

## Paternalistic model of child: a comparison between late Ottoman society and early Republic of Turkey<sup>1</sup>

Kemal Inal\*

*Faculty of Communication, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey*

Received November 11, 2014

Accepted December 28, 2015

### **Abstract**

*Ideal child model of the late Ottoman Empire and the early Republic of Turkey is largely the same and based on the paternalistic notion of decency, terbiye. In this article, it is argued why and how this ideal model of child is reproduced from late Ottoman society to the early Republic of Turkey. The thesis is that terbiye as an old tradition aimed at growing children at home and educating them in schools for survival of the social order based on trilateral power of God, Sultan/President, and Father- is one of the political, religious and educational heritages inherited from Ottomans to modern Turkey. But while terbiye in Ottomans is heavily regarded and practiced in Islamic conception of formal and informal training, modern Turkey's understanding of terbiye was founded on Turkish nationalism having a laique feature formulated in secular patterns. Although there are some continuities and discontinuities about terbiye in two periods, the decisive power of both governments was directed to reproduce the social order by placing the children into paternalistic place of society which shows that paternalistic relations are against the democracy for children in terms of self-determination on their acts and speech since the child has no right to determine his/her life both in present and future in terms of paternalist conception of society, government and education. The method of the study is based on the review and survey of the literature related to speeches by important official founders and some writings of key ideological and political Turkish figures.*

**Keywords:** *Paternalism, ideal Turkish child, terbiye, terbiyeli çocuk, Ottoman society, Republic of Turkey*

### **Introduction**

Both late Ottoman Empire and early Republic of Turkey had an ideal conception of child based on a paternalistic notion of decency, *terbiye*. This article argues why and how this ideal model of child is reproduced from late Ottoman society to early Republic

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is based on a paper submitted at the symposium of “*Paternalismus in der (sprachbezogenen) Erwachsenenbildung*” held by Vienna University, January 19-20, 2012 in Vienna, Austria.

\* Faculty of Communication, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

(e-mail: inalkemal@gmail.com)

of Turkey. The study claims that *terbiye* is an old Islamic heritage, inspired Turkish tradition for raising children both at home and outside of home, and educating them in schools for survival of the socio-political order based on trilateral legitimated power of God, Sultan/President, and Father. *Terbiye* was seen in both periods as a must for people as well as the government in order to create an ideal conception of child. However, to determine a discontinuity between two periods, while *terbiye* in Ottomans was heavily considered and practiced in an Islamic notion of training, modern Turkey's conception of *terbiye* was based on a Turkish nationalism to achieve the Western style of life. Although there are some continuities and discontinuities about understanding and practicing *terbiye* in two periods, the decisive powers of both governments aimed at reproducing the social order by defining and placing children in a paternalistic understanding of society. The study claims that paternalistic relations are in fact against the democracy in terms of children's right of self-determination.

The method of the study bases on the related historical literature survey primarily including some historical pieces on writings of the key ideological figures for each era like Ziya Gökalp, records of some official institutions such as the Ministry of National Education, and archives and speeches by important figures such as Atatürk, İnönü and Hasan Ali Yücel.

The paper consists of three parts. First, paternalism is defined in terms of children based on related literature survey, and then the ideal conception of *terbiyeli çocuk* (decent child) is explained with regard to paternalism in both societies. Lastly, the paper claims that there are some discontinuities as well as much continuity in both societies on ideal conception and practice on child which was formulated either in religion or nationalism.

### **Paternalism and self-determination**

Paternalism, a kind of attitude referring to the traditional power relations between father and children in family, rulers and ruled in politics (Thomä, 2011) means an interfere with an individual's freedom of choice and/or action, even if he/she thinks that this intervention is harmful and doesn't have any benefit for himself/herself (Franklin, 1993:40). In another definition, paternalism is "the interference of a state or an individual with another person, against their will, and defended or motivated by a claim that the person interfered with will be better off or protected from harm", so it imposes people some restrictions by the law such as anti-drug legislation, the compulsory wearing of seatbelts, and in medical contexts by the withholding of relevant information concerning a patient's condition by physicians" (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2002). This conception of paternalism can be traced in many philosophers' works as well as in some policies of the nation-states. To example, Plato (2011) mentioned his paternalistic approach in his book *Republic* where he described a philosopher king who should have the absolute power and has to be wise enough to rule his "flock." For him, this philosopher king was to be benevolent despot who would act for the good of his subjects. He put forward "the view that the people should not only be protected from each other, but also from themselves, not only physically and psychologically, but also morally "immoral" behavior, even if it does not harm others, causes a disorderly soul, which is ultimately destructive to society. Plato thought it was the duty of the state to mold its subjects into virtuous citizens, into the best they could be, much as a father would raise his children" (New World Encyclopedia, 2015). Like Plato, Aristotle, too, believed in a paternal society, but his ideas were based on the belief that there exists and must be a natural hierarchy in society and nature, that means all the things and creatures are subordinate to nature,

animals are subordinate to humans, women to men, slaves to citizens, and children to adults, and that within oneself, the body is under the authority of the soul (mind). He thought that living under the authority of some kind of government acting in people's best interests was only natural way. He advocated the view that the state should not only protect people from physical harm, but moral harm as well. For him, in order for people to be happy they need to be virtuous that should be the duty of the state to guide and enforce virtuosity (New World Encyclopedia, 2015). Another philosopher Saint Thomas Aquinas was in agreement with Aristotle's views of paternalism, that is, the state has the right and the duty to act paternally towards its subjects. "As Aristotle believed that the state was needed to promote virtue and that virtue would lead to happiness (or *eudaimonia*), Aquinas believed that it was the state's job to promote virtuous subjects in order to serve god, which would lead to happiness. It should be noted however that Aquinas did not believe all vices should be controlled by law (for practical reasons) and that acts that harm others (such as murder, theft) should take precedent over ones that don't" (New World Encyclopedia, 2015). This political approach to paternalism was widened towards education later, in order to grasp the true way in training the children. For example, Rousseau claimed a formulation of natural education on which only adults could have true views for the child (Rousseau, 2011). Like Rousseau, Locke, too, granted an absolute authority to adults to fill children's mind which he saw as a *tabula rasa*, an empty intellect in birth (Locke, 2003).

