



JATSS, 2025; 7(3), 305-341

First Submission: 08.07.2025

Revised Submission After Review: 21.09.2025

Accepted For Publication: 28.09.2025

Available Online Since: 30.09.2025

Research Article

**The Construction of Citizenship Imagination and İdeological Apparatuses
in the Early Republican Period**

Barış Kandeğer^a

Abstract

Introduction: This article reveals the multifaceted role of ideological apparatuses in constructing citizenship as envisioned by the founding authority of the Early Republican regime.

Method: A historical analysis was employed in relation to the scope of the subject and primary and secondary sources concerning imagined citizenship during the Early Republican Period were selected and analyzed.

Results or Findings: During this period, ideological apparatuses played a multifaceted role in constructing imagined citizenship, strengthening the Republican regime, building a modern nation-state on solid foundations and establishing the intellectual and practical infrastructure for a modern, civilized life compatible with the Republic.

Discussion or Conclusions: During this period, imagined citizenship was conceived and attempted to be realized within an identity capable of modernization and development. This identity was aligned with positivist and secular thought and belonged to the regime within the field of action created by ideological Apparatuses. During this period, political authority made ideological apparatuses functional in a broad, multifaceted way within a framework of political subjects in order to construct citizenship.

Keywords: citizenship, early republican period, ideological apparatuses, People's Houses, Village Institutes

JEL Codes: Z00, Z18, K3, K100, K190

^aAsst. Prof. Dr., Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Van/Türkiye. E-mail: bkandeger@yyu.edu.tr , ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9996-3813> (Corresponding Author)



JATSS, 2025; 7(3), 305-341

İlk Başyuru: 08.07.2025

Düzeltilmiş Makalenin Alınışı: 21.09.2025

Yayın İçin Kabul Tarihi: 28.09.2025

Online Yayın Tarihi: 30.09.2025

Araştırma Makalesi

Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Yurttaşlık Muhayyilesi ve İdeolojik Araçlar ile İnşası

Barış Kandeğer^a

Öz

Giriş: Bu makale, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde rejimin kurucu otoritesinin tahayyül ettiği yurttaşlığın inşa edilmesinde ideolojik araçların çok yönlü işlevselliğini görünür hale getirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntem: Çalışmada konunun kapsamı ile ilişkili olarak tarihsel analiz yöntemi kullanılmış, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde tahayyül edilen yurttaşlığa ilişkin birincil ve ikincil kaynaklar seçilmiş ve analiz edilmiştir.

Sonuçlar ya da Bulgular: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde ideolojik araçlar; hem tahayyül edilen yurttaşlığın inşa edilmesi hem de Cumhuriyet rejiminin güçlü kılınması, modern ulus devletin sağlam temeller üzerine inşa edilmesi, Cumhuriyet ile uyumlu modern ve medeni bir yaşamın düşünsel ve eylemsel altyapısının sağlam temeller üzerine kurulması için çok yönlü ve geniş içerikte bir işlevselliğe sahiptir.

Tartışma ya da Yapılan Çıkarımlar: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde tahayyül edilen yurttaşlık, ideolojik araçların oluşturmuş olduğu eylemsellik alanında rejime aidiyeti olan, Cumhuriyetin ideallerine ulaşma kapasitesine sahip, pozitivist ve seküler düşünce ile eklenmiş bir modernleşme ve kalkınmayı gerçekleştirmeye muktedir bir kimliğin içinde öngörülür ve gerçekleştirilmeye çalışılır. Bu dönemde siyasal otorite/iktidar, ideolojik araçları geniş bir içerikte ve çok yönlü olarak politik bir özne çerçevesinde yurttaşlığı inşa edecek şekilde işlevsel kılar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yurttaşlık, erken cumhuriyet dönemi, ideolojik araçlar, Halkevleri, Köy Enstitüleri

JEL Kodlar: Z00, Z18, K3, K100, K190

^a Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi, Van/Türkiye. E-mail: bkandeger@yyu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9996-3813> (Sorumlu Yazar)

Introduction

The emergence of the modern state reshapes many political phenomena through a new paradigm. The modern state marks a shift from fragmented power to centralized, absolute authority. It is a key force in transforming political, economic and social conditions. As its institutions develop, the state's roles and functions in society align with its structure. Citizenship is one such phenomenon, defined in the context of the modern state. It includes duties, rights and freedoms and helps form a national community. The 18th and 19th centuries saw the dominance of the modern state, marked by clear territory, sovereignty and state monopoly on violence. This identity is built on foundations like sovereignty, citizenship, bureaucracy, taxation and legitimacy (Weber, 2006; Poggi, 2009; Heywood, 2018; Saygılı, 2010; Pierson, 2000). The modern state emerged first in Europe. In the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire began reforms to adopt this model, mirroring changes in Europe.

The solution to the Late Ottoman problems was building a modern state and establishing citizenship. Adopting this new state paradigm made citizenship necessary. In the 19th-century Ottoman Empire, citizenship became inseparable from the idea of a modern state. Empires attempted to define citizenship on equal terms due to political and social pressures, which fit modernization goals. As a result, the Ottoman Empire combined different identities into an egalitarian Ottoman identity in the 19th century. A traditional Muslim approach still dominated, yet non-Muslims enjoyed specific rights under their own laws through the millet system. This did not fundamentally conflict with the new citizenship identity. The reason was that these rights and freedoms, protected by autonomy, were now included in the Ottoman identity on an equal basis to foster belonging.

