

The origins of revolutionary critical education in Turkey

Kemal İnal

Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

This article examines the origins of Revolutionary Critical Education in Turkey from the late Ottoman Period to the present, focusing mostly on post-2000 developments in society at large-scale and in education in particular. The chapter argues that Revolutionary Critical Education is a product of the post-1960 military intervention period where socialist movements gained an impetus towards massification in terms of youth radicalism as well as through some educational bodies such as trade unions. I conclude by arguing that following the emergence of some mass-based people's movements in recent years all over the world, we are faced with a radical situation that allows us to theorise a new understanding of education which should be formulated as Revolutionary Critical Education.

Keywords: revolution, revolutionary critical education, Turkey, socialism, social class

Introduction: Problem and Purpose

This chapter aims to illuminate the origins of critical revolutionary education from the late Ottoman Empire (the second half of nineteenth century) to contemporary Turkey (the present) in the context of different moments, such as historical events, laws, sets of ideas, practices, and organisations, within the framework of a critical approach. The origins of critical revolutionary education in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey are discussed within the selected events, documents and ideas. The two main figures in terms of origins in shaping the ideas, tradition and knowledge on revolutionary critical education in Turkey have been the first modernisers like statesman, bureaucracy, officers, and bourgeoisie in the early republican period and then socialist ones such as teachers, intellectuals, scientists, militants, artists, and politicians after the 1960s. On the one hand modernisers have been influential in breaking the power of Islamic mystical educational tradition on the road to revolutionary critical education. On the other, many socialist figures have criticised the bourgeois educational tradition in favour of a socialist revolution. Consequently, in Turkey, the role of socialist figures, ideas, and practices in the development of a revolutionary critical education approach is indisputably accepted by many. But these figures' role and practice problematizing education has been in the context of the instrumentalisation of education until the early 1990s, rather than founding a counter-hegemony in Gramscian sense or critical education approach. From 1960s to the beginning of the 1990s, education was primarily

perceived in terms of its economic rather than political function. So, education on the road to a critical education approach, which began to take its definite shape in early 1990s, has been seen as a functional institution in various modernizing processes contributing to national development, modernisation, and progress. The first and dominant aim of those who support official education ideology was to grab power through and over education. Until the 2010s neither a “revolutionary pedagogy” nor a “pedagogical revolution” has been a matter of concern by socialist figures, ideas and organisations. On the other hand, a number of those in liberal circles continue to view education as an instrument in creating value in the name of productive labour power, technological innovation, and research and development. The Kemalist left has shared a similar position by viewing education as an instrument towards independence against imperialism and reactionary powers. The socialist left has discussed education in the context of reforms for a long time and reduced it to a sub-agent in democratic struggle.

Periodically, of course, there are also some overlapping moments. For example, in the period 1960-1980 education was discussed by Leftist Kemalists¹ both in a national development perspective, namely under the broad banner of modernisation, and by revolutionary motives associated with socialism. They published academic books and journals, founded political parties and cultural associations, and rallied to obtain the people’s support. Their national revolutionary aims were motivated mostly by both socialist ideology and conventional modernisation paradigm. Leftist Kemalists’ main motive that shaped education in the 1960s was anti-imperialism and independent national development. But as the result of the rising Turkish fascist movement after 1968, the real factor that determined the content and orientation of education in the 1970s was the anti-fascist revolutionary struggle by Marxists and socialists in the country. Yet in both periods, education has been instrumentalised by both Leftist Kemalists and Marxist socialists in favour of either national development or a socialist revolution and seen entirely as a “milieu” for the political struggle. In the period of 1980-2013, some actors and organisations concerned with education, among them feminists, liberal leftists, ecologists, nationalists, social democrats, anarchists, and LGBTI groups, joined socialists in taking a stand in favour of a public, free, democratic, scientific, secular, egalitarian, and anti-sexist education; and arguing / working against the recent capitalist ideologies and processes such as neoliberalism, globalisation, privatisation, and commoditisation. They also defended a set of ideals like justice, sexual equality, and the right to education. Education from this perspective was discussed as people’s public right, rather than being seen as a development tool, and a milieu where socialist ideas were being discussed entered a new path with all feminist, anarchist, and liberal left inclusions by 1980s. In the first period, education in the more structured form was discussed as a tool, to be used in transforming the state but then it has been highlighted in the context of emancipation, awareness and transformation of individuals in public life. The macro-view directed towards the transformation of the state has been replaced by a micro-view with some civil demands like multicultural and mother tongue education in schools. In both periods, the political conjuncture has been decisive in shaping the dominant educational view in alternative circles.

The main argument of this chapter is that progressive forces have been largely responsible for the formation and formulation of critical education, from the late Ottoman period to modern day Turkey. These progressive forces have been named as *modernisers* comprising diverse groups such as liberals, Westerners, and Populists, contrasted with *traditionalists* who are presented as pious dignitaries, politicians and ulemaⁱⁱ in the second half of nineteenth century in the Ottoman Empire; *republicans* (supporters for western-style modernity, those who forged and implemented positivist scientific tradition against the Islamic views, those favouring the modern university against madrasasⁱⁱⁱ or midrise in Turkish versus *reactionaries* (ulema, softas, madrasa advocates et al.); and *socialists* who defended a socialist way of education against *supporters of official ideology* (Kemalists in the 1930s and 1940s and supporters of liberal capitalism mixed with Islamic beliefs after 1950). The political, economic and cultural struggles between all these groups largely paved the way for the ideas and programs concerning education. This means that the resulting system is a result of, settlement from, the struggles between these groups competing views of education. Of course, in this process, the technological-pedagogical debates through and over education were very heated and influential. All these arguments and competing views by different sides show us that education is forged and determined by the demands of political institutions, dominant ideology and mode of production, that means education did not have relative autonomy in a particular period. It was necessary to wait until the 1990s for an educational approach that was formulated as the tool of “the real fight”. But after the 1990s, education found itself in a new route towards critical pedagogy, critical feminist pedagogy and revolutionary critical education.

The last period of Ottoman rule and the early Republican years: The foundation of modern education

The last years of the Ottoman Empire, in the late 19th and early 20th century, were an era of new opportunities and challenges in the field of education. Although in this period the classical educational organisations of the Empire such as madrasas, the traditional schools and Koranic courses survived, many educational concepts and new pedagogical organisations peculiar to Western cultures were also implemented. The resulting set of educational innovations and modernisations from the closure of madrasas inherited from the Ottoman Empire to many education developments such as transition to the mixed-education, foundation of new national Ministry of Education, increasing emphasis on positive science, inauguration of vocational schools, and some reforms based on John Dewey’s reports,^{iv} gained impetus in the era of Abdulhamid II (1878-1908) and included: increased number of practice-based lessons in schools, the foundation of modern military schools and transition to a modern mixed-education, the creation of a new curriculum with an emphasis on positive sciences, new and modern textbooks, etc. However, as stated by Somel (2010: 25), “*Ottoman education reforms largely depended on the ancient tradition which aimed at arousing in students an obedience and loyalty to the central authorities and saw the education as the tool to be used in instilling religious and moral values*”. The Ottoman education tradition, under the influence of religion, thus remained until the beginning of Republican period, and a

version of “discipline”^v had a strong impact in reproducing the values of obedience in schools. The anti-secular traditional actors, including primarily Ulema, resisted the educational reforms with the fear of losing their religion. This painful process lasted for many years. But at the end, after foundation of modern Turkey in the beginning of 1920s, religion-based education in Ottoman society was replaced by a science-based secular model of education as a result of many experiences and developments.