This paternalistic conception of education and child was developed with the progress of capitalism and the modern state. Empire states and nation-states used paternalism in schools as well as ruling politics and social life in order to empower their rule. These political powers benefited from many ideologies such as religion and nationalism as a survival strategy for their countries.

Upon the ideas formulated above, three reasons were asserted to legitimate paternalism from the adult view of point on child: First, children are deprived of rationality, knowledge and experience needed for political autonomy. Paternalism tries to protect children against harmful consequences of their deficiencies. Second, children would see the wisdom of decisions taken by adults in the name of them and approve these decisions' benefit later. In this sense, paternalism is approved with consent towards benefits that would be gained in the future. Third, children are dependent on adults in many ways and cannot care for themselves without the help of adults. Based on the limitation on the freedom or autonomy of a particular class of society, paternalism here is justified with children's deficiencies about their care in the present (Franklin, 1993:40-41).

As seen in these definitions, paternalism provides us with a very large scope in defining the power relations between different social sides. But in this study, we will take the concept only in terms of children to pay attention to the ideal model of child at the context of late Ottoman Empire and early Republican Turkey comparatively, by focusing on two ideologies, namely traditional religion and modern nationalism. Paternalism was employed by these ideologies as an ideological tool to conserve and legitimize the dominant social order. Thus, in paternalism which always operates from top to bottom, based on hierarchic relations between children (the ruled) and adults (the rulers), and oppresses the child's rights, the trilateral power of God-State-Father<sup>2</sup> (of course, all three are male) means a domination on children (and women) in all respects of life such as education, politics and culture. Role models for children in

---

<sup>2</sup> Erasmus states that, authority to govern people must firstly begin from the God and then come down to the prince (Erasmus, 2000), which has been seen by the Catholic Church as a norm that would regulate the social order since beginning of the Middle Ages.

terms of paternalistic relations are God in temples, Sultan/President in public spaces and Father in family's private space. All these role models are regarded as the best way for the child to follow since it is believed that children, because of their so-called incapacities in understanding legitimacy of the social order, cannot decide how to manage their lives. Concerning the property relationships, the child belongs first to the God, then to Sultan/President, and lastly to Father. Therefore, the child belongs firstly to the God in religious societies, to the Father in patriarchal cultures, and to the Governments in nation-states where all these ideological tools can be used in synchronized ways. In religious society, God is claimed as the only owner of child but in nation-states the nation is absolutely regarded as the real and only owner of the child for whom the state would provide him/her with all the modern facilities such as education, health, and culture services. The common point for these three conceptions of paternalism is that the child has very limited rights on decisions for his/her life for future, means that self-determination is absent for the child. All decisions in favor of the child are taken by the Father in family, by Sultan/ government in the political area of country, and by God's representatives on religious matters and spaces. So the child is an object but not subject as an agent, means that they are deprived of rights and open to every kind of regulation by his/her social milieus.

Paternalism is primarily based on patriarchy which has deep roots in traditional cultures and governments where father is the only decision-maker for his family including his all children. This view has been defined first by Aristotle's concept of *patria potestas*, the overriding power of the father. Considering the classical inheritance, in Roman law "the oldest living male in a family had far-reaching powers over all his descendants whatever their age and wherever they were living. These included not only rights over property, but also rights of life and death, and it was the oldest living male or Father who could sentence and execute his own child" (Cunningham, 1995:24). As Aristotle said, a father rules his children as king does his subjects (Cunningham, 1995:24). All patriarchs in history established their authority based on the right to paternity which means that fathers have all kind of property rights on their children.

This traditional conception was assimilated later by Emperors such as Louis XIII of France (1601-1643) who saw his subjects as his own children, and regarded himself as husband of all French people, which means that we are a big family in the world, and God is our father. Thus, in paternalism the King's government was based in terms of the model of unlimited power of father (Thomä, 2011). In this regard, paternalism is very sex-oriented ideology since it is based only on male authority and operates against female's self-determination. While father's position outside the home is very critique, important, and decisive, mother is dictated that she should be located only at home, very close to her children in order to train them in understanding of *terbiye* compatible to paternalism.

Paternalism as an ideology to govern the ruled at all levels of social life is originated from three sources, namely religion from the past to present, traditional culture from ancient times to present, and nationalism in modern times. In point of religion, for example, as said in Gospel of Matthew, "all people, you are brothers, and do not say to anybody my father, because your father is one who is in heaven" (Thomä, 2011:57). In traditional culture and societies, the ruled must always obey to the patriarch in family, namely father since he (father) is the representative of all good manners which direct our souls to the right way of life.<sup>3</sup> In nation-states, loyalty to statesman as the legitimate representative of nation is absolutely demanded by the rulers since all of us, as the

---

<sup>3</sup> Father of the family thought that he had the characteristics of King who was seen a smallest God in life, as a mini model in himself (Thoma, 2011: 28).

ruled of the country, are sons of Statesman. In nation-states the child should be owned only by the state in order to maintain nation's existence regardless of the conditions. Nation-states as modern political forms are considered to have a paternal character despite having a claim of democratic tradition. Following the French Revolution, Danton, one of the leading figures in this revolutionary upheaval, alleged that child must be belonged to the state rather than his/her parents. Danton said: "All children belong to the state but not to their parents...Who can tell me that children driven by their father's egoism do not create a hazard for republic? We have done things enough for emotions. We have to say this to parents: We do not grab your children. You cannot leave them deprived of the national education" (Danton, 2012). This political outlook at the ruled was developed by modern governments in very detailed way in order to achieve a socially and politically harmonized society. The governments today are increasingly called upon to introduce paternalist policies restricting the choices of individual citizens in their own interests and without their consent (Thomas and Buckmaster, 2010).

