is a politics in which teachers should take great care not to get involved." Rather, they should focus on being "guardians of the regime" and "children of the revolution."[41] Baltacioglu also insisted on the non-politicization of teachers, aside from their support of

democracy and Republicanism.[42] Again, the link between educational thought and political evolution should be borne in mind. These sentiments were expressed after two experiments in competitive politics were judged to have incited instability, disorder, and tendencies towards reactionism. The 1924-1926 Progressive Republican Party episode was contemporaneous with internal upheavals such as the Seyh Sait Rebellion, while the Free Republican Party interlude of 1930 was ended by the regime when the former proved so popular as to arouse resistance to security forces. Significantly, this concern even extended into the first years of multiparty politics at the end of the 1940s. In an Education Ministry magazine, writers declared that teachers "must not get involved with politics," and should avoid entanglements in the differences between political parties.[43]

Another way to understand what was to characterize the properly Republican pedagogue is to focus on those specific words most attractive to educational writers in describing the teacher. Table 2 focuses on the terms which in themselves were the single largest group of descriptors (roughly thirty-seven percent) and their weight relative to a) the entire sample and b) each other.

*Table 2: Most Used Descriptive Terms of Turkish Teachers*

| Term | Turkish | # | % A | % B |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Friendship, Love | *Sevgi, Muhabbet, Ask* | 12 | 6 | 17.1 |
| Duty | *Vazife* | 8 | 4 | 11.4 |
| Sacrifice | *Feda* | 8 | 4 | 11.4 |
| Faith | *Inan, Iman* | 8 | 4 | 11.4 |
| Patience | *Sabir* | 5 | 2.5 | 7.1 |
| Sincerity | *Samimi* | 5 | 2.5 | 7.1 |
| Exemplariness | *Örnek, Misali* | 4 | 2 | 5 7 |
| Self-Denial | *Feragat* | 4 | 2 | 5.7 |
| Purity; Clean | *Temiz* | 4 | 2 | 5.7 |
| Idealism | *Ideal, Mefkure* | 3 | 1.5 | 4.3 |
| Justice, Balance | *Adl, Itidal* | 3 | 1.5 | 4.3 |
| Service | *Hizmet* | 2 | 1 | 2.8 |
| Qualification | *Ehliyet* | 2 | 1 | 2.8 |
| Resoluteness | *Azim, Azamet* | 2 | 1 | 2.8 |

Within this group of terms, friendship, love, duty, and sacrifice dominate, together accounting for forty percent of the most-used terms and fifteen percent of the larger cluster of traits. One more item of significance is the usage of the term "faith." Though *iman* and *inan* are terms pregnant with religious significance, in all cases, these words were used with either a secular or nationalist connotation. Educators spoke of a "real, pure faith in united education," "a strong faith in their own [i.e., teachers'] greatness," or a "categorical belief in the blessings [benefaction; *nimet*] of the Republic," as well as "a faith in the homeland and Turkey," but there was no explicit mention of religious belief.[44] Long-serving Education Minister Hasan-Ali Yücel utilized the same quasi-religious idiom when speaking directly to primary school teachers, describing them as "educators, faithful [*imanli*] in the revolution, self-sacrificing and pure-hearted, who have taken upon yourselves a holy duty [*kutsal bir hizmet*] like raising the Turkish child."[45] As seen in reference to Kubliay, the use of words with a traditionally religious-Islamic connotation exhibited a secularization of religious terminology as well as a sacralization of the Republican teaching mission, especially in light of the use of terms such as missionary or apostle (*havari*).

Finally, portrayal of a new-old dichotomy highly critical of the Ottoman approach in all matters was integral to both the rhetoric and substance of Republican (as well as "Young Turk") educational thinking. In this conception, the teacher embodied the transformation, exemplifying the contrast between old, discredited, and ineffective methods on the one side, and new, salutary interactions, on the other. Illustrative in this regard are a series of images, the first of which portrays a classroom from the Ottoman-era Darülfunün. Corresponding to upper levels of secondary and early tertiary education, the image of an incompletely modern-attired teacher (wearing the fez) totally unable to manage a class of turbaned, inattentive students portrays the ineffectiveness of pre-Republican educational dynamics as conceived by Turkish educators in the 1930s. The caption even reads "the old Darülfunün's conference hall was indeed a bizarre sight to be seen."[46] Contrasted to this is another illustration, from the same periodical, in which Ataturk looks out at the teacher audience, addressed directly and in powerful terms:

> Turkish Teacher:
>
> In order to raise the idealistic and laicist Turkish youth to whom Ataturk entrusted [*emanet ettigi*] the Republic, carry in your bosom as a faith [*iman*] these six pillars (we are republican, nationalist, populist, statist, secular, and revolutionary), which are the testament of faith of our revolution [*inkilabimizin amentüsü*].[47]

Here the centrality of the teacher was linked to the role of youth as Republican savior, in a manner using traditionally Islamic terminology in the service of a decidedly secular goal.

**Disciplined Freedom and an Organized School**

In characterizing the student-teacher dynamic, Turkish educators often focused on the theme of discipline (*inzibat*). Here, an uncertainty lingered from the 1920s onward. In essence, though all writers decried the excessive emphasis on blind obedience and control that they perceived to be the Ottoman norm, some educators were hesitant to grant the child too much liberty and were reluctant to accept all the logical conclusions of a Deweyan "Progressive Education." The late Ottoman and early Republican teacher Abdülfeyyaz Tevfik was quick to insist on the importance of a tangible, uniform discipline. For him, the "new-fangled" idea of freedom (*hürriyet*) had been totally misunderstood in the school system of the Constitutional Era (1908-1919), when teacher-student relations had been characterized by anarchy and a lack of respect. Tevfik therefore asserted the importance of a conditional, or restricted freedom (*mukayyed hürriyet*): "however much accepted and civilized is the kind of freedom constrained by law, order, instructions, and etiquette, the kind [of

freedom] which is categorical is that much savage and reproachable." Tevfik, and others like him, were thus concerned that if the Turkish Republic were to succeed at guaranteeing the more enduring manifestations of liberty—such as national sovereignty, unity, and political development—the political factionalism, social chaos, and lack of firm central authority associated with the last Ottoman decades needed to be averted through adherence to order, in and out of school.

