

# **Political Goals and Social Ideals: Dewey, Democracy, and the Emergence of the Turkish Republic**

**Charles Dorn and Doris A. Santoro**

## ***Abstract***

Most historical scholarship on John Dewey's 1924 educational mission to Turkey has focused on the degree to which the educator and philosopher's recommendations were actually implemented. By bringing the disciplinary lenses of history and philosophy to bear on Dewey's mission, this collaborative study differs from previous work by illuminating the disjuncture between Dewey's conception of democratic localism as essential to an educational system in a vibrant democracy (a social ideal) and Turkish officials' view of centralized, formal education as a means to promulgate a homogeneous, modern, secular and democratic identity for their new nation-state (a political goal).

## ***Introduction***

Only months following the declaration of the Turkish Republic in October 1923, Turkey's newly appointed Minister of Public Instruction, Sefa Bey, invited U.S. philosopher and educator John Dewey to survey his fledgling country's educational system. Having just emerged from a brutal war for independence, Turkey was beginning a process of rapid modernization under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal "Atatürk," and government officials looked to Dewey for recommendations on how to make Turkish schools agencies of social reform that would advance their state's identity as a democratic republic. Dewey traveled for two months throughout the country with his wife, Alice, and met with teachers and government officials in rural Anatolia, urban Istanbul, and the nation's recently declared capital, Ankara. He filed a brief preliminary report prior to departing Turkey and then a longer, more comprehensive report after his return to the United States.

The historiography of Dewey's Turkish mission has been concerned principally with the degree to which the educator's recommendations were actually implemented. Scholars' assessments of Dewey's role in the development of Turkey's educational system range from Joseph Szyliowicz's claim that Dewey had little to no influence on Turkish schools, to William Brickman's assertion that there is no conclusive evidence that Dewey had an impact, to Zekiye Süleyman's finding that Dewey's recommendations had a significant influence on Turkish education.<sup>1</sup> Bahri Ata, moreover, has argued that Dewey's influence is evident primarily in curricular reforms in elementary schools that featured adoption of the "project method" and the creation of Village Institutes, adult education centers built in rural communities.<sup>2</sup> In addition, scholars have documented the ways in which the Turkish Ministry of Public Instruction enacted Dewey's recommendations regarding rural teacher training and the improvement of the system of teachers' salaries and promotions.<sup>3</sup> Indeed Szyliowicz, despite his contention that "it is unlikely that many changes in Turkish education can be attributed to Dewey's influence," has suggested that pedagogical practices such as drawing on students' interests, learning by doing, and practicing democracy in schools may have stemmed from Dewey's recommendations.<sup>4</sup> Many historians also note that several of Dewey's works were translated into Turkish, with one scholar claiming that *Democracy and Education* was required reading of all schoolteachers.<sup>5</sup> Finally, Selahattin Turan has argued that Dewey's report, which he claims offered an accurate diagnosis of and prescription for modernizing Turkish education at the time of the founding of the Republic, is still relevant today.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to investigating the degree to which Dewey's recommendations influenced Turkish educational policy, the literature also makes claims about the quality of his influence. Some interpretations suggest that Dewey's recommendations were ineffectual because they did not respond to the "reality" of the new Turkey and others suggest that using Dewey's language enabled Turkish officials to promote the illusion of democracy. Brickman, for instance, characterized Dewey as wholly unstudied in Turkish history and culture, while Szyliowicz concluded that Dewey's recommendations reflected his cultural and political ignorance. Similarly, Büyükövenci has suggested that Dewey lacked sensitivity to the needs of newly established Turkey, writing, "Due to the social and political conditions [existing in Turkey at the time of the Republic's establishment], some of the advice was not applied, such as avoiding the centralized system and giving more autonomy to foreign schools."<sup>7</sup> Equally problematic, however, is the contention by some historians that Dewey's report was used to provide the language for reform without the corresponding actions. Büyükövenci has argued that wholesale assimilation of Dewey's recommendations, unaccompanied by their philosophical underpinnings and commitments, led to failed "imitations" of educational practice. Along with Büyükövenci, Bilgi and Ozsoy have noted that Dewey's work was used as a justification for Republican-era reforms in official discourse, particularly his work on cultivating democracy in schools.

Other historians, however, have viewed Turkey's early educational needs as prompting Dewey to reshape some of his signature convictions. Again, Ata, for instance, has suggested that Dewey's report signals a "reciprocal relationship" between the American philosopher and the Turkish government officials.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, Dewey's reports did sound familiar refrains, yet they also addressed issues particular to the Turkish situation. An example of the former involved Dewey's perennial concern with the professional status and conditions of teachers, leading to his highlighting the need to increase Turkish educators' salaries and to provide a measure of stability in regard to their job placements. An example of the latter involved Dewey reversing his traditional position on avoiding excessive reliance on books for learning. Given the distinct needs of the Turkish people, Dewey advocated for mobile libraries to expand access to books and combat the nation's widespread illiteracy. Dewey's report demonstrates that although he brought his characteristic commitment to democracy to bear in his evaluation of Turkish education, he also was responsive to the material conditions of the Turkish people.

The literature that documents and analyzes Dewey's report and Atatürk's response reveals the conceptual slippage that existed between two influential figures committed to promoting democracy through education in Turkey. It also provides evidence of the problem in viewing Dewey's and Atatürk's approaches to educational reform as merely cultural misunderstandings. Turan, for instance, has argued that "Dewey's recommendations concerning the role of the Ministry of Education and the role of education in a pluralistic democratic state contradicted the policy of the Turkish government."<sup>9</sup> Yet the misalignment of Dewey's recommendations with the Turkish government's objectives can be attributed to more than policy conflicts. Several misinterpretations in the literature on Dewey's visit to Turkey (and the ensuing Turkish response) signal how Dewey's and Atatürk's understandings of democracy cannot be easily mapped onto one another. Yet neither are they in separate conceptual spheres. These misinterpretations can be revealed and their significance understood only through an appreciation of Dewey's social philosophy *and* Atatürk's political theory of the Turkish state. These include, for instance, references to the "sterilized" (as opposed to "purified"<sup>10</sup>) environment of school, the need to "purify and cleanse" Turkish culture as a task of the central government (as opposed to "learning from all the contacts of life"<sup>11</sup>), and understanding "common good" as license to issue directives (as opposed to engaging all concerned in common, cooperative endeavor<sup>12</sup>).

Rather than exploring whether Dewey was guilty of cultural ignorance or Atatürk and his fellow officials were guilty of despotic resistance, it is more productive to consider the effects of these two men's differing conceptions of democracy. Both Atatürk and Dewey advocated passionately for democracy and appeared to be in agreement regarding the purposes of schools in a modern, democratic state. Yet, Turkish policies such as requiring that rural residents build schools demonstrate that Dewey's concept of a voluntary participatory democracy was not the same sort of democracy Atatürk envisioned. Although Brickman's unfamiliarity

with Dewey's philosophy can be seen in his insinuation that Dewey's call for "intellectual centralization" was pandering to the Turkish government, scholars more familiar with Dewey's philosophy understand intellectual centralization to mean something very different from edicts and directives emanating from a strong central government.<sup>13</sup> Intellectual centralization in the context of Dewey's philosophy meant sharing the collective knowledge produced by individuals within a society, rather than ensuring that all of the individuals have the knowledge as dictated by a central authority. As Büyükvenci has argued, wholesale adoption of foreign methods that lack the conceptual convictions that sustain them are bound to appear fraudulent. This paper undertakes a closer analysis of the meaning of democracy for two men dedicated to its pursuit through education while taking neither as the authentic democratic stance.

