



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 7 Sayı: 31 Volume: 7 Issue: 31

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

OFFICIAL HISTORY TRANSFORMATION OF THE EARLY TURKISH REPUBLIC: CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES REFLECTED IN THE TEXTBOOKS

Erinç Erdal YILDIRIM*

Abstract

In Turkey of the 1930s; construction of a national and secular identity among the peoples was the core problem of the ruling cadre. Hence, official history was used as one of the major devices to install Turkish identity and collective memory to the nation which was shaped to adopt the official ideology of the Turkish Republic. From this viewpoint, education and especially history courses were instrumental in spreading the official ideology.

On the other hand, consolidation of the Republic an regime was witnessed in the 1940s. Namely, the year of İsmet İnönü's presidency also known as "National Chief Era" was the time when confidence to the strength of the regime was established and the fear of regression almost disappeared among the ruling elite. This also affected the official perception of history. The clear break from recent past softened, strong responses towards Ottoman and Islamic identity/culture were decreased and it was reconciled with the modernization process of Ottoman-Turkish history through paying attention to "continuities" rather than "breaks". In this context, regarding above mentioned arguments, this research aims to present the changes and continuities in the formation of the official history during İsmet İnönü Era (1938-1950) of the Early Turkish Republic with specific reference to the high school history textbooks used in Atatürk and İnönü eras.

Keywords: Nationalism, Early Turkish Republic, Official History, History Textbooks, Education

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü.

Nationalism and Historiography

As the products of the Enlightenment in the 18th century which also led the emergence of nation-states; nationalism with its multi-dimensional characteristics led the emergence of a variety of theories aiming to explain it. In this respect, Ernest Renan in his famous study of 1882, stressed the subjective and cultural elements of a nation as having common glories in the past – a heroic past – and a common will in the present¹. In the same study, Renan also underlined the need for consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life with assimilating a nation's existence to a daily plebiscite. These indicate the historicity of nations; the role of the past, history and memory for future generations of the nation as well as a requirement for their consent for continuation of common life. The production of continuing consent of the people requires a collective memory for the construction of national identity/consciousness. Hence nation-states gave prominence to the structuring and control of collective memory, i.e. history for the construction and continuation of their nations as well as the transmission of the dominant/official ideology. To put it in another way, "the relationship between history, memory and the nation were characterized as more than natural currency: They were shown to involve a reciprocal circularity, a symbiosis at every level – scientific and pedagogical, theoretical and practical"².

Basing upon the abovementioned perspective, many sources on nationalism have defined nations as *imagined* or even *invented* communities³ and the scholars dealing with this subject stressed the importance of the analysis of constructing national identity within the nation-states. The reason behind this definition was that the members of these communities/nations did not know each other, but had an imagination of the entire community in their minds which made them feel the bounds and unity with it. From this point, nation-states attempted to legitimize themselves by basing their discourse on the depth of their past and historical continuity throughout the time. Albeit their emergence within a specific period of history, they also tended to make connections with the ancient communities they shared the same territory with: They presented an image of a homogeneous community moving from a glorious ancient past to the cusp of a bright, modern future - a future envisaged by the leadership of the time. In this respect, modern nation-states required collective

memory and a national identity to construct their specific history over. Collective language and history played a significant role in constructing it. Thus, historians of the young nations, although their historical roots were based on a recent past, established their narratives on the ancientness/eternity and uniqueness of their own nations. With Hobsbawm's definition, this was a process of 'invention of tradition', which was a process of formalization and ritualization, characterized by reference to the past⁴.

History Education and Textbooks as Ideological Tools

The success of nationalist ideology may well be related with the education system. Nationalist culture was shaped and constructed in schools and new generations were inculcated there in line with nationalistic perspective. Thus, nationalism, from its emergence until today, has been an instrument of providing the development of state-controlled educational systems and schools functioned as formation centers of national system in many countries⁵. In this context, history education had a special place in constructing national identity among the people of the same state.

The analysis of reproduction of ideological discourse and its transmission to the public, demonstrates the pioneer role of education and specifically the textbooks as they contain the knowledge filtered by the official ideology of the state. In other words, textbooks become the fields in which the effect of state power is explicitly observed in educational dimension. The ruling cadre utilizes them as educational tools to transfer and reproduce the knowledge and values derived from official ideology⁶.

In the case of Turkish Republic; 1930s were years of nation-state building process and nationalism and construction of a national identity among the peoples was the core problem of the ruling cadre. Hence, official history was used as one of the major devices to install Turkish identity and collective memory to the nation which was reshaped to adopt the official ideology. From this viewpoint, history courses, especially the textbooks were instrumental in popularizing the official ideology. In this context, regarding above mentioned arguments, this research aims to present the changes and continuities in

¹Ernest Renan (1996). "What is a Nation?", *Becoming National: A Reader*, Geoff Eley, Ronald Grigor Suny (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 41-55.

²Pierre Nora (1989). "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*", *Representations*, 26, p.10

³ Ernest Gellner (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Blackwell; Benedict Anderson (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso; Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (1991). *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, London: Verso

⁴Eric Hobsbawm (1983). "Inventing Traditions", *The Invention of Tradition*, (eds.) Eric Hobsbawm, Terence Ranger, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 4. Commemoration ceremonies of important historic dates, flag ceremonies or children songs taught in schools serve good examples of this process in terms of constructing collective identity/citizenship consciousness since they contain strong nationalist symbols.

⁵Gerald L. Gutek (2005). *Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Education: A Biographical Introduction*, Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill

⁶Kemal İnal (2004). *Eğitim ve İktidar: Türkiye'de Ders Kitaplarında Demokratik ve Milliyetçi Değerler*, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları, p. 11

the formation of the official history during İsmet İnönü Era (1938–1950) of the Early Turkish Republic through making comparisons between the high school history textbooks used in the Atatürk and İnönü eras⁷.

An overall look at the studies discussing the relationship between the official ideology and historiography in Turkish Republic displays that, they basically tended to evaluate the official historiography and the basic assumptions of *Turkish History Thesis* as a continuous phenomenon with slight changes almost until 1980s, with the construction of *Turkish Islamic Thesis*. In this respect, within these studies, İnönü Era was not given the place it deserved since it witnessed crucial changes in socio-political arena which also paved way to the shift in cultural and educational policies. Undoubtedly it affected the official understanding of history as also reflected in the textbooks used in the history courses of the period, which makes this study an important explanatory source in displaying the changes.

Formulation of Official History During Early Republican Era

When we look to the case of formation period of Turkish Republic; a new system was aimed to build up which was a nation-state from an empire. In this context, a division was made as the 'old' and the 'new', and the latter was described as a clear cut break from the former. During this transition process, the old was explained as bad and insufficient for the legitimization of the new order. In this case, the new 'invented tradition', i.e. official history of the nation was formulated as *Turkish History Thesis* and introduced to the intellectuals, historians and teachers – who would also play a crucial role in disseminating it to the society - through the First and Second Turkish History Congresses.

