

The First ‘History of the Turkish Revolution’ Lectures and Courses in Turkish Universities (1934–42)

SÜLEYMAN İNAN

‘The History of Turkish Revolution’ (*HoTR – Türk İnkılap Tarihi*) course taught in Turkish Universities, covering the Kemalist system and espousing its principles began in 1934 with lectures organized by the highest state authorities. There have been discussions in Turkish university circles – especially among professors in the fields of jurisprudence, political science and history – from that time up to the present on the aim, scope and content of the course.¹ These discussions have centred mainly on two points: the first concerns the course’s aim, which is to ‘inject’ the Kemalist ideology; and the second is on the methodological problem within the course. Although many studies have been conducted on the HoTR course, almost none of these studies have focused on the historical factors that gave rise to it and on the historical figures that began it and determined its content. This article aims to study the ‘lectures’ (*konferanslar*), which were an important step in the emergence of the course and lasted until 1942.

Although the HoTR course began in the second half of 1934, some historical developments took place based on the importance of revolutionism (*inkılapçılık*) and the Turkish revolution around the beginning of 1930s. Thus, it is useful to touch upon some historical events before discussing the HoTR course.

Some events which took place at the beginning of 1930s drew the attention of sectors of the Turkish authorities to the importance of the course. The first of these was that the principle of revolutionism was accepted in the congress of the Republican People’s Party (RPP – *Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası*), which was the only party at that time. Atatürk, who said ‘my most important work is the foundation of the Republic of Turkey’, thought that the revolution could continue only with the help of those people who would understand and support it. He believed that this was possible by teaching it to the new generation and thus keeping the revolutionary creed alive in young people. In 1937, the principle of ‘revolutionism’ was set out in an article of the Constitution and thus it became one of the basic principles of not only the party but the state.

Another event that made the HoTR course necessary was the emergence of totalitarian political systems in some European countries and Russia. Being under threat from totalitarian regimes in Germany, Italy and Russia, Turkey saw the course as necessary to prevent its people from being influenced by such ideologies.

A further factor that affected the emergence of the course was the historical studies of the period. As part of the effort to make the Turkish people regain their self-esteem, lost over centuries of military defeats, in 1931 the Turkish Historical Society (*Türk Tarih Kurumu*) was established. The last volume of the four-volume *General Turkish History (Umûmi Türk Tarihi)* prepared in cooperation with the Ministry of Education is titled *The Republic of Turkey*, and although it was written as a course book for high school students (15–18 years old), it presented the historical panorama of the period and indicated the extent to which the republic was a centre of attention in historical studies.² Besides, the ‘Turkish History Principle’ (*Türk Tarih Tezi*) that emerged at this time, and which claimed that the Anatolian region had always been a Turkish land, replaced what was a religious-oriented historical perspective with a nation-based one, and in this way aimed to revive the feeling of patriotism and the sense of belonging to a particular nation.³ Thus, based on a national perspective, Turkish history was dated back to the ancient Anatolian civilizations. This historical perspective was seen as the only possible way to achieve the level of Western civilization which was the main aim of the recent revolutions in the country. It is clear that the HoTR course that to taught in Turkish universities would help realize the socio-political functions aimed at by the Turkish Historical Society and the other historical studies.

Maybe, the most important development that placed the HoTR course on the agenda was the attempt to reform the universities. The first decade of the Turkish Republic (1923–33) was a period in which the ‘House of Sciences’ (HoS – [*İstanbul Darülfünunu*], later renamed University of Istanbul) could not fulfil the functions expected of it in spite of all the efforts made by the state. With the Unification of Education Act (*Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu*), passed in the first year of the republic, almost all the pre-university educational institutions were reformed. However, the only university then, the House of Sciences, was left alone in the belief that it would reform itself according to the general socio-political changes in the country. In 1932, there were more and more complaints about the inability of the HoS to carry out the scientific functions expected from it. According to these complaints, despite the juridical and autonomous position of the HoS, the university, which was the main component of the HoS, became self-centred and did not contribute to the revolutionary process that was going on in every aspect of socio-political life. For instance, Falih Rıfıkı Atay, a journalist who supported the revolutionary process, complained in a journal article that the HoS was indifferent to the Turkish revolution and argued that in times of revolution universities should leave aside scientific issues and serve the revolutionary cause. He claimed that one of the main responsibilities of the university was to keep the revolutionary spirit alive in the minds of people.⁴ The highest level complaint against this situation came from Reşit Galip, the Minister of Education, who, in the opening speech of the new academic year of the House of Sciences (University of Istanbul), stated:

There have been great social and political revolutions in the country but the House of Sciences (HoS) has been indifferent to them and remained on the outside. The HoS has behaved as if it was not aware of them. There have been radical changes in the legal system. The HoS has been content with only including the new laws in the educational programme. There has been a

renovation of the alphabet by adopting Latin characters; there has begun a movement of pure language. The HoS has taken no notice of them. A new historical perspective pervaded the whole country and became a national movement. The HoS waited three years to show an interest in this event. The HoS in Istanbul has ceased to realize its functions and has become self-centred.⁵

The House of Sciences in the historic centre of the Ottoman Empire, Istanbul, bore traces of the old Ottoman regime and contained people and factors that were against the newly born Ankara-centred regime. The presence there of academics that were against the 'new' and its indifference to the revolutionary process in the country were interpreted as evidences that the HoS did not share the ideal of the Republic. Doubts about the institution became more intense when no one from it responded to the demand of the newly established state for a book to be written on the revolution, though it proposed a grant to fund it.⁶ The answer of the Rector (*Darülfünun Emîni*) of the institution to the criticism of the HoS was that they could not fulfil the expectations due to financial problems.⁷ However, the lack of response to the state's demand in spite of the grant showed that the reason behind their indifference was other than financial and this was contrary to what was expected from them.⁸

The necessity of the HoTR course emerged at this point, during discussions on reform of the university. The complaints about the HoS drew attention to the importance of national consciousness-raising efforts among young people and of the education of society on national issues. Thus, it can be said that what prepared the ground for the emergence of the course was the complaints about the university's inability to reform in accordance with the new regime. Via the course, the new regime would be taught to the university students, who were seen as the 'future of the country' (*ülkenin istikbalî*). This was also in line with Atatürk's idea as presented in his 1927 'Speech to Young People' (*Gençliğe Hitabe*) that the new generation would be the protector of the Republic.⁹