By bringing the disciplinary lenses of history and philosophy to bear on Dewey's mission, this collaborative study differs from previous work in illuminating the conceptual slippage between Dewey's understanding of democratic localism, as essential to an educational system in a vibrant democracy, and Turkish officials' view of centralized, formal education as a means to promulgate a homogeneous, modern, secular and democratic identity for their new nation-state. Although Dewey concurred with Turkish officials that the goal of Turkey's educational system was to contribute to that nation's development into a "vital, free, independent, and lay republic in full membership in the circle of civilized states," he nevertheless warned against "the evils" associated with centralization and bureaucratization. "There is a danger," Dewey wrote, "that too much and too highly centralized activity on the part of the Ministry [of Public Instruction] will stifle local interest and initiative, prevent local communities taking the responsibilities which they should take; and produce too uniform a system of education, not flexibly adapted to the varying degrees of different localities."<sup>14</sup> For Dewey, the social ideal of democracy required that local entities shape the emerging democratic republic. Only by bringing decision-making to the local level and embracing the pluralist character of Turkish society, according to Dewey, could the Turks be educated in a truly democratic manner while being prepared to participate in democratic government.

Dewey's support for pluralism, however, was antithetical to Turkish officials' primary objectives, as they saw them, of insuring the territorial integrity of their new country, securing their people's sovereignty in a modern democratic state, and defining "Turk" and "Turkey" in the context of the failed multi-ethnic and multiconfessional Ottoman Empire. Considering formal education central to their nation's transformation, ministerial officials sought to standardize, rationalize, and centralize schooling, employing a Weberian approach to modernization that was, they believed, incompatible with pluralism and local control.<sup>15</sup> Turkish officials' political goal was for the strong central government to usher their newly constructed nation-state into a modern era, aligned with the West and guided by the principles of its Enlightenment.

Few English-language scholars outside Turkey have focused on the role of education in the formation of modern Turkey—a surprising weakness given the significance Turkish leaders have historically ascribed to their country's educational institutions. Formal education, in particular, has not received the meaningful attention it deserves.<sup>16</sup> As founder and first president of the Turkish Republic, Atatürk assigned tremendous importance to Turkish schools in ushering in the era of modernity and secularism that he envisioned. For instance, he took the title of “Teacher of the Turks” and declared to his nation’s newly formed Grand National Assembly in 1924 that the Republic’s survival relied almost completely on expanding educational opportunities and eliminating illiteracy in both rural and urban areas. Yet to achieve these objectives Republican leaders imposed a degree of hierarchical governance as well as curricular and pedagogical uniformity unprecedented in the history of the Ottoman Empire. For his part, Dewey warned that this approach, which was already in evidence by the time he arrived in Turkey, was not developed from democratic ideals and was not likely to foster democratic associations and initiative in schools and communities across the Republic.

Educational reform was a crucial element in the reworking of traditional social and political structures existing in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the First World War, a history that has parallels in the empires of Continental Europe and their reconstitution as modern democratic nation-states. Rather than an historic event specific to the Turkish Republic, then, Dewey’s mission, and the way that it highlights his conception of democratic localism and of democracy as a social ideal, elicits a consideration of the ways in which varying nation-states have transformed themselves into democratic republics, among which Turkey may now be counted.<sup>17</sup>

### ***“The Future of the Republic”***

Beginning in approximately 1300 A.D. as a “tiny, scarcely visible, chiefdom,” the Ottoman state expanded to become a vast empire that included present-day Turkey (Anatolia) and spread west from the Persian Gulf to present-day Algeria and north from the Red Sea to Austria.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the Empire’s military strength was such that in 1529 and again in 1683 Ottoman forces lay siege to Vienna. Ruled by a centuries-old Ottoman dynasty, Islamic religious unity characterized the empire, with the Ottoman Sultan claiming title of Caliph (God’s representative on earth). Over the course of the nineteenth century, however, the empire slowly declined and, although it consistently sought to modernize its social, political, and economic institutions during this time, its defeat as a member of the Central Powers in the First World War led to its dissolution.

With Ottoman territory occupied by the Allied nations beginning in 1918, a nationalist independence movement developed, with Mustafa Kemal Atatürk at its head.<sup>19</sup> Following three years of armed conflict and political negotiation, Atatürk’s nationalist government passed the Law of Fundamental Organization, which effectively served as a declaration of independence from Allied occupation. Atatürk

then led the Turkish government in implementing a series of reforms, including abolishing the Sultanate (the government of the Ottoman Empire), declaring the formation of the Republic, eliminating the Caliphate (the seat of Islamic spiritual leadership), and ratifying a national constitution.<sup>20</sup> On February 17, 1926, Turkey adopted a secular legal system modeled on the Swiss civil code. In keeping with this reform impulse and in an effort to ensure the development of a modern democratic republic, the nationalist government accelerated the reconstruction of the nation's educational system, which had begun earlier in the nineteenth century.

During much of the Ottoman Empire's history, education took place within *mektebs* (primary schools), *madaaris* (advanced upper-level schools), and *madrasas* (higher institutions of Islamic education), with instruction in the first two kinds of schools centering on the memorization and recitation of Qur'anic verses. Structurally, all three kinds of institutions fell outside of the state's purview. Typically affiliated with, if not physically attached to, a mosque, the mektebs and madaaris were established by the community's *ulema* (learned men of the Islamic faith) and financed by charity and the support of *evkaf* (pious foundations).<sup>21</sup> As early as 1839, however, the Ottoman government, under the authority of Sultan Abdul Medjid (1839–1861), issued the *Tanzimat Fermani* (Reform Edict) in an effort to confront the political, economic, and military challenges increasingly posed by Western powers. Designed to adapt traditional administrative structures and policies to Western models, the Tanzimat reforms emphasized both the state's role in providing a modern education to all citizens and education's role in modernizing the state. As a result, Ottoman officials established a Ministry of Public Schools in 1847 to oversee the establishment of a program of modern and secular education that included instruction in the humanities, geometry, mathematics, sciences, and foreign language. Almost twenty years later, a newly created Ministry of Public Education assumed administrative responsibility for the modern, but slowly developing, military and civilian secular school system in which Ottoman officials planned to educate future civil servants and state-level bureaucrats.<sup>22</sup>

As the Ottoman Empire slowly declined, however, eventually becoming the "sick man of Europe," governing officials assigned ever-increasing importance to education in developing a cadre of elites who would maintain the Sultanate's authority while transforming the state itself into a modern nation able to compete both economically and militarily with the West, especially Russia and Greece. In 1869, therefore, the Sultanate issued the *Maarifi Umumiye Nizamnamesi* (Regulations for General Education), mandating further, wide-reaching educational reforms, including:

1. Compulsory primary education (in *sübyan* [primary] schools).
2. A reorganization of the central and provincial administration of education, that is, the setting up of administrative units in *vilayets* (provinces).
3. A reorganization and regularization of teaching methods.
4. Provisions for clearer criteria concerning the promotion and status of teachers.