The real problem was thus the absence of a single, uniform system of discipline, which did not change from school to school or in the hands of individual teachers. In this respect, Tevfik favored constraining the teachers as well as the students. Furthermore, there was to be little equality between the two: "in the schools there is no savagery like the desire to live free and independent [*serazad*]. In these institutions the teacher and the student are entitled to totally separate rights and modes of conduct to manage and protect dignity."[48] This hierarchical relationship was supported by reference to the efficient workings of a well-ordered army, where everyone knew his place. Criticism and debate may be laudable qualities, but their "place and time is not the period [season; *hengam*] of instruction and teaching." Though this may seem an extreme approach, Tevfik reasoned it to be only natural, dictated by human nature. People—in particular the young student—desired a regular, uniform, perhaps even strict discipline. Rather than a jumble of mixed messages and weakness, the student would always prefer a velvet fist of sorts, as long as it was not arbitrary.[49] Incidentally, when discussing this dangerous, corrosive kind of freedom, the author referred to the life of the totally ungovernable Arab nomads, who are little different from animals. Along with a racially negative attitude toward the East, this also adumbrates the Turkish inclination to the West as described above, even if the idea of school freedom came from Europe to begin with.

Writing a decade later, the secondary school teacher, mid-level administrator, and later instructor at the Ankara Gazi Pedagogy Institute, H. Fikret Kanat, also supported the kind of school discipline that was firm and based on a clear teacher-student division. Agreeing with Tevfik, he opined, "youth hate all kinds of weakness. Youth are only obedient towards those who are more powerful and more strong-willed than them in every way." Thus, while an atmosphere of freedom may work in the schools of the United States and Canada, such an extreme approach was entirely inappropriate to Turkey. Indeed, notwithstanding the statistical prominence of qualities of friendship and kindness in teachers, which we saw above, Kanat dismissed this as a function to be performed by the teacher: not only was it "not the teacher's first duty to be a friend to" the student, but "in duty there is no friendship. It is mandatory to instill this feeling in children."[50] A teacher who tried to gain the kindness of his or her students would only see disobedience.

In this respect, Kanat and others like him exhibited an almost pathological fear of "undiscipline" (*inzibatsizlik*), as "no way of management can be imagined that is so pernicious to the character." If permitted in the classroom, it would encourage disorder (*intizamizlik*), which like a virus, would "spread on its own."[51] These two evils of disorder and undiscipline were to be avoided like the most dangerous enemies. While Kanat's tone here was perhaps somewhat extreme, other educators involved in the daily administration of schools also supported a close monitoring and restriction of students' freedom: "the teacher who keeps the class under a continually controlling eye will almost always be successful in ensuring discipline."[52]

Against this approach were the great many voices calling for a looser discipline conforming to the democratic republic that Turkey was becoming. Chief among them was Sadrettin Celal Antel, a scholar of pedagogy with international experience, who worked as teacher and administrator in late Ottoman years, then went on to a university career in the early Republic and wrote pedagogy texts used in Turkey through the mid-1950s. He did value discipline and order, the manifestation of both of which, in the school, were integral to a child's moral and ethical education. "In order to provide the social and moral formation that the Republic demands," however, it was necessary to encourage "reciprocal respect and fondness." Reviewing different modes of school discipline during the late 1920s, Antel found that only "free discipline, student administration, and self government" would inculcate in students a conscious commitment to civilization, order, and duty. Indeed, this American-inspired approach was most suited to the new Turkey because it cast "the classroom as a small republic, and accepted the student as a young citizen possessing societal rights and duties." This would instill in youth a conscious "unity of hearts, minds, and efforts," because "rather than selfish, excessively individualist inclinations, it would cause inclinations towards cooperation and solidarity to flourish."[53] Thus, instead of the false discipline imposed by harsh treatment, free orderedness and responsibility—all qualities desired in the new Turkey—would emerge from the school experience.

Writing a few years later, Antel expanded upon his view of how the classroom ought to work to produce a disciplined and strong young adult. Inspired by Alfred Adler,[54] Antel felt that the most important concern of a teacher should be not to injure a child's courage and self-esteem by excessive restrictions and chastisement. Indeed, to a large extent a child's defects resulted from negative parental or teacher influences. Yet, "in most situations, more than punishment, children need treatment." Thus, teachers were to begin from the particular needs and character of individual students: "the teacher's duty is not to ruin, shatter, or annihilate; to the contrary, it is to work for the manifestation of hidden skills and capacities which most children do not even know they possess, and in such a way to produce in them a sense of self-reliance." Antel thus pointed towards a particular kind of school atmosphere, "an environment of freedom, cheerfulness and trust" in which the teacher's role is that of a guiding, reassuring hand helping the student to discover his or her own strengths while they improve on their weaknesses.[55] In all this, the educational initiative started from the child (*cocuktan baslamak*) in a manner conforming entirely to the sprit of contemporary international educational attitudes from America and Britain in particular.

Others exhibited these same attitudes throughout the 1930s and 1940s. The Istanbul educational official and leftist Kemalist Sevket Süreyya Aydemir reasoned that denying a nation freedom until it "understood freedom," was simply a pretext for autocracy. Likewise, Turkish teachers must not deny their students freedom, as only through living liberty, and even erring in its use, will youth learn its value and limits.

Writing in terms identical to sentiments emerging from American and European pedagogical centers, Aydemir noted, "a good lesson is the one in which the student is at every point a partner, and learns by doing and living." This also suggested that there cannot be a yawning, hierarchical gap between teacher and student: "only by the student and teacher mixing with each other can one go towards the goal" of a full education.[56] As regards the tenor of discipline in this new kind of school, the text writer Fevzi Selen agreed entirely with Antel that "the school is not at all an institution holding children under harsh order and discipline [*zapturapt*]," as this totally distorted the kind of society the new Republic was to reflect. "An educational system giving rise to and inculcating fear, and relying upon punishment, is totally bereft of any value [needed] to play a firm role in the reform of character."[57] Indeed, religion tried to educate based on fear, and this only accomplished the total corrosion of social solidarity. Turkey needed to avoid this by cultivating a civil, democratic school environment, which would apportion duties commensurate with a freedom gained by proper self-management. By providing the proper order and environment, the teacher would be much less intrusive, as "this discipline's first principle [would be] to help the child...to be like he himself desires."[58]

From the late 1920s through the 1940s, two divergent perspectives regarding discipline coexisted in Turkish educational thought. While one emphasized congeniality, flexible discipline, and students' own initiative, the other was most concerned to preserve order, unity, and hierarchical interactions with a rather constrained venue for student participation in the life of the school's miniature society. This second approach came to dominate in the 1930s, as people such as Kanat, Tevfik, and others took up positions in the Educational Ministry and teachers' schools, thus allowing them to influence emerging teachers. By contrast, Sadrettin Celal was removed from his academic position during the university reforms of the early 1930s when, in the guise of transforming the Ottoman-era Darülfunün into Istanbul University, over two-thirds of its faculty were let go, only those personally identified with the mono-party regime were retained. By the same token, though writing with some regularity on educational matters, S.S. Aydemir's official association with the central Turkish Education Ministry was limited to brief periods in the 1930s. Beyond this, his egalitarian leanings were influenced more by his socialist inclinations than by experiences as a state educator.