In the very political discourse mentioned above, national school was assigned to produce this paternalistic model of child formulated by statesmen in order to survive inside the national borders, removed from and against all enemies. The expected attitudes from children to whom nation's future is entrusted is that, says Durkheim (1956), in all schools which are seen as a kind of miniature of society, the rules of state as a modern political body must be internalized by children as a role-model. The state's role-model has been embodied in the writings and speeches by statesmen, in the words of founding ideological key figures and in the archives and records of official institutions that can be taken into account as the views and practices of representing the government.

### ***Terbiyeli çocuk in Ottoman society: religious child***

Ottoman society was divided into many communities called *millet* (nation) based on religious and sect identity (Ortaylı, 2000:13). This system led the state and communities to establish their educational institutions and practices first of all on the ground of religious values and rules which are considered as the only and real base of all life and society. In Ottoman society, political system was very dominant and decisive on the structure and decisions of family. The relations among the state and family were reproduced by a culture of obedience (or loyalty) based on a hierarchical system from top (the Sultan) to bottom (Ottoman parent/people, *kul*). The culture of obedience was a tradition inherited from ancient Turks lived in the middle Asia (Gökalp, 1987) where obedience was an important value and rule for survival of society. The Turkish man (father) praised by tradition had an absolute authority on his wife and children. Ortaylı (2000:88-89, 96) alleged that authority of father in Ottoman family was very limited and Islamic law was very far from giving the title of *Patria Potestas* of Roman Law. But the authority of father on his boys/daughters and wives were available and unquestionable. In the absence of father in family, the big brother had the authority on family members. In any case, the child in Ottoman family has been under the legal control and custody of father. Moreover, the birth of child occurred in a line belonging to the father.

The woman praised by tradition was one who should obey to her husband (*eşine sadık olmak*) without questioning his decisions concerning the familial matters. Child had a responsibility to obey to both his/her father and mother, of course all relatives at the surrounding. Later, namely the decision taken by Turks coming from the Middle Asia to be a part of Islamic community *Ümmet*, this culture of obedience was supported

and empowered by Islam which puts the man in the centre of family relations and determined all familial status according to the dominant position of man. Man as the head of family (*aile reisi*) had a key and decisive role in familial organization. The title of father as the head of family was given by both law and customs and traditions (Belge, 2011:677). All children of family had to be socialized in the framework of family head's general rules and values. Hence historical tradition which restricted the rights of speech and free behavior of children in front of elders got an approval and power from Islamic interpretations in late periods/ in this period (Doğan, 2001:16-20, 26-27). In Turkish-Islamic family, basic principles of education have been founded on *terbiye* which means to have politeness or decency showing a loyalty to Islamic conception of morality (Onur, 2005:106-107). The foundations of *terbiye* in Ottoman society were defined in the context of four main factors: a culture of obedience (*itaat kültürü*), servant of Sultan (*Padişaha kulluk*), religious faith (*dini inanç*), and commitment to the authority of the father (*babanın otoritesine bağlılık*). In Ottoman society every child used to grow by the religious culture, and would have gone to the way of his father after passed to the youth period (Ergenç, 1997:100-101). All these factors have been accepted and used in educational system in very detailed ways. Religious education at the primary level was one of the most important mechanisms in reproduction of Islam in order to create or train an ideal type of human who would be expected to be faithful, obedient to the God and Sultan.

Religious education in Ottoman society was a must for every child to be a good Muslim in family as well as in Sultan's country. The first level of education for child was based on to get a religious faith. Also the role of teaching two behaviors, namely obedience and etiquette was very important and belonged primarily to religious community (Ortaylı, 2000:97). In an edict prepared in 1824, Mahmud II complained about some Ottoman parents who wanted their children to be an apprentice rather than make them learn religious matters (Yücel, 2011:139). Religious or Islamic education was dominant in all levels of schooling in Ottoman society. The education was founded on religious information given by *Imam* or *Hoca* (religious chef of *Mahalle*, district) to make them learn main principles of Islam (Başgöz, 1995:5). The most commonly used method in educating children was to memorize the Quran in the most effective way and read it best. When a child memorized Quran, he used to be considered a well-educated, decent boy (*terbiyeli çocuk*). In moral education, the first aim of the pedagogical curriculum was to create well-behaved or decent children who were expected to be very silent, *uslu* when they were with adults together. But for girls there were another dimension in life where they had to be closed down at their homes and submit to their fates after completing the primary school, *mahalle mektebi* (district or local school).

These schools were organized as Quran Schools (Somel, 2010:22) where Islamic conception determined all content of curriculum and behaviors of school children. As mentioned by Fortna (2005:44-45), Islam officially approved in schools determined the rhythm of everyday life in schools with pray, traditional festivals and holidays. The students were evaluated according to their religious-moral behaviors as well as their academic capacities. No voice of girls at the public space referred to their invisibility, which means a must for a young girl in her future chances, mainly in finding a good husband, *iyi koca*. Destination for boys in life was to follow the father's path but for girls to get married in order to have their own family like all other mothers, means the fact that in Ottoman society in nineteenth century parents wanted children to be like them. Girls would take the manners from their mothers, but boys from their fathers. The girls used to be prepared in the family for an early marriage but the boys would learn all practical works about an occupation with their fathers (Doğan, 2001:129). This means that socialization of Ottoman children had followed the gender pattern either at

the home for girls or outside the home for boys. The places for socialization of children were very restricted, namely home, school and district (*mahalle*). This shows us that Islam in Ottoman society played a very sexist role, which should be considered normal since all Abrahamic religions were based on male prophets' views and ideas. In a book by Canan (2001), it is claimed that there is no need for western conception of human rights for children since the God (*Allah*) endowed their rights to children. The author puts forward that *terbiye* in both schools and at home should be given to children regarding their sex identity because of many dangers like homosexuality.