5. An increase in “science” institutions (literature and natural sciences).
6. A graded school system consisting of the following schools:
7. Primary schools . . . in all villages and town quarters.
8. *Rüşhdiyes* [upper elementary schools] in all towns of five hundred or more families.
9. An *idadi* [a junior high school] in all towns of one thousand families or more.
10. A *sultani* [academic secondary school] in each provincial capital.
11. Men’s and women’s teacher training colleges in Constantinople.
12. A university in Constantinople.
13. Private rüşhdiyes for girls in suitable places.
14. Free education in the sübyan, rüşhdiye, and the idadi.<sup>23</sup>

Although never successfully fulfilled, the Maarifi Umumiye Nizamnamesi provided the framework for reforms eventually implemented in the Turkish Republic. Perhaps most importantly, these policies catalyzed the establishment of military and civilian secular schools from which a generation of leaders, educated in Western models of political, social, and economic systems, graduated. Among these graduates were members of a group of young, progressive reformers known as the Young Turks, along with Atatürk, the future founder of the Turkish Republic.<sup>24</sup>

In July 1908, the Young Turks led a revolution that resulted in significant political reforms being implemented throughout the Empire. Ottoman losses in the Balkan Wars of 1912-1914, however, as well as the Ottoman defeat in World War I, opened the door for foreign intrusion.<sup>25</sup> By November 1918, the British, French, and Italians were in occupation of Istanbul, with the Greek military advancing into Anatolia two years later. Nevertheless, the Ottoman victory against combined British and French forces in the Gallipoli Campaign (known in Turkish as *Çanakkale Savaşları*) during World War I provided a symbol of Turkish nationalism around which Turks rallied and elevated Atatürk, commander of the Gallipoli Campaign, to the status of hero. Establishing a revolutionary government in Ankara, Atatürk called for the Turkish people to rise up against the foreign occupation, escalating an already existing guerrilla insurgency and launching a violent war for independence. Three years later, Atatürk’s nationalist army defeated the Greeks, the Allies evacuated Istanbul, and on October 29, 1923, Atatürk declared the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, with Ankara as its capital and Atatürk as its first president.<sup>26</sup>

Although the proclamation of the Turkish Republic marked a moment of significant success in Atatürk’s efforts to lead his nation to independence, it also posed a dilemma. A disciple of Western Enlightenment ideals, Atatürk embraced the concept of the sovereignty of the people, leading him to (among other acts intended to foster democracy) establish a Grand National Assembly as Turkey’s representative governing body. As biographer Andrew Mango writes, however, given Atatürk’s practical experience as a military commander, the opposition he confronted from defenders of the Ottoman dynasty, the threat that spreading communist and fascist

ideologies in Europe and Asia posed to his leadership, and his knowledge of the severity of physical destruction throughout his nation, Atatürk believed that “direct government” by the national parliament was not feasible.<sup>27</sup> As a result, Atatürk and his ministers adopted a centralized approach to constructing—politically, economically and socially—the Turkish Republic. Indeed, Atatürk’s conception of democracy can be reasonably compared with that of America’s revolutionary leadership. As with Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton (among others), Atatürk believed that republican principles were best safeguarded by an educated and cultured elite. According to Mango, for instance, Atatürk claimed that “enlightened people” were best suited to establish the new republic. “In order to make sure that civilized opportunities open up for us,” Atatürk declared in a speech delivered in 1919, “we must speak as masters of the country.”<sup>28</sup>

Educational reform provides a particularly revealing example of Atatürk’s centralized approach to fostering republican principles in Turkey. Even prior to the adoption of the first constitution of the Turkish Republic in April 1924, government officials began the process of reforming education to meet what Atatürk and his advisers believed were the needs of a modern democratic republic. By issuing a single edict, the *Tevhidi Tedrisat Kanunu* (Law of Unification of Instruction) on March 3 of that year, Turkish officials abolished the nation’s centuries-old religious schools (mektebs, madaaris, and madrasas), appropriated the school funds provided by pious foundations (evkaf), and, by placing all educational institutions under the control of the Ministry of Public Instruction, assumed administrative authority for opening and closing schools, approving courses of study, issuing operating regulations, and inspecting school facilities.<sup>29</sup> In place of the madrasas, the Ministry established a faculty of theology at *Daru'l-Fünun* (Istanbul University) and permitted the founding of schools for the training of Muslim prayer leaders (*imam hatip okulları*), although the government maintained tight bureaucratic control over these institutions.<sup>30</sup> As a result, the national government began the process of standardizing and centralizing the nation’s educational system.

By assuming control over educational institutions at all levels of provision, including those administered by foreign entities (such as Christian missionaries) as well as minority groups within Turkey (including Jews and Orthodox Greeks), Turkish officials signaled their intent to use education as a tool in nation building. In doing so, Atatürk and his officers adopted the approach taken by other nations, especially colonial powers, in using educational reconstruction and reform as a way to reorient society.<sup>31</sup> Abolishing religious education, expanding secular educational opportunities, and eliminating illiteracy in rural and urban areas, Turkish officials employed educational reform as a mechanism for moving Turkish society into a modern democratic future. As one scholar has written, “In shaping a modern nation, Atatürk put a special emphasis on education. Schools were in a sense considered as the castles of the modern republic.”<sup>32</sup> Indeed, in his often-cited “Message to the Turkish Youth,” Atatürk proclaimed that “the future of the Republic” lay “in

the hands of the schools and the younger generation.”<sup>33</sup> As a result, the Ministry of Public Instruction modified the nation’s previously existing schools into a system comprised of a publicly funded, five-year, coeducational, primary school course and a six-year secondary school course that included an *ortaokul* (a three-year middle school) and a *lise* (a three-year high school). In addition to these schools of general education, the Ministry developed technical and vocational schools as well as teacher-training institutions.<sup>34</sup> The resulting expansion of Turkish education was so rapid that although the Ottoman government could claim only 2,632 primary schools employing 8,165 teachers and educating 254,990 students in 1913, by 1927 the Republic supported 5,883 primary schools with 11,766 teachers and 385,455 students.<sup>35</sup> It was this rapidly expanding system, which was more equitable and accessible than any educational arrangements that had existed during the Ottoman era, that Turkey’s newly appointed Minister of Education, Sefa Bey, invited John Dewey to evaluate in 1924.<sup>36</sup>

When Dewey arrived with his wife, Alice, on the Orient Express into Istanbul on July 19, he had already achieved international recognition as a foremost American educator.<sup>37</sup> Having spent part of 1919 lecturing in Tokyo and the following two years in China at the National Universities of Peking and Nanking, Dewey was no stranger to foreign educational systems.<sup>38</sup> He had arranged a relatively short stay in Turkey, however, and undertook his journey during the summer months, a time when most schools and classrooms were in recess. Nevertheless, Dewey had ample opportunity to meet with teachers, school administrators, and ministerial officials. In early August, for instance, he talked with some of the approximately 400 newly trained teachers who gathered at their *Darulmuallimin* (Normal School) for a performance in his honor.<sup>39</sup> Dewey also delivered a series of talks, met with administrators at Robert College (the oldest American school outside of the United States), toured the facilities of the Galata-Lycée (considered one of Turkey’s finest educational institutions), and gathered data from U.S. Embassy officials, the Turkish Ministry of Public Instruction, and the Turkish Chamber of Commerce. He inspected schools in Istanbul, Ankara, and the ancient city of Bursa as well as those throughout the Turkish provinces. And although there is some confusion over whether Dewey actually met with Atatürk during his visit, at least one Turkish scholar describes the two men as having had an opportunity to talk at length about the nation’s educational system at the Congress of Union of Teachers held in Ankara in late August.<sup>40</sup>

Prior to completing his mission, Dewey submitted an essay entitled “Secularizing a Theocracy: Young Turkey and the Caliphate” to the *New Republic* magazine, which published the article in the U.S. on September 17, one day before Dewey and Alice departed for home. Dewey wrote four additional essays based on his experiences—“Angora, the New,” “The Turkish Tragedy,” “Foreign Schools in Turkey,” and “The Problem of Turkey”—which the *New Republic* also published, respectively, in its October, November, December 1924, and January 1925 issues.<sup>41</sup> Dewey also wrote a preliminary report on Turkish education prior to his departure, copies of

which he submitted to Vassif Bey (who had replaced Sefa Bey as Turkey's Minister of Public Instruction) and Robert Scotten, First Secretary of the U.S. High Commission at the American Embassy in Istanbul.<sup>42</sup> Finally, following his return to New York, Dewey wrote and submitted his final evaluation.