By and large then, advocates of authoritarian understandings of discipline were more incorporated into official education during the 1930s and reflected more closely the emerging ethos of the mono-party regime. Yet, it would be premature to discount the views of Antel, Aydemir, and others including Baltacioglu as having no impact on teachers' self-perception or understanding of their mission, just as it would be something of an overstatement to perceive a political rift within the pedagogical community between pluralistically and conservatively inclined educators, with the former entirely marginalized. First, even while not working in official capacities, their pedagogical writings received wide circulation, even in officially sanctioned periodicals. Second, pedagogues at all levels were in frequent contact with them, often citing them as inspirations. Third, though demonstrating an intermittent attitudinal autonomy—Sadrerttin Celal had disagreed with officially celebrated Turkist ideologue Ziya Gökalp in 1915-1920 while Baltacioglu had been the Istanbul chair of the short-lived Free Republican Party in 1930—they very much supported the Kemalist approach and the principles of the ruling party. Indeed, it has been remarked for Baltacioglu that "the ruling elite never considered him an outsider to republican politics." Finally, Baltacioglu and Antel returned to influential academic positions in the early 1940s at Ankara and Istanbul Universities, while Aydemir worked in the Istanbul Culture Directorate in the late 1930s.[59]

Still, uncertainties about the proper balance between student liberty and teacher control lingered to the late 1940s. While recognizing that freedom—now termed *serbestlik*—matched the spirit of the times, was democratic, and worked against social paranoia, indolence, and imitation, Nurettin Topçu felt it also quite possibly permitted "indifference and listlessness in ethics, and deprivation from sacredness." In political terms, there was also the danger that freedom in the schools "would lead towards values of internationalism and a lack of discipline.... In national life cosmopolitanism and unnationalism are born from total freedom." Here Topçu—a younger pedagogue emerging in the 1940s who would go on to advocate ideas tinged with both Western philosophy and an Anatolian Islamism—raised the spectre of both the post-Tanzimat ideological listlessness, which early Turkish nationalists such as Ziya Gökalp had feared, and Soviet communism quite threatening to Turkey after World War II. As regards discipline itself, history had demonstrated that only disciplined societies had accomplished anything. Further, "discipline saves the youth from living emptily, [and] teaches him sacredness [*mukaddesat*] as well as moral values." Still, it too had a downside, in that it "led to imitation and makes people into a herd...discipline is the enemy of freedom." Ultimately, Topçu arrived at no solution and concluded only by remarking on the shortcomings of each. He did not propose any sort of synthesis.[60]

Discussions of discipline tell us much about the school dynamic educators envisioned. Beginning with discipline, secondary school educator and Peoples Houseleader Agah Sirri Levend went on to paint a comprehensive picture of the school's mission, the role of the teacher, and the hoped-for end product. Writing around 1940, he, like Topçu, was not at all sure that the proper approach to *inzibat* had been taken. This was related to his evaluation of a child's innate nature. Youth were disinclined towards order, and rejected it at every chance. Whenever possible, they were inattentive, and had no sense of respect for elders. Furthermore, children were totally bereft of any commitment to duty, and, most dangerously, whatever patriotism they possessed was abstract and composed of fleeting emotions. They had no knowledge of Turkey's accomplishments or status in the world. Thus, Levend felt that the raw material that entered the schools was quite poor, and in effect the opposite of the citizen the new Republic needed.

This is where the school-as-society took over. It "will create the student's spirituality," through an emphasis on unity, society-oriented activities, and positive habits. Levend returned repeatedly to the importance of national unity through the schools: "for the country, before anything else the raising of children who possess the *same* ideal, under the *same* system,

and especially, these young ones' possessing the *same* thought in terms of conceiving and understanding concerns of the country, and nurturing the *same* hopes, is all necessary [emphasis added]." This, then, is what a school we call normal will do." In order for the school to acculturate the students to unity it required a society-oriented pedagogy. Desiring to produce a "person of organizations [*teskilat adami*],"[61] schools should share certain elements of the school administration to students. Indeed, taking off from the notion of "self-government" popularized by Antel, several educators championed extracurricular activities and school cooperatives, perceiving such organizations as instilling a sense of social and even political responsibility. Youth would thus emerge "with the conviction that he himself is doing good and beneficial work for his school or nation."[62] Allowing students to administer their own affairs as much as possible would engender "not a blind obedience, but [instead] a willful and conscious obedience," based on self-control and equal sharing of school and civic responsibilities.[63] Cooperatives in particular were "populist and populist-engendering [*halkastirici*]," and would thus inspire solidarity and duty-orientedness, as their dynamics taught that "unity is strength." In such a manner, the school would create within it the kind of new society—"a purified and refined social medium"—which could then radiate out and come to characterize the nation.[64]

In this effort, the teacher played the most integral role. As regards cooperatives and other student activities, it was necessary for the instructor to play a consciously restrained role, being no more than a guide (*rehber*), even allowing the students themselves to correct an activity's problems. Outside this context though, the most definitive characteristic of the new Republican teacher was his or her omnipresence in the life of the student. Levend in particular signaled this by asserting that "the *muallim* is before anything else a *mürebbi*," in the sense of a morality-providing, father-like influence in the student's life. Fundamental to this effort was "being connected to the student's daily life even outside of class. The student would [thus] feel that whether in the classroom working or in the garden playing, oversight is not absent for even one moment; he would always see that [the teacher] is occupied with him." To make this clear to their charges, teachers "would be aware of their students until they arrive to their families, keep [records in] well-organized registers, and monitor their habits and inclinations."