Turkish History Thesis could be regarded as the reformulation of Turkish history so as to provide the nation-wide adoption of the official ideology which required possessiveness of Turkishness. Although this thesis was formulated in 1930s, its historical and ideal sources could be traced back in the second half of 19th century. One of the main veins feeding the historiography of the early Republican period was Turkology studies made by French and Hungarian researches. In the late 19th century, Ottoman Empire was affected by those studies and this helped the development of national consciousness among Turks.

⁷The basic arguments of this study were derived from the PhD dissertation completed in 2012. For a detailed information, see Erinç Erdal (2012). *History and Education in the İnönü Era: Changes and Continuities on Perceptions of History and its Reflections on Educational Practices*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ankara, METU.

Ziya Gökalp could be mentioned as one of the Ottoman intellectuals who were influenced by the works of Turcologists such as Leon Cahun or A. Vambery⁸.

It is also worth mentioning that the prominent ideologues and intellectuals of the Turkish Republic such as Yusuf Akçura, Fuat Köprülü and Ziya Gökalp wrote articles in journals such as *Türk Yurdu* and *Halka Doğru*, presenting the core of their theses to the readers. As a matter of fact, the objective of *Türk Yurdu* explained as "revealing and spreading the antiquities, history, popular and elite literature, ethnography and ethnology, social conditions and established civilization of Turkish civilizations by studying its old and new geography"⁹ was functional in assisting the readers to understanding the intellectual background of the official historiography of the Republic.

Turkish History Thesis

Historical understanding of the Republican cadre was a response to Islamic-Ottoman history in a sense, so it broke the ties with the Ottoman past both socio-politically and historiographically. The new nation needed a new outlook upon history and it was indispensable to reject the "unsuccessful Ottoman past". Disconnecting the Turks from the Ottoman past, Turkish History Thesis aimed to bring forth connections with pre-Islamic era and especially ancient Anatolian and Near Eastern civilizations.

As a matter of fact, one of the main targets of the Republican cadre was to bring out the autochthonous peoples of Turkey. In this respect, researches under the roof of Turkish History Association were conducted to bring out the historical origins of Turks. While the historical focus was Central Asia; territorially, historical researches focused on Anatolia. In other words, through Migration Theory¹⁰, official historiography combined Central Asia and Anatolia as historical and geographical/territorial roots of Turkey.

Turkish History Thesis¹¹ was formulated in this atmosphere as a reaction against the European

⁸ Taner Timur (1984). "Batı İdeolojisi, Irkçılık ve Ulusal Kimlik Sorunumuz", *Yapıt*, 5 (Haziran-Temmuz), p. 7-30

⁹ Nejat Kaymaz (1977). "Türkçü Tarih Görüşü", *Felsefe Kurumu Seminerleri: Türkiye'de Tarih Eğitimi*, Ankara: TTK Basımevi, p. 440

¹⁰ There had been immigrations to Anatolia within different time periods, thus it was essential to complete the immigration chain and connect it with the Turks. Hence, this theory guided historiography based upon Central Asia where history of Turks as the founders of all civilizations had begun.

¹¹ The main assumptions of the Thesis are driven from the book *Outline of Turkish History* published in 1930. A comprehensive analysis of the Thesis was done by Şefika Akile Zorlu Durukan (2006). *The Ideological Pillars of Turkish Education: Emergent Kemalism and the Zenith of Single-Party Rule*, Unpublished PhD.

perceptions of the Turks as an inferior race and Eurocentrism over all other civilizations. It first attacked the idea that Turks were incapable of creating a civilization by asserting that the very first civilization was the achievement of Turkic people in Central Asia who were of the "white race", not the "yellow race". It primarily argued that all civilizations of the world derived from this area through outward migrations of Turkic people. It should be also noted that, the claims of being autochthonous were the reactions to the territorial claims of imperial powers of the area after the First World War and aimed to eliminate their negative propaganda as well. This was the main reason of - perceiving ancient Anatolian and Near Eastern peoples as Turks - to adopt Anatolia with its complete past, including, all its values and culture. Hence, the Thesis was used as a tool to legitimize the ancientness of Turkish history and its historical continuity throughout the time. That is to say, it was a "defensive historiography"¹² emphasizing the Turks as mutual participants of the contemporary western world both culturally and historically.

Although it appeared to be extreme in some points, formulation of official history was quite common not only for the nation-building process of Turkey, but also for the other nation-states as well¹³. This was a pertinent era of constructing national identity within a society unaccustomed to such. This *romantic history* period would also end some time later and historical studies would be based on scientific and objective methods as also predicted by Fuat Köprülü¹⁴.

First clues of Köprülü's predictions were observed as early as the following couple of years. Atatürk's death and the presidency of İnönü witnessed important social and political changes. This period of time, often identified as a *humanist era*, was a time span when significant educational and cultural policies had effects regarding the official understanding of history.

İnönü Era: Reflections of Humanism

Thesis, The University of Wisconsin – Madison and Büşra Ersanlı (1996). *İktidar ve Tarih Türkiye'de Resmî Tarih Tezinin Oluşumu (1929-1937)*, İstanbul: Afa Yayınları,

¹² Enver Ziya Karal (1977). "Tanzimat'tan Bugüne Kadar Tarihçiliğimiz", *Felsefe Kurumu Seminerleri, III. Türkiye'de Tarih Eğitimi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, p.258

¹³ For information on Italian, French, German and British historiography and contributions of historian to nation-building processes in the 19th and 20th centuries, see Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, Kevin Passmore, (eds.) *Writing National Histories*, London: Routledge, 1999

¹⁴ Vasilij Vladimiroviç Barthold (1940). *İslam Medeniyeti Tarihi*, (trans.) M. Fuad Köprülü, İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi, p. 23

The social and political changes occurred in Turkish Republic as the İnönü Era advanced, paved the way not only to determining the cultural policy of the period, but also to applying the new perceptions brought to understanding of history and to teaching it in schools as well. That is to say, changes during İnönü Era were the precursors of a smooth shift in the mindset of the time. The appointment of Hasan Ali Yücel as the Minister of Education in the first Cabinet formed under the presidency of İnönü was not a coincidence. During his ministry, also known as the *humanist era*, took place critical advances in educational and cultural field¹⁵. These changes as well as the new humanistic understanding reflected on the official approach to history both from disciplinary and educational aspect.