The reports by Dewey paved the way for later inspirations for some populist education and cultural reforms such as People’s Adult Schools to teach the new Latin alphabet to rural people (Millet Mektepleri, 1928) in the form of campaign for literacy all over the country, People’s Houses (Halkevleri, 1932) for spending leisure time in towns and cities, and the formation of Village Institutes (1940), which marked the end of Ottoman’s traditional Islamic education.

Modernisation in every field, starting in the last years of the Ottoman Empire, was radicalised in the Republican era, which reduced the influence of religion over education. The policy makers, teachers and students who met with Western culture, science, technology, teaching methods, classical works and practical pedagogical practices, viewed religion as responsible for underdevelopment of Turkey.^{vi} Accordingly, education has become the most important state institution that endorses secular values. For the Republican cadres, a populist/peasant-based educational philosophy, mixed with a version of positivism and elitism, produced and controlled by the elite class; and a practical education approach, aimed at training the “citizen” against the conception of “servant” (kul) of the Ottoman Emperor, would, with the help of enlightened teachers’ hard work, modernise Turkey. However, this populist/peasant-based education philosophy could no longer survive by the 1950s, and would take a new social trajectory after the liberal-conservative attacks of the Democratic Party (DP) which ruled Turkey in the 1950s for ten years. While religious schools like Imam-Hatip Schools^{vii} were re-opened in 1950s, primary and secondary school teachers continued their mission of raising ‘modern individuals’. As the DP cadres, representing the more right-conservative side of official ideology of Kemalism in 1950s, closed^{viii} the Village Institutes which were seen by many as the most important alternative school in the republican history of Turkey, the number of Imam Hatip schools started to rise across Turkey. But the Turkish Army which always saw itself as the founder and main protective of the modern secular Republic was concerned about the future of the secular government system. The military, after its intervention against the DP rule in 1960, implemented many reforms that would disentangle the oppressive liberal-conservative atmosphere. All these reforms paved the way to the foundation of new trade unions and autonomous formal structures, such as official TV and radio channel (TRT) and university, giving rise to the flourishing of many leftist ideologies and organisations. These new, autonomous, official organisations would become a major origin of critical pedagogy, and an important step in the formation of a new libertarian philosophy of education. Many educational organisations^{ix} were founded in the second half of the 1960s, as well as political action-based practices of socialist left^x. These groups combined with a long list of major/ macro and minor/ micro experiences, such as cooperatives,

associations, foundations, a number of journals on education, original and translated books, courses offered in universities, theses and reports, and grassroots organisation works. All of these phenomena, in one way or another, supplied the building blocks of contemporary trends in critical education.

A new conception of critical education emerged in this context, and roughly followed two paths: a liberal and socialist trajectory. The first, liberal path began to reveal itself in the era of the Prime Minister (later President) Turgut Özal in the 1980s. The educational materials, textbooks, school practices, new teaching methods, and a variety of new pedagogical techniques in this liberal path were imported from the West^{xi} and presented as alternatives.

By the end of 1960s, the thesis of the notorious class organisation of Turkish big bourgeoisie (TÜSİAD), that the Turkish education system should be reformed and adapted to the demands of the market due to its very statist, centralised and supposedly inefficient structure, was reasserted and led to the neoliberalisation of the Turkish education system (İnal, 2012). According to TÜSİAD, all levels and stages of education had to be reformed, in order to train a more productive labour force to cope with the increased competition in highly globalizing world. By the 1990s, as a result of increasing neoliberalisation, many educational institutions had been opened, fees were introduced at all levels of public education, and education was introduced in a more individualistic mode, inoculated from social philosophy. Accordingly packaged as a tool of upward class mobility for “a more prosperous life”, education began to be seen as a most productive economic investment. Opening the purse, the parents found themselves looking for more qualified private schools, instead of public schools that were often in poor quality in terms of level of teaching and education materials.

This process transformed Turkey into a country where a set of educational ideas and institutions based on Western origins, and a market orientation, have become dominant. While the public education tradition continues to lose its power, the state has accelerated privatisation in education, as in all social areas like health, transportation and culture, and began to implement a number of policies to support private educational institutions such as financial incentives for new private schools and universities. In this period, one of the most important obstacles facing critical education was the fact that the so-called alternative models and ideas functioned as a Trojan horse to bring the neo-liberal philosophy of education into the very heart of alternative education debates in Turkey. For example, many schools implementing the Montessori method of education present themselves as an alternative against the market.^{xii} In Turkey, there are many private schools which are presented by their owners as alternative to the educational problems public schools have faced. Some Turkish academics^{xiii} define these schools to have a capability in solving traditional education problems of the Turkish national teaching system. Besides these schools, there are some other so-called alternative school models like ‘Smart Schools’ that use advanced technology. On the question of which system and model these liberal ideas and practices are alternative to, one cannot find within them any criticism against the dominant conception of education and its function in the capitalist system, which in turn produces this conception.

The second path to emerge in the 1960s/1970s was socialist. Many ideas, practices and institutions proposed and implemented in socialist circles have been based on to a large extent Marxist revolutionary tradition with the will to overthrow the dominant conception of education. Relative institutional democratisation steps after the coup against the DP in 1960 were an unexpected development, and facilitated the introduction of leftist ideas into Turkey's intellectual life. For example, many left-wing publishing houses were founded between 1960 and 1971. With the establishment of progressive publishing houses, many socialist classical works began to be translated into Turkish. Perhaps the most important step on the ladder of socialist politics, a socialist political party (Turkish Workers' Party-TİP)^{xiv} achieved representation in the Turkish parliament for the first time in 1965. In addition to these developments, some progressive youth organisations and Turkey's first major teacher organisation, called 'Turkey Teachers' Union' (Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası-TÖS), were established by socialists. These developments led to a very energetic intellectual atmosphere among university students' political movements. Turkey met with new ideas^{xv} in many areas.^{xvi}

During this period a kind of *socialistenlightenment*^{xvii} was inscribed on the agenda of the country. There were three important developments here in terms of the origins of revolutionary critical education. First was the emergence of a new cultural field for alternative learning, made possible by the socialist publications, publishers, intellectuals, discussions, and media organisations. In this process a new generation of enlightened intellectuals who graduated from the Village Institutes, which were instrumental for the formation of a new educational model between 1940-1953 (Kirby, 2000; Türkoğlu, 2009; Başaran, 2010; Yalçın, 2012), were very influential in training teachers, translators, academics, trade unionists, writers, and social theorists. Second was a new conception of *progressiveeducation* created by educational organisations. In particular, based on the problems of teachers, the Turkish Union of Teachers (TÖS, 1965-1971) tried to found a democratic system of education against the capitalist mode of education that had been supported by the reactionary and conservative social actors (Koç, 2012). Third was the political actions of socialist university youth who demanded reform of the public education system in progressive ways in order to solve academic issues in universities.^{xviii}

It can be argued that the socialist theses on education in 1960s were largely crafted in an economic-political framework of national-revolutionary development, full independence, and anti-imperialist demands. Consequently, a direct connection between Turkey's development and education was assumed, and it was claimed that education had to have a reformed content to deal with the problems and demands of people, in order to develop within the framework of national, independent, and anti-imperialist path, that means for them there is a standard human capital link between education and national economic development. During this period, the schools, often universities, teachers, and students were seen by the state and conservative press as the actors of uprisings.^{xix} It has been said that education had to be restructured in a new manner to be sensitive to the educational problems of people in finding solutions for the country including the problems of dependency to capitalist countries,

imperialist encirclement, the feudal structure in agriculture, and the exploitation of workers. After the closure of the Village Institutes that were based on practical learning by means of work and vocation, the national education system became removed from an educational conception based on practical learning. We have to draw attention to the fact that the practical approach of the Village Institutes were no less bound within the connection between education and economy. These schools had offered their students a new way of living based on collective work to solve traditional problems of rural areas of Turkey (Kirby, 2000). We did not find this, later, in technical high schools after the 1960s.^{xx}