The reform of the university gave rise to the foundation of the Revolution Institute (*İnkılâp Enstitüsü*). This institute was designed to function as a spiritual club (*manevi ocak*) that conveyed the basic principles and aims of the revolution to the new generations.¹⁰ Although there were various expectations of it, the ideological mission of the institute was certain.¹¹ It could be said that its theoretical background was shaped in the process of the search for an ideological ground in the 1930s.¹²

Although the process of institutionalization continued for about ten years, the Revolution Institute was in legal terms founded on 20 June 1933.¹³ According to the first course schedule prepared for the spring term of the 1933–34 academic year, there would be 'History of Turkish Revolution' courses in March in Istanbul and in April in Ankara. A more regular course schedule began to be used in the following academic year (1934–35).¹⁴ The law about the course was the University of Istanbul Regulation that was accepted by the Council of Ministers on 11 October 1934.¹⁵ According to the article concerning the course in the Regulation, final year students would attend the institute and those who were successful would get a certificate at the end of the academic year.¹⁶ Without that certificate the student would not be able to graduate from the university. Attending the course was not compulsory, but it became a centre of attraction not only for the students but also for the public. For this reason, a member of the parliament close to Atatürk made a proposal to the

parliament suggesting that the course be open to the public.¹⁷ It was therefore decided that people could attend the course with listener cards.

The name of the course appeared in journals such as *National Revolution and History (Milli İnkılap ve Tarihi)* even before it began to be taught at the university.¹⁸ After the course began, it was called 'The History of the Turkish Revolution course'. It was also sometimes called 'Revolution course' (*İnkılap Dersleri*).

After the course began, its aim became clearer. As a matter of fact, the world socio-political situation determined the aim of the course. The economic crisis at the outset of the 1930s and the subsequent depressions in the Western world made it necessary for the new regime to use all possible means to gain the sympathy of the public, particularly the intelligentsia. In this regard, the HoTR course functioned as a kind of theoretical background for the revolutionary process and the single-party regime in the country.

Another aim of the course was to raise the revolutionary consciousness and enthusiasm among university students. Recep Peker defined the aim of the course as 'to make the new generation experience the same revolutionary enthusiasm as the people who lived and made the revolution experienced and to teach them the principles of the revolution and make them ready for duty'.¹⁹

The History of the Turkish Revolution course began to be taught in the Revolution Institute at the University of Istanbul on 4 March 1934, which was also the date of the foundation of the Institute.²⁰ The location chosen for the course was Zeynep Hanım Mansion close to the old Faculty of Arts.²¹ The first lecture was given by Minister of Education Yusuf Hikmet Bayur. This meant that what was, in effect, the opening ceremony for the Institute was attended by a great number of people. The speech was also broadcast on radio and was cover news in the semi-official *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper.

In his speech, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur told how six European countries (the Russian Empire, Britain, Germany, Italy, France and Austria) wanted to disband 'the half-invaded' (*yarı-müstemleke*) Ottoman Empire and how the allied countries had designs on the lands of the empire during the First World War. He declared that there were no such things as pity and fairness in international relations. He likened international relations to 'the dance of the wolves' and stated that such ideas as friendship and enmity should be seen in these terms. Bayur handled the weakness of the Ottoman Empire in respect of two points: the first was the Capitulations (*Kapitülasyonlar*), and the second was the Islam Caliphate (*İslam Halifeliği*). For him, the 'economic' (*iktisadî*) capitulation abolished/undermined the economic control of the state in its customs and obstructed the development of a national industry; what he called 'juridical' (*adlî*) capitulation, on the other hand, protected foreigners from being tried in Turkish courts and thus provided them with economic advantages particularly in public works. The other weakness of the empire, the Islamic Caliphate, had lost its appeal to the Muslim world because of the colonization of the country. Besides, since it was higher than the parliament in political affairs, it obstructed the development of the country.

Yusuf Hikmet Bayur determined the teaching plan of the course. For him, the First World War and the Turkish War of Independence (*Türk İstiklal Savaşı*) were

the military and political part of the revolution. The other element was 'the change of the 1300 year old principles of jurisprudence'. The last part was economic and it concerned 'the movement from an economy based on small shops and manual work to one based on developed industry'.²² From Bayur's speech, it is possible to categorize the HoTR into three historical periods: the military and political period between 1914 and 1923; the jurisprudence period between 1923 and 1926; and the economical development period between 1929 and 1934.

Prime Minister İsmet İnönü's lecture took place 14 days after the opening ceremony on 20 March 1934 in the Faculty of Law of Ankara University.²³ İsmet İnönü's lecture was significant because it was the first time a Prime Minister had given a lecture at a Turkish university.

In his lecture, İnönü presented his views on the Turkish revolution. For him, the aim of the Turkish revolution was not only to defend the country against invaders. It was also the Turkish people's survival of the Ottoman system. In this regard, there was no relation between the reforms of the last century of the Ottoman Empire and the revolution led by Atatürk. The Turkish revolution was unique in its national and socio-political character. İnönü defined the reforms of the last century of the Ottoman Empire as movements that 'took place in an enclosed cell that [were] isolated from the realities of the country and thus they could not lead the Turkish people to independence'.

On the role of the revolution following the Turkish war of independence, İnönü said that the Turkish nation was a 'great society' (*yüksek cemiyet*). Not believing in any dogma and not sticking to any dogmatic idea for the welfare of society was the greatest revolution accomplished by this 'great society'. For him, this was the supremacy of the new regime in contrast to the old regime and its conservative adherents. The revolutionary creed (*inkılap davası*) had two purposes: first, those gained with the reforms should not be lost; and, second, structural changes should be made in socio-economic life to realize the needs of society.

In the last part of his speech, İnönü touched upon the economic aspect of the revolution and declared that it was the duty of the Turkish revolution to take 'state precautions' (*devletçi tedbirler*) for the economic welfare of society. State intervention, like every other economic policy, was the practical way to cope with economic problems. This policy did not aim to prevent private enterprise; instead, it was seen as a factor that would stimulate private enterprise. Towards the end of his lecture, İnönü said that the revolution might seem to progress in a 'zigzag' but this was because of the dynamic nature of social life. According to him, the revolutionary process progressed by taking into account the factors originating in the conditions of life and by making changes where necessary. He stated, 'Instead of pouring out or declaring theoretical principles (*nazarî prensipler*) without taking into account the realities of social life, our revolution progresses by considering the whole view of life and the national ideal and by taking precautions where necessary in its progression'.