This paternalistic way of thinking on culture, society, and politics as well as education was current in the late Ottoman Empire and modern early Turkish Republic. No doubt, there can be some discontinuities among two societies as well as continuities in terms of paternalism on the ideal model of child. Both the late Ottoman society and the early Republic of Turkey had some similar concepts like *terbiye* in educating children at home as well as in schools. The *terbiye* was seen an absolute respect demanded from child to obey the ancestor, Sultan/Statesman, or Father. Specific to Turkish culture, it has deep roots in Central Asia, inherited by the Ottomans beginning from the settlement of Turks in Anatolia. *Terbiya* has a meaning of education and good manners in Arabic (Osmanlıca Türkçe Sözlük, 1990), one of the words used most commonly in Quran to invite all humans in the way to service for Allah (Yazır, 2006). In Ottoman society, the fundamental basis of making a decent, well-behave society was by means of dissemination of education. *Terbiye* considered as an education way of individuals and society has also some other meanings such as training, raising, punishing and educating with punishment (Somel, 2010:86). In Ottoman society, *terbiye* had three meanings: Obedience in Allah (In religious terms: "*Allah'a teslimiyet*" – absolute submission to God), schooling of children for State's demands and interests (In educational meaning: "*eti senin, kemiği benim*" – Thy flesh, bone of my), and discipline of/by Father in family (In terms of morality: "*Hayırlı evlat*" – Better son). It can be said that *Aile reisi* (head of family, always father) is one of paternalistic concepts inherited by modern Turkey from Ottomans. This shows that although patriarchy significantly lost its power during the transition from Ottoman to modern Turkey but it was not entirely removed from the public space as well as private settings. So paternalism always needs patriarchy which cannot survive without paternalism.

Therefore, *terbiye* aims at training a child to create an obedient, submissive, and controlled individual and society, which means the reproduction of culture, politics and religion in terms of conservative values. *Terbiye* in Ottoman society was heavily based on three religious meanings:

- 1) *Fear* in front of the God: In Ottoman society the children used to be frightened by adults in order to make them silent and prohibit their undesirable behaviors. Many expressions were used for this purpose (Abdülaziz Bey, 2000:33).
- 2) *Beating* the child by a wood (if necessary) to make him/her a good Muslim: In Quran, beating women and children by a wood, if necessary, is legitimized to being a good Muslim in society. Of course this role in the family belonged first and only to the father rather than mother or anyone (Yazır, 2006). In Ottoman schools, the teacher (Imam) had a long wand to beat the children (Başgöz, 1995:5; Onur, 2005, 2007).
- 3) *Destination*: Children were to follow the way of Father as exemplified in traditional rules.

On the other hand, after Turkey preferred to enter and have the Western modern culture, *terbiye* has gained a very different characteristic that means to educate the child for the sake of national values such as bravery against all enemies, save the country,

think of himself/herself with blue blood etc. In Ottoman society where Islam was dominant in the governmental decisions of Sultan, Imam and Father, *terbiye*'s aim was to train younger generations for being a good Muslim, but in modern Turkey this role was assigned first of all to Turkish national state in order to create a new child model that was defined by the state as *yurttaş* (citizen). For Ottomans, the child should be a servant (*kul*), meaning someone who is in the service for Allah whereas on the contrary, modern Turkey expected the Turkish child to be a citizen so as to protect the country against all enemies. However, this paper argues that both definitions are the same in terms of paternalistic relations towards the child since he/she as a *kul* as well as *yurttaş* has no self-determination, the rights to maintain his his/her life.

Loyalty to Sultan's authority, and his political order was replaced by an ideal "nationalist soldier-citizen" in pursuit of national revenge after the Ottoman rule was defeated in wars and lost many lands in the second half of nineteenth century (Öztañ, 2011:6). This led the ruling power to organize the state in the form of a nation-state where people were no longer to be raised by religious ideology.

### ***Terbiyeli çocuk* in educational system of early Republic of Turkey: nationalist child**

The Ottoman Empire was always ruled by Sultan who was seen as the shadow of God on the earth. According to Ottoman traditions, loyalty to the Sultan had an absolute need in survival of the social system. For example, one of the most important rulers of Ottoman Sultans Abdulhamit II (1842-1918) attributed a role to education to train loyal subjects only for him (Ateş, 2012:113). Everyone in the country used to be expected to work for the sake of the Sultan and if needed, to die for him. Thus, all these matters were formulated in terms of religion (Ergenç, 1997:98). Sultan's presence in a mystical cult of his personality was always issued in all Ottoman schools like the other public spaces. The Ottoman primary school children used to start to shout in the classroom the popular slogan "*Padişahım çok yaşa!*" (Long live the Sultan), a very traditional and ritualistic education routine in order to reproduce the power of patriarchy in all children's hearts and minds. Children were considered and expected as the servants (*Kul*) of the Sultan as well as God. For Saffet Bilhan, Ottoman Sultans called all people under the rule of his authority as *evlatlarım* (my sons), saying that the Ottoman state in a sense had a nature of extended family (Doğan, 2001:9).

The scope of education had massively religious characteristics in primary schools, mosques, dervish, and lodges so as to empower Islamic conception of society. Ottoman children had no rights to speak in front of his/her fathers, to decide on his/her future, and to leave the home without permission of father. It means that they are deprived of self-determination. But the trends of Westernization and modernization in Turkey go back to the last periods of Ottoman society. One can say that intensive political, economical and social relations between the Western countries and Ottoman Empire since 1839 lead to many transformations in both official institutions and social structure of Ottoman. Most particularly, at the ends of nineteenth century when the first Westernization efforts began to modernize first of all the official institutions such as government, military and education, schooling system was tried to be changed according to the new models imported from the West. This was a reformative period in the Empire where many new transformative ideas specific to the West occurred in the minds of modern intellectuals (Kafadar, 1997; Somel, 2010). Above all, the importance attached to the individual rights after the proclamation of *Tanzimat* reforms aimed at reorganizing the state apparatus in the years of 1839-1876 in Ottoman history, paved the way for some modern ideas needed to employ Western method and techniques in the education of children. On the one hand, the problem on how to