With the Tanzimat and Constitutional reforms, there were attempts to build both a modern state and the citizenship such a state needed. This process deepened during the Early Republican Period. Citizenship became part of creating a modern state and society. It describes the relationship between the state and individuals, defined by rights and responsibilities. In the modern nation-state, citizenship includes voting and enjoying political, economic, cultural and civil rights (Marshall, 1992). It is important to consider how citizenship fits into this idea. Citizenship took root with the Tanzimat reforms and grew during the Early Republican Period. Knowing what citizenship means and how it is defined is crucial. Examining this process through ideological apparatuses can help us understand citizenship from this era. Ideological apparatuses were key in constructing citizenship both during the Tanzimat and Constitutional periods and the Early Republican era. Especially in the Second Constitutional Era, citizenship was shaped through education programs and curricula. Modern states used similar apparatuses. In France, for instance, educational policies aimed to instill citizenship (Üstel, 2008b).

This study examines how citizenship was constructed in the Early Republican Period using ideological Apparatuses. During the Tanzimat and Constitutional periods, educational reforms aimed to shape citizenship. In the Early Republican Period, institutions like People's Houses (Halkevleri) and Village Institutes (Köy Enstitüleri) became important apparatuses. These institutions combined educational, cultural and social aims. They worked together in complex ways to build citizenship as it was envisioned at the time. This study focuses specifically on the Early Republican Period. Earlier educational reforms, like curricula from the Second Constitutional Era, paved the way for this era. During this period, ideological

apparatuses began to build a national identity and connect citizens to the state. Turkish nationalist policies especially provided the foundation. In the Early Republican Period, these apparatuses continued to shape citizenship aligned with Republican ideals. This was largely done through institutions such as People's Houses and Village Institutes. Their broad and multifaceted use aimed to develop citizens as political actors.

During the Early Republican Period, the founding state employed a variety of ideological apparatuses to establish the desired citizenship identity for the Republic. One of the most important goals for political authority is a citizenship that breaks away from traditional codes and makes modern code possible in all areas of life. Therefore, it is considered necessary for citizens to first adopt and accept the regime, its founding values, modern forms and the ideas and approaches of a positivist, secular life in order to fulfill this mission. Within this framework, the founding state, elites, intellectuals and professionals of the Early Republican Period strove to construct the envisioned citizenship through the effective, multifaceted functions of ideological Apparatuses. In this process, populism contributes significantly to the construction of the aforementioned citizenship and the mission of ideological Apparatuses. A strong relationship and interaction are established between populist thought, which can be considered a discourse within the official ideology and ideological Apparatuses, which significantly affect the construction of a classless, privilege-free society. This is because populist thought draws the discursive and action-oriented framework of the multifaceted functions of ideological Apparatuses, such as People's Houses and Village Institutes. Ultimately, this ideology seeks to produce a collective identity of citizenship.

In this context, the article aims to analyze which ideological apparatuses were used to construct the imagined citizenship, what purposes they served and the cause-and-effect relationship between the purpose and the apparatuses within the framework of the aforementioned period and phenomena. Within this scope, the study emphasizes that ideological apparatuses in the Early Republican Period had a multifaceted and broad functionality in both constructing the imagined citizenship and strengthening the Republican regime, building the modern nation-state on solid foundations and establishing the intellectual and practical infrastructure of a modern and civilized life compatible with the Republic. In this study, primary and secondary sources related to the imagined citizenship of the Early Republican Period were selected and analyzed using historical analysis. In this context, the imagined citizenship is conceived and sought to be realized as an identity capable of achieving modernization and development through positivist and secular thought, aligned with the regime's ideological apparatuses and possessing the capacity to attain the ideals of the Republic. In this context, the article aims to analyze the ideological apparatuses used to construct imagined citizenship, their purposes and the cause-and-effect relationship between purpose and tool within the aforementioned period and phenomena. The study emphasizes that, during the Early Republican Period, ideological apparatuses had multifaceted functionality. They were used to construct imagined citizenship, strengthen the Republican regime, build the modern nation-state on solid foundations and establish the intellectual and practical infrastructure of a modern, civilized life compatible with the Republic. For this study, primary and secondary sources related to the imagined citizenship of the Early Republican Period were selected and analyzed using content analysis.

The study covers the Early Republican Period, spanning the years 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. The study focuses on educational programs, textbooks, and course content designed during the 1920s and 1930s, particularly at the primary school level. Additionally, it examines

the ideological functions of the People's Houses and Village Institutes, which were established and operationalized in the 1930s and 1940s, in building citizenship. The educational programs and lessons address the anticipated functions of the People's Houses and Village Institutes in building citizenship. The imagined citizenship is conceived as an identity capable of achieving modernization and development through positivist and secular thought. This identity is aligned with the regime's ideological apparatuses and possesses the capacity to attain the ideals of the Republic.

The Historical and Theoretical Background of Citizenship

Citizenship is not just an expression of political affiliation or legal status. It is also a historically variable, philosophically multilayered and socially constitutive relationship. Citizenship plays a fundamental role in defining the boundaries between the individual and the state, rights and obligations and the private and public spheres. Citizenship establishes the basis for possessing and protecting certain rights while defining the normative framework that sets the limits of these rights. This dual nature elevates citizenship beyond a mere legal category, making it a signifier of political identity, ethical positioning and collective belonging. In this context, citizenship encompasses not only an individual's subordination to the state, but also their capacity for rational action directed toward the public good (Marshall, 1992; Arendt, 1998; Heater, 2004). Citizenship has emerged as a phenomenon whose meaning has evolved within the framework of political and social conditions. From antiquity to the Middle Ages and modern times, its meaning has been shaped by the nature of the relationship between rulers and the ruled.