Official History of 1940s: Changes and Continuities

Cultural and educational progresses of this era undoubtedly had major effects on the concept of history as well as on textbooks as mentioned before. First of all, while steps were taken to reconcile history studies with the Ottoman past, publications were reinforced with topics reflecting this period. The book *Tanzimat*, published by the initiation of Hasan Ali Yücel in 1940 to commemorate the centennial of the Era, was considered as the symbol of the change in the official perception regarding Ottoman history. With this study, the Republic by identifying the process as "an important turning point in Turkey's Westernization movements"¹⁶, was in a way making a settlement with the Ottoman modernization¹⁷. A certain number of books were also published in this period as there reflection of a rise of interest towards the Ottoman past.

Third Turkish History Congress held on November 15th, 1943 was another significant event since it represents the official perception of history. The presentations demonstrated an explicit change in historical understanding of 1930s and the core ideas of the History Thesis. Firstly to mention for the studies regarding ancient history was distancing from the Thesis. Accordingly, the Anatolian, Mesopotamian and Near Eastern civilizations were no longer regarded as of Turkic origin. Similarly, the presentations on Ottoman history displayed the change in perception of the

¹⁵ Translation activities of Eastern and Western literary and philosophical sources of Translation Office, organization of certain educational congresses, publication of educational journals such as *Tebliğler Dergisi* and *İlköğretim* and encyclopedias as *Encyclopedia of Islam* were a few of attempts Ministry of Education made.

¹⁶ Hasan Ali Yücel (1940). "Önsöz", *Tanzimat I Tanzimat'ın Yüzüncü Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle*, İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, p. 5

¹⁷ Mehmet Ö. Alkan, (2001). "Kaynakça'ya Dair", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce I: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, (ed.) Mehmet Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 408

Ottoman past. Organization of sessions including Ottoman history omitted in the previous two, all by itself, was the indicative of this change. Moreover, reconciliation with the Ottoman past was visible in the presentations since the emergence of Turkish Republic was traced back to 19th century as the historical and ideological roots of the Republican modernization. This new vision of Ottoman past also led a peace with Islam which would no longer be denied as a cultural element of Turks. These changes were more evident in the history textbooks that will be discussed below.

New History Textbooks

The publication of the four volume history textbooks –first three in 1942 and fourth in 1945- was the outcome of the necessity of writing new textbooks for the new era. As a matter of fact, the books published in 1932 were criticized by the teachers, parents and students right from the beginning. This in a way compelled the Turkish History Association to accept that the textbooks were far from meeting educational requirements and to invite their revisions in 1936. Consequently, Enver Ziya Karal-member of the IPC- sent a comprehensive report to Ministry of Education regarding writing new history textbooks¹⁸. In response to Karal's report, a notice was sent from the Ministry of Education entitled "History Textbooks to be Written for High Schools" giving the instructions with a specific emphasis that, the textbooks should be written centering Turkish history and according to the Turkish History Thesis¹⁹. Subsequently, Arif Müfid Mansel, Cavit Baysun and Enver Ziya Karal were assigned to write the new history textbooks. This selection by a committee consisting of the members of Ministry of Education and Turkish History Association was not coincidental since they studied history in European universities and were academically and pedagogically well qualified scholars for this assignment. The new books encompassed different epochs of history as the ancient, medieval, modern history as well as the history of the Turkish Revolution. However, when compared with the textbooks of the previous era, each volume included clear differences reflecting the changing mentality of the administrators they deemed essential to convey the official understanding of history to the students of the new generation.

¹⁸ TC. Maarif Vekilliği, Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi, 04.04.1941, Ankara

¹⁹ Although there were indicators of a change in the official perception of history, emphasis on the Thesis seems quite interesting. This can be regarded as a preference of the author and IPC to display that the history content was still shaped in line with the Thesis and it was not totally abandoned. Maarif Vekilliği Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi Issue:2-1186, Ankara, 26 June 1941

Ancient History

The ancient history textbook (*İlkçağ Tarihi*) which was published in 1942 had certain differences when compared with History 1 (*Tarih 1*) published in 1931. The basic aim of the 1931 edition was to convey the assumption to the new generation that Turks created the earliest civilization in the world and the other civilizations were derived from them. Apart from this, although Turkish race was mingled with other races during the migration, they never lost their genuine characteristics due to their superior quality.

Similar to the previous, the focus of the new book was the basic elements composing ancient civilizations with a significant difference that Turks were classified as one of those elements rather than being the core. The most advanced civilizations of ancient times were declared as the Sumerian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Hittite, Persian, Greek and Roman. Turks were regarded as a part of those civilizations; not the earliest and this was stated as "those ancient civilizations passing from race to race and generation to generation, composing our contemporary civilization"²⁰.

A critical point to be mentioned regarding the discrepancies of the two editions was the emphasis of the ancientness of Turks that the 1931 edition made. While the book traced the establishment of the Turkish states back to 13000 BC, 1942 edition carried this date to 7000 BC with rather scientific and reasonable assertions such as "Although Scythians living in western Asian steppes could not establish a big state, they occupied an important place within civilization starting from 7000 BC."²¹ Additionally, it is observed in the 1942 edition that the tone of the narrations were less assertive while the ancientness of the Turks was expressed in 1931 edition as "In pre-historic times; the inhabitants of India were dark skinned, resembling monkey flocks... The ones who exiled them to the south and advanced the Indian civilization were Turks."²² Accordingly, it was assumed in the 1931 edition that Turks lived the pre-historic eras at least 5000 years earlier than the other civilizations. However, there is no such assumption in 1942 edition and furthermore, it was stated that human communities were developed and civilized in different times in line with their own capacities and within their existing circumstances²³. In relation to these, unlike the 1931 edition, explanations about human races were limited to half a page in the 1942 edition which stated

²⁰ Arif Müfid Mansel (1942). *İlkçağ Tarihi*, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, p.3

²¹ Mansel, *İlkçağ Tarihi*, p. 11

²² *Tarih İTarih tenevelki Zamanlar ve Eski Zamanlar* (1931). İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, p.28-29

²³ *ibid.*, p.2

that due to the amalgamation of different races a pure one was nonexistent²⁴.

Another indicator of the discrepancies between the 1931 and 1942 editions of the Ancient History book was the contextualization of the history of Turks. This can initially be noticed in the titles and subtitles in the books. While 1931 edition used *A General Overview of the Great Turkish History*; the other book titled the same issue as *Motherland of Turks – Migrations*. The length of the content also differed in both books. Namely, there were 28 pages under this title in the former book while this was dropped to 10 pages in the latter²⁵.