### ***"There is a Great Difference between Unity and Uniformity"***

Dewey began what he titled "Report and Recommendation upon Turkish Education" in characteristic fashion, observing that only after determining "the aim and purpose of the schools" could the Turks take the steps necessary to develop an effective educational system. "Fortunately," Dewey argued, "there is no difficulty in stating the main end to be secured" through Turkish schooling. It is the development of Turkey as a vital, free, independent, and lay republic in full membership in the circle of civilized states.<sup>43</sup> To achieve this ambitious objective, Dewey proposed fostering democratic dispositions by using the schools to: "1) form proper political habits and ideas; 2) foster the various forms of economic and commercial skill and ability; and 3) develop the traits and dispositions of character, intellectual and moral, which fit men and women for self-government, economic self-support and industrial progress; namely initiative and inventiveness, independence of judgment, ability to think scientifically and to cooperate for common purposes socially." Moreover, Dewey argued, in order for the schools to achieve these ends all Turks, rather than just a ruling elite, needed to receive this education.<sup>44</sup>

By assigning schools responsibility for educating "the mass of citizens" for "intellectual participation in the political, economic, and cultural growth" of Turkish society, Dewey demonstrated that he was of the same mind as Atatürk in believing that education was an essential element in transforming a fallen dynastic empire into a democratic republic. To create such a republic, according to Dewey, Turkish schools needed to serve as "centres of community life," to provide "direct vocational and industrial training," and to adopt a curricular program that could "be modified in different sections of the country" and "be adapted to local conditions and needs." In particular, Dewey emphasized in his report that each school's course of study be "connected with the life of the pupils." If they were not, he asserted, they would "neither serve them [the students] practically nor enlist their full interest and attention."

In addition, Dewey highlighted in the report the variety and multiplicity of material issues that Turkey, a nation having just emerged from a decade of violent struggle, confronted in developing its educational system, including the need to improve school facilities, increase teacher status and pay, expand student access to reading materials, and, for the benefit of local schoolteachers, translate foreign educational literature into Turkish. In promoting the schools' role as centers of community life, Dewey recommended that schools be used as partners in improving "health and hygiene" among Turkish children, especially in rural areas. Among his ideas, Dewey suggested that the prevalence of malaria and trachoma be diminished

through a community-wide educational campaign administered by the schools as well as through the development of a “practical course in hygiene” that would be compulsory for all students.

Of all these concerns, however, it was the question of “the relation of the Ministry of Public Instruction to the school system” for which Dewey reserved his strongest language. Acknowledging that in a country without a history of universal public education the Ministry of Public Instruction was obligated to take the lead in developing a nation-wide system of secular public schooling, Dewey nevertheless urged the identification of a constructive and proper role for the Ministry as being “of utmost importance.” “There is a danger,” he wrote:

that too much and too highly centralized activity on the part of the Ministry will stifle local interest and initiative, prevent local communities taking the responsibilities which they should take; and produce too uniform a system of education, not flexibly adapted to the varying degrees of different localities, urban, rural, maritime, and to different types of rural communities, different environments and different industries, such as pastoral, grain-growing, cotton, fruit, etc. There is also danger that any centralized system will become bureaucratic, arbitrary and tyrannical in action, and given to useless and perfunctory mechanical work in making useless records, requiring and filing useless reports from others, and in general what is termed in French “papasserie” and in English “red tape.”<sup>45</sup>

Dewey’s use of the terms “arbitrary” and “tyrannical” in this passage—and especially his repeated use of the adjective “useless”—reveals the potential that he understood existed for the Ministry to become a bureaucratic straightjacket in administering Turkish education. However, he also foresaw a more administratively circumscribed yet profoundly constructive role for Ministerial officials—the promotion of “unity” within Turkish education. “While Turkey needs *unity* in its educational system,” Dewey wrote, “it must be remembered that there is a great difference between unity and uniformity, and that a mechanical system of uniformity may be harmful to real unity.”<sup>46</sup> Dewey, therefore, urged Vassif Bey and his ministerial colleagues to subvert “the evils attendant upon too great centralized power” by providing “moral leadership” rather than demanding bureaucratic uniformity. “Unity is primarily an intellectual matter, rather than an administrative and clerical one,” Dewey wrote. “It is to be attained by so equipping and staffing the central Ministry of Public Instruction that it will be the inspiration and leader, rather than the dictator of education in Turkey.”<sup>47</sup> Dewey further argued that the Ministry, in addition to avoiding “the danger of degenerating into a routine clerical and bookkeeping office,” should proactively seek to diversify schools and curricula at the local level. By this, Dewey meant that Ministry officials should assign “local educational bodies” such as teachers’ organizations responsibility for administering schools in their communities and regions. Decentralized control of this kind, Dewey argued, would permit schools to adapt to local circumstances and condi-

tions. “Without this change,” he wrote, “the school studies will not be connected with the life of the pupils, and hence will neither serve them practically nor enlist their full interest and attention.”<sup>48</sup>

To illustrate the distinction between unity and uniformity, Dewey described the factors that, he believed, should influence the development of a course of study in a Turkish school. Using nature study as a specific curricular example, Dewey explained how bureaucratic uniformity would dictate that all schools should teach the same topics related to nature study, using the same methods. “But,” Dewey wrote, “the central Ministry should on the contrary not merely permit diversification but promote it, and even insist upon it.” “It would,” he continued:

take the lead in studying the problems and needs of different portions of the country, indicate the kind of topics, materials and methods adapted to maritime, pastoral, fruit-growing, grain-growing, cotton-raising, silk-worm districts, to urban industrial and commercial districts and the special industrial capacities of each region. It would, by means of syllabi, reading and study-courses for teachers, as well as by means of the character of instruction given in normal schools located in different portions of the community, make sure that teachers were well grounded in the special conditions, resources and needs of particular localities, and anxious to connect the teaching of nature study with the life of the part of the country in which the school was situated.<sup>49</sup>

Dewey concluded his illustration by describing how these principles held true for the study of other subjects that might similarly be related to local conditions, including history and geography. Unity, according to Dewey, left sufficient room for curriculum to be adapted to the needs of various regions and their peoples, uniformity did not.

The example of nature study illuminates how Dewey shared with Turkish officials a belief in the importance of education in fostering a democratic republic. Yet it also reveals how they differed in their approach to educational reform. Dewey’s claim that the central Ministry should not only “permit” diversification as dictated by local conditions but “insist upon it,” reflected his belief that local engagement is emblematic of democracy and that its quality is judged based on the number and variety and associations that groups with shared interests have with other groups. As historian Barak Salmoni has written, however, Turkish educational officials “felt that orientations to sub-national geographic, ethnic, and cultural formations—labeled regionalism, or *mintikacılık*—endangered the strong state centre that guarded democracy.”<sup>50</sup> Turkish leaders, and Atatürk himself, therefore, sought not only to minimize difference but intentionally extinguish it through the school curriculum. By dictating the content of curricula from Ministry of Public Instruction headquarters in Ankara, for instance, Turkish officials imposed curricular reforms that sought to “Turkicize” the people and their language as well as their history and culture. Beginning in 1927, for example, state schools throughout the Republic were permit-

ted to teach only Turkish language and literature (eliminating Arabic and Persian from the curriculum). Schools were also required to teach the “Turkish Thesis on History,” which hypothesized that Central Asia was the cradle of civilization, and the “Theory of Sun Language,” which postulated that all languages derived from Turkish.<sup>51</sup> The Ministry of Public Instruction even required that international schools, which were frequently given leeway in determining their curriculum and language of instruction, teach Turkish history in Turkish by a Turkish national.<sup>52</sup> These reforms, according to historian Andreas Kazamias, “were inextricably intertwined with the nationalistic policies of the republic” and were intended to “train a Turk, who is committed to the Turkish language, the principles and policies of the Turkish revolution and in general to Turkish ideals.”<sup>53</sup> In contrast with Dewey’s disdain for social and political uniformity and his promotion of unity, Turkish officials considered uniformity an obvious and necessary mechanism for fostering unity within the new Republic.