In antiquity, especially in ancient Greek thought, the concept of citizenship was widely discussed and considered important and valuable. In the Athenian polis, citizenship was not just an identity, but a state of action. Citizens did not earn this status based on blood ties or residency; rather, they earned it through active participation in political life. Citizens participated in lawmaking processes, served on juries, served in the military and contributed to the continuity of the public sphere. According to this understanding, citizens represented collective reason rather than individuality. As Arendt emphasizes, in ancient Greece, citizenship was essentially associated with the capacity to be visible in the public sphere through action and speech (Arendt, 1998). In this context, citizenship meant existing within the polis (city-state). In other words, citizenship is not about existing within the private sphere, but rather about existing as a subject of the public sphere.

In Ancient Greece, the concept of citizenship went far beyond a mere legal status. It was a way of life in which individuals participated in the political community as integral parts of it. In Athens, citizenship was not only a right acquired by birth but also an obligation to actively participate. Women, slaves and metics were excluded from this status. Men with citizenship rights, however, participated directly in lawmaking processes, courts and public affairs. This situation reinforced the concept of the polis, the organic bond between the individual and the political community, which lies at the heart of citizenship. In this model, citizens are not only subject to the laws, but also active participants in making and enforcing them. Athens's model of citizenship was based on direct democracy. Decisions made in popular assemblies, called *ekklesia* and councils, called *boule*, were based on the collective will of all citizens. As Aristotle emphasized in his work *Politics*, citizenship is not merely a set of rights but also a set of duties (Aristoteles, 2011). Limiting oneself to the private sphere was considered a moral deficiency. In this context, citizenship became a moral obligation requiring citizens to participate in the public sphere.

Similar to Ancient Greece, citizenship in the Roman Empire expressed participation in political and public life (Heater, 2004). As in ancient Greece, citizenship and the public sphere were synonymous in the Roman Empire. In both societies, citizenship entailed a privileged identity. Roman law was evaluated based on public and private rights and responsibilities. A citizen's relationship with the public (Res Publica) was based on virtues and moral values that included rights and responsibilities (Ağaoğulları, 2015; Çelik, 2012). Citizenship is a matter of public law and the public sphere. Therefore, as a phenomenon belonging to the public sphere, citizenship expresses loyalty and a sense of responsibility to the state.

The centralization of the relationship between the individual and God has shaped Christianity's understanding of political community and deeply influenced the concept of citizenship. Unlike the active, public citizenship model of antiquity, Christianity is based on an ethical structure in which individuals are responsible to the divine order rather than worldly authorities. This understanding established an order in which earthly citizenship was subject to sacred authority. For example, Augustine distinguished between "the city of God (Civitas Dei)" and "the city of men (Civitas Terrena)" (Ağaoğulları, 2015). In this context, citizenship became a relationship of loyalty defined by servitude to God rather than a legal or political status. During this period, political authority was considered to have a divine origin and earthly rulers were seen as "God's shadow on earth." Thus, citizenship became less a status of belonging and more a spiritual obligation defined by obedience and faith (Okandan, 1952; Çilingir, 2024; Çelik, 2022; Ağaoğulları, & Köker, 2020; Akgün, 2013). This situation limited the existence of free individuals in the public sphere, reducing their capacity to engage in politics. As a belief system centered on individual salvation, Christianity has abstracted citizenship from public participation, constructing it as a spiritual form of existence. Conversely, the blurred boundaries between church and state gradually transformed the concept of citizenship into a relationship of dual loyalty. Christian individuals were held accountable to both God and worldly authority. This dual allegiance weakened the holistic and active nature of citizenship, prioritizing moral loyalty over political participation. This approach distanced citizenship from political subjectivity, turning it into a relationship of obedient faith (Markus, 2006).

The French Revolution of 1789 was a turning point in the modern understanding of citizenship. One of the Revolution's foundational documents, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, defines citizenship as grounded in universal rights that are inherent at birth. Citizens are no longer subjects granted by the king's grace, but rather equal members of a nation composed of free individuals. Here, citizenship is the political expression of having rights and obligations. The Revolution symbolizes the transition from absolute monarchy to the nation-state structure by linking citizenship with collective sovereignty. During this period, Rousseau's concept of the "general will" was put into practice. However, post-revolutionary citizenship practices deviated from the ideal of universality. Women, the propertyless and people from the colonies were excluded from these rights. This situation reveals the tension between the discursive universality of citizenship and its historical practices. Nevertheless, the Revolution placed the concepts of "equality" and "rights" at the center of citizenship, laying the foundation for modern constitutional orders. Citizens are now subjects of law as well as political subjects. Within this framework, the French Revolution is considered the epistemological starting point of contemporary theories of citizenship (Çelik, 2012; Yıldırım, 2019; Ağaoğulları, 2015; Jones & Jones, 1995; Blaufarb, 1995).

Two traditions are emphasized based on their approach to citizenship. The republican tradition defines citizenship in terms of participation in the common good and the ability to act in the public sphere. In contrast, the liberal tradition defines citizenship as an individual's possession of rights. Republican citizenship means not only freedom from oppression, but also effective participation in political processes. This concept carries the legacy of ancient Greece and Rome into modern political theory. In republicanism, citizenship is both a duty and a virtue. In contrast, the liberal understanding of citizenship prioritizes the protection of the individual against the state. This concept was systematized by thinkers such as John Locke and John Stuart Mill. According to liberalism, citizens are individuals endowed with rights and freedoms and the state is an apparatus that guarantees these rights. Thus, citizenship is defined in terms of negative freedom, or protection from external interference. In modern liberal democracies, citizenship is largely synonymous with legal statuses, such as the right to vote, freedom of expression and property rights. However, contemporary political thought has sought to synthesize these two approaches. Notably, Arendt's conception of citizenship, based on the concepts of "public sphere" and "action," reimagines the republican model of participation, emphasizing the individual's capacity for political action. Thus, the citizen is redefined as both the subject of rights and an agent capable of transforming the political world (Arendt, 1998; Kasimoğlu, 2024).