Another prominent difference between the two textbooks was in the manner of approaching other ancient civilizations. In 1931 edition, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Anatolia, even Greece and Rome were narrated as associated with Turks and the roots of the peoples of all were claimed to be Turks from Central Asia. For instance, it was asserted in the book that the initial peoples of Egypt were Tuareks who were actually Turks having moved from Caspian region towards North Africa²⁶. Similarly, it was asserted that Budha, the founder of Buddhism, was a decendent of Saka Turks; that Hun princes, Bleda and his brother Attila²⁷; and Roman Emperor Maksimin was from the Alan Turks²⁸. Moreover, it was stated and exemplified in the book that reviews of Aegean and Greek history bore indications that “some of the Greek words meaningless in different languages were of Turkish origin.”²⁹ Even the language of Ionians were claimed as of Central Asian Turks, not Greek³⁰. However, none of these claims existed in the 1942 edition. While Hittites were referred to as *Eti Turks* in 1931 edition, the origin of Anatolian peoples were defined as Protohittites, Luvisand Hurrisin the latter book without the mentioning of a relation to Turks³¹. Similar assertions existed for civilizations of Aegean Region referring to their foundation by Cretans and Anatolians living in Greece in 3000 BC.

²⁴ *ibid.*, p.5

²⁵ As a matter of fact, shortening the content of history textbooks used in primary and secondary grade was discussed in the Second Education Congress (*İkinci Maarif Şurası*) held in 1943. The common opinion about all history textbooks was that they were not able to achieve the aims of history curriculum and not suitable for the students' level of understanding. It was also declared that the new high school history textbooks published in 1942 were undoubtedly advanced in quality when compared with the previous ones. Maarif Vekilliği İkinci Maarif Şurası (1991), 15-21 Şubat 1943 Çalışma Programı Raporlar Konuşmalar, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, p. 199-202

²⁶ *Tarih I*, p.103

²⁷ *ibid.*, p.76

²⁸ *ibid.*, p.333

²⁹ *ibid.*, p.181

³⁰ *ibid.*, p.186

³¹ Mansel, *İlkçağ Tarihi*, p.49

As seen from the above mentioned examples, there was a clear shift in the narration of 1942 edition, referring to Turkish History Thesis. Yet, a reservation was still apparent in some issues such as Sun Language Theory. It was stated in the book that the most important feature of Sumerians, founders of the earliest civilization, was the invention of script. It was also argued that many words in Sumerian language were very similar to Turkish. This can be regarded as an indicative of the continuity of the language thesis to some extent. This connection about linguistics leads the reader to a consequence of Sumerians being the descendants of Central Asia Turks³².

Medieval History

The content of the Medieval History textbook (*Ortaçağ Tarihi*) was Turkish, Islamic and European history during medieval times. Among the most important features of History II (*Tarih II*) published in 1932 was exalting of Turks during pre-Islamic Turkish history. For instance, throughout the explanation about *Migration of Tribes*, the effect of German tribes on the collapse of the Roman Empire remained in the rear while the migration was presented as if the leading actors were the Huns. Included as well were remarks such as “Hun invasions subverted Europe”³³, “There were no nations in Europe to confront Turkish cavalries composed of the courageous Huns, practically living on horse-back”, “Entire Europe was full of fear and anxiety”³⁴. However, 1942 edition does not hold any overestimations for the role of Huns regarding Migration of Tribes; they were defined as “a part of tribes migrating towards West”³⁵.

Another notable point concerning Turkish history in the observed textbooks is counterclaims about the European historians' definition of Turks as uncivilized and barbarian. The discomfort towards this claim is apparent in the 1932 edition where nomadic lifestyle of Turkish tribes is ignored for the sake of emphasizing that Turks were civilized people, not barbarians. It was also asserted that, “European Huns were living in cities mostly in wooden houses”, “sitting on chairs and eating on dining tables” and that they had progressed in literature³⁶. In fact, the information about pre-Islamic Turks aim to give an impression that 'civilized' Turks were not nomadic but rather settled. The same defensive reflex is considerably limited in 1942 edition in which none of the statements about European Huns in 1932 edition exist.

³² *ibid.*, p.43

³³ *Tarih II Ortazamanlar* (1933), İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, p.25

³⁴ *ibid.*, p.23

³⁵ Cavit Baysun (1942). *Ortaçağ Tarihi*, II. Sınıf, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, p.2

³⁶ *Tarih II*, p.27

The prominent feature of Islamic history in 1932 edition was a clear remoteness from the Arabs and the religious references of Islam while narrations were simplified into ordinary historical events. However, the same issue was handled in a different manner in 1942 edition. The first remarkable point was that unlike the previous book, there were no humiliating statements pertaining to the Arabs. Yet, the chapter focusing on the pre-Islamic period, with its cautiously selected expressions, was the most informative on this topic. For instance, it was claimed that before accepting Islam, Arabs were idolater and lived primitively; however had a big respect for Kaaba; and had superior qualifications such as intelligence, courage and honesty³⁷.

Carefully selected and softened expressions for Arabs were also observed in narrations of Islamic era. That is to say, there were no tautologies classifying Arabs as primitive before or under Islam³⁸. The period of Abbasids and their relation with Turks was explained with reasoning as Abbasid administration benefiting from contacts with the Turks. Furthermore, "superiority of Islam and Arab" was interpreted as "product of benefits developed from Central Asian relations in respect to commerce and civilization"³⁹.

Contrary to the previous, narrations from religious framework were used in the 1942 edition. In explanations on the period of Mohammad, defining him as "Exalted" (*Hazret*), moreso 'prophet' was often replaced by 'Hz. Mohammad' in this issue. It was also accepted as a certainty in the book that prophecy to Mohammad arrived through a divine inspiration (*vahiy*) and that the holy book Koran with its powerful narration significantly influenced the Arabs⁴⁰ while it was declared in the previous edition as 'this phenomena was assumed among the Muslims'.

The difference in two textbooks is also apparent in the narration of Turkish acceptance of Islam. Massive Muslim conversion during Abbasid period was assessed as a major event for Turkish and world history in the 1942 edition. However, it was explained that long contact with Muslims enabled the Turks to understand Islam extensively and thus provided its acceptance and dissemination among them. It was also asserted that hitherto, Turks were the protectors of the Muslim world and rescued Muslims from dangers they drenched into. The statement "this religion was spiritually more suitable for them than all others"⁴¹ in the book is very significant since it represents the initial step of

conciliation with Islamic heritage, in other words, disintegration from ideological reflexes of 1930s with a more reasonable approach to the past. The dimensions of this shift can be better seen in details in the chapter about Muslim civilization. This was the following chapter which included that a bright civilization emerged with the expansion of Islam and this religion brought justice to people⁴². Apart from these, degrading statements about Arabs and ignoring their role in constructing Islamic civilization⁴³ was abandoned in the 1942 edition where it was expressed that this civilization was a combination of the works of Turks, Persians and Arabs.