educate the child by modern methods is a matter of contemplation, on the other hand the new educational reforms, as claimed by Somel, aimed at evoking emotions of obedience and loyalty among the students' hearts and minds for the central authority. But educational institution considered as a tool in inculcating religious and moral values was devoted to the old tradition (Somel, 2010:25). The first aim in the Ottoman-Islamic schooling system before modernization period was to teach the religious information and values, means that at that time there was a very little place for secular and practical information in the curriculum and courses (Somel, 2010:35). But the need to copy the Western educational systems in order to end the decline of the Empire gave cause for the foundation of vocational schools (mostly military schools) serving to instruct secular and practical knowledge and skills. In spite of the fact that in these schools there was a trend towards modern pedagogical systems in using modern methods and techniques, the children were continued to be trained in authoritarian and disciplinary patterns and practices during the reign of Abdülhamid II. It meant that a very traditional kind of "beating culture" in schools was very widespread and effective (Onur, 2005:386-399). This shows us that during the decline years of Ottoman Empire, though the modernizing efforts aimed at secularizing the educational system which included first of all the schooling of girls and acceptance of modern education methods (Onur, 2005:130), modern and democratic methods could not prevail in the education of children. On the contrary, Republican children had more both the right and the task to speak, criticize and decide in all matters so as to progress towards to the citizen tradition of West. In Ottoman schools all boys and girls used to be educated by religious authorities such as Imam, *Hoca*, *Hatip*, *Müezzin* etc. During Republican period, these religious authorities' right to take part in schools as teachers was forbidden, saying that traditional instructive authorities would not take an official position in the modern educational system. Instead of them, teachers with Western formation would be appointed as only teaching staff in schools. Religious education was completely suppressed in favor of secular and western-oriented education at all levels of schooling. Memorization marked as a very scholastic method in teaching the Quran was abandoned in favor of Dewey's educational conception stressing on practical instruction in schooling instead of scholastic education. But, said by Kaplan (1999:392), Turkish national ideology continued to stress on the importance of submissive behaviors and attitudes for school children. One can say that there can be seen some continuities between two periods in terms of some pedagogical rituals. During the early Republican period (1923-1938) primary school children did not shout "Live long Mustapha Kemal", ritualistic pattern as seen in the Ottoman schools since they were any more called citizen by the government but they would be imposed to read the *And* (oath) every morning before entering their classrooms:

I am a Turk. I am right. I am diligent. My law is to protect younger children, respect all adults, and love my homeland and nation more than myself. My principle is to progress. Be my presence a gift to Turkish presence.

The *And*, a Turkish nationalist oath formulated for primary school children was a very nationalist educational ritual showing the hierarchical relations between children and Turkish nation-state. As a powerful symbolic pedagogical ritual, formulated and written first by Reşid Galib, the Minister of National Education between 1932 and 1933, it continued to be read every morning in the yards of primary schools. Accepted this ritual, the Turkish state tried to dictate their children to whom (Turks), why (love for motherland), and how much (presenting its own presence to the presence of the Turkish Nation) they have to love. Based on Turkish state's paternalistic policy (practice), the conception of ideal type of Turkish child was always designed to

emphasize on love for motherland which sacred values were ascribed on. With the belief in solving all problems faced by the Republic of Turkey by means of national education formulated as a *cultural army* against domestic enemies including the illiteracy of people, namely of the villagers, *Milli Eğitim* (National Education) was embodied in physical and national activities such as ceremonies, festivals, and national holidays for Turkish children and youth (*Mektepliler Bayramı, Çocuklar Bayramı, İdman Bayramı* etc.). Claiming their words, the founders of the Republic also identified what should be the will of the Turkish children, and in addition to this, explained the leading nationalist nature of dominant values for children: courage, bravery, heroism etc. Training the children first of all to create physically a very powerful generation was put into practice in the courses of military training in schoolyards (İnal, 2007:109-111). The officially desired values for children to create an ideal type of child by using these activities were defined at the context of national aims/intentions. All Turkish children and youth had to participate into physical demonstrations of national holidays with a great faith and enthusiasm. The decent child (*Terbiyeli Çocuk*) would be expected to participate into all national festivals and sports, and to learn the needed Turkish national values. Atatürk declared many times that the every kind of sport should be considered as one of the tools for national *terbiye* of Turkish children and youth. But the sport must take a very important role said by Atatürk in 1926 as following:

(...) The sport is very important for us. Because it is a matter of race. It is an issue of reform and clarity. It is a problem of selection and even some of civilization (İnal, 1991:148).

These nationalist policies and practices were declared in the words of the intellectuals and founders of Republic, in the legal and educational legislation, and ceremonies and rituals hold in schools and national feasts (İnal, 2007). Among many intellectuals, Ziya Gökalp occupied a very important position and played a role in creating a very detailed national ideology in order to inspire the founders of the Republic of Turkey during the foundation. He defined national education in the name of *terbiye*. For him, *terbiye* is a role of socialization which would be imposed only by society, which requires operating a system of award and punishment together (Gökalp, 1997:113). According to Gökalp, Turkish child must be well-behaved (*terbiye etmek*) if he/she wants to live in Turkish society but there is a difference between decency (*terbiye*) and teaching (*öğretim*). The purpose of decency is to teach Turkish culture to Turkish children but the teachers in the schools should teach modern practical information. The school plays a role of decency to prevent national crises (Gökalp, 1997:42-49). The aim of decency is the nationality but the purpose of teaching system is to modernize the students (Gökalp, 1997:63). Therefore, while the children learn their own social culture by virtue of national decency, they would study the Western techniques and advanced knowledge thanks to modern teaching system. The decency has three basic aims for him: Turkishness, Islamism, and Modernity. For him, the purpose of *terbiye* should be to educate Turkish children according to a national type that has very deep roots in Turkish culture, Islam and modernity. Therefore, it consists of three parts that are still needed to create a new synthesis of conception on education (Gökalp, 1997: 52, 105-106). He tells in the citation below that the decency is a mechanism practiced by the parent and the state forcefully from the top to the bottom

(...) Each decency consists of a permanent effort which is practiced to get children accept some life styles for seeing, hearing and conducting the things in spontaneous way. We oblige a child to eat, to drink and to sleep in regular times from the beginning of the early ages. We force him or her to be clean, silent and obedient (Gökalp, 1997:121).