Even this was not enough. While the child was out of the school, the teacher's—and by close extension, the state's—controlling, guiding function continued. On the streets, at the movies, or playing with other youngsters, the teacher was to be nearby. Not even the home was beyond the school's supervision, as pedagogues, especially in the villages and smaller towns, were counseled to make the rounds of students' houses in order to advise parents on raising children and to monitor the children's behavior. During national holidays, both in school and during break, the teacher should expend every effort to nationalize youngsters and indoctrinate them with solidarity and love of duty. On such days of national celebration, "would not a youngster seeing his teacher in front of him find his feelings of reliance on the greatness [of his teacher] strengthened, and to what [great] degree would the faith he felt towards the day's holiness increase?"[65] That Levend spoke of national and not Islamic holidays indicates the near-religious faith in Turkey he hoped students would gain through the efforts of their teachers. Other educators shared his view, devoting much attention to teachers' use of national holidays to educate the public as a whole in an explicitly political fashion and to accustom youth to uncompromising societal and territorial unity.[66]

Finally, even during vacation, both teacher and school were to remain influential in the life of the student, as educators "would establish children's camps during summer vacation in order to keep the child's life under order."[67] Other writers advocated establishing summer camps on school campuses. In addition to providing physical conditioning necessary for later military service (from the mid-1930s military training was part of the middle and secondary school curriculum), camps would permit teachers to observe students' moral character more easily and to educate them as to how to "benefit from their free time in a rational and sound fashion." Furthermore, summer camp would ensure an uninterrupted socialization process.[68] Along with affirming that raising youth "is such a cause of the country that it can only be served with the state's authority," Levend hoped that the school's encompassing presence in the student's life would "make students know their place and duty within the [societal] collective, and serve to strengthen the feeling of solidarity within them."[69]

Throughout our discussion, the theme of school as political society-in-miniature has recurred. Abstracting conceptions of school dynamics onto the societal level, we arrive at a pedagogical "blueprint" for modern Turkey during the 1920s-1940s. Citizens were to value national unity and a collectivist orientation to social welfare above all else and to undertake their responsibilities towards fellow citizens in a disciplined, active manner. This, in effect, defined modernity in the aggregate pedagogical view, just as nationalist commitment and devotion to the Republican state was to take the place conceptually and functionally of earlier religious faith. As for the state, extrapolating from prescribed teacher functions, the Republican order was to become an ever-present factor in daily life, regulating mass mobilization, just as it guided all aspects of sociopolitical comportment and even economic activity. Indeed, through monitoring and controlling its charges, an ethically-interested state would envelop society, gradually teaching individuals how to live as Turkish citizens. As we have seen throughout, this blueprint was conditioned by a particular Kemalist reading of late Ottoman dysfunctionalities as well as internal dangers to the new Turkey.

**Reassessments in the Late 1940s**

Throughout the 1930s and into the 1940s, an intermittent positive evaluation of student freedom in the schools had been unable to displace concern for control, order, and teacher-monitored school dynamics. By the end of the 1940s, however, Turkey's changing geopolitical priorities of avoiding Soviet encroachment, acquiring Western political and financial support, and quieting domestic political and economic discontent, necessitated a stronger commitment to democracy. This, in turn, generated a reconsideration of school dynamics, now under the rubric of democracy. In this environment, influential educators considered both the meaning of democracy as well as the role of the school in preparing citizens for democratic life.

Three views in particular illuminate both the changes and continuities of attitudes. The first were those of Mustafa Ergun, primary education inspector in the Kutayha region and Ibrahim Özgür, instructor at Balikesir Pedagogy Institute. For Ergun, a citizen in a democracy was "an always alert ethical entity under the influence of a conscious love for freedom and equality" who would never become "a submissive, cowardly and hapless subject under the authority of any group." This citizen grasped the consequences of his actions and understood that he had societal responsibilities shared with others. Finally, the proper democrat "never holds back even for an instant from being interested in the country's affairs," and on such national matters "never hesitates to put forward his views either orally or in writing."[70] For Özgür, who, writing three years later, concurred with Ergun's description, "one of the most important characteristics of a democratic regime is its granting to the individual of a profound measure of [unique] value," constrained only by the concern of not injuring other people's dignity. As well, cooperation in thought and activity, based on mutual respect, characterized a democratic society, where people "are never abandoned under needless restrictions" or made the target of one group's antipathies.[71]

For any society to be comprised of such people, the state would have to ensure that "all citizens arrive at least to a minimal [basic] cultural level." According to Ergun, primary schools were the chief instrument in this regard. Yet, it was not through textbooks and lectures that democracy would be learned; rather, "it will only be possible by in fact making come alive for them the needs of democratic life,... [through] bringing school life into a condition of being... an organized community in which people mix which each other." Thus, ideas popularized in the 1930s by S.C. Antel regarding student government needed to be applied on every level, through student councils, work committees, debates, and voting. The political-pedagogical results for Ergun were exactly those necessary for the country's new democratic life. By setting up rules and duties on their own in response to real-life needs, students would "remain bound to regulations lovingly and willingly, with no external pressure," just as school dynamics would succeed at eliciting student interest in societal affairs. Further, choosing students and committees to fulfill functions would accustom students to voting, while elections and debates would ensure that youth "would put forward his own thought and opinions in front of the community" becoming in the process "free thinking and free-willed citizens," exactly what democracies required. In every case, the teacher's active engagement was needed to structure every class "in order to make [students] use their own freedom."[72]

Ergun and Özgür's conception of democracy illustrated an advance, in the direction of pluralism and trust of individuals, over writings from the 1920s through the mid-1940s. Fuat Gündüzalp, though championing the need for societal and pedagogical democratization, appears to have conceived of it in terms similar to educators' earlier understandings. An instructor at the Gazi Pedagogy Institute, he wrote two extended pieces on the topic in 1948. For him, the primary characteristic of a democratic regime was that it "did not recognize class difference or distinction among individuals." Thus, all citizens possessed the same rights according to the law. Indeed, "in a democracy, 'law' is a sacred [*kutsal*] concept," and it alone could determine the extremely important matter of mutual rights and duties of state and individual. Beyond the law's supremacy and equal application, "in a democracy citizens possess freedoms like believing in the religion or philosophical approach that he desires, spreading his [sic] thoughts in writing or verbally, and establishing societies." Here then, Gündüzalp agreed with earlier definitions of democracy by seeing it primarily as legalism and equality, yet diverged to a degree by espousing freedom of thought, publication, and association.

Still, he was in accord with Ergun in seeing schools as chiefly responsible for democratization, and particularly through student self-government they were "the number one tool of democracy education." In this respect, Gündüzalp was highly critical of earlier attempts at inculcating such principles. Very few educators themselves had been educated in democratic environments; as a result, beyond stale official directives and lectures to passive students, nothing had been done to meaningfully infuse schooling with a sense of responsible freedom: "Giving totally dry information we cannot gain for our children the desired characteristics and, as a matter of fact, for forty years we have not been able to do so to the degree for which we hoped."[73] Given Turkey's multiparty aspirations, however, its education must also progress. As Gündüzalp emphasized, "gaining for our children the characteristics democracy desires is practicable [only] through making them live at least in school to a wide measure a democratic life." Put differently, "raising children according to the principles of democracy is not a crime, but a duty." Rather than relying solely on books and lectures, "democracy education...is provided by making them live [in] a democratic atmosphere in accordance with their age and needs." The problem "has been hidden in this 'making-live' [*yasatmak*] word." Thus, "whoever would earnestly desire democracy in the nation's administration would have to accept student self government as the primary means." Of course, there really was no alternative; the democracies of the world had defeated totalitarianism during World War II, and this was in reality "the victory of democracy education." Turkish educators of the late 1940s thus returned yet again to the school-as-nation-in-miniature analogy that had been so attractive to Republican pedagogues since the 1920s.