In the 20th and 21st centuries, the republican tradition was reevaluated and the classical ideal of citizenship was updated and developed into a concept known as "new republicanism." According to this approach, citizenship is a set of virtues and responsibilities integrated into public life. Citizens are not figures who emerge only during election periods; rather, they are subjects who continuously participate in public debates, monitor governance and intervene when necessary. New republicanism places citizens at the center as individuals capable of liberating action. It interprets freedom as the ability to make decisions together in communal life, not merely as non-interference. In this context, new republicanism does not limit participation to voting. It manifests itself in various forms, such as protest, civil initiative and involvement in local decision-making processes. Governance gains meaning through citizen participation and citizens' public responsibility is central to the sustainability of democracy. According to new republicanism, the public sphere is not merely a space governed by the state. Rather, it is a place where citizens can meet, discuss and take collective action. Therefore, citizenship is not merely allegiance to the state but also the political expression of the will to live together. This approach has been developed in response to the disempowering effects of neoliberal governance and technical democracy models. New republicanism advocates for direct participation in order to overcome the limitations of representative democracy. By prioritizing the political presence of groups excluded from public life, such as migrants, minorities and women, this model transforms citizenship from a legal status into an action-oriented, ethical obligation (Pettit, 1997; Sandel, 1998; Honohan, 2002).

Constitutional Periods: Laying the Building Blocks of Citizenship

In the modern sense, the concept of citizenship emerged in the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat period. Before the Tanzimat, citizenship was based on ethnicity, religion and sect. Muslims and non-Muslims were evaluated and classified differently (*millet-i hâkime/millet-i mahkûme*). Muslims were considered the foundation of the Ottoman state and had a shared identity (*Millet-i Hâkime*), while non-Muslims were defined as distinct religious and cultural groups within the *millet* framework. This demonstrates that the *millet* system, which existed in Islamic law, was adopted by the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, *millet* and community were one and the same in the

Ottoman Empire. Through the millet identity, ethnic and religious communities conducted their relations with the state within the framework of autonomy (Aybay, 2003; Eryılmaz, 1992; Somel, 2009; Özcoşar, 2003).

The construction of a modern state and society, which began during the Tanzimat period, necessitated the establishment of a citizenship-based system instead of a nation-based system. While the nation system included a classification based on religious differences within the imperial structure, citizenship defines an identity based on equality within the modern state structure (Şentürk, 2010). In the 19th century, sensing the necessity of a modern state, the Ottoman Empire aimed to establish a relationship with its people based on citizenship. The modern equivalent of this goal was to transform the identity of subjects into citizenship and determine and implement mutual rights and responsibilities through an equal, rational and legal relationship. To this end, the empire issued the Tanzimat (1839) and Islahat (1856) Edicts to establish legal equality without privileges. These edicts are significant because of their resemblance to the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (Dinçkol & Işık, 2015). Noteworthy aspects of the construction of citizenship identity include equality before the law, personal inviolability and security, protection of honor, dignity and chastity, freedom of religion, conscience and worship, guarantees of life and property, fair and equal taxation and the rational and equitable organization of military service in accordance with the modern state (Tanör, 2018). This approach is similar to the French model of citizenship. It aims to equalize ethnic and cultural differences under the umbrella of the Ottoman identity, which is based on the principles of rights, freedom and equality.

These decrees mark a transition from subjecthood based on ethnic, religious and cultural differences to an equality-based approach, where everyone is considered an Ottoman citizen. The Reform Decree, in particular, reflects an approach that includes equal citizenship (Üstel, 2008a; Somel, 2009). Within this scope, many regulations were established to promote equality in the development of modern citizenship. These regulations included hearing cases between Muslims and non-Muslims in mixed courts, giving equal consideration to witness testimony and regulating modern criminal laws. Other provisions aimed at establishing equality in modern citizenship include the abolition of iltizam and granting rights to non-Muslims to enter the Meclis-i Vala-yi Ahkam-i Adliyye (High Council of Justice), local councils and schools, as well as the right to property for all (Ubicini, 1998; Tanör, 2018). An important reflection of this process was the 9-article Ottoman Citizenship Law, which came into force in 1869 and legally defined citizenship in the Ottoman Empire. Inspired by the French Nationality Code, the law provided for citizenship acquisition based on descent and place of birth. There are two approaches to acquiring citizenship: The first is citizenship based on blood, descent, or lineage and the second is citizenship based on territory, or place of birth, or geographical ties. In a citizenship based on blood ties, both the mother and father are decisive. In the latter, the place of birth is decisive (Reyhan, 2024). Both approaches are evident in the Ottoman Citizenship Code. According to this law, children whose mother and father, or only their father, are Ottoman citizens will have Ottoman citizenship status. Additionally, children of foreign nationals born in Ottoman territories have the right to obtain Ottoman citizenship upon reaching adulthood. Furthermore, individuals who have resided in Ottoman territories for at least five years are eligible to obtain citizenship within three years. This regulation acknowledges the right to citizenship for those born in and/or residing in Ottoman territories (Aybay, 2003; Osmanağaoğlu, 2004; Erdoğan, 2008; Şentürk, 2010; Serbestoğlu, 2011; Ekici & Şahin, 2020).