For Gökalp, the obligation or enforcement gives a yield after a while. Thus, this becomes a habit in time. The knowledge and values imposed on child are internalized by him or her. Gökalp challenges the view by Herbert Spencer who claimed that the decency based on the rational approach to pertain the child to emancipation was practiced in history and argues that this approach could not be practiced (Gökalp, 1997:122). Based on Durkheim's views, he insists on the thought that the society must oppress on child make the decency successful. For Gökalp, the decency by which society tries to make the child familiar to the social traditions is a sort of representation by socialization. As a result, what Gökalp figures out the decency is that children have to be socialized only within lines of national culture both in schools and outside of the schools. In a sense, the decency for him is something of paternalistic project which conveys its space, field and power in all society. One cannot mention that the children, in this project, have some rights of speech, freedom and self-determination on how they would be socialized in what kind of decency. They could be an object for the current regime only in the context of their duties for survival of society and the state.

The founders of the Republic of Turkey declared many thoughts on children to identifying the paternalist policies as formulated first by Gökalp. Their words, views or thoughts disclosed and embodied the paternalistic policies of Republican Turkey. These policies which targeted firstly children and then women in many ways were so influential on Turkish parents' thoughts and decisions. In addition, these were thoughts formulated as ideal principles of nationalist education. The main goal of this ideal was to create a western-oriented child on the way to modernization exemplified dominantly by the West. This child must be physically *strong*, *decent* in moral, and mentally *intelligent*. In the early Republican period, the sports as a national ritual was employed to create a "robust and strong youth" (*gürbüz ve yavuz evlatlar*) (Akın, 2004), that meant a national body politics for a new generation for the republic's survival. Regeneration in population required first logic of fighting enemies all over the world. In this context, Atatürk intended the children to achieve a destination, a war against the enemies since the country was occupied some time ago:

Turkish children! Pay attention to my last words! (...) You have pride and magnificence. Don't show these to someone! Keep it for your own high energy! If it needs, behave modestly. But if it needs again, show your overwhelming punch! (Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, 1988:339).

One can take these words in stride since Atatürk was a former Ottoman Pasha or soldier and fought at many battle grounds for very long years. It is possible to trace this logic in his many words. To give an example, in one of his speeches he said Turkey needed to have two armies in order to achieve happiness: *A military consists of soldiers and a military consists of cultural men*. He addressed the culture in the social and educational meanings. For him, the children from Republican Turkey are culturally creatures trained in a culture as Turkish nationalism. Therefore, education must be nationalist and teach the children a national morality in all places such as school, family and so on. He explains the decency which he treated it from the point of the relations between the education for children and the future of the country as following:

It is the decency which either causes a nation to live in free, independent, glorious and supreme community or leaves it in slavery and poverty. (Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, 1984: 133).

For Atatürk who called Turkish children to struggling against the people contrasted with national unity, the matter of how the new generation would be trained was very important. For him who directly constructed positive relations between Turkishness, moral and education, modern schools from Republican Turkey instead of traditional

educational institutions from Ottoman period would have played a decisive role in the training of children. But he says there is a need to illuminate first of all the Turkish adults rather than children as following:

We cannot achieve only by training our children. They are for our future. They are men who would form the future. In the event that if the parents of these children are illuminated from now, their children can be useful in serving for the nation and the country. It needs them to be trained in good ways. The parents should believe in the power of training at home. For this, journals and newspapers as well as schools should be distributed into remote places such as villages in the country (Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, 1984:136-137)

Amongst the founder figures of Republic, Atatürk was the most effective personality for children in following his thoughts. As the first founder of the Republic (in politics), the head teacher (*başöğretmen*) of the Turkish nation (in education), and the most famous unique leader (all over the world) in opinion of Turkish people, he declared that the first mission of Turkish child was to fight against all enemies, a very nationalist view ever seen in the country. The basic feature of national citizen to be trained in the schools during the early Republican period was a characteristics formulated within the conception of “*militan*” (Üstel, 2004:323) from whom official authorities demanded many national duties which were considered as the indicators of loyalty and devotion to nation-state and its rulers. According to Atatürk, Turkish children must be educated as nationalist for survival of Turkey but not the supporter of Sultan or religion which were considered responsible of every evil and belonged to the outmoded ancient times. He defined Turkish nationalist child as one who was the most talented in the world ever seen. Because of this definition, he entrusted the Republic of Turkey to the children, saying that Turkish child would be the main owner of the country in the future. In 1922, he declared that the first task of Turkish children was to fight the enemies who were against Turkish Nation, The Turkish State and Grand National Assembly of Turkey. For Atatürk, *terbiyeli çocuk* could devote his/her presence to the national government in order to protect the sacred motherland. All Turkish children were expected to accept Atatürk as their only and invaluable ancestor. In this respect, Atatürk, very special and sacred surname for Turks, is officially forbidden to be given to any Turk, which means a limitation specific to this name. It refers that Mustafa Kemal is ancestor of all Turks. He has another special title Gazi which is given to soldiers who were wounded at battle grounds.

Symbolic images and perception of Atatürk among Turkish children as well as adults have been based on some understandings in terms of paternalism. The first is inaccessibility. For example, kissing Atatürk’s hands, a very traditional attitude expectation from Turkish or Ottoman children, was considered as a moment for a Turkish child to reach very difficult but the most precarious moment that will be remembered for lifelong (Sönmez, 2004). The second is a child-friendly conception of Atatürk. He was commemorated first and the only leader who presented a gift, national festival to both Turkish and all children of the world (*23 Nisan Ulusal Egemenlik ve Çocuk Bayramı*). The third is name of fatherhood. Atatürk’s first two names (Mustafa and Kemal) would be given to many Turkish children to show a sense of loyalty to him and his thoughts.