Falih Rıfıkı Atay – a journalist and writer who viewed socio-political issues with the ideological perspective of the time – stated his impressions of İnönü's lecture as follows: 'İsmet Pasha insisted on one fact: the existence of the Turkish nation depends on its independence. . . In the same lecture, İsmet Pasha also underlined the fact that the Turkish revolution is still going on. . . We will never forget what İsmet

Pasha has said and we will never let any of his statements lose its power and efficiency'.²⁴

When the lectures of the Minister of Education and Prime Minister are viewed together, both of them underlined the fact that the Turkish revolutionary movement should not be linked to the reforms of the late Ottoman period. In other words, the Turkish revolution was a unique movement without connection to any other past event.

Those who were to teach the HoTR course were named in Yusuf Hikmet Bayur's speech:²⁵

It is certain that such an important course cannot be taught only by one person. The part concerning the military and internal issues will be taught by Mr. Recep, the General Secretary of RPP (Republican People's Party), who has shown a great interest in these issues from the beginning of the struggle for national independence and who has occupied certain representative positions related to these issues; the part concerning jurisprudence and the economy will be taught by Mr. Mahmut Esat and Yusuf Kemal, who have taken part in the jurisprudence and economic aspects of the revolutionary process from the very beginning in representative positions; and the part concerning foreign affairs will be taught by myself, who has been the director of political affairs of the national government from the very beginning of the revolution.

It is therefore clear that the course would be taught by the following four politicians:

1. Recep Peker: Member of Parliament of Kütahya province and the General Secretary of RPP.
2. Mahmut Esat Bozkurt: Member of Parliament of İzmir province.
3. Yusuf Kemal Tengirsenk: Member of Parliament of Sinop province.
4. Yusuf Hikmet Bayur: Member of Parliament of Manisa province and Minister of Education.

Mr. Y. Hikmet was to teach the historical, Mr. Y. Kemal the economic, and Mr. Recep and Mr. M. Esat the political aspects of the Turkish revolution.

The fact that those who would teach the course were selected from among politicians cannot be explained only by the lack of teaching staff in the newly established system. In fact, this is the conscious preference of the authorities and Atatürk's influence on this selection is apparent. This can be understood from Bozkurt's statement that the 'Great Chief' (*Büyük Şef*) Atatürk requested him to teach the new generation the revolution's history of jurisprudence; when this request was conveyed to him by the Minister of Education, he accepted it immediately although he had planned to work in his farm in Selçuk.²⁶

Another factor that affected the selection of these people is that they had already been in the 'modernization' (*modernleşme*) process of the revolution since the Turkish War of Independence. When Yusuf Hikmet Bayur introduced them, he particularly emphasized the fact that these people had been in the revolutionary

process 'from the very beginning of the national struggle'. Thus, their having occupied important positions in the revolutionary process and experienced the enthusiasm of the revolution from the very beginning would make it possible for them to interpret and explain the revolution from the inside. For those people teaching the course was a matter of revolutionary creed rather than a scientific act.²⁷

Since these four 'teacher' politicians played a functional role in the formation of a history of Turkish revolutionary discourse in Turkish universities, we should have a closer look at them.

Recep Peker (1889–1950) was the ideologue of the single-party period and prepared the programmes of the Republican People's Party. Peker, as the General Secretary of the party, was also Atatürk's spokesman and he had the right to carry out Atatürk's work where necessary. Peker, who played an important role in the construction of the Kemalist single-party state, became the representative of the extremists in the party due to his authoritarian and fascistic attitudes. He was born in Istanbul, had his secondary education in Kocamustafa Pasha Military School and then graduated from Harbiye School (1907), a military school which trained many famous Turkish commanders. He occupied some military positions during the Turkish–Italian war (1911–12), the Balkan wars (1912–13), and in the Rumeli and Caucasian fronts of the First World War. In 1919, he finished at Military Staff College. He moved from Istanbul to Anatolia towards the beginning of 1920 to take part in the Turkish War of Independence and became the General Secretary of the Turkish Parliament that was founded on 23 April 1920. In 1923 he was elected as Member of Parliament of Kütahya province and thus also a member of the second-period parliament. In the same year he was elected as General Secretary of the RPP. He became for a while the editorial writer of *Hakimiyeti Milliye* newspaper, which was the mouthpiece of the newly established system. He was Minister of the Interior between 1924 and 1925 and also the representative Minister of Development and Housing. In the second and third İsmet Pasha (İnönü) parliaments he was Minister of Defence (1925–27) and Minister of Development and Housing (1928–30). In 1927, he was elected General Secretary of the RPP for the second time. He established the first government of the multi-party period and with his radical Atatürkian line of thought he followed an unwavering policy against the opposition in the parliament. He died in Istanbul in 1950.

Mahmut Esat Bozkurt (1892–1943), the architect of modern Turkish jurisprudence, participated in the Turkish Communist Party that was founded by Atatürk in 1923. His leftist-nationalist views are still referred to by different groups from the nationalists to the extremist leftists. He closed the Masonic Lodge which he thought was serving the aims of imperialistic countries. Bozkurt was born in Kuşadası, an Aegean coastal town, and graduated from the Istanbul School of Law in 1912. He took a Ph.D. degree in Fribourg University, Switzerland, writing his thesis on 'The Ottoman Capitulation Regime' ('Du Regimes des Capitulations Ottomanes'). He became the head of the Turkish Student Association (*Türk Talebe Cemiyeti*) that was established in 1919 in Lausanne. He returned to Turkey to take part in the Turkish War of Independence after İzmir was invaded by the Greeks and began the *Kuvayı*