This law recognizes the right to citizenship based on the principle of equality. Therefore, the criteria for citizenship are addressed within the framework of a land-based citizenship approach, or French-style citizenship, in accordance with the conditions of the time. The Ottoman Empire's first modern constitution, the Kanuni Esasi (1876), included citizenship provisions. These provisions concern rights, freedoms, duties and responsibilities. According to Article 8, this law states that everyone is an Ottoman citizen, regardless of religion or sect. While Article 9-10 stipulates that everyone has the right to freedom within the limits prescribed by law and that these freedoms cannot be abolished or punished, Articles 11-26 redefine and enshrine the rights and freedoms mentioned in the Tanzimat and Islahat decrees. These include freedom of religion and conscience, freedom of property and equality before the law, all of which were the subject of the Tanzimat and Islahat Edicts. Article 18 emphasizes the requirement to know Turkish in order to become a civil servant, making it possible to establish citizenship through an official and common language. This provision also specifies that Turkish is the official language of the state. According to Article 113 of the constitution, the sultan's power to exile citizens was eliminated in 1909 because it conflicted with the fundamental rights and freedoms (TBMM Başkanlığı İdari Teşkilatı, 2023; Kili & Gözübüyük, 2000; Tanör, 2018; Erdoğan, 2008; Somel, 2009). These provisions of the 1876 constitution demonstrate that citizenship was not defined based on ethnic or religious identity. Given nationalism's corrosive effect on empires, defining citizenship in this way was rational.

Regulating the relationship between the state and its citizens based on the modern state and society has become an important political issue. The state mobilizes its ideological apparatuses for the establishment of modern state citizenship on a rational basis. Althusser (1991), states that the modern state uses these apparatuses to make citizens adopt its official ideology. According to Althusser, the role of the state's instruments of coercion (DBA) and ideological apparatuses (DIA) in establishing hegemony and influencing society is crucial. These apparatuses involve physical or non-physical violence. These apparatuses convey the state's ideological values to society in a manner that serves the state's interests. They include schools, families, religious institutions, political institutions, civil society organizations, the press, mass media and cultural institutions. During both the Second Constitutional Era and the Early Republican Era, these apparatuses became an effective means of constructing citizenship. In this context, textbooks and their content were organized as apparatuses of ideology to produce the type of citizen the political authority envisioned.

During the Second Constitutional Era especially, curriculum programs and course content were important ideological tools used to foster citizenship. In this context, textbooks and their content were organized as tools of ideology to produce the type of citizen the political authority envisioned. While a similar approach continued in the Early Republican Era, the Republic attempted to construct a civic identity through effective ideological tools, such as People's Houses and Village Institutes. During the Second Constitutional Era, citizenship-related content was incorporated into school curricula to establish the aforementioned identity. This concept was essential for the state at that time. To establish citizenship knowledge and identity in line with the modern state's requirements, a course called Malumat-ı Medeniye was added to primary, secondary, and high school curricula, and a book with the same name was published. This course covered topics such as homeland, nation, state, parliament, public administration, and taxation. It also addressed the duties individuals have toward themselves, their families, their homelands, and their nations in order to be good citizens. Emphasizing the rights and responsibilities of citizens, this course and textbook stressed the importance of

individuals having a civil and moral identity, being good people, and being good citizens for their families, the state, and society. In this way, the course became one of the vehicles for the official ideology. These concepts and discourses ensured the construction of citizenship and established a close connection with political and social structures. This identity shifts the source of political power. Once citizenship is established, the source of sovereignty shifts from divine to worldly. The concrete manifestation of this shift is national sovereignty. Divine-based sovereignty transforms into national sovereignty. In this context, the Second Constitutional Era introduced national sovereignty through the Civil Knowledge course, or *Malumat-ı Medeniye*. Close relationships were established between national sovereignty and the concepts of citizenship, elections, representation, and parliament. Furthermore, concepts such as equality, freedom, and brotherhood were used to envision the creation of the kind of community of citizens that the state needed because only such a community could sustain a constitutional system (Yaşar, 2018; Parlak & Kaftan, 2010; Üstel, 2008a).

The citizenship established within this framework will serve as a reference point for the future transformation of the political system. Additionally, the addition of the moral education course (1913) to the curriculum included topics such as honesty, responsibility, humility, diligence and thriftiness to promote responsible citizenship (Ozan & Kuş, 2021). There is also an effort to develop the entrepreneurial skills of the envisioned citizen. This effort stems from the fact that non-Muslims acted against the Ottoman State as an economic power and collaborated closely with European states. Furthermore, it is believed that economic development is achieved through a community of entrepreneurial citizens. A Turkish-Muslim economic structure would reduce the effectiveness of non-Muslim economic powers and establish a modern nation-state with a strong economic foundation based on the national economy and bourgeoisie (Toprak, 1995). The concept of the nation, an important phenomenon of the 19th century, refers to a human community that shares a specific territory, common myths, historical memory, mass public culture and common legal rights and duties (Smith, 1991). The modern nation-state is a relatively recent phenomenon that possesses the right and authority to use legitimate force over defined territories. It homogenizes the people under its rule and creates a common culture, symbols and values. The state aims to preserve origin myths and unify the population (Guibernau, 1997; Heywood, 2018). In this context, a state of transition emerges between the citizen and the nation. The modern state performs many functions, such as speaking on behalf of phenomena in this state of transition, granting rights and imposing duties, changing and transforming these phenomena and disciplining and making them productive (Pierson, 2000). The modern nation-state intervenes in the political and social spheres, attempting to reproduce members of society based on citizenship within the framework of the official ideology.

Within this scope During the Second Constitutional Era, the state used ideological apparatuses to build and strengthen the modern nation-state. Among these apparatuses, education programs occupy an important place. For the state, these programs have multidimensional content, ranging from personal development to fulfilling political, economic and social needs. Within this framework, the *Rehber-i İttihad* (Guide to Unity) course included citizenship education and covered topics such as homeland, freedom, parliament, humanity, education, Ottomanism and equality. The course aimed to instill in children patterns of thought and behavior, such as a love and knowledge of the homeland, the ability to establish equal and healthy relationships with members of society and unity and solidarity (Kaya, 2020; Toprak, 1988).