In this context, by then prominent university student Harun Karadeniz^{xxi}, who was one of the first in Turkey's education history to say 'education is for production', can be considered as one who was open to new ideas and education in a relatively democratic environment. His most important act in terms of critical education in Turkey was his service as one of the leading figures in the "private schools must be nationalised" campaign. Asserting that the student movement could not be independent of the working class movement, Karadeniz (1975) defended in his book, *Education is for production*, the idea that individuals capable of production in education should be trained in schools.^{xxii} Karadeniz was a reflection of a common way of thinking in that period. During this period, Doan Avcıoğlu who was one of the most important and influential left-socialist thinkers, was talking about the same idea that Karadeniz discussed, but Avcıoğlu adopted a more well-known thesis of transforming the factories into schools (Avcıoğlu, 1982). In his thesis, as a socialist-revolutionary view, there was a search for more efficient, effective, and useful education for national development. He argued that the factories should be transformed into schools operating day and night, as a remedy for rural children to get a job in factories. But Avcıoğlu was not seeking to transform the status quo in the socialist direction, but to get closer to the Turkey of Atatürk's vision, putting the country in the league of western countries under the banner of national development. Similar thoughts can also be found in the writings of Fakir Bay Kurt who was the head of the largest teachers' union (TÖS) in the 1960s and a well-known novelist. For example, in the "Revolutionary Council of Education" held by TÖS in 1968, Baykurt said that the most important thing for underdeveloped countries was liberation from imperialism, based on national struggle and development. However, one can say that this refers to the fact about the catch-up or accelerated development, being a central part of many socialist groups/parties' programs and thinking in 1960s socialist world. In this process, the main mission of teachers is to awaken the people and educate them for a developed country (TÖS, 1969). The intellectuals in the revolutionary struggle in the 1960s were mainly concerned with education with regard to national liberation and development by using education as a tool, for forming a more revolutionary or progressive theory of education while fighting against imperialism.

Education in resistance in the 1970s

The 1970s was a period when socialist organisations, militant trade unionism, and the re-socialisation (in the sense of returning to the political struggle) of intellectuals and university

students after the coup in 1971, gained a significant level of massification. At the same time, Turkey faced a very serious economic crisis caused by stockholding, black market, high interest rates and inflation, low labour wages, and lockouts by the bourgeoisie, in addition to the armed ultra-nationalist groups' actions provoked and supported by the state. During this period, propagandist action and a tough style of personality in militant struggle, in the name of revolutionary life, were the most important elements that created an alternative learning environment amongst youth.^{xxiii}

The youth who defined themselves as 'professional revolutionaries' tried to create a "revolutionary-participatory" way by organizing and living with the people. The youth positioned^{xxiv} themselves as opposite to the reactionary and capitalist apparatus of education. Consequently, organizing people by living among became one of the most important sources of learning for the youth. During the struggle, the people were seen by students as needing assistance to raise their social awareness, on the one hand; they were sometimes moved to tutorial positions as a spontaneous revolutionary subject in some areas, on the other. The choice for the revolutionary youth to live in people's very poor houses and settlements was perhaps the most prominent feature of people's revolutionary tutorial position. This pattern of learning from the real-life experiences of people had covered a large area, from collectively constructing slum housing in illegal ways for poor citizens, to helping people prepare for anti-fascist attacks. Some definitions, such as "socialist teacher", "socialist student" and "young revolutionary", were used as indicators of not just a political stance, but of how and what kind of social existence is endorsed. The socialist figures as revolutionary subjects, like teachers, students, workers, and trade unionists, have been seen by the revolutionary groups of 1970s as founding actors in the formation of a new world, beyond playing the role of agents introducing the people with socialist ideas.^{xxv} In this context, every socialist actor, political group and alternative educational organisation tried to be a change-transformation pedagogical agent in the 1970s. People's informal educational organisations, such as some associations, illegal political parties, and foundations, created a parallel pedagogical world against the state's official educational institutions. The socialists got some connections in universities and high schools, albeit partial and temporary. On the other hand, in this armed-struggle process, various institutions, especially prisons, played a very influential critical pedagogical role in creating different sorts of resistances against the prisons' administrations, including communal life as a new alternative social organisation, and political training seminars. After the military coup of Marc 12, 1971, many socialists had been arrested and imprisoned because of their identities and political activities, many of them were university students, academics, and journalists. Three of these students (Deniz Gezmiş, Hüseyin İnan and Yusuf Aslan) were hung in the Ankara prison by the military government, and some of them (Mahir Çayan and his nine comrades) were killed by armed Turkish soldiers in a village house where they were captured.

Prison as the Major Source and Venue for Revolutionary Critical Education

After the military coup of March 12, 1971 many socialist students, journalists, academics, trade unionists, teachers, workers, public employees, and the villagers were arrested, tortured, hanged, incarcerated in prisons, and deprived of their rights (Ersan, 2013).

In prisons, especially after the coup of September 12, 1980, because this coup was much more brutal against the socialist prisoners than the coup in 1972, the socialist prisoners carried out many acts of resistance on various grounds in order to voice their demands, and to defend their ideology and identity. These included political protests against torture, uniform wearing, unfair trials, the stripping of certain rights, and intensive resistance such as self-burning, refusal to stand trial, political advocacy, and hunger strikes. In this process of struggle, numerous militants from socialist organisations have defined themselves as captive revolutionary prisoners. They produced a set of structures such as communal living, revolutionary reading groups, Marxist organisational training as most important parts of the fight, and revolutionary communication/relationship forms such as shouting slogans at regular intervals. Organisational loyalty, solidarity and sharing relationships, built both in and out of the prisons, extensively socialised the revolutionary teaching/learning processes beyond private relationships.^{xxvi} During the struggle, as the greatest symbol, Turkish prisons can be defined as one of the most important spaces in forming an influential trend towards revolutionary school of prison. Just as the Palestinian prisoners transformed the Israeli prisons into the “revolutionary school” (Nashif, 2010: 262) in 1970s and 1980s, the resistance culture in Turkish prisons had created a unique revolutionary school.

The Turkish revolutionaries, in the captivity conditions, created a unique structure, relationship and symbols based on struggle, martyrdom, and a culture of freedom. They arguably tried to form a “counter-hegemonic area of discourses and practices” against the control practices that the prison as a coercive apparatus created, and the hegemony it produced over the bodies of prisoners (Foucault, 1992). During the process, many revolutionary settings of education have been substantiated in prisons in very difficult conditions: the creation of revolutionary reading groups, communal type of collective living, preparation of shared political defence declarations for trials, reading and discussion of literary works, writing letters, notes and even books in prisons (Bostancıoğlu 2011; Eren 2012; Ersan 2013).