Milliye (an organization of people's resistance against the invaders) movement in Kuşadası. He was elected in 1920 as Member of Parliament for İzmir province. He took part in the Constitution and Foreign Affairs commissions and became the Minister of Economy (1922–23) when Rauf Orbay was Prime Minister. At Bozkurt's suggestion and with Atatürk's approval, the first 'National Economy Congress' (*Milli İktisat Kongresi*) was then organized in İzmir in 1923. Bozkurt also took part in the preparation of the Constitution that was passed in 1924, became Minister of Economy in Ali Fethi Okyar's cabinet in the second half of 1923 and was appointed as Minister of Justice towards the end of 1924. He played an important role in the foundation of the Ankara School of Law that would train the future jurists of the country. Mahmut Esat, who continued in his position as Minister of Justice in subsequent governments, until he retired towards the end of 1930s, played the chief role in the law reforms which took place in 1924 (such as the Turkish Civil Law, Turkish Penal Code, Coasting Trade Law, Civil Procedure, Law Merchant and Law of Obligations). He also represented the Turkish government at Lahey International Court of Justice (in 1927) over the incident known as the 'Bozkurt–Lotus event', in which a Turkish ship named *Bozkurt* and a French ship named *Lotus* bumped into each other in the Aegean sea in the August of 1926. As a result of the death of eight Turkish seamen, the captain of the French ship was arrested by the Turkish authorities, resulting in problems in relations with France. Consequently, Turkey took the issue to Lahey International Court of Justice and the suit ended in favour of Turkey. This legal case is seen by Turkish historians as the end of capitulations and the beginning of a modern period of jurisprudence based on sovereignty rights. When the law requiring every Turk to have a surname was passed in 1934, Atatürk, referring to this international success, gave Mahmut Esat the surname 'Bozkurt'. He also taught as a professor 'international law' in the Faculty of Law and 'constitutional jurisprudence' in the Faculty of Political Sciences at the University of Ankara. Bozkurt died of a cerebral haemorrhage in Istanbul in 1943. Among his main books are *Lotus Davasında Türkiye-Fransa Müdafaları* (*Turkey–France Defences in the Lotus Case*) (1927), *Türk İhtilalinde Vatan Müdafası* (*The Defence of the Country in the Turkish Revolution*) (1934), *Türk Köylü ve İşçilerinin Hakları* (*The Rights of Turkish Peasants and Workers*) (1939), *Devletlerarası Hak* (*International Law*) (1940), *Atatürk İhtilali* (*The Atatürk Revolution*) (1940) and *Aksak Timur'un Devlet Politikası* (*The State Policy of Aksak Timur*) (1943).

Yusuf Hikmet Bayur (1881–1980) occupied a special place in the history of Turkish politics with his controversial views and strong personality. He served for later generations as a reliable source for a detailed and documentary record of the events of the Atatürk period. Bayur was born in Istanbul in 1881. He was the grandson of Kamil Pasha, one of the late Ottoman Viziers. Due to his family origins, he worked as a teacher in *Mekteb-i Sultani* (School of the Sultan). After the establishment of the Turkish parliament, he became Head Officer of Political Issues in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He served as counsellor to the Turkish committee in the London (1921) and Lausanne (1923) Conferences. In 1923, he was appointed as ambassador to the Turkish Embassy in London and in 1925 as the Belgrade Plenipotentiary. He also worked as the General Secretary of the President of the Republic, Atatürk, for

two separate years, first in 1927 and then 1932. In between these two dates he worked as Kabul ambassador (1928). In autumn 1933 he became Minister of Education and he served in this position for ten months. During this period, he played an important role in the university reforms in Turkey. He became Senior Professor of Indian History at the University of Ankara, in the Faculty of Language, History and Geography, which was founded in 1935. When the multi-party period began, he left the RPP in 1946 because of some disagreements over party politics. He took part in the foundation of Nation's Party (*Millet Partisi*), the first opposition party, and served this party as General President for two years. He also worked as editorial writer for *Kudret*, the party newspaper. He left Nation's Party in 1952 and was elected as an independent Member of Parliament in the 1954 and 1957 general elections. With the military coup on 27 May 1960, he was arrested and imprisoned in Yassıada with Democrat Party (*Demokrat Parti*) members who were in power before the coup. He left political life after being freed under the amnesty of 1963. He then devoted himself to writing for about 20 years, until his death. Among his main books are *Türkiye Devleti'nin Dış Siyaseti* (*Foreign Politics of the Turkish State*) (1934), *Türk İnkılâp Tarihi* (*The History of the Turkish Revolution*) (1940–67, 3 volumes), *Hindistan Tarihi* (*Indian History*) (1946, 3 volumes), *Atatürk, Hayatı ve Eseri* (*Atatürk, His Life and Work*) (1963), *XX. Yüzyılda Türklüğün Tarihi ve Acun Siyaseti Üzerine Etkileri* (*The History of the Turkish Nation in the Twentieth Century and its Effects on World Politics*) (1974).

Yusuf Kemal Tengirsenk (1878–1976), who was born in a small town (named Boyabat) in the Black Sea region, lived for almost a century and passed the last 40 years of his life as an academician. In the Constitutional Era of the late Ottoman period, he was arrested while a student in a military school for not giving away his friends' names. Tengirsenk served as Member of Parliament both in the parliament of the late Ottoman period and the parliament of the newly established Turkish system. In the modern Turkish state, he served in various governments as Minister of Economy, of Foreign Affairs and of Justice. He graduated from the Faculty of Law at the University of Istanbul and then took his Ph.D. degree in the Faculty of Law, Department of Political and Economic Sciences in Paris. After the invasion of Istanbul in 1920, he moved to Ankara and from there, with Bekir Sami, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the time, he went to Moscow as a representative. On 16 March 1921 he returned to Moscow as the head of a delegation to sign the Turkish–Russian Friendship Treaty. In 1923, he was appointed as ambassador to London, but upon the decision that a Member of Parliament and could not also be an ambassador, he resigned the ambassadorship. In 1930 he was appointed Minister of Justice for the second time; however, he subsequently resigned from this post, abandoned active political life and became Professor of Economics in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ankara.

The first books on the history of the Turkish revolution are rather edited lecture notes that are important historical documents representing the views on the Republic of the four 'professor' members of parliament. In this regard, having a look at these books will make it easier to identify the themes handled in the HoTR courses.

Recep Peker's *İnkılap Dersleri (Revolution Courses)* was published by Ulus Publishing House in 1935.²⁸ The book consists of themes that Peker treated in his lectures and each theme title is presented as a chapter title in the book. These titles are: 1. The Meaning of the Revolution, 2. Revolution of Freedom, 3. Revolution of Class, 4. Reactions to Revolution of Class, 5. Political Parties, 6. Types of Political Parties, 7. Different Political Parties, 8. The Working Types of Political Parties, 9. Independence.

In his book Peker handles the military and interior political dimensions of the Turkish revolution and the new conceptions brought about by it by contrasting it with the revolutions in other countries. He especially focuses on the term 'revolution' (*inkılap*) in his book. According to him, revolution is 'cleaning a social structure of what is reactionary, bad and dangerous and replacing it with the new, right, good and useful'.²⁹ It presupposes the use of force where necessary against those rooted and reactionary traditional social factors when realizing revolutionary practices. Peker points out that this is possible only with the existence of a political party (staff) that knows what is good and right for society. On the other hand, ignoring Ottoman history, he criticizes the revolutions of freedom (*hürriyet inkılabı*) in Europe that began with the French revolution and resulted in free speech. For Peker, instead of the parliamentary systems in European countries that made free speech possible for reactionary movements (*mürteci unsurlar*) and gave rise to class conflicts and individualization which may be considered as the denial of the ultimate state dominance, Turkey has its own revolutionary idea based on nationalism, rather than the European Parliamentary Practice.