In the late mono-party conception of student self-government, after teachers assigned school activities and upkeep directly to students, the latter could choose groups responsible for such services, initially under teachers' "close scrutiny, and if needed, influence." In the higher grades of school, weekly meetings "almost like a national assembly" would consider matters in and out of school. To avoid anarchy, teacher and headmaster involvement was essential. Teachers were to provide whenever appropriate "oversight and even guidance," and nothing contrary to ministry directives would be permitted. In this respect, directives (*yönetmelik*) were akin to the national constitution (*anayasa*). And, so that students did not irresponsibly exploit freedoms of assembly and self-government, "essential [was] the preservation of the veto right" belonging to headmasters. Gündüzalp claimed this was in no way inimical to democracy: "as a matter of fact even in the most advanced democratic states the President is accorded this right." Yet, the headmaster was more empowered than the head of a republic; rather than "the status of a president of republic [*cumhurbaskani*] he has the status of the

sovereign [*hükümdar*] of a country administered by a constitutional regime [*mesrutiyet*]."[74] In sum, though schools were to teach democracy as a lived phenomenon, teachers and headmasters were to preside over a controlled democracy not boundless in its horizons. Such dynamics were to apply *mutatis mutandis* to Turkey's new multiparty life.

As we saw above in attitudes to teachers' traits, whether focusing on school democracy, order, or decorum, discussion of the classroom dynamic throughout the mono-party years in Turkey exploited the imagery of the old (Ottoman) versus the new (Republican) dichotomy. In particular, a pair of illustrations printed together in the official *Primary Education* illustrates the enduring power of such juxtapositions. At the top of the page is "The old era's primary school." The cramped classroom with dirty walls on which crookedly hung Arabic alphabets and implements of discipline had only one grated window. Inside the classroom-*cum*-hovel sat a gargantuan, turbaned Islamic teacher (*hoca*) on dust and leaves, with claw-like fingers and hooked nose, who looked out menacingly on students who had earned the wrath of his rod. The students sat uncomfortably on the floor over low tables, appearing fearfully confused in fezzes and unkempt clothing. Recreating the entire complement of Western stereotypes regarding Islamic-Ottoman decrepitude, the illustration made it clear that absolutely no learning could go on in "the old school."

Directly under this picture was "one of the classrooms from the new primary school." In an immaculate room with straight beams and airy windows, neatly dressed students sat in a straight row, in chairs with backs. All the students were females, and rather than a teacher looming large and dominant, one young girl stood, reading an essay to an attentive audience. Here, two Turkish flags and a bust of Atatürk peered over the emerging Republican citizens. Thus, the Republic had ushered in an era of rationality, cleanliness, nationalism, and new opportunities for all members of society, redefining what faith would mean. In this effort, the teacher and classroom were integral to the transformation from old to new.[75] Indeed, the two together would embody the ever-present, guiding function of the educating state, through which, to use Levend's terms, the teacher became the axis or hub (*mihver*) of a child's upbringing, mediating all experiences on the way to becoming a modern, ordered, and thus free, Republican citizen.

**Conclusion**

From 1923-1950, Turkish educators engaged in a sustained discourse regarding teacher traits and the nature of school dynamics. Though it is essential to remember that imaginative and prescriptive pedagogical discourse does not *necessarily* reflect the realities of schooling, what we have surveyed here provides valuable insight into how the "teachers' army" viewed themselves, the needed dynamics of schooling, and the sociopolitical results of the educational experience for new citizens. Naturally, educators saw teachers as central to the entire national educational effort, and at the risk of overburdening them, expected teachers to display sacrifice, patience, total commitment to the educative mission, and a love of students. In defining themselves, pedagogic elites and practitioners were also defining the kind of citizen they wished to produce in schools because teachers were seen as sociopolitical exemplars. Most significant in this respect was the emphasis on order, sacrifice, and commitment to work in a manner privileging the collective good over personal interests. While reflecting collectivist trends in Turkish nationalism going back to Ziya Gökalp—also an educational thinker—these formulations of teachers' traits also exemplified the casting of the secular state and its functionaries in terms with traditionally religious connotations.[76] Indeed, the locus of faith in Turkey was entirely the Kemalist regime. Just as important, the teaching corps utilized the Kubilay-Dündar heroic narratives and celebrated teachers' qualities in order to elicit for the "teachers' army" more official and societal esteem.

As regards school dynamics, considering schools "societies-in-miniature" meant that evolving conceptions of school life reflected changing ideas of how the sociopolitical order ought to function. The ideal seemed to be a balanced, responsible freedom, or a discipline that emerged from student-citizens' knowledge of the order necessary for a community's survival. While Turkish pedagogical discourse favored involved, "self-starting" citizen-students, concern for democratic life was tinged throughout with fears of instability—hence the notion of constrained liberty (*mukayyed hürriyet*) crystallizing in the 1930s. Changing domestic and international political conditions influenced thinking on this matter, such that by the 1950s, democracy in school life had been revisited, more positively. All the same, this tension between democracy and discipline was never resolved. Indeed, not only did Ergun and Gündüzalp write at the same time as Topçu, but educators during this period also called for more authority to be given to teachers and school directors, so that they could regulate student democratization. Further, as we have seen, those supporting active, free students still wished to ensure that principals—school sovereigns—could step in at any time to restore order and the proper flow of the democratic process among citizen-students who may not entirely understand the liberties they had received. Though outside the scope of our present inquiry, such attitudes were reflected on the level of official policy debate in 1948-1949.[77]

In this respect, school self government was to conform to the contours of a tutelary democracy. This is quite significant, as the brand of post-1950 multiparty politics emerging on the national level in Turkey has also been described as tutelary in nature, or based on a guardian regime.[78] Here, a central aspect is the commitment of elites—political or military—to educate masses from above into a democratic yet firmly regulated political culture, and if need be, to step in and prevent a downward spiral from democracy to anarchy due to citizens' incomplete comprehension of the former. We have seen in these pages that such a phenomenon may, to a degree, be due to conceptions of democracy in action nurtured by educators in the crucial years surrounding the introduction of multi-party politics in Turkey. Those very conceptions, while focusing more on freedoms, contained certain commonalities with educators' attitudes in the 1920s and 1930s privileging law, equality, and a disciplined society over citizen liberties. Into the multiparty era of Turkish history then, Turkish educators still feared an "Ottoman-style" chaos and disintegration of order in both schools and society.