These revolutionaries were incarcerated in extremely small, cramped and unsanitary cells, and subject to excessive controls, pressure, and ideological practices of intimidation, like physical torture, the forced singing of the National Anthem as a powerful symbol of official ideology of Kemalism every day, and compulsory recitation of Kemalism lessons. In the relationships and connections with the prison administration, the communal organisations provided the revolutionaries with power, information and political socialisation which rendered the struggle permanent. A wide variety of revolutionary actions, practices and rituals played an important role in the production of revolutionary education. Political actions

such as self-immolation, as a form of suicidal act, has been one of the most important visible indicators for the revolutionaries against the “prison in the prison” and against the variety of tortures. The most valuable information produced by the Turkish and Kurdish revolutionaries in the prisons, especially during the periods when mental and physical torture was increased after the coups of 1971 and 1980, involved surviving strategies in certain areas: the techniques against torture, nutrition, mental health, and so on. The revolutionaries attached importance to their political and cultural identities by reproducing it more strongly against the prison administrators who, by breaking resistance of revolutionaries, aimed at making them passive subjects. They also gained mental power through reading and discussion groups, conferences, courses in educational topics, vocational practical knowledge, and physical training which helped them retain and reproduce their identity.

In general, these revolutionary prisoners created alternative forms of communication in order to constantly reproduce the revolutionary stance required by their own political identity. In particular, the information from the prisoners’ lawyers and their families would result in the transfer of information from the prisons to the democratic powers in society. The numerous ways the prisoners found to overcome the dominant authoritarian forms of control, like the censorship, restrictions and prohibitions, would become some of the most important resources of information of revolutionary pedagogy. In this process, the collective identities of the prisoners synthesised with the ideologies of the revolutionary groups to create a new perception on time and space.

Of course, during this period, the information revealed by ex-revolutionary confessors has been very damaging by creating a counter-hegemony to break the revolutionary resistance. But despite these confessors, the revolutionary stance did not weaken. As discussed by Nashif in his article on the Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails, “each area in the reproduction of motifs on heroism creates a revolutionary pedagogy unique to its own” (Nashif, 2010: 302). The organisational and pedagogical models of revolutionaries in jails were extremely democratic despite rigid organisational norms and rituals. To give an example, everyone in the organisation network was equal in communal life and reading groups as well as hunger strikes. Just like any of the revolutionary followers, the top leaders joined the hunger strikes.

Certainly in the 1970s, one of the most important actors in the path of revolutionary critical education has been the well-known largest teacher organisation TÖB-DER, the Association of Unification and Solidarity of all Teachers (Tüm Öğretmenler Birleşmeve Dayanışma Derneği).^{xxvii} This association, the largest socialist-oriented educational organisation, primarily defended a democratic conceptualisation of education led by a militant profile of revolutionary teachers. The democratisation of education was the first and foremost political demand of the association in the Congress of Democratic Education (1978). As a result, it saw imperialism, feudalism, racism and reaction as the real issues to be overcome in the struggle to democratise education, and believed that education needs to have a public character in favour of people. According to it, the primary mission of the teachers was to struggle for development of working classes’ progressive culture. One of the results of this

role was the creation of a new culture called “revolutionary culture” (TÖB-DER 1978). This culture claimed a semi-rural and semi-urban character embodied in various symbols, communication format, naming, lifestyle, and political expressions.

In the 1980s some collectivist terms such as ‘people’s liberation’, which had produced a revolutionary ideal, were replaced by the new terms of ‘human rights’ and ‘freedom’. The apparent discovery of individual rights and freedoms is also very important. It led to the creation of a new critical pedagogical tradition which began to search for “identity politics” with the effect of postmodernism, rather than the structural issues such as capitalism, exploitation, and class inequality in the framework of critical education. With the weakening of the class struggle which tried to collect and merge multiple identities into itself, the struggle for identity policies gained more importance and came to the fore. In addition, the demands by various ethnic, sexual, and religious identities found their voice in education theory and practice. Meanwhile, the former socialist revolutionary’s organisation and ideas were later severely criticised by the feminist critical pedagogues for conceptualizing women as objects rather than as active subjects, and through its ideas on friendship, leisure time, language, dress, etc, continuing to see women in a subordinate position. In addition, it trivialised the love and emotional relationship between the woman and man by stigmatizing it as part of the bourgeois lifestyle. Indeed, from the 1980s, feminists who focused on women’s rights, the liberal left who pursued the civil rights, and the libertarian socialists who highlighted the violation of human rights, all these groups have rediscovered the individual having a personality, citizenship, and rights.

The radical feminist movement which began to develop from the mid-80s has been an important moment in the development of critical education in terms of problems of women. Feminist critical education, especially in the first decade of 2000s, was able to show in curriculum, textbooks and classrooms how the field of education was full of discrimination against women, by using a number of research techniques such as in-depth observations, discourse and content analysis, and oral history studies within the framework of various concepts such as gender, awareness-raising, private space, and female identity.^{xxviii} During this period, the education system in Turkey was also heavily criticised with regard to class inequalities, identity issues, neoliberalism, multiculturalism, and multilingualism. The focus of this criticism was on the structure of education transformed from the national character to highly globalizing relations, and from conservatism to neo-conservatism, which prevented the evolution of the education system towards the use of scientific knowledge and democratic values. The education system had many problems: extreme centrist structuring of the educational organisation, no voice of students and teachers in educational decision-making, the educational practices formed according to the Sunni^{xxix}-Turkish values, the biased and incorrect information, and no voice of the different identities in curricula, textbooks, and pedagogical practices in the classrooms.

Identity Politics and the Struggle for Rights in the Context of Public Education after 1990

Turkey experienced a military coup in 1980 as the result of the agreement of the Turkish big bourgeoisie with the United States.^{xxx} The coup was carried out primarily against the very strong socialist sections of Turkey, which meant that for a new capital accumulation, all the political barriers, the militant groups of socialist workers, trade unions, and left-wing political parties needed to be cleaned from the political map. In 1980, Turkey entered a new path of neoliberal capitalism under the guidance of the prime minister (later president) Turgut Özal, a former bureaucrat in the World Bank. The military coup leaders tended to implement neoliberal policies in the absence of the closed left parties, unions, associations and imprisoned socialists. Their main policies were the rapid privatisation of public entities, tax hikes, declines in workers' wages, commodification of public resources, and a set of new barriers against the organisation of the unions. In this context, a very strong neoliberal deep wave in education emerged. The state encouraged the foundation of new private schools and universities, introduced fees for each and every component of public education, reduced teachers' salaries, and ceased its support for public schools.

But the most important aspect of education in terms of curriculum and textbooks was its extremely religious character. Pro-fascist coup leaders have worked to fill in the gap of ideological field which was in void by the defeat of socialists, with the Turkish-Islamic synthesis^{xxxii} as a reactionary formula produced in the end of 1970s. According to this formula, both Turkism (nationalism) and religion (Islam) would create a new set of values for the students in educational institutions. During this period, the military coup leaders implemented their decision to make religious instruction in schools mandatory for all students regardless of their differences in religious beliefs. They filled the content of curriculum and textbooks with the religious-nationalist values and knowledge. In addition, they conferred power to the school administrators over students and teachers. At this point, Turkey has run a fast track from secular to reactionary education. For the first time, the number of mosques came to exceed the number of primary schools.^{xxxiii}

In the 1980s, the re-design of education by the coup cadres on the basis of religion and nationalism gradually moved on to discuss the efficiency and productivity of the national education system. The memorisation of the dates of Turkish wars in history, religious matters, and other traditional issues was questioned primarily by the bourgeoisie and the liberal intellectuals, in terms of educational efficiency, in the context of changing conditions of capitalism needed a transformation of education according to the new market demands. While the big bourgeoisie criticised the education system with regard to the inefficient structure of education, the leftist groups focused their criticism on the basis of reactionary education system. The main agenda of the leftist struggle in 1980s was the rising nationalist and religious content and practices in education.