Another book is Yusuf Kemal Tengirsenk's lectures on the *Türk İnkılabı Dersleri-Ekonomik Değişmeler (Turkish Revolution Courses: Economic Changes)* that was published by the Student Association of the University of Istanbul in 1935. Like Peker's book, each lecture forms a chapter. The first five lectures deal with the economic changes which had taken place from the Ottoman period to the time of the book. The sixth lecture is entitled 'Revolution in Population', the seventh 'Revolution in Agriculture', the eighth 'Revolution in Industry', the ninth 'Revolution in Transportation', and the last is 'Revolution in Commerce'.

Dialogue method is sometimes used, which indicates the friendly class atmosphere of Tengirsenk's lectures. Since the main subject of the book is economic changes, relevant statistics, numerical information and data are presented. In Tengirsenk's lecture notes, when he praises the independence of the Turkish nation, his discourse seems exaggerated in some cases. For instance, when describing the conditions of the 1920s, he says, 'when all the fires of the world dropped upon the heads of the Turkish people and our future existence was pathetically uncertain, with bare feet, with sticks as weapons in their hands, and with not a farthing in the Treasury, the Turkish people tried to fight against the invaders'.³⁰

Another book on the history of the Turkish revolution is Mahmut Esat Bozkurt's *Atatürk İhtilâli (The Atatürk Revolution)*, which was published in 1940.³¹ This book was also the first important publication of the Revolution Institute of the University of Istanbul.

Bozkurt begins his book with the dedication 'To Atatürk' and the following poetical statements:³²

In this book
I tried to tell your work.

Could I?
I do not think so.
You and your work are so sublime;
Difficult to reach!

The book was not published when Atatürk was alive, and in the subsequent statement Bozkurt says: 'I come before Atatürk with a fragmented heart and with a book orphaned and torn to bits and pieces'.

As a matter of fact, Bozkurt designed his book in three volumes. However, during his lifetime he could only write the first volume, which is entitled *The Atatürk Revolution*.³³ If he could have written the other two volumes, the second would have been about the Turkish War of Independence in which, he said, 'extraordinary happenings took place' (*insan üstü hadiselerinin ifadesi*). On the other hand, the third would have been about economic, legal and social developments following the establishment of the Republic.

In the book *Atatürk İhtilali* there is no such thing as a table of contents. The poor editing as well as the multiple references make the book difficult to follow. It jumps from one subject to another, touching upon many issues from Nazism to Fascism, to the Magna Carta and the French Revolution. The large amount of information included in this 500-page book, in fact, shows the writer's intellectual level. However, he is sometimes criticized for not relating events to the Turkish revolution. For instance, an influential socialist writer of the period, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, states, 'Mahmut Esat Bozkurt's book is like a bundle of subjects not connected to each other. He talks about such subjects as life and death, who John Locke is, and so on, which are not related to the Turkish revolution'.³⁴ The new endnotes added to the book, and other additional notes, indicate that the book was intended to be rewritten, excluding some irrelevant parts and including new sections.

As can be understood from the title of the book, *The Atatürk Revolution* focuses mainly on the idea of revolution. First, dictionary or encyclopaedia definitions of the term are presented in a contrasting way. Then, from Locke to Rousseau, Kant and Marx, various philosophers' ideas of revolution are analyzed. And, lastly, Bozkurt winds up the argument by trying to present his own definition of the term. According to Bozkurt, revolution (*ihtilal*) is a movement which destroys, in political, social and economic terms, an old and reactionary system, usually through the use of force, and establishes in its place a new and innovative one.³⁵ Revolutions not only change administrators and the political form applied in the country; they also change the social institutions. The decisive point in Bozkurt's definition of the term is the replacement of the old with the new (*ileri*). If there is no such replacement, the revolution becomes a reactionary (*irtica*) one. In his definition, Bozkurt classifies revolution into three categories: political, social, and economic. Only with the co-presence of these three categories does a revolution become complete. For Bozkurt, the examples in world history for this definition and categorization are the French Revolution of 1879, the Russian Socialist revolution of 1917 and the Atatürk revolution that began in 1919.

When he discusses whether revolutions should be regarded as legitimate or not, his view is close to Locke's, which indicates that Bozkurt sees revolution as a natural right of the nation to use as required. He disagrees with Kant's idea that revolution is

a loathsome movement that may destroy everything valuable in human life – an idea which is contrary to that of Locke. However, like Kant, he too thinks that in some cases the right of revolution is open to misuse.

Yusuf Hikmet Bayur's book, on the other hand, was first published in 1940 by the Turkish History Institute with the title *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Revolution*).

Like Bozkurt's, Bayur's book was not published in Atatürk's lifetime. Statements in the preface to the book, make clear Bayur's wish that he could have shown the book to Atatürk and asked his guidance.

Bayur's *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi* provides a comprehensive analysis of the period from Abdülhamit the Second (one of the late Sultans of the Ottoman Empire) to the end of the First World War. In the following years other editions of the book appeared and to each one new information obtained from recently discovered documents was added. The indebtedness stated in the book to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkish Historical Society, State Archives, Institute of the Turkish Revolution of the University of Istanbul indicate the source of the additional information and documents. Due to the extra information, the number of the volumes increased to three. According to the most recent edition of the book in 1983, the titles of the volumes go as follows:

Volume I: The historical events from the Ayastephanos (*Yeşilköy*) Treaty to the Second Constitutional Era (*İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi*); the ideational and religious conflicts in the period leading to the Second Constitutional Era.

Volume II: Tripoli (*Trablusgarb*) and Balkan Wars; treaties to share the Asian part of the Ottoman Empire.

Volume III: The First World War that took place between 1914 and 1918.

The administration staff of the Constitutional Era (the Sultan, Caliph, and the Unionists – *İttihatçılar*) is harshly criticized in the *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi*, which is an analysis of the history of the events that prepared the ground for the National Struggle. In the book, it is also stated that Atatürk saved at least the Turkish part of the Ottoman Empire.