History of the Modern Ages

The textbook (*Yeni ve Yakın Çağlar Tarihi*) covers Ottoman and European history between 14 and 20th centuries. Yet, in this study, the sections related to Ottoman history were taken up and analyzed. The common approach of the two textbooks was their having a strong emphasis on Turkishness. For instance, the 1942 edition explained general outlook and social structure of Anatolia and Turkification of the different ethnical groups during the foundation period of the Empire as; "In this way, Anatolia has started to become Turk with its stone, soil, water and people."⁴⁴. Likewise, 'Ottoman Turks' and 'Turks' used instead of 'Ottomans' in the 1932 edition (*Tarih III*) remained unchanged in many parts of 1942 edition. This edition even went further and included glorifications and essentialist descriptions concerning Turks that the previous edition did not cover. For instance, the expansion and fortification of the Ottomans in Anatolia and Rumelia were attributed to the "superiority of Ottoman Turks" and "perfectness of Ottoman institutions"; and it was claimed that Ottomans with qualifications such as courage, heroism and honesty were the representatives of the "actual, genuine character of Turkish race"⁴⁵.

A striking point of the book was contextualization of the Empire's Islamization policy together with Turkification as a significant state policy which was

⁴²ibid., p.52

⁴³ The following expression demonstrates explicitly this situation; "During the period of Islam, those occupied with science and education were mostly non-Arabs. The establishment of Islam civilization was a product of the efforts of other nations, especially Turks and Persians." *Tarih II*, p.162.

⁴⁴Enver Ziya Karal (1942).*Yeni ve Yakın Çağlar Tarihi*, III. Sınıf, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, p.3

⁴⁵Karal,*Yeni ve Yakın*, p.8. The particularistic character of official historiography with the general formulation "we resemble to ourselves" is distinctively visual here. However, as it can be observed in the above lines, this understanding, through the influence of Barkan's historical writings, was altered to convey the uniqueness of Ottoman institutions.

³⁷Baysun, *Ortaçağ Tarihi*, p.28

³⁸*Tarih II*, p.124

³⁹Baysun, *Ortaçağ Tarihi* p.43

⁴⁰ibid., p.29

⁴¹ibid., p.44

ignored in the previous edition⁴⁶. This can be regarded as another indicator of reconciliation of the ruling cadre with the Islamic identity of the Empire which until then was deliberately kept in the background.

In the textbook, the Classical Age Ottoman institutions and administrative mentality were defined quite positively. In general, the image of "protective state" is prominent in numerous parts of the book. Ottoman land management was compared with European feudalism and regarded as much superior for not having class distinction and that Ottomans were not serfs like the Europeans. Although the Ottoman system was based on state ownership of the entire land, in the book it was asserted that land belonged to the ones living on and cultivating it and that this provided "the loyalty of the people to the state"⁴⁷. This claim in the book was fortified with the statements attributed to Kanuni Süleyman as 'peasants were the true masters of the state and thus were protected in most effective ways'⁴⁸. Similarly, Ottoman understanding of administration in 15th century was evaluated as "the core principle of the state is ruling Christians with tolerance" and when compared with the European counterparts, the rights given to Christians were "the consequence of a mature policy superseding the period"⁴⁹.

Conversely, the narration in the 1932 edition is relatively distant and even negative to the Empirical times at some points. Enactment legalizing fratricide⁵⁰ during the reign of Mehmet II was defended in the 1942 edition as not a barbarian application as put forth by the Europeans⁵¹. On the other hand, in the previous edition it was argued that although there were such applications before Mehmet II, "violence, cruelty and injustice" was not appreciated by anyone⁵². In fact, the distant approach to the Empire was not apparent only on fratriciding, but was related in many parts of the book on other issues as well. In the 1942 edition, military successes were explained with more vigor when compared with the previous edition. In this context, conquest of Istanbul was focused to strictly factual knowledge in the 1932 edition with no emphasis on 'pride on this glorious victory'. Contrary to this, in the 1942 edition, the conquest, especially Fatih's ingenuity of sliding the warships over the land, from the Bosphorus

to Haliç (Golden Horn) were described as "a mind-blowing great job"⁵³, and the whole event, shaking Turkish and Islamic societies with excitement, was applauded as "the most fascinating action in the world"⁵⁴.

Examining the difference in the approaches of the two textbooks to late Ottoman political developments and modernization process was also very illuminating for the comparisons. Two basic differences were observed during this analysis. The first was precisely definition of the actors of modernization process as modernists and reactionists valid in the 1932 edition. The reactionists who were against modernization and aimed to nullify the attempts with revolts were identified in many parts of the book as religious fundamentalists. Comparing the Turkish enlightenment with the European under the light of positivist paradigm; it was asserted that starting from the Renaissance, the West overcame bigotry through constructing social and political life upon scientific fundamentals. Whereas in the Ottoman Empire, prevailing illiteracy and bigotry was the biggest stumbling block to all kinds of progresses and this led the regression of social and political life even in the 19th century. From this viewpoint, the reactionary revolt ending the era of Selim III was regarded as "a religious reaction of functionaries (*ulema*) and Janissaries, performed by exploiting religion for political gain"⁵⁵. Likewise, Abdülhamit II's sultanate was described as a reactionary period and the basic characteristic of the era was limited to a Sultan-founded extensive secret service and its denouncing activities⁵⁶. Islamism, the ideology which was given the role of safeguarding the Empire was criticized for being overemphasized by the Sultan and thus, this period was presented with quite subjective and sentimental approach defined as "arbitrary", "unsuccessful", "dishonorable" and "boring"⁵⁷.

Second point differentiating the 1932 edition was that, the modernization process was defined as period creating a Western domain within the Empire through

⁵³Karal, *Yeni ve Yakın*, p.21

⁵⁴ *ibid.*, p.23

⁵⁵ *ibid.*, p.196

⁵⁶ Yet there is not mention in the textbook of the popularization of education which was a significant progress during this period. As known, the period of Abdülhamit II was a time when all sorts of attacks (military, economic, missionary) of the West were confronted by the Sultan obliging him to develop defense mechanisms he deemed suitable. The tools of defense were the same the West used for attack. In this respect, Western style educational institutions were designed with Islamic elements, and adapted into Ottomans' requirements. For detailed information, see Selim Deringil (2002). *İktidarın Sembolleri ve İdeoloji: II. Abdülhamid Dönemi (1876-1909)*, İstanbul: YKY; Benjamin Fortna (2002). *Imperial Classroom: Islam, State and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

⁵⁷ *Tarih III*, p.296-297

⁴⁶ *ibid.*, p.11, 29, 61

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, p.9-10

⁴⁸ *ibid.*, p.61

⁴⁹ *ibid.*, p.28

⁵⁰ After the 15th century, slaying all brothers, natural candidates for sultanhip for the sake of the state was made a legal process with Fatih Code of Laws (*Fatih Kanunnamesi*) which was continued for almost three centuries.