Since 1985, the university youth has increasingly become a major actor in the struggle against the new (privatisation) university model consistent with the logic of military coup, and the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) founded according to the coup cadres' demands. Since the end of 1980s university staff also began to establish associations for the struggle against the increasing fees for education, a number of issues about dormitory, dining and transportation, and a variety of academic problems. In this period a new position emerged for advocating the public nature of education, while neoliberalism has been gradually showing its effects at all levels in the creation of a market-oriented education. Thus, during this period, the primary objective in education was to resist the neoliberalisation of public education system and to look for the useful tools for struggle. The socialists who have been reorganised in the context of social-liberal discourse rather than a socialist rhetoric, have tried to prevent neoliberal changes under the name of education reforms and the liquidation of public resources. For example, the biggest socialist education trade union of Turkey after the 1990s, Eğitim Sen, always preferred to propagandise some education reforms in the context of liberal democracy, instead of expressing socialist revolutionary demands in education. The Turkish big bourgeoisie, especially its largest organisation TÜSİAD^{xxxiii} had the major role in neoliberal restructuring of education. In the 1990s, the expected reforms in the state apparatus including education were not realised due to the economic crisis that was accompanied by the political crisis caused by the armed Kurdish revolt. This failure caused frustration in some capital organisations, especially in TÜSİAD. The 1990s have subsequently been a period when many rightist and leftist trade unions in the public sector were founded. The left-wing union Eğitim-Sen (later Eğitim-Sen^{xxxiv} after unification with nationalist-oriented union Eğitim-İş) defended the public pedagogical rights of teachers, academics, students and parents, and campaigned for an educational administration working in a more democratic way by rejecting the neoliberal policies of education.

As a result of protests by university and high school youth, a very important heritage of revolutionary critical education was formed in Turkey. During this period, courses offered in various universities, articles, academic theses, and symposia and conferences on critical education, proliferated in academic and non-academic settings. By this period, particularly Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* which was the first relevant book published in Turkish accelerated the process, and later translation of many critical educators' works (e.g. Peter McLaren, Michael Apple, Henry A. Giroux, Glenn Rikowski, Peter Mayo, and many others) into Turkish was very influential in terms of the development of critical pedagogy in Turkey. Through these translations, teachers, students, and academics, including a number of intellectuals and parents, had the opportunity to learn about a wide variety of critical educational approaches.

The journals of *Zilve Tenefüs*^{xxxv} (The Bell and the Break) and later *Eleştirel Pedagoji*^{xxxvi} (Critical Pedagogy) started to be published by the editor Kemal İnal in the first decade of 2000s. They introduced theories, approaches, and debates in the critical education field, and examined Turkey's education system in the framework of this approach. In addition, the manifesto drafted by critical educators Kemal İnal and Ulaş Başar Gezgin, and

signed by many Marxist intellectuals, declared the foundation of *The Revolutionary Critical Education Initiative*.^{xxxvii} This manifesto argued that with the massive people's revolts like Gezi in Istanbul, Turkey was facing a new era whose conditions needed to be taken into account by critical educators.^{xxxviii}

Finally, critical education theory, which was carried out in media studies since 2005, is noteworthy. The media literacy offered as an elective course in secondary schools has been influential in this area. With the impetus of the introduction of this course into the official curriculum, a set of theoretical books,^{xxxix} textbooks, academic theses and case studies have been published in the field of critical media literacy. However, academic works on media literacy with a revolutionary stance beyond the critical dimension are yet to appear in Turkey.

In particular, the Gezi Park protests where a number of alternative media initiatives enabled the production of a new organisation and teaching-learning conception revealed that a set of influential concepts such as communal life in urban areas among youth, alternative media initiatives, forums, direct democracy practices in parks and public spaces, and grassroots organisation in rural areas which took place in informal settings (i.e. streets and parks) as well as in formal settings, should be analysed beyond critical pedagogy.^{xl} These more recent moves after Gezi moment should be characterised and connected with a new radical/transformational politics of socialism since it represents a very different world for us in terms of alternative politics, organisation and way of living that cannot fall into the postmodern identity politics trap, as described below.

The Revolutionary Critical Education Initiative

The Manifesto by the Revolutionary Critical Initiative signed by many Marxist intellectuals and academics^{xli} in February in 2014, and which was published in a journal,^{xlii} put forward a need to build a new theory of education. Its starting point was the idea that the liberal-oriented critical pedagogy^{xliii} is not sufficient in explaining the revolutionary nature of the social revolts like Gezi Park in Istanbul. Claiming that we need a new conception of education in order to understand, interpret, and draw lessons from the mass resistance and revolts of peoples occurring on a global scale, the manifesto argues that the people's actions that are increasingly taking on a revolutionary character, leads to the need for an educational theory to revolutionise and essentially shift the discussions from "revolution in pedagogy" to "revolutionary pedagogy". According to the manifesto, in order to evaluate the new mass movements in terms of educational issues, the teaching character of people's new type of actions should be understood by starting from a new language of struggle, collective experiences, and alternative organisations against the neoliberal capitalism. For the manifesto, we are faced with a set of new developments. Now everyone is learning from everyone else as the pedagogical boundaries of space expand and blur.

Moving beyond a simple act on socialisation and learning, the educational processes turn into a lesson for the ideological and coercive state apparatuses like police, capital, teachers,

experts, professionals and parents at all levels and spaces. Education is no longer just limited to formal educational institutions. Learning time and space becomes compressed, such that learning from theory is replaced by learning in and from actions in the waves of rebellion and resistance. The most important aspect of this new style of learning and teaching is directed to found a new democracy in a transparent manner. In this context, while educational actions are increasingly revolutionised all over the world, educational initiatives collectively dare to establish democracy in all places and moments with all the subjects, rather than perceive it in a formal type, namely in a parliamentary form.

Thus education gets a revolutionary character in every moment, space and dimension of life as it is getting out of formal structure. Contrary to the suggestions by the more liberalised notions of critical pedagogy which bases its theses on market with a cultural and economic twist, revolutionary critical education is thoroughly politicised. It moves beyond the politics of formal patterns to found education in revolutionary relations and structures, and as dynamic entities with regard to the consistency between theory and practice, rather than finding solace in educational reform. By transforming each location into a space in educating each other together, revolutionary critical education argues for de-territorialisation of education by opposing the vertical and hierarchical learning-teaching models of formal education. In this process, the melting of particular identities into a universal identification with other identities by means of democratic education perhaps becomes a model indicative of common identity in the class struggle. The most fertile area of revolutionary critical education is public spaces like squares, social media, and streets, which are often forbidden to the revolutionaries by the state to maintain its hegemony. An increase and diversification in educational tools, such as smart phones, TV, internet, banners and flags, graffiti, various artistic or political performances, make the rebels more active in teacher-learner positions. This makes educational processes in revolutionary actions quite attractive. So the critical subject can get out of his/her borders by taking part in communal identities.

Conclusion

After 1960, socialist and liberal left-wing academic, political and social studies in Turkey played a decisive role for the development of critical educational tradition. Everyone expected education to play an instrumental role for national development in 1960s. During this period, education has been seen as an access problem rather than a content issue: poor access to education, a more equitable system of education or equality of education for disadvantaged children, the problem of availability of schools in rural areas, insufficient demand of education by and for all girls, and widespread illiteracy, etc. In the 1970s, education has been considered as a part of socialist struggle towards a democratic notion of education, and pedagogy has been an important tool in the way to revolutionary breakthroughs. By the 1980s, however, the main objective of the struggle for democracy in and by education was a struggle first of all against liberalism, then neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism. A conception of education which was dealt with within the framework of national development in 1960s has been seen as a democratic issue in terms of a public right

for people. Emphasis on the public nature of education which was increasingly determined according to the interests of the companies and market demands, got stronger by the 2000s.