Bayur divides the Turkish revolution into two periods: the period of reforms in the late Ottoman Empire that Bayur dates to the middle of the eighteenth century; the second period, which he calls the Atatürk revolution, which began in 1918, the start of the Turkish revolution. He conceives the reforms of the first period as limited and superficial and those of the second period as comprehensive, all-inclusive and profound.

By 1942 it became necessary to organize the revolution course into a programme or lectures, train a certain number of teaching staff for it and conduct research and issue publications on it. This issue was raised on 1 October 1941 by İsmet İnönü, the President of the Republic, in his annual opening speech to the parliament. He stated, 'The Revolution course that has been given until now in the form of lectures should be given comprehensively in the universities with the title of "The History of Revolution and the Regime of the Republic of Turkey"'. He also stated that an

'Institute of the History of the Turkish Revolution and the Republic of Turkey' should be founded to do research in this field and to expand the course.³⁶

This speech was regarded as an order by the government; later a draft of a proposed law was submitted to parliament by the Ministry of Education concerning this issue.³⁷ The proposal was accepted in parliament without query or discussion. All the members of parliament considered the establishment of such an institute to the benefit of the Republic. For instance, according to the Istanbul Member of Parliament Alaeddin Gövsa, the aim of the Institute was 'to teach the ideology of the regime of the Republic to students and to present the Revolution in an academic way'.³⁸ Minister of Education Hasan Ali Yücel also pointed out that the Institute would help the Turkish War of Independence, and the revolution was to be taught in a scientific way to the new generation, who were the future of the country.³⁹

With the establishment of the Institute, the courses given until 1942 in the form of lectures by politicians (members of parliament) were given over to the academicians and began to be taught as one of many in the university, though without losing its importance. Thus, in Enver Ziya Karal's words, 'the teaching method that was an obstruction for understanding the course comprehensively has changed in a way that will make the country a developed one'.⁴⁰ There was a common view that with the Institute a scientific method would be applied in the teaching of the course and the subjects covered would include the newly discovered documents and information.⁴¹

The Institute of the History of the Turkish Revolution (*Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü*) realized the function specified for the revolution course by the Act passed in parliament. In the draft, the motive for the proposed law was said to be that the course would teach university students the historical causes of the revolution, the way it emerged, and the realities of life on which its principles rested.⁴² It was also stated that when combined with their national manners and good morals, the things they would learn from the course would help them face possible future social problems with a revolutionary creed and frame of mind.

Professor Enver Ziya Karal, who was appointed as head of the Institute of the History of the Turkish Revolution, stated that the following points would be taught to students:⁴³

1. To protect the country against foreign invaders even in the harshest conditions.
2. To make the nation work in cooperation for the establishment of the Turkish state and its development.
3. The stages of modern Turkish revolution.
4. To protect the structure of the regime of the Republic of Turkey and make it stronger.

The Institute prepared a draft suggesting how the course should be taught.⁴⁴ In the programme framed in 1942, the HoTR course was handled in two parts.⁴⁵ The first part, entitled 'The History of the Turkish War of Independence and the Turkish Revolution', included developments from the Montreux Treaty to the beginning of the Second World War.⁴⁶ In the second part, entitled 'The Regime of the Republic of Turkey', the Turkish regime was introduced and its structure, qualifications and the events that prepared the ground for its emergence were defined.

With the foundation of the Institute, the name of the course did not change although İsmet İnönü named it 'The History of the Turkish Revolution and the Regime of the Republic of Turkey' in the above-mentioned opening speech. In the parliamentary meeting on the law concerning the establishment of the Institute on 15 April 1942, the Kastamonu Member of Parliament, Abidin Binkaya suggested the use of the modern Turkish word 'Devrim' for 'revolution' in the name of the Institute instead of the old Turkish word 'İnkılap'. The Minister of Education Hasan Ali Yücel agreed with this suggestion and instructed that the old Persian and Arabic-rooted words in the Constitution should be replaced with modern Turkish words.⁴⁷ About 26 years after this meeting, on 20 March 1968, the name of the course was changed by the Institute to 'Türk Devrim Tarihi'.⁴⁸ It should be noted that the leftist movements that were increasing day by day in the 1960s were also influential in this decision because the Turkish word 'devrim' is one that had been commonly used to define the leftist movements in the country. This is why the word 'inkılap' began to be used again instead of 'devrim' after the military coup on 12 September 1980.

After 1980, the History of the Turkish Revolution course did not change much in content. However, the military administration of this period renamed the course 'Atatürk Principles and the History of the Turkish Revolution' (*Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi*), which indicated the pedagogical function the military administration expected from it. However, according to the well-known political scientist Bülent Tanör, such naming was chronologically incorrect because the six principles that were called the Atatürk Principles (which are Republicanism, Populism, Nationalism, Laicism, the Policy of State Control and Revolutionism) were specified in the Republican People's Party Congress in 1931 while the revolutionary actions (such as the closing of the convents of dervishes, the reform of headgear and dress, the use of the Latin alphabet, and so on) took place mostly towards the middle of the 1920s.⁴⁹

The History of the Turkish Revolution course emerged as a result of the need to teach the new generation the history and principles of the revolution. In this regard, the lectures given by the four 'professor' members of government in the Revolution Institute of the University of Istanbul and the Ankara University Faculty of Law are worthy of taking into consideration.

In the History of the Turkish Revolution lectures, each politician who gave a lecture reflected his own political view. For instance, in Peker's lectures, the parliamentary system is regarded with extreme scepticism and the need for authoritarian state control is frequently emphasized. In Tengirsenk's lectures, on the other hand, as opposed to the idea of private enterprise in classical economy, the need for the involvement of the state in the economy is stressed and the importance of getting rid of capitulations is underlined. In contrast to those of others, in Bozkurt's lectures, anti-imperialism and the idea of independence are prominent. In Bayur's lectures, on the other hand, opposition to Western domination and the Turkish nation's struggle for independence are treated from a nationalist point of view.

These politicians, who were devoted to the Republican ideals, also reflected their views when handling the Ottoman period with an unfavourable approach. They said that a mobilization of enlightenment should begin, opposed to the Ottoman

heritage, and they underlined the vital differences between the Ottoman and the Republican periods. In their lectures, the Ottoman background that had influenced the Turkish revolution throughout its progression was either touched on only briefly or disregarded. The late Ottoman period was treated in a particularly subjective way and from a strongly republican frame of mind. This was in accordance with the thesis that the idea of Turkish republicanism was a 'break from the Ottoman' (*Osmanlı'dan kopuş*).