⁵¹ *ibid.*, p.26

⁵² *Tarih III, Yeni ve Yakın Zamanlar* (1933) İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, p.36

interference of the big powers in the internal affairs for the sake of assuring safety of the Ottoman minorities. Another pertinent feature of the narration was negligence of internal dynamics; as a consequence, underestimation of the prominent actors and critical milestones of this process. This outstanding accumulation transferred directly to the Turkish Revolution and its core principles are overlooked in the referred issue. The Imperial Edict of Gülhane (*GülhaneHatt-ıHümayunu*) declared in 1839, which was the first step on enlarging the rights of Christians in the Empire, was described as the intervention of European states into Ottoman affairs due to Egyptian Question⁵⁸. Young Ottomans - intellectuals and public officials playing critical roles during this period- were underestimated meanwhile, and were defined merely as young men who were only interested in reading French books and *naively*⁵⁹ believed that all problems of the Empire would come to an end with Constitutionalism⁶⁰. Accordingly, it was reflected that these idealist young men also were not sufficiently informed about the economical, financial and administrative issues of the Empire, that they even “could not understand the essentials of nationality”⁶¹. Likewise, the significance of Young Turks was ignored in Ottoman-Turkish modernization period. There were prejudiced claims as well which concealed historical realities such as the Young Turks “did nothing but only propaganda in Europe”, “did not learn or carefully follow modern European history” and Committee of Union and Progress ‘consisted of only 3-5 people who had no serious influences within the country’⁶².

Contrary to these, the approach and the wording of the 1942 edition was considerably distinct from the previous one. At the outset, regarding the narration of modernization period, there is no such duality as modernists and reactionists with the overemphasis on religious reactionism. Secondly, the steps taken during this period were not underestimated as if they were totally wrong and bound to fail. Contrarily, 1839 Imperial Edict of Gülhane was explained as a restriction of royal authority and Sultan’s acceptance of a superior legal power by his own will, in a similar manner to many other European countries. In this context, Mustafa ReşitPaşa, who spent a long time in Europe, with the effect of his experiences, felt the necessity of a renewal in Ottoman state law and declared the Edict⁶³. Furthermore, relatively more historically accurate and

in-depth descriptions can be observed in reference to Ottoman intellectuals, namely the Young Ottomans. It was explained that these people, who went to Europe in the 19th century for various reasons became closely acquainted with the Western institutions, gained a perspective concerning the essential approaches to secure the survival of the Empire and attempted to apply their convictions upon their return. Their contributions to the modernization process and the reforms, especially those in education field were also discussed in the book⁶⁴.

History of the Turkish Republic

The fourth volume in the series, History of the Turkish Republic (*Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*), covered history of Turkey from the end of the First World War up to 1944, when the textbook was written. The book started with the general condition of the Ottoman Empire after World War I and resulting the emergence of the consciousness of independence. A less accusing and judging attitude was observed for this period in comparison with the 1932 edition (*Tarih IV*). While the previous edition using an aggressive language with words such as “inglorious”, “rascal”, “impotent”, “coward”⁶⁵ claimed that the Sultan and his government, consented to living a dishonorable life, in order to preserve their positions by ingratiating the enemy, the 1945 edition differed. It displayed the fears of the Sultan and the insufficiency of the administrators who were “far from being capable of accomplishing the big deeds that Turkish nation expected”⁶⁶.

The narrations on Mustafa Kemal also differed in the two editions. In many parts of the 1932 edition, Mustafa Kemal was characterized with elaborated practically mystical statements as “he was born to conduct and control people”, “he was born as a soldier” and as a genius, with an extraordinary genesis, always fore-seeing and telling the truth⁶⁷. He was also defined as totally different from and superior to all other members of the CUP⁶⁸. To support such attributions even some anachronistic remarks were included in the text such as the idea of founding a Republic was pronounced by him as early as 1900 for he was not content with constitutionalism⁶⁹. On the other hand, the 1945 edition did not contain such statements. In fact,

⁵⁸ibid., p.240

⁵⁹The italics belong to the textbook.

⁶⁰ ibid., p.254

⁶¹ ibid., p.255

⁶² ibid., pp.297-298

⁶³Karal, *Yeni ve Yakın*, p.168

⁶⁴ ibid., p.170-175

⁶⁵*Tarih IV Türkiye Cumhuriyeti* (1934). İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, p.13-14

⁶⁶Enver Ziya Karal (1945). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi: 1918-1944*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, p.4

⁶⁷*Tarih IV*, pp.18-21

⁶⁸ ibid., p.18. However, it is well known that, Mustafa Kemal was not one of the most prominent members of the CUP at that time. He was to acquire his fame as military commander of the Turkish forces during Dardanelles battles.

⁶⁹ ibid., p.18

exaggerated glorification around his name was abandoned and Mustafa Kemal was humanized in the book listing his military successes following his brief biography.

There are some other discrepancies between the two editions such as presenting Mustafa Kemal as the 'single man'⁷⁰ during National Struggle and foundation process of the Republic in 1932 edition. The book was composed to inspire the reader to symbolize the will of the nation with Mustafa Kemal's personality and think of him as the only leader to know and apply the best decisions for the people, that he and his ruling cadre could differentiate what is good and bad for the public and supply the intensive care and protection the newly born nation-state needed. Conversely, the new edition, although full of respect and reverence, did not present Atatürk as a single rescuer. Consultations between Atatürk and İsmet İnönü were mentioned at several places, especially in parts explaining critical views and decisions. For instance, renewal of the assembly in April, 1923 was explained as the decision of Atatürk and İnönü, both feeling the necessity of this renewal in order to maintain the unity of the country⁷¹. It was also asserted that before proclamation of the republic, Atatürk and İnönü worked together and prepared a proposal indicating the basic principles of the Republic⁷². The book even concluded with: "History will always record the great name of President İnönü with this prosperity [of Second World War] in the foreground."⁷³ This, once again is the demonstration of how these textbooks reflected the political atmosphere of the period. The 1945 edition was published when İsmet İnönü was the 'Unchangeable General President' and 'National Chief' of the country, with the aim of presenting İnönü as the proper leader to pursue Atatürk. The book also gave place to İnönü's speeches on various occasions even more than to those of Atatürk.

In parallel with perception of Atatürk as the 'single man', a clear distant stance towards any kind of opposition is apparent throughout the first edition, and the opponents are regarded as 'bad'. The narration about Progressive Republican Party (PRP-*Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*) and Liberal Republican Party (LRP-*Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*) serves a good example of this approach. In the book, a basic message was given that Atatürk and his party, RPP already knew and represented general interest, thus there was no need to opposing parties. The opposition in the national assembly was also accused of being the center of

reactionists aiming to restore Sultanate and Caliphate. Supporters of PRP were described as "illiterates, puritans discontented with the revolutions", "ingrate", "remorseless", "incendiary" and "traitor"⁷⁴. Similarly, a connection was made with the foundation of LRP and resurgence of reactionists and annulling of the party itself just before the Menemen Incident was affirmed as "well-timed, appropriate and in point"⁷⁵. However, opposing views were not categorically rejected in 1945 edition. PRP was not totally reviled; it was stated that there were many sincere patriots within the party indeed. Though the book did not refrain from accusing the conservatives of monopolizing PRP and LRP for their own interests⁷⁶.