Meanwhile, the third International Conference on Critical Education held in Ankara in 2013 was a noteworthy event with the participation of the well-known critical educators like Peter McLaren, Dave Hill, Kostas Skordoulis and Panagiotis Sotiris. As it stands today, there is now a positive accumulation of experience in Turkey in passing from the critical pedagogy tradition to the revolutionary critical education as many recent developments are promising: The Gezi revolt case, congresses and conferences on critical education, the books translated from foreign languages into Turkish and so on. In the past, formal education was instrumentalised on behalf of a number of sociological ideals like development, economic growth and access to education by referring to a version of the functionalist logic. But today, we are faced with a new conception of education which presents us itself in a very new democratic way. There is a transition from a static form of formal education to a dynamic democratic form of education. In this regard, the radical nature of Revolutionary Critical Education against the hegemonic feature of conservative formal pedagogy in official schools is increasingly getting foothold. Today people instantly learn in political actions, not only from books and theories. The events in social movements based on revolutionary acts of people may be more instructive in achieving socialist democracy.

ⁱ Leftist Kemalists including many policy makers, writers, teachers, trade unionists and so on, were some intellectuals who argued a socialist version of Kemalist national official ideology.

ⁱⁱ *Ulemawas* an integral part of the Ottoman elite, namely clerics and professors who were called as *müdderris* in *Medrese*, the Ottoman higher education institutions. This social class was dependent on the state and most were salaried officers. This very traditional class was criticised as it was unable to adapt itself to the contemporary conditions and to renew itself; bigotry, obscurantism, scholasticism, rigid traditionalism, fundamentalism and anti-science approach, beginning from the late Ottoman period and the period following the proclamation of Republic of Turkey in 1923. It has lost its elite position after 1923. The new elites i.e. Intellectuals, bureaucrats, officers and commercial bourgeoisie as the dominant actors in the new age displaced the ulema. For detailed information, see: Bein, 2013; Kushner, 1987, 51-53.

ⁱⁱⁱ The madrasas, the most common higher education institutions in the fields of religion and law until the 16th century, have been unable to adapt themselves to the contemporary developments, stayed away from the philosophical thought and science, and become the institutions reproducing Sunni Muslim opinion and law tradition (Tekelivellkin, 1993: 11-18). See also İnal (1999). These schools were closed by the modern Turkish state in 1924.

^{iv} John Dewey, who was invited to Turkey first in 1924, has been the most noticeable education actor among many educators such as German Alfred Kühne, Swiss Albert Malche, and Belgian Omer Buyse in Turkey's education history in the development of a national education system. In his reports, Dewey had made several recommendations in order to found a liberal, practical and vocational education system, instead of very theoretical and mystical Ottoman education heritage. Among Dewey's recommendations were more vocational and practical education, educational decentralization, training of new experts, preparation of new curriculum and textbooks, and training of modern primary school teachers. For detailed information, see: Bal, 1991.

^v This discipline was named as *terbiye* which was seen as traditional obedience infused in all components of the education process.

^{vi} See Kaplan (1999) for detailed information on the effects of western philosophies and education ideas in making of modern Turkish education system.

^{vii} These Islamic secondary schools have always been a subject of intense debates in Turkish national education system in terms of redundancy. For detailed information on these schools, see: Gökaçtı (2005).

^{viii} There is a well-known argument on the closure of these schools. Some intellectuals (Kirby, 2000; Başaran, 2010; Yalçın, 2012) argue that the DP closed these schools with the fear of communist ideas instilled by the

teachers in the students. During this period, namely between 1950 and 1960, Turkey has been a pro-Western country by taking advantage of Marshall help from USA (1948), becoming a member of NATO in 1952, and accepting to send its army in Korea to fight communist troops of North Korea in 1952.

^{ix} The leading organization of this period was the Turkish Teachers' Union (Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası, 1965-1971) which mobilised a mass movement with its impact on trade unionism and politics. In addition, many Village Teachers' Associations (Köy Öğretmen Dernekleri) were founded by 1950s. Thirdly, TÖB-DER, the largest organization of teachers in 1970s should be noted. For detailed information see: Koç (2012).

^x Among these, leading ones are the well-known socialist experience of municipality that took place in a small town named *Fatsa* between 1978-1980; an independent information and education cooperative (*Bilar*) at the end of 1980s; the *Free University* (Özgür Üniversite) established by Marxist intellectual and academician Fikret Başkaya in 1990s which still operates in AKP's reign; the *Mathematics Village* (Matematik Köyü) founded by the leading Turkish mathematician Ali Nesin; and some other educational works by socialist parties and trade unions such as party schools and worker's schools.

^{xi} The west here mainly refers to USA with which Turkey before started to contact in terms of many relationships including education, military, and politics.

^{xii} The Montessori schools, very widespread in Turkey due to great success all over the world, are based on Maria Montessori's method for young children. The schools where the Montessori method is implemented nowadays attract attention with their very high tuition fees. For detailed information, see Korkmaz (2012).

^{xiii} For example, Aydın (2006), who is from Ankara University, defined these schools as the only alternative for Turkey to have an advanced education system.

^{xiv} The party has been the most prominent legal party in Turkey in 1960s and 70s. 15 socialist deputies of this party were voted for the Parliament for the first time and had a strong opposition performance against the pro-capitalist parties. For detailed information on the political activities of the first president of the party, Mehmet Ali Aybar, see Aybar (1988).

^{xv} Socialism was the first among these ideas but socialism in Turkey was known long before, of course under the name of communism which was criminalised by the state in order to discredit it during the cold war.

^{xvi} What is new is that socialism has been popularised among the youth, and become a common and powerful force in the political arena. During this period, one can say that modern ideas such as anti-imperialism, workers' rights and the emancipation of proletariat, women's rights, feminism, and opposition to war have entered the country and become even stronger.

^{xvii} Adopting a leftist version of the official ideology (Kemalism), some intellectuals argued that the foundation of a sort of modernizing National Socialism should be based on the Enlightenment tradition. For more information, see Avcıoğlu (1982).

^{xviii} The student movement of May 1968 in Turkey started with the educational issues such as representation of youth in university administration, dormitory problems of students, examinations etc. that require reform; but within a short period entered a new path of armed-struggle as a result of anti-communist and extreme nationalist paramilitary organizations based on the provocations of the Turkish state and U.S. imperialism. Peaceful demonstrations of university students have been targeted to be suppressed by both official and non-official armed organizations. For detailed information on the May 68's scope, character and consequences see Kışlalı (1974), Er (1988), and Kabacalı (1992).

^{xix} These uprisings were represented on the official and conservative press as very negative terms such as anarchist, vandals and so on. For detailed information about the representation of these uprisings on the rightist and leftist press at that time, see Şeşen (2014).

^{xx} Vocational high schools in Turkish national education system were based primarily on teaching a set of occupations like lathe-levelling. These kinds of schools could not offer high-quality practical education to the students as the schools have inadequate vocational training, poor infrastructure and unqualified graduates. For detailed information on the recent restructuring of vocational high schools at the request of the capitalist class, see Bulut (2007) ve Bulut (2012).

^{xxi} Involved in many anti-imperialist student protests, university occupation and workers and villagers' political actions in Istanbul and some other cities, Karadeniz was one of the leaders of the university movement of May 1968.