### ***“One of the Fundamental Problems of Education”***

In an official Ministry of Public Instruction pronouncement, published under the title “Four Fundamental Principles of New Education,” Turkish educational officials emphasized the important link they understood to exist between democracy and education in the new republic. “Education,” the Ministry declared, is “national, education is secular, education is scientific, and education is democratic.”<sup>54</sup> In many ways, these tenets might be understood as characterizing Dewey’s educational philosophy. Yet the order in which Ministry officials prioritized them reveals the conceptual slippage that existed between Turkish officials’ plan for educational reform and Dewey’s recommendations. Conceiving of democracy as a social ideal that served as a guide for individuals, human groups, and institutions that wanted to pursue the benefits of a way of life characterized by freedom of inquiry and interchange, Dewey wrote that democracy is “more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience.”<sup>55</sup> Dewey’s criteria for democratic life, therefore, were animated by the following questions: “How numerous and varied are interests which are consciously shared? How full and free is the interplay with other forms of association?”<sup>56</sup> In response, he argued that democracy hinged on “pluralism, experimentalism, and consequent toleration.”<sup>57</sup> Democracy was, in Dewey’s formulation, a process, a way of life, and an education in itself, which depended on ends in view, that is, goals both large scale and personal that are shaped, altered, and redirected by the plurality of individuals who comprise a community. In a clearly related and yet somewhat distinct fashion, the Ministry’s plan focused on the schools’ role in achieving the political goal of raising a secular, modern, democratic nation-state out of the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. To that end, Turkish educational reform entailed a highly centralized system characterized by tight bureaucratic control and curricular and pedagogical uniformity.

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey characterized the history of educational philosophy as an effort to balance social and state interests while maintaining plurality. In the chapter, “The Democratic Conception in Education,” Dewey analyzed three epochs he named as times when “the social import of education was especially conspicuous”: the Platonic thought of Ancient Athens, the Enlightenment era of eighteenth-century Europe, and the age of German Idealism in the early nineteenth century.<sup>58</sup> Dewey’s analysis of German Idealism proves instructive for reading his “Report and Recommendation Upon Turkish Education” in light of his democratic and educational philosophy. In particular, his critical reading of the role of schools during the rise of German nationalism provides a lens through which to read Dewey’s warnings regarding the Ministry of Public Instruction’s role and its use of formal education in the development of the newly formed Turkish nation-state.

The problems Dewey identified in German schools highlight the ways in which he believed nationalism could overtake the broader purposes of democratic education. “One of the fundamental problems of education in and for a democratic society,” Dewey argued, “is set by the conflict of a nationalistic and a wider social aim.”<sup>59</sup> Nationalism, according to Dewey, leads to totalizing effects that render education synonymous with service to the state. The problem is not that the state provides the means to education, but that the state becomes the means *and* the goal of education.<sup>60</sup> Germany’s nationalism, Dewey wrote, led to a thoughtful system of education in which education became a civic function unique in its scope and intentionality. Like Turkey, Germany instituted comprehensive, compulsory education that sought to restore the country’s integrity and ensure its political and economic promise. Also akin to Turkey’s Law of Unification of Instruction, Germany “submit[ted] to jealous state regulation and supervision all private educational enterprises” in an effort to control the content of its citizens’ education in its goal of nation-building.<sup>61</sup> In Dewey’s view, however, the nation is too small a unit for the social function of education; that is to say, not all education could or should contribute to nation-building and not all social learning and cooperation could or should take place within the bounds of nation. Dewey’s criticism of Germany’s educational system, therefore, was that “the state furnished not only the instrumentalities of public education but also its goal.”<sup>62</sup> According to Dewey, when the state furnishes the goal of education, democracy is thwarted, because externally devised ends are imposed. Democratic, state-run education would enable local communities to contribute to the betterment of the state and to share in its aims and goals. For Dewey, however, the state’s furnishing of the goals is undemocratic. The role of the state in formal education highlights the differing conceptions of democracy in Dewey’s report and recommendations and in Turkish officials’ political goals. Dewey viewed democracy as a social ideal, one that could not be achieved through legislative action or finalized in institutional arrangements. In contrast, Atatürk and his ministers approached democracy as a political goal immediately realizable through policy and the directives of the central government.

When cautioning against the “bureaucratic, arbitrary and tyrannical” character of a centralized system of education, Dewey employed adjectives that, for him, ran counter to democratic association and hindered the social ends of education—meaningful, deliberate, and independently initiated human interaction and experience.<sup>63</sup> For the most part, however, Dewey remained silent on the Turkish government’s nationalist agenda. Indeed, despite Dewey’s suspicion of nationalism in any context, it would be an error to think that he advocated a stateless community. Rather, he believed that a democratic state should recognize its place as preserver of plurality and be vigilant against supplanting national or state ends for social ends. “Not that the state isn’t upon the whole a respectable and needed institution,” Dewey wrote in an essay published in the *New Republic* three years prior to his Turkish mission, “but that to become state-minded instead of socially minded is to become a fanatic, a monomaniac, and thus to lose all sense of what the state is.” He continued:

For a state which shall give play to diversity of human powers is a state in which the multitude of human groups and associations do *not* dissolve. It is a mechanism, up to the present a rather clumsy one, for arranging terms of interplay among the indefinite diversity of groups in which men associate and through active participation they become socially minded.<sup>64</sup>

In Dewey’s formulation, then, efforts on behalf of states to ensure equality, even when redressing situations in which inequity reigned, were not democratic if plurality and interchange between groups were suppressed. Plurality, for Dewey, was present in all social situations, that is, always and everywhere. The question was not whether plurality existed, but if and how it was enabled to flourish and contribute to shared, provisional understandings that were essential to democratic life. There was never a singular society, for Dewey, but a “plurality of societies” made up of human groups that share interests, experiences, and ends.<sup>65</sup> Accordingly, in Dewey’s vision of democracy individuals and their attendant plurality shape the groups in which they are members and the institutions that they create and utilize. For Atatürk and his ministers, however, democracy’s watchword was equality, not plurality. Barak Salmoni has quoted the “father” of republican Turkish educational thought and practice, Ismail Hakki Baltacioglu, as describing democracy in Turkey as “the statification [*devletleşimi*] of equality.”<sup>66</sup> The Turkish state, for instance, sought to achieve equality by removing distinctions in “class, sect, race, ethnicity, and wealth” and viewed these efforts as synonymous with democracy.<sup>67</sup> Removing distinctions did not mean merely removing barriers to full participation in society, however. This process rested on the assumption of the benefits of homogeneity and the suppression of pluralism. According to Salmoni:

Prioritizing equality while interpreting it as cultural homogeneity was probably intended to avert ethnic separatism by including all citizens—on condition of abandoning ethno-religious pluralism or self-assertion. Fur-

ther, the requirement of a strong state to prevent disintegration positioned the regime as guarantor of that equality, just as nationalism—embodied by the republican government—was presented as the hallmark of democracy.<sup>68</sup>

Dewey's concerns regarding the antidemocratic potential of nationalism, however, were unlikely to be well received in the new Turkish republic. Atatürk has been quoted as saying that “a non-national educational system was the reason behind the failure of the previous education system.”<sup>69</sup> Nationalism served as a key principle in Kemalist ideology and its instrumental educational reforms. In seeking to build a unified Turkey from the fragments of the Ottoman Empire, the republican government championed equality as the eradication of difference and saw itself as the guarantor of democracy.