## NOTES

[1] See John Dewey's *The Child and the Curriculum* and *The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Carleton W. Washburne, *Better Schools; a Survey of Progressive Education in American Public Schools* (New York:

The John Day Company, 1928); Carleton W. Washburne, *Winnetka: the History and Significance of an Educational Experiment* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963); Evelyn Dewey, *The Dalton Laboratory Plan* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1922).

[2] See Ismail Hakki, "Asrimizin Terbiye Gayeleri," *Muallim* 1, no. 1, (1332): 10, in addition to his *Talim ve Terbiyede Inkilap* (Istanbul: Kitabhane-yi Islam ve Askeri Tüccarzade Ibrahim Hilmi, 1912). For more background on Baltacioglu, see Frank A. Stone, "The Evolution of Contemporary Turkish Educational Thought," *History of Education Quarterly* 13 (1973). For more on Baltacioglu's "Young Turk" period reformist activities, see See Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (New York, Routledge, 1998), 494 in particular.

3 I use Althusser's "ideological state apparatus," not in the sense of an instrument deployed by the capitalist state facing a legitimacy crisis of economic disparities and the preservation of inequitable social orders, but in the spirit of state-run education being a conscious tool used by 1923-1950 Turkey to create Republic-loyal citizens imbued with particular sociopolitical convictions known as Kemalism.

[4] See Gavin D. Brockett, "Collective Action and the Turkish Revolution: Towards a Framework for the Social History of the Atatürk Era, 1923-1938," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 4 (1998): 44-66, 55-57 in particular, where he highlights the difficulty in determining Mehmed's success in acquiring widespread support. Many reacted with disinterest, or even horror.

[5] "Fehmi Kubilay, 1906–1930," *Terbiye* 6, no. 31 (1930): 257.

[6] Kazim Nami, "Ideal Için," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 14 (1931): 98.

[7] Hifzirrahman Rasit, "Büyük Sehidimiz Kubilay Için," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 14 (1931): 101.

[8] "Fehmi Kubilay, 1906–1930," 258.

[9] Rasit, "Büyük Sehidimiz Kubilay Için," 101.

[10] Hikmet Turhan Daglioglu, "Inkilab Ögretmeni," *Ögretmenler Gazetesi* 10 (1936): 10.

[11] Rasit, "Büyük Sehidimiz Kubilay Için," 101.

[12] "Fehmi Kubilay, 1906–1930," 258. There is a degree to which portraying Zeki Dündar as struggling in vain to enlist the local governor's help may have reflected two themes in educational thinking: first, the contrast between old, Ottoman-style administrators and new, Republican officials; and second, the rivalry for esteem and resources between provincial governors (*valis*) and local educational officials. Alleged disregard on the part of the former was one of the motives behind Mustafa Necati's establishment of educational districts from 1927-1929. See Ilhan Basgöz and Howard Wilson, *Educational Problems in Turkey, 1920-1940* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968).

[13] Rasit, "Büyük Sehidimiz Kubilay Için," 100.

[14] For more on the notion of a Kemalist religion in place of the discredited Islamic past, see Feroz Ahmed, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (London: Routledge, 1993), 78-83.

[15] That such themes and presentation were still prominent fifteen years into the Republic see "Cumhuriyetimizin Onbesinci Yil Dönümü," editorial, *Ögretmen Sesi* 37-74, (1938): 67.

[16] Daglioglu, "Inkilab Ögretmeni," 19. One may translate *aziz* as "dear, beloved, cherished," or as "saint." The second meaning strengthens further the religious imagery, and such intent on the part of the author is not altogether unlikely, especially in his use of the plural *azizler*, often meaning "the Saints."

[17] Ali Haydar (Taner), *Milli Terbiye* (Istanbul: Milli Matbaa, 1926), 69.

[18] Nami, "Ideal Için," 97.

[19] Raşit, "Büyük Sehidimiz Kubilay Için," 102.

[20] Nami, "Ideal Için," 98.

[21] "Iki Cephe," *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* (1921). Hilmi Malik, *Inkilap Yolunda* (Ankara: Kitap Yazanlar Kooperatifi, 1933), referred to this very quotation and general idea continually, at times quoting Mustafa Kemal. Significantly, this was a publication meant both for adults and youth.

[22] Rasit, "Büyük Sehidimiz Kubilay Için," 102.

[23] Sadi Irmak, "Ögretmen ve Cemiyet," *Ilkögretim* 14, no. 271-72 (1949): 3596. This was originally published in *Ulus*, 1949.

[24] I analyzed over forty-five pieces written between 1923 and 1945 to determine which categories of descriptive terms were used most frequently to portray the personality type of a teacher. Additionally, I examined which concepts, while not explicitly indicated, were emphasized most, either anecdotally or otherwise, in order to paint a picture of what professional educators wished to see in cohorts emerging from teachers' schools. To avoid a redundancy, pieces dealing directly with Fehmi Kubilay were eliminated. While a certain amount of subjectivity is unavoidable as regards the criteria for clustering descriptive terms into categories, consistent appearance of clustered descriptors adds weight to my criteria's validity.

Content analysis for the frequency of descriptive terms is a delicate matter, especially in reference to non-Western languages, where adjective couplets (defined here as two nearly synonymous terms juxtaposed or used in proximity to each other) are regularly used to modify one noun. This is particularly the case for earlier twentieth-century Turkish, which still incorporated much Arabic terminology and even rhetorical style, especially as regards adjectival use. While this tendency was much reduced in the later 1930s and 1940s, it raises certain methodological questions: should these couplets (for example, *itidal ve tahammül, sefkat ve muhabbet, selamet ve metanet*) be counted statistically as one descriptor or as two? One could argue for the former idea, in that two similar terms are being employed to convey a single concept. In favor of the latter position is the possibility that writers made a conscious decision to use more than one term, which although similar, were intended to convey different senses. My practice has been to count these couplets (or strings of three or more for that matter) as separate terms, with the exception of construct phrases (*izafet*) such as *azm-i sebat*, for example. I thank Ayman al-Dessouky for his insights on this matter.