During this period, official ideology and history were introduced for the first time through curricula, textbooks and educational programs. Attention was drawn to the

importance of obedience to authority and the law, beginning with the family. The political construction of childhood based on citizenship was established through textbooks (Alkan, 2008; Kaya & Biçer, 2021; Toprak, 1988). The building blocks of this construction are political authority, loyalty to the homeland, social discipline, obedience, honesty and diligence. A connection is formed between the homeland and the family that is unconditional and selfless. The ultimate goal of this relationship is to produce good Ottoman citizens for the state. This envisioned citizenship will be a civic identity formed by generations raised according to the principles of freedom, equality, brotherhood and justice. In other words, citizens of the Constitutional Monarchy were sought to be created. The *Malumat-ı Vatanîyye* (National Knowledge) course, which was to be taught in primary and secondary schools, would ensure that children acquired such an identity (Öztaş, 2011; Toprak, 1988). Similar to the Platonic approach (Platon, 2010), educational programs develop children's mental and physical abilities within the framework of love for, loyalty to and responsibility toward the homeland, with a focus on the family. Obedience is considered an important step toward becoming a good citizen because it is thought to transfer from the family to the state in a hierarchical manner. Obedience to one's father ensures obedience to the state.

The modern state requires a citizenship identity that establishes a bond of belonging to the state. This identity is also required for the rational basis of the state's relationship with its citizens. On the one hand, this requirement ensures the modern state's systematic and regular access to the tax and military resources it needs. On the other hand, it guarantees the existence of citizens who understand the values of modern, civilized life and can apply these values in their daily lives. In other words, the state aims to create competent individuals who can live civilized lives within modern society. Civilization is important because it produces unproblematic obedience to the established order and its rules, thereby curbing excesses and enabling citizens to act lawfully. Thus, constructing citizenship is profoundly meaningful and important for the modern state as a means of establishing identity and influencing the social sphere (Pierson, 2000; Mann, 1993; Poggi, 2009). Education is an important part of this process (Guterk, 2006; Alkan, 2008) and includes love for the homeland and knowledge of good citizenship in the curriculum. Education is regarded as an important issue by the state. This is because citizenship, which meets the needs of the modern state, is to be constructed through education. In this context, with the increase in school enrolment rates in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, education began to shift from being status-based to becoming mass education. The modern state carried out this change to fulfill its own needs and those of society, including the needs of capitalism. In this context, the number of *rüştiye* schools increased from 277 to 619 between 1879 and 1908 and the number of *idadi* schools rose from 6 to 109 between 1876 and 1908, showing a significant increase in the rate of schooling (Findley, 2011).

The Second Constitutional Era encompasses the process of establishing Ottoman citizenship through educational programmes. It is an important milestone in the "transition from subject to citizen" process (Tunaya, 2004). During this period, a modern sense of citizenship emerged and political parties, associations, mass communication apparatuses and the press became closely connected with different social groups. Public interest in political and social issues increased and an organized society emerged. People participated in political and social issues, such as elections, political campaigns, strikes and boycotts. The proclamation of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, the 1909 Constitutional Amendments, the 1909 Law on Associations, the spread of modern educational institutions and curricula, the strengthening of civic consciousness and spirit

through national holidays and the production and activation of civic identity were decisive factors (Üstel, 2008a; Çetinkaya, 2008). The establishment of political and administrative institutions, recognition of fundamental rights and freedoms, creation of a legal and formal framework, enshrinement of constitutional provisions (1876) and provision of political participation established a close link between the state and its citizens within the modern political and social structure. However, this connection could be severed due to events that occurred during the Late Ottoman period, such as the 31 March Incident and the Bab-ı Ali Raid, as well as during the Early Republican period due to events like the Sheikh Said Rebellion and the Menemen Incident. These events are particularly noteworthy in terms of shaping the form and nature of citizenship, the ontological basis of the relationship between the state and its citizens and how the founding authority constructed the concept of citizenship.

Citizenship education is provided in the course entitled ‘Malumat-ı Medeniye, Ahlakiye ve İktisadiye’. This course formed the basis of the “Citizenship Knowledge” course taught during the Republican period. Its aim was to instill in students their responsibilities towards the state, emphasizing that fulfilling these responsibilities constituted good citizenship. The close relationship between school curricula and the ideological sources of the state is noteworthy in determining civic identity. The curriculum established after the proclamation of the Second Constitutional Monarchy coincides with the dynamics of this period. The curriculum incorporated concepts and discourses that praised the virtues of the Constitutional Monarchy, such as freedom, equality, brotherhood and justice and that criticized Abdülhamid II for his despotism. These concepts influenced the nature of citizenship identity (Öztañ, 2011; Üstel, 2009). As part of constructing citizenship, the “Mekatib-i İptidaiyeye Mahsus Talimatname (1915)” published during the Committee of Union and Progress period, emphasizes the need for multifaceted education to raise individuals in line with the state’s and society’s goals. Accordingly, the desire was for children in schools to be educated in a way that would enable them to contribute to the development of the state and society through their mental, intellectual and physical capacities. This educational process was said to ensure the mental and moral development of children (Üstel, 2008a). During the constitutional era, the adopted fundamental values and envisioned curriculum aimed to create obedient, hardworking, moral, civilized and thrifty Ottoman citizens. This formation process, which began with the family and continued in state-led schools, demonstrated the state’s utmost concern for citizenship. The aforementioned ideas and approaches aimed to foster the unity of civilized individuals and citizenship. Emphasis is placed on the idea that becoming a civilized individual is achieved through mental and moral development. At the same time, the importance of bearing public responsibilities as obedient, patriotic, knowledgeable, hardworking, thrifty and self-sacrificing citizens is highlighted. Thus, the civilized individual and the citizen are equated in an effort to produce the desired state- required identity.