As having many titles such as the second man of the regime, former officer and president, and very close friend of Atatürk, former Pasha İsmet İnönü (1884-1973) suggested that the actual morality for Turkish children was patriotism. For him, all Turkish children must always fight against enemies, no matter of what the conditions are for them. They should be educated first and only by Turkish teachers very well to

defend the country. Ideal Turkish child is one who must be a combatant boy like soldiers on the battle ground. İnönü's very patriotic thoughts were taken further by Kazım Karabekir (1882-1948), religious-oriented Pasha<sup>4</sup> of Turkish army and chief of general staff. He demanded *Talim ve Terbiye*, a traditional conception of discipline in order to create a children's army. For this, he wrote an anthem for children (İnal, 2007). During his military mission, he was influenced to see poor, neglected and uncared children. After the war, he founded a child town where these children lived, aimed at encamping with them (Karabekir, 2015). Hasan Ali Yücel (1897-1961), the legendary minister of National Education between the years of 1938 and 46, said that in contemporary society educational and moral duties became more important but these should be carried out in collaboration with the family and the state. He used *terbiye* instead of education (*eğitim*) given by the state. For him, the Turkish parent should submit their children to the state in order to create a good citizen and human (Yücel, 2011:133, 137, 142). He idealized Turkish child in very detailed way, paying attention to the Turkish children's having not bad habits like lying, gambling, etc. (İnal, 2007:110) to show the good mood and nature of Turkish children as below:

- 1) Turkish child is truthful. He/she hates to tell lies.
- 2) He/she willingly obeys to the laws of Turkish state, the moral rules of Turkish society and the regulations in school.
- 3) His/her teacher, too, like his/her parents, is faithful to the Turkish customs and venerates his/her teacher.
- 4) He/she keeps in mind that he/she is a Turkish Nation and Republic's own child. He/she obeys the dignity, honor, health and rights of it. He/she acts appropriate for the rules of good manners asked by social life. He/she protects the national properties and the sacred school where he/she was taught.
- 5) He/she does not damage his/her health and power devoted to the service for motherland and nation by poisonous and harmful materials.
- 6) He/she avoids to gambling.
- 7) He/she spends his/her leisure times in good places such as family, recreation grounds, people's houses, rural areas and theaters. He/she does not attend to the bad places such as taverns, wine shops and coffee houses (İnal, 2014:160).

In Republican period, the rights and duties for children were re-defined in many anew organized laws including Civil Law, which can be seen as quite a progressive step compared to the Ottomans. With the new educational system established in primary schools, *terbiye* for motherland and nation in the courses of Turkish, Geography, History, and Civics was tied to be given to children. *Terbiye* means not only teaching in school but also a conservative morality in daily life. It has a commonly accepted meaning, that is to say, "obedient" in the presence of adults, primarily father. "*Terbiyeli olmak*" (to be decent) is still considered as one of the most important virtues in society today. It refers to the desired position for the child in the face of God, the state, and the father but symbolizes to stand for passive position in the presence of adults, namely men.

## Conclusion

This article claims that Turkish ideal model of child from the Ottomans to early

---

<sup>4</sup> Pasha, a military figure, prestigious title and highest degree in Ottoman system of army, was continued to be used in not only modern Turkish army but in social life after the soldiers retired. For example, as noted by Belge (2011), it was seen as a very prestigious title by Turkish people in everyday life. There is a word for this among people: "*Benim oğlum büyüyünce paşa olacak*" (My son would be a pasha when he grows up).

Republic of Turkey is very paternalistic, and is based on the Ottoman/Turkish conception of *terbiye* since all decisions are still taken by adult powers in religious, political, and familial areas in behalf of him/her. Both Ottoman and Turkish ideal model of child was founded on a very native and traditional concept of *terbiye*. The determining factor in paternalistic relations for children in Ottoman State *was* religion Islam. This period was very conventionalist in which the traditional way of living was seen a must for children. All children were counseled by adults and had to follow their parent's way where all of old traditions are still seen as a reliable guide in social life. They had to obey to the father and to be disciplined according to the father's rules and principles in family as well as in all public spaces such as school, army and other institutions. This paternalistic conception is a must for children, and if the children do not obey, they would be beaten by adults in order to redresser them. Thus, paternalistic way of teaching in school and family by means of *terbiye* has been legitimized by dominant ideology, primarily Islamic religion in Ottoman and secular nationalism in Republican Period. In the early republic of Turkey, instead of religion, official ideology of nationalism has been a decisive factor in determining children's way and style of life. This period refers to modernism in politics as well as daily life of children culturally and socially. The modern Republic of Turkey had some new developments differed from Ottoman tradition, which has put the child in center of society and the state, modernized him/her for future of Republic, accepted that the child had a unique presence; and had a conception of national socialization of children. This secular conception draws a very different line for children in their formal and informal lives but, on the contrary, in Islamic period, the God and his representative Sultan have been only role-model powers for children to be a good Muslim on the way of *terbiye* which means both a legitimized way and social destination. However, in modern times of Turkey, children would be expected to follow the national leader's path in order to be a nationalist child for whom the education was redesigned in modern conception of *terbiye* which meant for Republican cadres a new, secular way in social life to be a modern human. So there are some discontinuities between these periods as the determining power on how and by whom *terbiye* would be used as a power to manage the children. But there is some continuity in the realm of father's unfinished authority on his children. This means that democracy is still depended in a way on a weakened paternalism and *terbiye*.

Paternalism formulated primarily in *terbiye* is a still powerful tool of authoritarian states since both periods did not see the right of speech of children as an absolute right, means that self-determination is still a very remote ideal for children. As said by Holt (2000), children have been owned and controlled by adults for all times. This undemocratic ideology was reproduced in many segments of both Ottoman and Turkish societies, especially among poor families, villagers, and traditional Islamic communities. But we faced a new conception of paternalism which, as noted by Dwyer (2012) presented conflicts between parent's demand for freedom and state's view of children's welfare. For Dwyer (2012), this is a category of custody dispute and child-protection interventions in which the parent's demand might appear morally strongest since these parents are not seeking directly to control the life of a child, but rather are engaged in self-determining conduct or speech. So the issue is that parents' custody should not be punished by state or courts in order to form an ideal basis of childhood. But the issue of custody for children should be always in official control to protect them from every kind of abuse. The welfare of a child must be based on his/her self-determining choices on acts and speech for which the parents would be in supporting position.