[25] Sources: see notes further on. Additionally: Ali Haydar, *Milli Terbiye*, Kazim Nami, "Muallimlerin Kiymeti," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 5, (1930): 130; Bovet, "Terbiyede Hürriyet," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 6, (1930): 164-165; Kazim Nami, "Örnek bir Köy Muallimi," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 7, (1930): 17; Sadrettin Celal, "Ahlak Musahabelcri," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 8, no. 13, (1931): 72; Nevzat Ayas, "Vatandasi Niçin ve Nasil Okutmali," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 10, no. 33 (1933): 83; Nusret Kemal, "Terbiye Meselesi," *Ülkü*, (1933): 437; Mehmet Saffet, "Inkilap Terbiyesi," *Ülkü*, (1933): 109; I. Hakki, "Ders Yili Baslarken," *Ülkü*, (1934): 84; Hifzirrahman Rasit Öymen, "Ilkokul Ögretim Programlarinin Onarilmasi Münasebetile," *Okul ve Ögretmen* 1 (1936); "Eski Mektep, Yeni Okul," *Okul ve Ögretmen* 5, (1936); "Okul ve Ögretmen 2. Yilina Baslarken," *Okul ve Ögretmen* 11 (1927): 1; Sükrü Iz, "Ögretmenin, Zekasi Geri Kalmis Çocuklara Karsilastigi Zaman Ilk Vazifesi Nedir?" *Ögretmen Sesi* 37-73 (1938); "Cumhuriyetimizin Onbesinci Yil Dönümü," editorial, *Ögretmen Sesi* 37-74 (1938): 67; "Büyük Kayip Karsisinda Duygularimiz," *Ögretmen Sesi* 37-75 (1938): 99; Nurettin Topçu, "Muallim," *Hareket* 1, no. 6, (1939): 190; Eyip Akman, "Sinirli Karakterler," *Fikirler* 5, no. 124 (1935): 4.

[26] Rifat Necdet, "Terbiye ve Tedris," *Muallimler Birligi* 1, no. 4. (1341): 128; Abdülfeyyaz Tevfik, "Mekteplerde Inzibat II," *Muallimler Birligi* 1, no. 6 (1341): 247.

[27] H. Fikret Kanat, *Milli Ideal ve Topyekun Milli Terbiye* (Ankara: Çankaya Matbaasi, 1942), 194-205; Ramazan G. Arkin, *Ilkokul Ögretmenine Temel Kitap* (Istanbul: Türkiye Yayinlari, 1945), 10-18.

[28] M. Tevfik Ararad, *Tam Ölçüde Lise Davasi* (Istanbul: Sertel Matbaasi, 1939), 28-30.

[29] Hamit Zübeyir, "Halk Terbiyesi Vasitalari," *Ülkü*, (1933): 154; "Izmir Ögretmen Birliginin Toplantisi," *Fikirler* 5, no.128 (1935): 15.

[30] Ismail Hakki Baltacioglu, "Meçhul Ögretmen," *Türk'e Dogru* v. 2 (Istanbul: Yeni Adam Basin ve Yayin, 1943), 75. This piece was originally written in 1941.

[31] This is based on the author's examination of the educational and career paths of fifty-five Turkish educational officials, pedagogical writers, and teachers born between 1874 and 1921, and whose periods of activity overlap with the mono-party era.

[32] Sadrettin Celal, "Testler ve Muallim," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 4, (1930): 118-119.

[33] I.H. Baltacioglu, "Ögretmen," text of speech delivered to faculty of the Bursa Boys Lise at the Bursa Halkevi, published in *Türk'e Dogru* 2, 77-79.

[34] Hatemi Senih, "Demogoji ve Mürebbinin Rolü," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 8 (1930): 228. We may note in this context that statements here and above sanctifying the secular Republic's education are not entirely dissimilar to conceptions of the role of the teacher in late Ottoman years. From the 1870s as well, Ottoman education and its agents were indeed perceived as central factors in the moral improvement of youth, in a highly religious ambience combining Islamic ethics, Ottoman patriotism, and technological modernization through a "hybridity" explored adeptly by Benjamin C. Fortna in *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire* (London: Oxford University Press, 2002). The notable divergence in the Republican period was that rather than Islam providing the substance of moral education, Turkish nationalism became the focus, thus none too implicitly asserting that secular morality was indeed possible.

[35] Hermann Lietz, "Mektep Hayati," *Maarif Vekaleti Mecmuasi* 6 (1926): 49-52. Lietz (1868-1919) was keenly interested in reforming German schools to be a better, and more nationalist environment. See his *Die deutsche nationalschule: beitrage zur schulreform aus den deutschen landerziehungsheimen* (Leipzig: R. Voigtlander, 1911).

[36] Tevfik, "Mekteplerde Inzibat II," 247; Riza Öz, "Ilk Okullarla Orta

Okular Arasinda Hakiki bir Irtibat Lazim," *Ögretmen Sesi* 37-79 (1939): 253; Fikret Kanad, "Genç Muallimler Tavsiyeler II," *Fikirler* V, no. 124, (1935): 2.

[37] Of these five uses, Baltacioglu was responsible for three, in *Türk'e Dogru*. This indicates not only the paucity of concern with this cluster of traits past 1939, but also the special character of Baltacioglu as an educational writer.

[38] Necdet, "Terbiye ve Tedris," 148; Dogansivri, *Milli Terbiye*, 20; Lietz, "Mektep Hayati," 50; Selim Sirri Tarcan, "Yeni Nesli Nasil Yetistirelim," *Okul ve Ögretmen* 9 (1936): 14; Ali Riza Seyfi, "Ilk Okul Ögretmenleri ve Ulusal Hayatta Mevkii," *Ögretmen Bilgisi* 1 (1936): 7.

[39] See *Ilkögretim* 1, no. 1, (1939): 1. Here was also an example of the regime presenting itself as intimately connected with teaching the youth, continuing the head-teacher (*basögretmen*) image of Atatürk: on the periodical's first page is a picture of Inönü surrounded by a smiling group of young, confident-looking male and female students, who apparently adored him. While serving to burnish his populist credentials, in a sense Inönü had become the spiritual leader of the teaching corps.

[40] M. Rauf Inan, "Ögretmenlik Atmosferi, Ögretmenin Is ve Vazife Ahlaki," *Ilkögretim* 13, no. 249-251, (1948): 3253.

[41] Kazim Nami, "Siyasiyat ve Muallimler," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 8, no. 11, (1930): 2; Asim Kültür, CHP ve Ögretmen," *Fikirler* 5, no. 128 (1935): 14; Cemil Sena Ongün, "Ögretmen, Inkilab Senden Neler Istiyor," *Ögretmen Gazetesi* 8 (1936) 20.

[42] Baltacioglu, *Terbiye*, 39-41.

[43] Hasip Aytuna, "Ögretmenin Okuldisi Etkinligi," *Ilkögretim* 14, no. 260 (1948): 3417.