The first revolution courses, when seen in terms of the course books used, were quite contemporary; in other words, they dealt with current issues instead of past events. In the study of revolutionary acts the course became a 'political science' as well as a 'science of history'. The contemporariness of the revolution courses continued with the foundation of the Institute of the History of the Turkish Revolution in 1942. At its meeting towards the end of 1942, the Institute's Council of Science (*İlmî Kurul*) came to the decision that the HoTR course books would be renewed in every five years so that they could always include current issues or events that belonged to the recent past.⁵⁰

From the period of lectures to that of university courses, it can be said that the lectures on the history of Turkish revolution served to form a theoretical framework for the revolution and functioned as a type of 'revolutionary training' (*inkılap terbiyeciliği*),⁵¹ whereas the courses after 1942, with the foundation of the Institute of the History of the Turkish Revolution and the Republic of Turkey, acquired a methodological character, became more scientific, and thus began to require proficiency in the field.⁵²

Notes

The author thanks Dr. Süleyman Seydi for his critiques and suggestions in the writing of this article.

1. Concerning this issue, it is useful to observe the presentations at the seminar organized by the Association of Turkish University Instructors (*Türk Üniversite Öğretim Üyeleri Derneği*) and later published as B. Tanör, Z. Toprak and H. Berktaş (eds.), *İnkılap Tarihi' Dersleri Nasıl Okutulmalı* (Istanbul: Sarmal Yayınları, 1997).
2. See *Tarih IV. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti* (Istanbul: Türk Tarih Tetkik Cemiyeti – Devlet Matbaası, 1934).
3. Mango, *Atatürk* (trans. F. Doruker) (Istanbul: Sabah Yayınları, 1999), p.476.
4. Darülfünun', *Cumhuriyet*, 23 July 1932.
5. *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 1 Aug. 1933.
6. B. Asaf, 'Üniversitenin Manası', *Kadro*, Vol.20 (August 1933), p.24.
7. A. Söyler, 'Atatürk'ün Üniversite Reformu' (MA thesis, Ankara, 1987), p.59.
8. When the House of Science was closed, the Minister of Education Reşit Galip stated, 'The ideological framework of the Turkish Revolution will be formed by the university. Every citizen in the country is a student of such university'.
9. Hakan Uzun indicated Atatürk's views about the younger generation by citing the following event from the newspapers of the period: 'towards the end of his *Speech*, M. Kemal Pasha (Atatürk), with his voice become hoarse, stated, "I especially entrust the revolution to the new generation", which made his eyes wet with emotion. Then, he wiped his eyes with a handkerchief he took out of his pocket and got down from the dais to a roar of applause'. 'Atatürk Nutuk'unun İçerik Analizi', *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol.1, No.2 (2005), p.133.
10. F.R. Atay, 'İnkılâp Enstitüsü', *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 3 March 1934.
11. Ş. Süreyya Aydemir presented one of the most prominent views on this issue as follows: 'The duty of the Revolution Institute is to form an ideological background for the Turkish Revolution.' See Süreyya's 'İnkılâp Kürsüsünde, İnkılâp İlimleşmelidir', *Kadro*, No.28 (1934), p.6. A similar view was

- also presented by Nusret Kemal, who thought that the Revolution Institute was founded to serve for 'the Great Ideal' (*Büyük Ülkü*) and that it had no equivalent in the world. Besides, this institute would imbue the young people of the revolutionary period with the determination to achieve the level of modern civilization and end the 'Ottoman nightmare' (*Osmanlı kabusu*) Turkish culture had experienced. 'İstanbul Üniversitesi ve Bir Terbiye Esası', *Ülkü*, Vol.2 (Ankara: Birinci Kanun, 1933), p.381.
12. Tekin Alp's *Kemalizm* (Istanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1936) and Dr. M. Saffet Engin's (who was the Edirne Member of Parliament and of Turkish Historical Society) three-volume book *Kemalizm İnkılabının Prensipleri* (Istanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1937–38) are particularly noteworthy regarding this issue.
 13. T. Feyzioglu, 'Ana Çizgileriyle Atatürk'ün Hayatı ve Eseri (Kronoloji)', *Atatürk Yolu* (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1987), p.347.
 14. T.C. *Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi (BCA)*, Muamelat Genel Müdürlüğü Katalogu (MGMK) (Catalogue Number: 030.10.142.13.4). This document was sent to the President by the Minister of Education on 5 Dec. 1934. The schedule of the Revolution course that began to be taught in Ankara Faculty of Law and the University of Istanbul in 1934–35 was attached to this document.
 15. T.C. *Resmî Gazete*, 24 Oct. 1934.
 16. Cited from A. Çelikel, '*İnkılap Tarihi*' *Dersleri Nasıl Okutulmalı* (Istanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, 1997), p.47.
 17. *BCA*, MGMK (Catalogue Number: 030.10.8.49.7). In the Written Interpellation he submitted to the parliament, Mazhar Müfit Kansu, the Denizli Member of Parliament, stated: 'Apart from the students, the whole public is interested in and enthusiastic about the courses given by the Revolution Institute in the University of Istanbul and wants to attend them to learn something about the history of Turkish Revolution. However, they are prevented from attending the courses and profiting by them. However the public's desire for following the courses is worthy of gratitude, their being obstructed is equally regretful. Thus, what do the Members of Parliament think on the public's attending the courses? I request a response from the Minister of Education regarding this issue.'
 18. *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 4 Feb. 1934.
 19. R. Peker, *İnkılâp Tarihi Dersleri Notları* (Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1935), p.13.
 20. The first History of Revolution courses can also be said to have begun with the course entitled 'History of Revolutions' (*İhtilaller Tarihi*) in the Faculty of Law, Ankara University, by M. Esat Bozkurt. S. Erbaş, 'Amaç ve Kavramlar Üzerine', *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi* (Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi Yayınları, 2005), p.1.
 21. O. Aslanapa (ed.), *İlk İnkılâp Tarihi Ders Notları* (Istanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayını, 1997), p.9. In his book, Horst Widmann makes the following statements on Zeynep Hanim Mansion: 'This mansion was constructed in 1864 by Zeynep Hanim, the aunt of Sait Halim Pasha who was a grand vizier towards the beginning of the First World War and the wife of Yusuf Kamil Pasha. After Zeynep Hanim's death in 1881, the mansion was used for different functions until it was given to the House of Science in 1909. This building that contained the Rectorship of Istanbul House of Science, its central headquarters and the faculties of arts and sciences between 1909 and 1942 was located in between Vezneciler and Laleli. In this mansion, which became the symbol of the university, the House of Science conferences took place until 1942. Unfortunately, the mansion was burned with all the goods and furniture within it in 1942 and today's faculties of arts and sciences were built in its place.' *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (trans. A. Kazancıgil and S. Bozkurt) (Istanbul: Kabcacı Yayınları, 1999), p.80.
 22. *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 5 March 1934.
 23. As was reported in *Hakimiyeti Milliye*: 'İsmet Paşa Dün İnkılap Tarihi Kürsüsünde, Türk İhtilâlinin Ana Prensiplerini İzah Etti', *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 21 March 1934. The complete version of this speech can be found in Z. Bayraktar and C. Alper (eds.), *Ülkü – a Selection* (Ankara: 1982), pp.184–90.
 24. 'İnkılap Dersi', *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 24 March 1934.
 25. *Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 5 March 1934.
 26. M.E. Bozkurt, *Atatürk İhtilâli* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İnkılâp Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1940), p.5.
 27. Upon M. Esat Bozkurt's death, Nihat Erim writes: 'Both as a statesman and academician he always lived for his ideal, remained devoted to his leaders and propogated his ideal to the people around him.' 'Mahmut Esat Bozkurt İçin', *Ülkü*, No.5, 1 Dec. 1945, p.5.
 28. The second edition of Peker's *İnkılap Dersleri* was also published by *Ulus* (Ankara) in 1936, a year after the first one; the third was published in 1983 as a serial in special issues (issues 18, 19, 20, 21, 22) of *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi*, owned by Birikim (Istanbul). The fourth was published a year after that by İletişim (Istanbul).