A Political Perspective on the Constitutional and Legal Framework of Citizenship in the Early Republican Period

The Tanzimat and Islahat Edicts addressed citizenship similarly to the modern concept, as modern citizenship theoretically rejects any form of difference or privilege. Thus, the Tanzimat and, in particular, the Islahat Edict incorporated the idea of citizenship based on equality. Building on the fundamental principles of these decrees, the Ottoman Empire’s first written constitution, the Kanuni Esasi (1876), defined citizenship as equal and

independent of ethnic and religious identity. This approach was adopted during the Republican era as well and the constitution enshrined an egalitarian understanding of citizenship. However, the 1921 Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu (Constitution), enacted under extraordinary circumstances during the transition to the republic, does not contain any provisions defining citizenship. Despite this absence, the fundamental approach of the political authority was citizenship based on equality under a national identity. One important reason the political elite sought to establish citizenship based on an inclusive understanding was to promote the transition from subjects to citizens and create a modern citizenship identity (Van Het Hof, 2010). Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's opening speech to parliament in May 1920 supports this approach: "The nation consists of different identities within the country's borders and is not based on any differences" (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi [TBMM] Zabıt Ceridesi, 1336, Mayıs 1, s. 165). This idea shows that a land-based approach to citizenship was adopted. Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu (Basic Organization Law), drafted during the transition period, consisted of 23 articles and introduced the concept that sovereignty belongs to the nation. It also included provisions for a parliamentary government system and the unity of powers principle, as well as the concept of local administration (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, 2021; TBMM Başkanlığı İdari Teşkilatı, 2023; Kili & Gözübüyük, 2000; Özbudun, 2008; Tanör, 2018; Güneş, 2020). Because both the 1876 Constitution and the 1921 Constitution were in force during this period, it exhibits a dualistic constitutional structure. In terms of constitutional technique and scope, the 1876 Constitution and its provisions on citizenship remained in effect until the 1924 Constitution.

Although the 1921 Constitution does not contain any provisions regarding citizenship, its fundamental approach is consistent with the logic of the nation-state. This approach is reflected in Gazi Mustafa Kemal's ideas. This approach is evident in Article 88 of the 1924 Constitution. This constitution's approach to citizenship also bears similarities to the French approach, which is land-based. According to Article 88 of the 1924 Constitution, citizenship is an egalitarian concept that is not based on ethnicity or religion. According to this definition, anyone bound to the Turkish people by citizenship is considered Turkish, regardless of religion or race (TBMM Başkanlığı İdari Teşkilatı, 2023). This approach aligns with the tradition of republican citizenship. The republican citizenship approach presupposes egalitarianism (Durgun, 2010). Also referred to as the French republican citizenship approach, this modern citizenship approach evaluates different identities based on land under a single identity and on the basis of equality. While the 1876 Constitution was based on land-based citizenship rooted in "Ottoman" identity, the 1924 Constitution adopted a land-based approach grounded in "Turkishness" (Mumcu, 1986). Some members of parliament, such as Hamdullah Suphi Bey and Celal Nuri Bey, accepted a citizenship concept based on ethnic and religious identity. However, the 1924 Constitutional Commission adopted a citizenship concept similar to that of the 1876 Constitution (Gözübüyük & Sezgin, 1957; Bayrak, 2014). The citizenship approaches in both the 1869 Ottoman Nationality Code and the 1876 Constitution formed the basis for the Early Republic's citizenship approach. The 1928 Turkish Citizenship Law, based on descent and territory, was built on the same foundation. According to this law, children born to a Turkish father and/or mother, whether in Turkey or a foreign country, are Turkish citizens (Resmi Gazete, 1928, Haziran 4). This law links the acquisition of citizenship to citizenship itself. Therefore, children born to Turkish citizens are entitled to this right. The law incorporates a citizenship approach based on blood and soil ties, grounded in historical and social realities (Reyhan, 2024). For this reason, during this period when citizenship was organized according to the structure of the nation-state, the intention was to subsume

ethnic, religious and cultural differences under Turkish identity in order to create equal citizens.

Turkish identity is defined by criteria such as national, political, racial, linguistic, cultural, and historical unity (İnan, 1930; Çoban, 2021). Linguistic unity, in particular, is an important building block of national identity. Article 12 of the 1924 Constitution states that the ability to read and write Turkish is required to be elected as a member of Parliament, which highlights the role of the common language in constructing national identity. This approach is similar to the 19th-century approach to constructing national identity in modern nation-states. Both national and civic identity constructions should be considered within this scope. This approach includes a French-style political citizenship because those living within the country's borders are accepted as citizens through a higher identity (Reyhan, 2024; Alakel, 2011). Gazi Mustafa Kemal's statement that "The people who established the Republic of Turkey are called the Turkish Nation" (İnan, 1930, s. 18) reflects this approach as well. A contrary approach could lead to threats to the modern state and the republican regime, which are strongly desired. One of the cornerstones of a modern nation-state is undoubtedly a secular political and social structure. Citizenship in the modern sense is one of the conditions of such an order. Therefore, an approach to citizenship that includes ethnic and religious identity could hinder the formation of a modern nation-state (Dinçkol & Işık, 2015; Reyhan, 2024). It could also weaken the relationship between secular life and citizenship, which are both dynamics of this state. Consequently, a strong connection is established between the positivist and secular thought present in the founders' vision of the state and society and the citizenship defined in the constitution. The most concrete manifestation of this approach is the removal of the phrase "The religion of the Turkish State is Islam" from the 1924 constitution via Law No. 1222, enacted in 1928. Positivist and secular thought significantly affected the transformation of the political and social spheres to align with the needs of the republic (Karpas, 1996; Mardin, 2006; Tanör, 2018). The adoption of these two ideas was aimed at transforming the traditional and religious identity of the people inherited from the Ottoman Empire into a modern nation and citizenry. Furthermore, it served as a guiding principle in the construction of the state and society envisioned by the founding actors of the Republic (Kaya, 2015).