[44] Abdülfeyyaz Tevfik, "Tevhid-i Tedrisat–Tevhid-i Terbiye," *Muallimler Birligi* 1, no. 3 (1341): 158; Kazim Nami, "Köy Muallimleri Nelere Kadir Olabilir?" *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 11 (1930): 3; Kazim Nami, "Yeni Rejim ve Muallimler," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 8 (1930): 218-220; Hikmet Turhan Daglioglu, "Inkilab Ögretmeni," *Ögretmenler Gazetesi* 8 (1936): 18. Tevfik, like others, also refers to the "sacred [*mukaddes*] duty of teachers."

[45] See *Ilkögretim* 1, no. 1, 1.

46 Alternatively, "the old conference hall was a totally different world to behold": "Darülfunün konferans salonu görülecek bir alemdi." *Okul ve Ögretmen* 9, 1936.

[47] *Okul ve Ögretmen* 7, 1936.

[48] Abdülfeyyaz Tevfik, "Mekteplerde Inzibat I," *Muallimler Birligi* 1, no. 1, (1341): 198, 199.

[49] Abdülfeyyaz Tevfik, "Mekteplerde Inzibat II," 250, 248.

[50] H. Fikret Kanad, "Genç Muallimler Tavsiyeler II," *Fikirler* 5, no. 124, (1935): 4, 3.

[51] Kanad, "Genç Muallimler Tavsiyeler I," 2.

[52] Kaniye Özger, "Inzibati Bozmak Isteyenlere Karsi ne Yapmali," *Ögretmenler Gazetesi*, 10.

[53] Sadrettin Celal, "Gençlerin Ahlaki ve Içtimai Tesekkülleri Meselesi," *Terbiye Mecmuasi* (1927): 142-144, 146.

[54] See Adler's *The Education of Children*, trans. E. & F. Jenson (New York: Greenberg, 1930).

[55] Sadrettin Celal, "Çocuk ve Mektep," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 7, no. 17 (1931): 198, 200, 201.

[56] Sevket Süreyya, "Bir Ders Nasil Ölçülür," *Okul ve Ögretmen* 1 (1936): 15.

[57] Fevzi Selen, "Okulda Terbiye Faaliyeti ve Okul Inzibati," *Okul ve Ögretmen* 16 (1937): 449.

[58] Cemil Sena Ongün, "Yeni Disiplin," *Ögretmenler Gazetesi*, 3; Benal Ariman, "Çocugun Hürriyeti," *Fikirler* (1940), 6.

[59] Nazim Irem, "Turkish Conservative Modernism: Birth of a Nationalist Quest for Cultural Renewal," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 34, no. 1 (2002): 90.

[60] Nurettin Topçu, "Terbiyede Serbestlik ve Disiplin," *Yeni Bilgi* 2, no. 19, (1948): 15, 16.

[61] Agah Sirri Levend, *Maarifimiz ve Milli Terbiyemiz*, 48, 49-50, 60. Italics added.

[62] Rizvan Nafiz, "'Ders Harici' Faaliyetlere Dair," *Terbiye Mecmuasi* 2, no. 7, (1927): 12.

[63] Kazim Nami, "Bir Self Government Tecrübesi," *Muallimler Mecmuasi*, p. 198. Here the author is reporting on a talk given by a Romanian teacher at the Geneva-based J.J. Rousseau Pedagogy Institute.

[64] Ali Haydar et al., "Mektepte Kooperatif," *Muallimler Mecmuasi* 21-22 (1931): 13, 15, 17.

[65] Agah Sirri Levend, *Maarifimiz ve Milli Terbiyemiz*, 64, 69, 71, 72.

[66] Nusret Kemal, "Milli Bayram ve Halk Terbiyesi," *Ülkü* (1933): 245-252. In particular, he sees national holidays as working against regionalism (*mintikacilik*) and the state employee-citizen divide.

[67] Agah Sirri Levend, *Maarifimiz ve Milli Terbiyemiz*, 99.

[68] 'A. "Tatil Kamplari," *Terbiye Mecmuasi* 2, no. 6 (1927): 60-73. The article is based upon an observer's experiences at the Galatasaray Lisesi summer camp. Several pictures depict young, physically fit youths in short pants and short sleeves playing out of doors, swimming, learning how to fire a rifle, and lining up in military-style columns. The military nature of the camp is evident in the model daily schedule calling for morning and evening flag ceremonies, as well as daily training in the use of a rifle (67).

[69] Levend, *Maarifimiz ve Milli Terbiyemiz*, 100.

[70] Mustafa Ergun, "Demokrasi ve Egitim," *Ilkögretim* 11, no. 215-216, (1946): 2796-2797.

[71] Ibrahim Özgür, "Demokrasi ve Egitim," *Ilkögretim* 14, no. 275-277, (1949): 3604.

[72] Mustafa Ergun, "Demokrasi ve Egitim," 2797.

73 Fuat Gündüzalp, "Demokrasi Egitiminin 1 Numarali Araci," *Ilkögretim* 13, no. 255-256 (1948): 3331.

[74] Gündüzalp, "Demokrasi Egitiminin 1 Numarali Araci," 3332, 3334; Gündüzalp, "Demokrasi Egitimi," 3361-2. For these very same sentiments, see Ibrahim Özgür, "Demokrasi ve Egitim," 3604.

[75] *Ilkögretim* 3, no. 60, 1940.

[76] For a few examples of Gökalp's writing on nationalist education, see Ziya Gökalp, "Milli Terbiye I," *Muallim* 1, no. 1 (1332); "Milli Terbiye II," *Muallim* 1, no. 2 (1332); "Milli Terbiye III: Terbiyenin Gayesi Nedir? Fert mi, Yoksa Millet mi?" *Muallim* 1, no. 3 (1332); "Milli Terbiye IV," *Muallim* 1, no. 4 (1332); "Maarif Meselesi," *Muallim* 1, no. 11 (1333) (all written between 1915-1916). 77. See T.C. Milli Egitim Bakanligi, *Dördüncü Milli Egitim Surasi. Çalisma Programi, Komisyon Raporlari, Konusmalar* (Istanbul: Devlet Basimevi, 1949), 55, 57, 59 in particular. This government-organized conference on the direction of Turkish pedagogy dealt at length with educational democratization, based on the report by a committee on which Fuat Gündüzalp served.

[78] For just a few examples of such approaches, see Metin Heper and Ahmet, Evin, eds., *State, Democracy, and the Military: Turkey in the 1980s* (Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter, 1988); Ergun Özbudun, *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2000); Metin Heper and E. Fuat Keyman, "Double-Faced State: Political Patronage and the Consolidation of Democracy in Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 4 (1998): 259-276; Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin, eds. *Politics in the Third Turkish Republic* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994); William Hale, *Turkish Politics and the Military* (London: Routledge, 1994), 308-330; Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: a Modern History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1993), 185-189.