### ***“A Vital, Free, Independent, and Lay Republic”***

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey investigated the question of whether state-sponsored schooling could be democratic, asking, “Is it possible for an educational system to be conducted by a national state and yet the full social ends of the educational process not be restricted, constrained, and corrupted?”<sup>70</sup> His answer was “yes,” as long as the educational framework permitted innovation and freedom to pursue the greatest number of associations with other human groups. Equality was necessary in this experience, not to ensure sameness, as was the Republican government’s approach, but in order to permit all to enjoy the free play of intelligence. Dewey explained, “A society which makes provision for participation in its good for all of its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is so far democratic.”<sup>71</sup>

Dewey’s observations of the Turkish education system led to his concern regarding the system’s apparent lack of flexibility in relation to the groups it served. Yet he envisioned Turkish officials both fostering national unity and supporting a plurality of ideas in education. His recommendations, which included curriculum development at the local level, providing financial means for educators and Ministry members to visit progressive schools in other countries, and exchange programs with foreign schools within Turkey and for travel to places such as Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland, reflected his attempts to enable the school personnel to benefit from intellectual exchange and to attenuate the stagnation imminent in centralized control.<sup>72</sup> In both his initial and final reports, Dewey recognized the place of the Ministry of Public Instruction in providing “intellectual centralization,” that is, serving as a clearinghouse of ideas and providing the means to acquire new information. Yet, he also enumerated several ways that “decentralization of practical execution and details” could be achieved in the present system.<sup>73</sup>

Nevertheless, in his description of Turkey’s aim to become a “vital, free, independent, and lay republic in full membership in the circle of civilized states,” Dewey issued a warning even while allying himself with the objectives of Turkish lead-

ers.<sup>74</sup> For Dewey, a democratic society was one that was dynamic in its institutions, ideas, and membership and that viewed change as beneficial.<sup>75</sup> Therefore, Dewey understood the Ministry's demand for institutional and curricular uniformity as threatening to ossify rather than invigorate democratic educational reforms. For Ministry officials, however, achieving centralized control over educational institutions and curricula was simply part of a much broader set of political, economic, and social reforms that Atatürk insisted were necessary for the Turkish nation to become a modern republic. In addition to the curricular reforms previously noted, some of the more dramatic edicts Atatürk issued in an effort to promote social and cultural uniformity included the outlawing of the fez (a hat worn by men and symbolically linked to Islam), which Atatürk claimed "sat on the heads of our nation as an emblem of ignorance," and the adoption of the Latin alphabet, which eliminated the use of Arabic, the language of the Koran.<sup>76</sup> Equally dramatic, and specific to schooling, the 1924 Constitution demanded the formation of a compulsory system of education that would promote literacy among the historically unschooled poor. Even more "radical," however, was Atatürk's demand that girls receive the same form of primary education as boys, resulting in coeducational schools that were, according to one scholar, "a far cry from the days when women's schools were surrounded by high walls and staffed by women instructors or occasionally by carefully selected old or unattractive men."<sup>77</sup>

As described in this essay's introduction, the efficacy of these reforms in "modernizing" Turkish society continues to be debated. Indeed, limited financial resources posed just one of the many challenges Turkish officials confronted in realizing Atatürk's vision. What is not in question, however, is the authority with which Atatürk dictated these reforms as central to achieving his political goals. As Joseph Szyliowicz writes, Atatürk believed that "feelings of loyalty to the new nation and an acceptance of modernity had to be inculcated in the great majority of the inhabitants of the new state. Accordingly, Atatürk embarked on a radical policy of transforming the very nature of the polity and of adopting reforms that would change not only the outward appearance but ideally the mentality and behavior of the people as well."<sup>78</sup> Atatürk sought to make a democratic society rather than to make society democratic. Yet for Dewey, the ends of any initiative were constituted by the means of the reform: antidemocratic means could not lead to democratic schools.<sup>79</sup> A vital republic, in Dewey's view, was one that encouraged and embraced growth, wherein growth could not be predetermined or enforced. Institutions, such as schools, for instance, could be sites where "intellectual centralization" was organized, but the products of that intelligence should never be fixed or static.<sup>80</sup>

For Dewey, therefore, there was no predetermined end independent of the process in which affected members of the democracy were engaged. Democracy was, according to Dewey, an ongoing social ideal that institutions might support but could not produce. It was for these reasons that he advocated localism; the plurality of localities could invigorate and improve the framework offered by the central

government. Dewey recognized that the Ministry would have to take the lead in reforming Turkey's schools because universal, secular education was fairly novel within the new republic. For that reason, he viewed foreign and private schools as places where initiative and innovation could take place for the benefit of government-run schools. "Public schools," Dewey acknowledged, "must be more conservative and follow lines of greater uniformity. Private schools can engage in variation and experimentation."<sup>81</sup> Turkish officials, however, were deeply suspicious of the potential of foreign schools within Turkey to proselytize. They were also uneasy with these institutions' connections to regional adversaries such as the Greeks and Armenians. As a result, the Ministry attempted to control the foreign schools' curricula by dictating the content of Turkish history and requiring that it be taught in the Turkish language by Turkish nationals. Likewise, by assuming control of foreign schools, the government could revoke their charters if their practices were deemed threatening to national goals. Dewey was sympathetic to Turkish officials' distrust of foreign schools and, as a result, urged American schools operating in Turkey to suspend their Christian missions in light of the secular education they could provide in democratic values and scientific methods.<sup>82</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Dewey's belief in progressive reform rather than radical, revolutionary upheaval can be attributed to his belief in the vitality of democratic inquiry and action.<sup>83</sup> Following his mission to Turkey, Dewey recommended maintaining the current educational system for at least a year until further study could yield next steps that would not be capricious. Although educational reform had begun long before Atatürk came to power, and his success was built upon the earlier Tanzimat and Maarifi Umumiye Nizamnamesi reforms of 1839 and 1869, respectively, his approach was revolutionary in his elimination of an entire layer of educational provision. Historian Serif Mardin has argued that the timeline with which Atatürk operated his reform was "now." He explained, "The word 'fossil' (or 'residue')—*müstahase*) was to appear with increasing frequency in the vocabulary of Ottoman progressive intellectuals. It is this sense of unease in operating with a system which was a mixture of the old and the new which appears most clearly in the ideas of Kemal Atatürk."<sup>84</sup> And so while Atatürk and his ministers maintained a vision of the possible perfection of society, an inherently political goal, Dewey described the ongoing growth of society as a social ideal. For Dewey, therefore, reforms that did not include the participation of concerned and affected members could not be described as democratic, even when the reforms were to create so-called democratic institutions. Democratic societies, according to Dewey, change because they are vital. And although they are capable of growth, they will necessarily be imperfect.

Throughout his trip, Turkish reporters asked Dewey what system of education was needed for a democracy.<sup>85</sup> Yet Dewey's conception of democracy and education could not be manifested in an institutionalized system or legislated procedure of any

sort.<sup>86</sup> While Dewey claimed that he agreed with Turkish officials upon “the main end to be secured by the educational system of Turkey,” his vision of a democratic society and education were imperfectly aligned with Atatürk’s political objectives. Rather than reading Dewey’s report as either ineffectual or culturally ignorant, however, the difference is better understood by examining Dewey’s and Turkish Ministry officials’ approaches to democracy. Dewey’s elaboration of the criteria for democracy and for democratic education reveals the point of this conceptual slippage. According to Dewey: 1) Democracy is a social ideal; it cannot be conflated with the institution of government or the concept of nation, 2) Democracy involves enabling plurality rather than enforcing equality, and 3) Democratic entities are vital; they grow and change and always exceed their original aims or ends.