29. Peker, *İnkılâp Tarihi*, p.7.
30. The second edition of this book was published by *Altın* (Istanbul) in 1967, and the third by *Cumhuriyet* gazette in 1997 as a supplement for its readers.
31. Yusuf Kemal Tengirsenk, *Türk inkılabı Dersleri* (Istanbul: Resimli Ay Basımevi, 1935), p.56.
32. Bozkurt, *Atatürk İhtilâli*, p.9.
33. After the publication of the first volume, Bozkurt stated: 'Other volumes will follow the one came out today, and, thus, we will try to present our people with a complete, analytical and sythetical history of the Turkish Revolution in a short while.' *Atatürk İhtilâli*, p. 3. The notes of the following volumes which Bozkurt wrote but could not publish in his lifetime were kept in a safe until they were published in 2003 as the second volume, together with the first one. In the second volume, the following issues regarding the War of Independence were covered: the 1908 revolution, Wilson's principles, Erzurum and Sivas Congresses, the dissolution of the last Ottoman Parliament, the new Turkish Parliament, civil insurrections, the constitution, military wars and Atatürk's Supreme Military Command. See M.E. Bozkurt's *Atatürk İhtilâli* (trans. Zeki Arıkan) (Istanbul: TÜPRAŞ, 2003), pp.219–334.
34. Ş.S. Aydemir, *Menderes'in Dramı* (Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi Yayınları, 1999), p.99. Meanwhile, Bozkurt's lectures are said to have been listened to with 'enthusiasm'. *İlk İnkılâp Tarihi Ders Notları* (prepared by O. Aslanapa), p.10.
35. Bozkurt, *Atatürk İhtilâli*, p.65.
36. K. Özturk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının T.B.M.M. Açış Nutukları* (Istanbul: Ak Publishing, 1969), p.330.
37. *BCA*, Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Katalogu (BKKK) (1928 and after) (Catalogue Number: 30.18.1.2.108.45.5).
38. *'Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü' Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Ve Müzakereleri* (Ankara: Maarif Matbaası, 1942), p.34.
39. In the first lines of the book he wrote after Atatürk's death, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, who was one of the four members of parliament that taught the course, writes that Atatürk wanted the institute to be a 'research centre' for the recent history of the country and believed that those who gave the course would be vitally useful for the country's future. Y.H. Bayur, *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1983), p.11.
40. 'Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü', *Ülkü*, No.5, 1 Dec. 1941.
41. In the words of the Edirne Member of Parliament Refik Ince, the divinization of the revolutionary creed took place not by legends passed from mouth to mouth but by comprehensive work of the state, *'Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü' Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Ve Müzakereleri*, pp.39–40.
42. *ibid.*, p.10.
43. *Ülkü*, No.5, 1 Dec. 1941, p.7.
44. According to Toktamis Ates, there was not a consensus on this suggestion. *Türk Devrim Tarihi* (Istanbul: Der Yayınları, 1982), p.3.
45. *Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü* (Ankara: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), pp.23–9.
46. The chapters of the first part are entitled: A. The situation of the Ottoman State at the end of World War I; B. The beginning of the National Struggle; C. Establishment of the B.M.M. government; D. B.M.M. government and the War of Independence; E. Revolutionary movements and political events (from the Lausanne Treaty to the foundation of the Republic); F. The Foundation of the Republic; G. Revolutionary movements and political events (in the republican period); and H. Foreign policy.
47. *'Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü' Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Ve Müzakereleri*, p.62
48. H. Eroglu, *Türk İnkılâp Tarihi* (Ankara: Savaş Yayınları, 1990), p.5.
49. B. Tanör, *Kurtuluş* (Istanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 1999), p.13.
50. Seçil Akgün-Nesim Şeker, 'Türk İnkılabı Tarihi Enstitüsü ve Cumhuriyet Tarihi Öğretimi İçindeki Yeri, 1942–1980', *Bilanço – 1923–1998* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), p.229.
51. Peker's *İnkılab Dersleri* (1935) and Bozkurt's *Atatürk İhtilâli* (1940) should be mentioned in this context.
52. For History of Revolution course from 1942 up to the present, see the following works: B. Tanör, Z. Toprak and H. Bertay (eds.), *'İnkılâp Tarihi' Dersleri Nasıl Okutulmalı* (Istanbul: Sarmal Yayınları, 1997), 128 pages; N. Dogru, 'Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılâp Tarihini Derslerinin Dünü-Bugünü ve Geleceği' (MA thesis, İstanbul, 1989), 100 pages; M. Yılmaz, 'Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılâp Tarihi Dersleri ve Bu Konuda Yapılan Araştırmalar', *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, Vol.16, No.46 (March 2000), pp.313–26; E. Aybars, 'Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılâp Tarihi Durum Tespiti', *Atatürkçülük ve Modernleşme* (İzmir: Ercan Kitabevi Yayınları, 2000), pp.13–24.