Another significant feature of the 1932 edition was evaluation of Turkish Republic as a clear break from the Ottoman past. Regarding the narrations on modernization, Republican era was handled and analyzed with reference to the late Ottoman period, described as a 'total failure'. There is an obvious settlement of the Republic, disintegrated from its Ottoman and Islamic past. In this respect, whatever belonged to that past was 'evil', 'old', 'reactionist' and 'traditional'; and Kemalist cadre corrected them with reforms. However the same issue was not handled in the new edition as a break from and confrontation with the Ottoman past. For instance, unlike the previous edition's disparaging style, the abolition of the Caliphate was explained with its historical background first and then reasoned with its incompatibility with a secular nation state⁷⁷. Similarly, the condition of women in the Ottoman Empire was not reflected as totally backward. It was specified that, although Islam as a culture weakened the position of women in legal and social areas and they lost most of their rights; it was only so in big cities and towns. Provincial women maintained old Turkish traditions and their emancipated status remained unchanged⁷⁸.

The same approach was observed in the narration of core principals. It was stated in the new book that, during the last years of the Empire, nationalism gained strength among Turks. Yet, supporters of nationalism did not have a perspective on state organization; their efforts were rather on cultural field. Turkish revolution breaking away from the core, based every movement on this principle⁷⁹. Likewise, it was expressed that, despite the prevention of *ufulema*, Ottomans attempted

⁷⁰This commonly used expression is emerged from the book entitled 'Single Man' (*Tek Adam*) written by Şevket Süreyya Aydemir.

⁷¹ibid., p.98

⁷²ibid., p.101

⁷³ibid., p.182

⁷⁴*Tarih IV*, pp.190-191

⁷⁵ ibid., p.200

⁷⁶ibid., p.119

⁷⁷ibid., p.105

⁷⁸ ibid., p.125

⁷⁹ ibid., p.112

secularization in certain areas⁸⁰. Secularization initiatives in legal system through adoption of European practices during Tanzimat Period such as appeal courts (*nizamiyemahkemeleri*) was also specified in the book⁸¹. In other words, dynamics of Turkish modernization were not expressed as if they were emerged in the mind of Atatürk and put in practice starting from 1920s as in the previous edition; but was handled with emphasis on its historical and intellectual background in late Ottoman period.

Conclusion

Official historiography of Turkish Republic, in other words Kemalist historiography formulated in 1930s served the foremost tool of dominant ideology with the aim of constructing national identity and a collective memory to the citizens of the new nation-state. Therefore, in line with the modernization perception of the Republic, the official discourse was constructed as a clear break with the recent past for the legitimation of the new system. By this way, it was aimed to declare to domestic and foreign arena that Ottoman and Islamic social, political and cultural heritage was totally abandoned and a new order was established.

When compared with the 1930s, historiography during İnönü Era had certain characteristics which displayed changes rather than continuities. Regarding the official history formulated as Turkish History Thesis, the Third History Congress as well as the history textbooks written in the same year did not demonstrate an overall break, but merely a shift from basic assumptions. The new official history both represented in the congress and the textbooks had several important features. First of all, the preparation of the ordered books demonstrates an alteration in the mindset of the ruling cadre. While the 1931-1932 editions were written by a committee consisting of both politicians and historians with pronounced political stances in the establishment⁸²; the 1942 and 1945 editions were prepared by three academicians with bachelor's degree from leading European universities.

The change was also observed in refraining from resting the narrations upon the theories of 1930s, although an explicit break with them was avoided. However, approach to ancient history revealed the shift from the history thesis and the perception that civilization was spread throughout the world from Central Asia with Turks. In this respect, ancient civilizations of Anatolia and Near East were no longer regarded as Turkic origin. The narrations on Arabs and Islam were also differed as gradual peace with them became evident. There was also a change in the approach to Ottoman past which did not rely purely on breaks, but also paid attention on continuities. Regarding Ottoman modernization, Reform Era since Tanzimat was evaluated as a historical continuity rather than a break with the Turkish Republic. Another characteristic point of the conception of Ottoman Era was peace/reconciliation with its Islamic identity. That is to say, Islam was no longer regarded as a regressive factor within the history of Turks; contrarily its cultural and historical heritage was gradually accepted.

There were also differences between the textbooks of the two eras regarding both the attitude and the tone. The negative overviews of the history of Arabs and also entire Ottoman past were not observed anymore. Furthermore, smoothing and rasping sharp words was apparent in most of the texts. While the approach to certain issues was biased and very emotional in 1931-1932 editions, the removal of exaggerations and installing comparatively moderate reflections was apparent in 1942 edition.

There were various reasons of the shift from the basic features of official thesis. First of all and the most important factor was the structural transformation in 1940s which had certain unavoidable consequences upon the educational and cultural policies as well as history writing. Atatürk's death and the presidency of İnönü witnessed important social and political changes. In this period gaining of confidence among the administrators provided the fortification of the regime⁸³.

⁸⁰ *ibid.*, p.114

⁸¹ *ibid.*, p.120

⁸² This was not only peculiar to historiography in Turkey. The beginning of the 20th century was the period when history had an important role for the creation of collective memory and academic historiography had a considerable influence in the nation-building process. During this time, mainstream historians in European countries had a clear stance and participation in political arena which was appreciative. For instance, Historians such as Dahlmann, Gervinus, Droysen, Sybel, Baumgarten, Treitschke, Mommsen, Ranke in Germany and also Guizot, de Tocqueville and Thiers in France not only espoused political positions in their writings, but occupied powerful political posts. Georg G. Iggers, (1999). "Nationalism and Historiography 1789-1996: The German Example of Historical Perspective" (eds.) Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, Kevin Passmore, *Writing National Histories*, London: Routledge, p.19

⁸³ The debate in the National Assembly on 'using books written in Arabic alphabet in school libraries' is a clear indication of the milder approach of the ruling cadre. For example, Çanakkale deputy Ziya Gevher Etili strongly opposed this proposal arguing as, "There is a form and smell of a recourse (*rücu*) in the encountered opinion in this protocol. Even a direct recourse. We can never recourse from any of our great reforms that we have made by now." Hasan Ali Yücel, on the other hand expressed that a reaction or recourse was on no account in question. İstanbul deputy İbrahim Alaettin Gövs supported Yücel as he understood that there were some members of the parliament who were anxious about the regression of the country; but there was no need to fear since the young population was closely loyal to the all principles of the revolution. During his speech, continuous applaudings and 'bravo!' cries can be regarded as the indicator of the strong support from the Assembly. Meclis Zabıtları, Devre 6 cilt 2 içtima F, 10.5.1939

This resulted in changing attitudes and scopes towards the reactionists and decrease in the reciprocal defensive responses and rigid applications of the previous era in order to protect the regime. As the fear of regression almost disappeared among the ruling elite, opposing views were no longer stigmatized as 'reactionist'. Accordingly, it became the period when the strong responses towards Ottoman and Islamic identity/culture were decreased. In this socio-political atmosphere, there was no need in introducing Turkish Republic and its constituents as a clear break from the past. Hence, the official history of İnönü Era witnessed rebuilding historical and intellectual connections of Turkish modernization with its recent past. Considering all these facts, it is appropriate to describe this period as a 'consolidation era'.