Aware of the challenges Turkey faced in advancing universal, secular education in a country where illiteracy was the norm, schools were primarily religious, and rural districts might have no formal schooling in place, Dewey understood that the central government would need to be a guiding force in educational reform. “It is obvious,” Dewey wrote, “that in a country which has not had a general system of public education, and where the aim is to develop a system, in fact and not just on paper, of universal and compulsory public education, where most of the communities are still ignorant as to the kind of education, and of teachers required, the Ministry of Education must take the lead.”<sup>87</sup> Yet Dewey was concerned that nationalism and centralization would result in antidemocratic practices, namely, the suppression of plurality and the promotion of a society that could not grow beyond predetermined ends. Although Dewey wrote stridently against nationalism in the United States and Europe, he was more circumspect in his assessment of Turkey’s situation. He acknowledged the history of destructive foreign involvement in Turkey in his writing for *The New Republic* and he spoke of the progress represented by Atatürk’s regime over the violence and schisms of earlier eras. “Nationalism has its evils,” Dewey claimed, “but its loyalties are at least less dreadful than those of dogmatic religious differences.”<sup>88</sup> Despite Dewey’s awareness of the nationalistic project undertaken by the Turkish government, however, he persisted in recommending local control of school administration, curriculum, and budgets.

Dewey’s stance in opposition to uniformity contrasted with Turkish leaders’ efforts in establishing a coherent state. Ministerial officials saw themselves as pillars of the modern state (as Max Weber wrote of the “trained official”) and found in a centralized bureaucracy the mechanism through which to rationalize Turkish education. The democratic localism that Dewey promoted, therefore, with its emphasis on diversity, pluralism, and local authority, simply did not fit within this worldview. Indeed, rather than reflecting the elements of a stable, organized system of education, these qualities were understood by Turkish officials as unpredictable and open to volatility. Given the Turkish officials’ immediate political goal, such unpredictability was not something they were willing to risk. As a result, Turkish educational reforms produced a highly centralized, tightly controlled system best characterized

by a high degree of uniformity. Given Dewey's experience with the ever-increasing centralization, bureaucratization, and standardization of public schooling in the United States, however, Dewey privileged local autonomy over the centralization of educational authority in fostering Turkish students' civic-mindedness as well as their participation in the development of Turkey into a modern nation-state.

## Notes

1. Szyliowicz, *Education and Modernization*, 206; Brickman, "The Turkish Cultural and Educational Revolution," 14; Süleyman, *A Study*, 70.
2. Ata, "The Influence of an American Educator."
3. Büyükövenci, "John Dewey's Impact," 395-96; Celenk, "Secularization Process," 105.
4. Szyliowicz, *Education and Modernization*, 266.
5. Süleyman, *A Study*, 70.
6. Turan, "John Dewey's Report," 543-55.
7. Büyükövenci, "John Dewey's Impact," 397.
8. Ata, "The Influence of an American Educator," 130.
9. Turan, "John Dewey's Report," 552.
10. Regarding the "special environment" of schools, Dewey links the quality "purified" with "simplified" and "balancing/steadying/broadening." See *Democracy and Education*, 19-20.
11. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 360.
12. Bilgi and Özsoy, "John Dewey's Travelings," 160-61.
13. Brickman, "The Turkish Cultural and Educational Revolution," 11.
14. Dewey, "Report and Recommendation," 279.
15. Biesta and Miedema, "Dewey in Europe," 19.
16. Bernard Lewis's classic text, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, for instance, provides only a cursory examination Turkish education. Similarly, Michael Meeker's recent and otherwise detailed study of the Turkish district, *Of and the historic province, Trabzon* offers little insight into the role of formal education in these regions' journeys towards modernity.
17. After decades of struggling to implement the Kemalist approach, including recurring periods of military dictatorship, there is wide consensus that what is happening in contemporary Turkey is vibrant democracy. The current government is led by a political party which is not a direct descendant of Atatürk's, which enjoys widespread support and often reflects more popular sentiment and traditional social values than its predecessors, and which exhibits the consensus building among a range of societal factions that is typical of Western-style democracies.
18. Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire*, 13.
19. On the history of the Ottoman Empire, see Inalcik, *The Ottoman Empire*; Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*; Goodwin, *Lords of the Horizons*; Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire*; and Finkel, *Osmans Dream*, among others.
20. Scholarship on Turkish political and economic reforms is extensive. See, for instance, Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*; Meeker, *A Nation of Empire*; and Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, among others.
21. Mardin, "Religion and Secularism in Turkey," 196-97.
22. Bilgi and Özsoy, "John Dewey's Travelings," 158-59; Shaw and Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 2: 106-13.

23. Kazamias, *Education and the Quest for Modernity*, 63.
24. On the Young Turk movement as well as the military's role in seeking reforms, see Kayali, *Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism*; and Turfan, *Rise of the Young Turks: Politics, among others*.
25. On the decline of the Ottoman Empire, see Quatert, *The Ottoman Empire*; McCarthy, *The Ottoman Peoples*; and Hanioğlu, *A Brief History*, among others.
26. Finkel, *Osman's Dream*, 536-45.
27. Mango, *Atatürk*, 361-66.
28. Ibid., 262.
29. Winter, "The Modernization of Education," 185-86; Ozelli, "The Evolution of the Formal Educational System" 79-80.
30. Öcal, "From the Past to the Present," 191-94.
31. For instances of this approach, see Sobe, *American Post-Conflict Educational Reform*.
32. Büyükdüvenci, "John Dewey's Impact," 394.
33. Quoted in Ozelli, "The Evolution of the Formal Educational System," 79.
34. Kazamias, *Education and the Quest for Modernity*, 115-39.
35. Wilson, "Education in the Republic of Turkey," 603.
36. Although Bey issued Dewey's invitation, the mission's impetus undoubtedly came from Charles Crane. Crane, whose support Dewey acknowledged in *The School and Society*, had served at President Woodrow Wilson's request as a member of the Inter-Allied Commission on Mandates in Turkey in 1919 as well as U.S. Minister to China during Dewey's time in that country. Brickman, "The Turkish Cultural and Educational Revolution," 8.
37. There is significant confusion in the historiography as to when Dewey actually arrived in Turkey (an important concern given the relatively short period of time Dewey had to conduct his mission). William Brinkman, for instance, claims that Dewey arrived into Constantinople "about June 15." Bahri Ata, however, indicates that Dewey arrived over a month later, on July 19. Dewey himself wrote to Salmon O. Levinson on May 10 that he and Alice were "going to Europe this summer, Carlsbad & then Constantinople, sailing the 29th of this month," suggesting that the Deweys spent at least some time in Europe prior to arriving in Vienna for the journey, by rail, to Constantinople. Indeed, Dewey's arrival in Turkey on July 19 more accurately reflects the itinerary identified by Robert Scotten (First Secretary of the U.S. High Commission at the American Embassy in Constantinople) in the "Letter of Transmittal for Preliminary Report on Turkish Education" that Scotten sent to the US Secretary of State on September 23, 1924, along with Dewey's preliminary report.
38. In 1926, two years following his return from Turkey, Dewey traveled to Mexico. Two years later he visited the U.S.S.R. On Dewey's international travels, see Martin, *The Education of John Dewey*, especially book 3.
39. Ata, "The Influence of an American Educator" 124.
40. Martin, *The Education of John Dewey*, 337-38; Ata, "The Influence of an American Educator," 124.
41. Dewey, "Secularizing a Theocracy," 69-71; "Angora, the New," 169-70; "The Turkish Tragedy," 268-69; "Foreign Schools in Turkey," 40-42; "The Problem of Turkey," 162-63.
42. Dewey, "Preliminary Report."
43. Dewey, "Report and Recommendation," 275.
44. Ibid.
45. Dewey, "Report and Recommendation," 281.
46. Ibid.