To conclude, the problem is that how democracy should be accepted as a right for

children in social life as well as in field of schooling. This necessitates to limit the powers of adults as well as state apparatuses much as possible. The way to democracy passes on the rejection of paternalism as an official ideology used to determine children's lives.

### Bibliography

- Abdülaziz Bey. (2000) Osmanlı âdet, merasim ve tabirler. In: Arısan K, Arısan DG (editors). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yay., 2. Basım.
- Akın Y. (2004) Gürbüz ve yavuz evlatlar: erken cumhuriyette beden terbiyesi ve spor. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Ateş SY. (2012) Asker evlatlar yetiştirmek: II. meşrutiyet döneminde beden terbiyesi, askeri talim ve paramiliter gençlik örgütleri. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Başgöz İ. (1995) Türkiye'nin eğitim çıkmazı ve Atatürk. Ankara: TC Kültür Bakanlığı Başvuru Kitapları, Başbakanlık Basımevi.
- Belge M. (2011) Militarist modernleşme: Almanya, Japonya ve Türkiye. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Canan İ. (2001) Allah'ın çocuklara bahsettiği haklar. İstanbul: Timaş Yay.
- Cunningham H. (1995) Children and childhood in western society since 1500. London and New York: Longman.
- Danton G. Sur L'instruction Publique. Available from: <http://www.munseys.com/diskone/7dscsdex.htm?http://www.munseys.com/diskone/7dscscon.htm>. Retrieved on: 2nd December 2012.
- Doğan İ. (2001) Osmanlı ailesi-sosyolojik bir yaklaşım. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yay.
- Durkheim E. (1956) Education and sociology. Fox SD (translator). New York: Free Press.
- Dwyer JG. (2012) 'Parents' self-determination and children's custody: a new analytical framework for state structuring of children's family life. Faculty Publications 1281. Available from: <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/facpubs/1281>. Retrieved on: 29th April 2016.
- Erasmus D. (2000) Bir Hristiyan prensin eğitimi. In: Göbekçin T (translator). Ankara: Öteki Yay.
- Ergenç Ö. (1997) Osmanlı klasik döneminin ideal insan tipi ve bu dönemde çocuğun kültürel gelişimini etkileyen etkenler üzerine düşünceler. In: Onur B (editor). Çocuk kültürü: I. Ulusal Çocuk Kültürü Kongresi Bildirileri. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Çocuk Kültürü Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Yay., 97-104.
- Fortna BC. (2005) Mekteb-i hümayun: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun son döneminde İslam, devlet ve eğitim. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Franklin B. (1993) Çocukların politik hakları. In: Türker A (translator). Çocuk Hakları. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yay., 36-67.
- Genelkurmay Başkanlığı. (1984) Atatürkçülük-Atatürkçü düşünce sistemi. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Genelkurmay Başkanlığı. (1988) Atatürkçülük-Atatürk'ün görüş ve direktifleri. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Gökalg Z. (1987) Türkçülüğün esasları. İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi 3.
- Gökalg Z. (1997) Terbiyenin sosyal ve kültürel temelleri-I. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Holt J. (2000) Çocukluktan kaçış. In: Yılcı S, Aksoy C (translators). İstanbul: Beyaz Yay.
- İnal K. (2007) Modernizm ve çocuk. Geleneksel, modern ve postmodern çocukluk imgeleri. Ankara: Sobil Yay.
- İnal K. (2014) Çocuk ve demokrasi. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yay.
- İnan A. (1991) Düşünceleriyle Atatürk. In: Parmaksızoğlu İ (editor). Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yay.
- Kafadar O. (1997) Türk eğitim düşüncesinde batılılışma. Ankara: Vadi Yay.
- Kaplan İ. (1999) Türkiye'de milli eğitim ideolojisi. Ankara: İletişim Yay.
- Karabekir K. (2015) Çocuk davamız. İstanbul: YKY.
- Locke J. (2003) Eğitim üzerine düşünceler. In: Zengin H (translator). İstanbul: Morpa Kültür Yayınları.
- New World Encyclopedia. Paternalism. Available from: <http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Paternalism>. Retrieved on: 24th April 2016.

- Onur B. (2005) Türkiye’de çocukluğun tarihi. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Onur B. (2007) Çocuk, tarih ve toplum. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Ortaylı İ. (2000) Osmanlı toplumunda aile. İstanbul: Pan Yay.
- Osmanlıca Türkçe Sözlük. (1990) Ankara: Bilgi Yay., 5. Baskı.
- Öztan GG. (2011) Türkiye’de çocukluğun politik inşası. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yay.
- Platon. (2011) Devlet. In: Hasan İ (editor). Ankara: Alter Yay.
- Rousseau JJ. (2011) Emile ya da eğitim üzerine. In: Avunç Y (translator). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür yayınları.
- Somel SA. (2010) Osmanlı’da eğitimin modernleşmesi (1839-1908): İslamlaşma, otokrasi ve disiplin. In: Yener O (translator). İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Sönmez C. (2004) Atatürk’te çocuk sevgisi. Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2002) Paternalism. Available from: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/paternalism/>. Retrieved on: 31st March 2016.
- Thomä D. (2011) Babalar: modern bir kahramanlık hikâyesi. In: Doğan F (translator). İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Thomas M, Buckmaster L. (2010–2011) Paternalism in social policy when is it justifiable. Social Policy Section 8. Available from: [http://www.aph.gov.au/About\\_Parliament/Parliamentary\\_Departments/Parliamentary\\_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11rp08](http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11rp08). Retrieved on: 31st March 2016.
- Üstel F. (2004) Makbul vatandaş’ın peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet’ten bugüne vatandaşlık eğitimi. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Yazır EMH. (2006) Kur’an-ı kerim meali. İstanbul.
- Yücel HA. (2011) İyi vatandaş iyi insan. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yay., 5. Baskı.