^{xxii} But most of the other revolutionary student leaders at that time have been very influential on the youth with their books or articles, in formation and development of socialist ideas, instead of concrete academic recommendations on education as Karadeniz did. The best known figure is Mahir Çayan, a leading revolutionary student leader in Ankara University. In his writings, Çayan tried to form a theory of revolution for Turkey rather than touching on the educational issues: See Çayan (1992). This attitude was due to the priority allotted to urgent tasks required by militant socialist struggle.

^{xxiii} Intensive ideologization of revolutionary learning and teaching settings in this era, that is, militant students' playing the role of "informal lecturer" for the apolitical people not only with their ideas but with their lifestyles has been very important. Being a revolutionary for the youth was not only a profession but an identity and lifestyle. Every action was based on the liberation of people. Consequently, the most important lesson in revolutionary struggle had gained a common meaning. Those having a powerful rhetoric, dedication and resistance assumed the role of teacher in revolutionary struggle.

^{xxiv} The revolutionary youth, due to this position, underestimated being a student in the university as students were considered to be the members of the petit-bourgeoisie class and maintained a life style based on armed-propaganda in all parts of life, instead of attending to the school. Due to the frequent politico-academic boycotts, the interruption to education, closure of schools, and opposing groups clashing in schools, the leftist youth could not attend their schools in 1970s. In this period, education was seen not as an apparatus for climbing the social ladder but to a great extent as a tool in political struggle, as the importance attached to the schooling was not so high.

^{xxv} This kind of looking at the revolutionary politics could be seen in many revolutionary groups who defined the struggle as one of people's figures including many different sides of society such as teachers, workers, women, students, unemployed and so on. For this argument see Bostancıoğlu (2011).

^{xxvi} Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu, the leader of the largest and most influential revolutionary group in Turkey from 1975 to 1980, in an interview book on all these processes, said that because of their special conditions at that period, their private life was so limited that the revolutionaries were unable to find private time for their needs due to the density of events, meetings, interviews, and publication works (Bostancıoğlu, 2011:321). This has been one of the most important requirements that led to the education activities in their social and collective nature.

^{xxvii} During this period, the teachers have been organised in associations due to the ban prohibiting establishment of trade unions by public employees as a result of 1971 coup.

^{xxviii} On analysis of education in the context of gender, see Sayılan, 2012.

^{xxix} Islamic sect to whom the largest population in Turkey belongs.

^{xxx} Deniz Ozan, 2012.

^{xxxi} This synthesis was first formulated in the beginning of the 1930s but it was put into practice as a cultural and educational program of the Turkish after the 1980 coup. For detailed information of history and implementations of this Formula, see Copeaux (2006), Timuroğlu (1991).

^{xxxii} For detailed information on the erosion of secular, scientific and democratic education in 1980s, see Tanilli, (1989).

^{xxxiii} Since 1990, with the impetus of globalization, TÜSİAD has criticised the national education as inefficient, rote-based and more nationalist-traditionalist which could not cope with the toughest conditions of capitalist competition in a neoliberal age. It has performed many activities such as publication of many academic reports, organization of symposiums and congresses, lobbying for its demands in Turkish government, in the context of a number of expectations for a new schooling conception based on a student-centered pedagogy, high technology use in schools, the graduates adapted to the demands of the business environment and having a formation required by the exigencies of global capitalist competition among the corporations. TÜSİAD's demands for reforms in the education system according to the requirements of the neoliberal capitalism was met more by the AKP government which came to power in 2002. For detailed information on this issue, see: İnal (2013).

^{xxxiv} A wide variety of works by Union of Education and Science Workers (Eğitim Sen), such as agitated-prop works in schools, public spaces and streets, union organization among teachers, conferences on democratic education, and a number of education publications have contributed greatly to the development of critical education.

^{xxxv} Designed and managed by Kemal İnal, this was the first journal of critical education in Turkey's education history. During its history (2005-2006), many educational issues under the names of the problems of teachers, textbooks, peace education, nationalism in curriculum, and alternative education were published in the journal.

^{xxxvi} *Eleştirel Pedagoji* (Critical Pedagogy) which started its life under the editorship of Kemal İnal on January-February of 2009 can be considered in a way as a continuation of the *Zilve Teneffüs* in terms of thought, writers, and editorial policy. At the end of 2013, İnal has left this journal to found Revolutionary Critical Education Initiative.

^{xxxvii} Kolektif, "Devrimci Eleştirel Eğitim Girişimi", KAOS GL, Yıl: Mart-Nisan 2014, Sayı: 135, pp. 57-64

^{xxxviii} For detailed information, see: Gezgin, U.B. (2014). Gezi Revolt and Education: What Have We Learned From Gezi and What Else Can We Learn From Now On? In U.B. Gezgin, K. İnal, & D. Hill (eds.). *The Gezi Revolt. People's Revolutionary Resistance against Neoliberal Capitalism in Turkey*. Brighton: the Institute for

Education Policy Studies (pp.174-187). <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Gezi-Revolt-Revolutionary-Resistance-Neoliberal/dp/095220424X>

^{xxxix} Especially the works of Bekve Binark (2007) and İnal (2009) in this field are very important. Bek and Binark used a new approach by applying the critical pedagogy into media literacy in terms of gender studies.

^{xl} See for again: Gezgin (2014).

^{xli} These names are Aslı Odman, Bekir Balkız, Canani Kaygusuz, Emine Uçar İlbuğa, Engin Delice, Fikret Başkaya, Fuat Ercan, Gülay Aslan, Güliz Akkaymak, Hakan Mihçı, İrfan Mukul, Kemal İnal, Nejla Kurul, Remzi Altunpolat, Sait Demir, Serdar Değirmencioğlu, Soner Şimşek, Ulaş Başar Gezgin and Welat Ay.

^{xlii} Kolektif, “Devrimci Eleştirel Eğitim Girişimi Çıkış Bildirgesi”, *Kaos GL*, March-April 2014, pp. 57-64.

^{xliii} This kind of pedagogy, mainly based on identity politics in terms of postmodernism, is out of look at the class relations in capitalist system, that leads to the very liberal approaches in defining and describing the recent facts, as seen in Gezi revolt in Turkey. For getting a comprehension on this issue, see: İnal (2013).

Bibliography

- Avcıoğlu, Doğan. (1982). *Türkiye'nin Düzeni. Dün-Bugün-Yarın*, Tekin Yayınevi, İstanbul, Cilt I-II.
- Aybar, Mehmet Ali. (1988). *TİP (Türkiye İşçi Partisi) Tarihi-1-2-3*, Özal Matbaası, İstanbul.
- Aydın, İnyet.(2006). *Alternatif Okullar*, Pegem A, Ankara, 2.Baskı.
- Bal, Hüseyin. (1991). *1924 Raporunun Türk Eğitimine Etkileri ve J. Dewey'in Eğitim Felsefesi*, Kor Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Başaran, Mehmet. (2010). *Özgürleşme Eylemi. Köy Enstitüleri*, Cumhuriyet Kitapları, İstanbul, 6. Baskı.
- Bein, Amit. (2013). *Osmanlı Uleması ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti. Değişimin Failer ve Geleneğin Muhafızları*, (çev. Bülent Üçpunar), Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Bek, Mine Gencil. ve Binark, Mutlu. (2007). *Eleştirel Medya Okuryazarlığı*, Kalkedon, İstanbul.
- Bostancıoğlu, Adnan. (2011), *Bitmeyen Yolculuk. Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu Kitabı*, Söyleşi, Ayrıntı, İstanbul, Altıncı Basım.
- Bulut, Ergin. (2007) Transformation of the Turkish Vocational Training System: Creation of Lifelong Learning, Loyal Technicians, Unpublished Master Thesis, Boğaziçi University Atatürk Institute, İstanbul.
- Bulut, Ergin. (2012), “Learning to Flexlabor: How Working-Class Youth Train for Flexible Labor Markets” In: K. İnal and G. Akkaymak (eds), *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey. Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 71-82.
- Copeaux, Etienne. (2006), *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Çayan, Mahir. (1992). *Bütün Yazılar*, Atılım Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Deniz Ozan, Ebru. (2012), *Gülme Sırası Bizde. 12 Eylül'e Giderken Sermaye Sınıfı, Kriz ve Devlet*, Metis, İstanbul.
- Er, Alev. (1988). *Bir Uzun Yürüyüşü '68*, Afayayınları, İstanbul.