Another noteworthy reason for the departure from the basic arguments of Turkish History Thesis was humanist worldview of this period. The years between 1938 and 1946, was the period of Hasan Ali Yücel's Ministry of Education, when significant educational and cultural policies were put into practice. Unlike the previous era, the translations of world classics indicated how Ministry of Education regarded East and West as contemporary civilizations and that Turkey had a place within this context. The works of Blue Anatolianists⁸⁴, some of whom were the members of IPC and also conducting translation activities in the Office were also influential in nourishing cultural/humanistic and historical perception of this period. Their understanding of universal history and emphasis on 'being a part of ancient Anatolian civilizations' and 'adopting entire cultural and historical heritage of this land' obviously had an effect on this shift.

Lastly to mention were the effects of international changes in the understanding of history during the 1940s, promoting social and economic dimensions of history rather than focusing on political aspects. The impacts of this change on Turkish official and academic history included criticism of the strong nationalist perceptions having ethnisist tones and accordingly, Turkish academicians became participants of international workshops conducted to remove similar interpretations from the textbooks of certain European countries.

⁸⁴This group was consisted of Azra Erhat, Cevat Şakir Kabaağaçlı and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu embracing the historical and cultural heritage of ancient Anatolian civilizations. For detailed information on this issue, see Barış Karacasu (2001). "Mavi Kemalizm: Türk Hümanizmi ve Anadoluçuluk", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, II, Kemalizm, İletişim Yay., İstanbul, 334-343; Kaya Akyıldız (2002). "Mavi Anadoluçuluk", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, III, *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, İletişim Yay., İstanbul, 465-481

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Enver Ziya Karal's Special Collection
Decisions of Ministry of Education Instructional and Pedagogy Committee (TC. Maarif Vekilliği Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi Kurul Kararları)
Grand National Assembly of Turkey, Education Budget Negotiations (TBMM Celse Zabıtları Maarif Bütçesi Müzakereleri)

Books and Articles

- Akyıldız, Kaya (2002). "Mavi Anadoluçuluk", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, III, *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, İletişim Yay., İstanbul, p. 465-481
- Alkan, Mehmet Ö. (2001). "Kaynakça'ya Dair", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce I: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, (ed.) Mehmet Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso,
- Balibar, Etienne; Wallerstein, Immanuel (1991). *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, London: Verso
- Barthold, Vasilij Vladimiroviç (1940). *İslam Medeniyeti Tarihi*, (trans.) M. Fuad Köprülü, İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi
- Baysun, Cavit (1942). *Ortaçağ Tarihi*, II. Sınıf, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti
- Çıkar, Mustafa (1997). *Hasan Ali Yücel ve Türk Kültür Reformu*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları
- Deringil, Selim (2002). *İktidarın Sembolleri ve İdeoloji: II. Abdülhamid Dönemi (1876-1909)*, İstanbul: YKY
- Erdal, Erinc (2012). *History and Education in the İnönü Era: Changes and Continuities on Perceptions of History and its Reflections on Educational Practices*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ankara, METU
- Ersanlı, Büşra (1996). *İktidar ve Tarih Türkiye'de Resmî Tarih Tezinin Oluşumu (1929-1937)*, İstanbul: Afa Yayınları
- Fortna, Benjamin (2002). *Imperial Classroom Islam, State and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Gellner, Ernest (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Gutek, Gerald L. (2005). *Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Education: A Biographical Introduction*, Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1983). "Inventing Traditions", *The Invention of Tradition*, (eds.) Eric Hobsbawm, Terence Ranger, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 1-14
- Iggers, Georg G. (1999). "Nationalism and Historiography 1789-1996: The German Example of Historical Perspective" (eds.) Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, Kevin Passmore, *Writing National Histories*, London: Routledge, p. 15-29
- İnal, Kemal (2004). *Eğitim ve İktidar: Türkiye'de Ders Kitaplarında Demokratik ve Milliyetçi Değerler*, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi
- Karacasu, Barış (2001). "Mavi Kemalizm: Türk Hümanizmi ve Anadoluçuluk", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, II, Kemalizm, İletişim Yay., İstanbul, p. 334-343
- Karal, Enver Z. (1942). *Yeni ve Yakın Çağlar Tarihi*, III. Sınıf, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti
- _____. (1945). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi: 1918-1944*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi,
- _____. (1977). "Tanzimat'tan Bugüne Kadar Tarihçiliğimiz", *Felsefe Kurumu Seminerleri*, III. *Türkiye'de Tarih Eğitimi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi
- Kaymaz, Nejat (1977). "Türkçü Tarih Görüşü", *Felsefe Kurumu Seminerleri: Türkiye'de Tarih Eğitimi*, Ankara: TTK Basımevi
- Maarif Vekilliği İkinci Maarif Şurası (1991). *15-21 Şubat 1943 Çalışma Programı Raporlar Konuşmalar*, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi
- Mansel, Arif M. (1942). *İlkçağ Tarihi*, I. Sınıf, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti
- Nora, Pierre (1989). "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire", *Representations*, 26, p. 7-25
- Renan, Ernest (1996). "What is a Nation?", *Becoming National: A Reader*, Geoff Eley, Ronald Grigor Suny (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 41-55
- Tarih I Tarihtenevki Zamanlar ve Eski Zamanlar* (1931). İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası
- Tarih II Ortazamanlar* (1933). İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası

- Tarih III Yeni ve Yakın Zamanlar* (1933). İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası
- Tarih IV Türkiye Cumhuriyeti* (1934). İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası
- Timur, Taner (1984). "Batı İdeolojisi, Irkçılık ve Ulusal Kimlik Sorunumuz", *Yapıt*, 5 (Haziran-Temmuz), p. 7-30
- Yücel, Hasan Ali (1940) "Önsöz", *Tanzimat I Tanzimat'ın Yüzüncü Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle*, İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası
- Zorlu Durukan, Şefika Akile(2006). *The Ideological Pillars of Turkish Education: Emergent Kemalism and the Zenith of Single-Party Rule*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Wisconsin – Madison