47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., 289.
49. Ibid., 281-82.
50. Salmoni, “Ordered Liberty and Disciplined Freedom,” 88.
51. Bilgi and Özsoy, “John Dewey’s Travelings,” 165; Mango, *Atatürk*, 492-98.
52. Szyliowicz, *Education and Modernization*, 202.
53. Kazamias, *Education and the Quest for Modernity*, 148.
54. Süleyman, 53.
55. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 87.
56. Ibid., 83.
57. Dewey, “Social Absolutism,” 315.
58. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 88.
59. Ibid., 97.
60. Ibid., 94.
61. Ibid., 96.
62. Ibid., 94.
63. Dewey, “Report and Recommendation,” 280.
64. John Dewey, “Social Absolutism,” 316. Yael Tamir, in *Liberal Nationalism*, has argued that the idea of a nation-state without plurality is a fiction: “The era of homogeneous and viable nation-states is over (or rather, the era of the illusion that homogeneous and viable nation-states are possible is over, since such states never existed),” 3. Yet, as will be shown below, Atatürk’s aspiration was to create a nation-state premised on equality, but on the condition of eradicating plurality. Nationalism, according to Tamir, does not necessitate the eradication of difference.
65. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 82.
66. Salmoni, “Ordered Liberty and Disciplined Freedom,” 83.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., 88-89.
69. Gündüz, “Sociocultural Origins,” 195.
70. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 97.
71. Ibid., 99.
72. Dewey, “Report and Recommendation”; “Preliminary Report.”
73. Dewey, “Preliminary Report,” 307.
74. Dewey, “Report and Recommendation,” 275.
75. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 31.
76. Quoted in Kazamias, *Education and the Quest for Modernity*, 187.
77. Szyliowicz, *Education and Modernization*, 208-09.
78. Ibid., 200.
79. In Parla and Davison, *Corporatist Ideology*, the authors discredit a “tutelary democracy” thesis that would support a position of antidemocratic means to achieve democratic ends in the Turkish context.
80. Dewey, “Creative Democracy,” 224-30.
81. Dewey, “Report and Recommendation,” 296.
82. Dewey, “Foreign Schools in Turkey,” 40-42.
83. Szyliowicz understands Dewey’s recommendation to maintain temporarily the current system as emblematic of his misguided and ineffectual report to Turkish officials. He notes that Dewey’s proposal would be “totally unacceptable” to Kemal, 206.
84. Mardin, “Religion and Secularism,” 203.

85. Ata, "The Influence of an American Educator," 124.
86. Although it could be argued that the scientific method provides a framework for inquiry and communication in a democratic society.
87. Dewey, "Report and Recommendation," 280.
88. Dewey, "Secularizing a Theocracy," 70.

## **References**

- Ata, Bahri. "The Influence of an American Educator (John Dewey) on the Turkish Educational System." *The Turkish Yearbook* 31 (2000): 119-30.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964.
- Biesta, Gert J. J. and Siebren Miedema. "Dewey in Europe: A Case Study on the International Dimensions of the Turn-of-the-Century Educational Reform." *American Journal of Education* 105, no. 1 (1996): 1-26.
- Bilgi, Sabiha and Seçkin Özsoy. "John Dewey's Travelings into the Project of Turkish Modernity." In *Inventing the Modern Self and John Dewey: Modernities and the Traveling of Pragmatism in Education*, edited by Thomas S. Popkewitz, 160-61. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Brickman, William. "The Turkish Cultural and Educational Revolution: John Dewey's Report of 1924." *Western European Education* 16, no. 4 (1984-85): 3-18.
- Büyükövenci, Sabri. "John Dewey's Impact on Turkish Education." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 13, nos. 3-4 (September 1994): 393-400.
- Celenk, Suleyman. "Secularization Process in the History of Turkish Education." *Journal of Social Science* 19, no. 2 (2009): 101-108.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Free Press, 1916.
- . "Secularizing a Theocracy: Young Turkey and the Caliphate." *New Republic*, September 17, 1924, 69-71.
- . "Angora, the New." *New Republic* October 15, 1924, 169-70.
- . "The Turkish Tragedy." *New Republic*, November 12, 1924, 268-69.
- . "Foreign Schools in Turkey." *New Republic*, December 3, 1924, 40-42.
- . "The Problem of Turkey." *New Republic*, January 7, 1925, 162-63.
- . "Preliminary Report." In *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- . "Report and Recommendation Upon Turkish Education." In *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- . "Social Absolutism." In *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, Vol. 13, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- . "Creative Democracy." In *John Dewey, The Later Works, Vol. 14: 1939-1941*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

- Finkel, Caroline. *Osmans Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923*. London: John Murray, 2005.
- Goodwin, Jason. *Lords of the Horizons: A History of the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Henry Holt, 1998.
- Gündüz, Mustafa. "Sociocultural Origins of Turkish Educational Reforms and Ideological Origins of Late Ottoman Intellectuals (1908-1930)," *History of Education* 38, no. 2 (March 2009): 191-216.
- Hanioglu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Inalcik, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.
- Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Kayali, Hasan. *Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Kazamias, Andreas M. *Education and the Quest for Modernity in Turkey*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Mango, Andrew. *Atatürk: The Biography of the Founder of Modern Turkey*. Woodstock: Overlook Press, 2000.
- Mardin, Serif. "Religion and Secularism in Turkey." In *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, edited by Ali Kazancigil and Ergun Özbundun. London: Hurst, 1997.
- Martin, Jay. *The Education of John Dewey*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- McCarthy, Justin. *The Otoman Peoples and the End of Empire*. London: Arnold Publishers, 2001.
- Meeker, Michael E. *A Nation of Empire: The Ottoman Legacy of Turkish Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Öcal, Mustafa. "From the Past to the Present: Imam and Preacher Schools in Turkey—an Ongoing Quarrel." *Religious Education* 102, no. 2 (2007): 191-94.
- Ozelli, M.T. "The Evolution of the Formal Educational System and Its Relation to Economic Growth Policies in the First Turkish Republic." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 5, no. 1 (1974): 79-80.
- Parla, Taha and Andrew Davison. *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order?* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2004.
- Quataert, Donald. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Salmoni, Barak A. "Ordered Liberty and Disciplined Freedom: Turkish Education and Republican Democracy, 1923-1950." *Middle Eastern Studies* 40, no. 2 (2004): 80-108.
- Shaw, Stanford J. and Ezel Jural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

- Sobe, Noah W., ed. *American Post-Conflict Educational Reform: From the Spanish-American War to Iraq*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Süleyman, Zekiye. *A Study of the History and Development of Education in Turkey with Special Emphasis Upon the Influence of Professor Dewey's Theories of Education*. Masters Thesis, Smith College, 1934.
- Szyliowicz, Joseph S. *Education and Modernization in the Middle East*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.
- Tamir, Yael. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Turan, Selahattin. "John Dewey's Report of 1924 and his Recommendations on the Turkish Educational System Revisited." *History of Education* 29, no. 6 (2000): 543-55.
- Turfan, M. Naim. *Rise of the Young Turks: Politics, the Military and the Ottoman Collapse*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2002.
- Wilson, Lucy L.W. "Education in the Republic of Turkey." *School and Society* 28, no. 725 (1928): 601-10.
- Winter, Michael. "The Modernization of Education in Kemalist Turkey." In *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, edited by Jacob M. Landau. Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

---

Charles Dorn is Associate Professor of Education at Bowdoin College.  
E-mail: cdorn@bowdoin.edu

Doris A. Santoro is Assistant Professor of Education at Bowdoin College.  
E-mail: dsantoro@bowdoin.edu