- Eren, Mustafa. (2012). “Türkiye’de Hapishanenin Tarihi ve Estetize Edilen Ölüm”, <http://www.bianet.org/biamag/insan-haklari/142062-turkiye-de-hapishanenin-tarihi-ve-estetize-edilen-olum> [The access date: March 8, 2015]
- Ersan, Vehbi. (2013), *1970’lerde Türkiye Solu*, İletişim, İstanbul.
- Foucault, Michel. (1992), *Hapishanenin Doğuşu*, Çev. M. A. Kılıçbay, İmge, Ankara.
- Gezgin, Ulaş Başar. (2014). Gezi Revolt and Education: What Have We Learned From Gezi and What Else Can We Learn From Now On? In Ulaş Başar Gezgin, Kemal Inal, & Dave Hill (eds.). *The Gezi Revolt. People’s Revolutionary Resistance against Neoliberal Capitalism in Turkey*. Brighton: the Institute for Education Policy Studies (pp.174-187). <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Gezi-Revolt-Revolutionary-Resistance-Neoliberal/dp/095220424X>
- Gökçaftı, Mehmet Ali. (2005), *Türkiye’de Din Eğitime İmam Hatipler*, İletişim, İstanbul.
- İnal, Kemal. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan Günümüze Dinin Eğitim Üzerindeki Etkileri”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1999 (1-2):161-193.
- İnal, Kemal.(2009). *Medya Okuryazarlığı*, Ütopya, Ankara.
- İnal, Kemal.(2012). “Türkiye’de Büyük Burjuvazive Eğitim. Türkiye Sanayicive İşadamları Derneği’nin Eğitim Raporlarının Eleştirel Analizi”, *Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi*, Cilt:10, Sayı: 49, Kış, ss. 27-64.
- İnal, Kemal. (der.) (2013), *Gezi, İsyân, Özgürlük. Sokağın Şenlikli Muhalefeti*, Ayrıntı, İstanbul.
- Kabacalı, Alpay. (1992). *Türkiye’de Gençlik Hareketleri*, Altın Kitaplar, İstanbul.
- Kaplan, İsmail. (1999), *Türkiye’de Milli Eğitim İdeolojisi ve Siyasal Toplumsallaşma Üzerindeki Etkisi*, İletişim, İstanbul.
- Karadeniz, Harun. (1975). *Eğitim Üretim İçindir*, Gözlem Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Karaömerlioğlu, Asım. (2006). *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta. Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Köycü Söylem*, İletişim yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kışlalı, Ahmet Taner. (1974). *Öğrenci Ayaklanmaları*, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Kirby, Fay. (2000). *Türkiye’de Köy Enstitüleri*, Güldiken Yayınları, Ankara, 2.Baskı.
- Koç, Yıldırım. (2012). *TÖS. Antiemperyalist Bir Öğretmen Örgütü*, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kolektif, “Devrimci Eleştirel Eğitim Girişimi Çıkış Bildirgesi”, *Kaos GL*, Mart-Nisan 2014, Sayı: 135, ss. 57-64.
- Korkmaz, Eylem. (2012). *Montessori Metodu. Özgür Çocuklar İçin Eğitim*, Algyayın, İstanbul, 2.Basım.
- Kushner, David. “The Place of the Ulema in the Ottoman Empire During the Age of Reform (1839-1918)”, *Turcica* 19 (1987), 51-74.
- Nashif, İsmail.(2010),
“Devrimci Bir Pedagojinin Yapıları. İsrail Cezaevlerinde Filistinli Siyasal Tutsaklar” (çev. M. Ş. Önver), İçinde: E. T. Ewing (Hazırlayan), *Pedagoji ve Devrim. Eğitimin Temelleri Üzerine Disiplinlerarası ve Ulusüstü Yaklaşımlar*, Dipnot, Ankara, ss. 259-307.
- Sayılan, Fevziye. (Der.) (2012). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Eğitim*, Dipnot, Ankara.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin. (2010), *Osmanlıda Eğitimin Modernleşmesi (1839-1908). İslamlaşma, Otokras ve Disiplin*, çev. Osman Yener, İletişim, İstanbul.

- Şeşen, Elif. (2014), *Öğrenci Hareketleri ve Medya: Geçmişten Günümüze Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Örneğinde Medyanın Öğrenci Hareketlerine Bakışı*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Tanilli, Server. (1989). *Nasıl bireğitimistiyoruz? Amaç*, İstanbul, 5. Basım.
- Tekeli, İlhan ve İlkin, Selim. (1993). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Oluşumu ve Dönüşümü*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara.
- Timuroğlu, Vecihi. (1991). *Türk-İslam Sentezi*, Başak Yayınları, Ankara.
- Tüm Öğretmenler Birleşme ve Dayanışma Derneği (TÖB-DER) (1978). *Demokratik Eğitim Kurultayı*, TÖB-DER yayınları, Ankara.
- Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası (TÖS) (1969). *Devrimci Eğitim Şurası*, TÖS yayınları, Ankara.
- Türkoğlu, Pakize. (2009). *Tonguç ve Enstitüleri*, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul, 4. Baskı.
- Yalçın, Güler. (2012). *Canlandırılan Ütopya: Köy Enstitüleri*, E yayınları, İstanbul.

Author Details

Kemal İnal is a Marxist academic and intellectual. He has been working as a sociologist in the faculty of communication at Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey. Focusing on the educational policy and cultural problems of Turkey, he teaches introduction to sociology, language policy, media literacy, media and children, interpersonal communication, social psychology and so on. He has published a high number of academic books in Turkish as well as articles on different areas, and translated many books from English and French into Turkish. He is the deputy Middle East editor for 'the Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies' and the founder of the Revolutionary Critical Education Initiative with Ulas Basar Gezgin in 2014. He founded and managed two bi-monthly academic journals on critical (revolutionary) education and was a columnist on education in two Turkish socialist daily newspapers for five years. With Guliz Akkaymak, he co-edited the book 'Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey. Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP' (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). He edited the book "Gezi, İsyân, Özgürlük. Sokağın Şenlikli Muhalefeti" (Gezi, Revolt, Freedom. The Festive Opposition in the streets, Ayrıntı Publishing House, 2013, İstanbul). With Ulaş Başar Gezgin and Dave Hill, he co-edited the book *The Gezi Revolt: People's Revolutionary Resistance against Neoliberal Capitalism in Turkey* (Institute for Education Policy Studies in Brighton, England, 2014). He is now the editor of Turkish-English journal "Alternative Education" which will have been publishing since January 2016.

Correspondence: inalkemal@gmail.com