In this context, political authority first defined citizenship (Üstel, 2008a) and then established the building blocks of citizenship (1924 Anayasası, md. 88). Clause 69 of the 1924 Constitution emphasizes these rights and duties by stating that all Turks are equal before the law and must obey it. The same article abolishes and prohibits all privileges of any group, class, family, or individual (Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türk Anayasa Metinleri, 2023). This provision establishes egalitarian citizenship through a national identity and populism as the founding principles of the Republic. Populism, which encompassed the idea of a classless and privilege-free society at this time (Peker, 1984), is one of the important ideas of the Republic. During the Early Republican Period, populism fulfilled important functions. Both the 1921 and 1924 constitutions stated that "sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation" (TBMM Başkanlığı İdari Teşkilatı, 2023), emphasizing that the source of sovereignty had become secular. Currently, the people own sovereignty and the right to exercise it belongs to the political authority. The people can exercise this right when they achieve a common consciousness and become the community of citizens envisioned by the Republic (Heper, 2018). The priority is to produce such a consciousness and integrate it with the regime to be established.

From now on, the populist approach of the Republic's founding figures will form the basis for constructing the envisioned regime and citizenship. According to Mustafa Kemal,

It is necessary to explain what populism is, its principles and the duties of populists towards the people. It is an indispensable responsibility to loudly proclaim the necessity of the Republic, instill love for its principles and embed the Republic and its principles in the hearts of the people (Gazi Hz., 1930, p.1).

Based on these ideas, it is important to note the correspondence established between populism and the Republic. Terms such as the people's government, the people's administration, the people's assembly and the people's sovereignty became intensively used in official discourse (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 1337, Kasım 26). During this period, citizenship is imagined as social rather than individual and society is considered homogeneous. Thus, an identity is established between the people and citizenship. Populism aims to create a community of homogeneous citizens and integrate it with the republican regime (Üstel, 2008a; İrem, 2004, Toprak, 1977). In the Early Republican Period, the founders of citizenship were political and bureaucratic elites, intellectuals and professionals who embraced the values of the republic and modernity (Eraslan, 2003; Tuğluoğlu, 2005). In his opening day speech to parliament, Gazi Mustafa Kemal emphasized the importance of providing the public with information through educational activities and spreading these activities to important centers of the country for identity construction and modernization (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, 1923, Mart 1). During the Early Republican Period, the founding elite and intellectuals took it upon themselves to lead the people, speak on their behalf and set goals to achieve the ideals of the republic and create a modern, civilized society.

The Construction of Citizenship in the Republic through Imagination and Ideological Apparatuses

Educational programs were one of the most important ideological apparatuses of the Early Republican Period, while the People's Houses and Village Institutes were another. Alongside the curriculum, these effective ideological apparatuses played a significant role in constructing the envisioned citizenship during this period. Schools are institutions where political, social, cultural, and economic elements necessary for the political system are conveyed to students under state control. These elements are fundamental to the reproduction of the official ideology through children (Sel & Sözer, 2018). Therefore, educational programs, textbooks, and course content key elements of the state's official ideology play important roles in constructing civic identity and align with the modern state. During the early republican period, the regime also sought to raise citizens in line with its values through educational apparatuses. These apparatuses were considered important in fostering national consciousness (Gürses, 2010). In this context, educational programs and course content designed during the Early Republican Era of the 1920s and 1930s, as well as the People's Houses and Village Institutes established in the 1930s and 1940s, played a crucial role in building citizenship as ideological apparatuses. The educational programs and course content designed for primary school levels (first through fifth grade) were particularly important in this regard. It is therefore necessary to address the educational programs and courses designed to fulfill the anticipated citizenship-building functions of the People's Houses and Village Institutes. The approach to citizenship adopted during this period aligns more with a republican approach than a liberal one.

According to liberal theory, citizenship is defined by the civil and political rights and freedoms of the individual (Sağiroğlu, 2018). This theory emphasizes rights and freedoms over duties and responsibilities. According to this theory, citizens are competent individuals who can choose their own life plans and participate in judging, examining, and reevaluating, while

rejecting the state's interventionist apparatus and strict controls. The theory envisions protecting and guaranteeing individuals and their rights and freedoms against the state and the social sphere. Republican theory, on the other hand, associates citizenship with participation in public affairs and the common good, emphasizing the duties and responsibilities of citizens in this area. According to this theory, individuals only have citizenship status based on belonging to and consciousness of the community and its common good. In the republican tradition, duties and responsibilities are an integral part of citizenship. Therefore, citizenship is not an individual identity, but rather one that encompasses rights and duties within the community and prioritizes belonging and solidarity. According to the republican approach, a citizen's connection to the public sphere and the common good depends on strong citizenship. In this context, the Early Republican Period's citizenship approach resembles the republican citizenship approach (Durgun, 2010). Citizens are imagined as having a responsible identity that represents, strengthens, and advances the Republic's founding philosophy, values, revolutions, and institutional identity in the public sphere. This requires strong citizenship. Important values for this approach include belonging to the community, a shared consciousness burdened with duties, and activism. The emphasis on people, society, and the nation rather than the individual, as well as the discourse of a classless, privilege-free society, can be seen as reflections of the Republican approach.

The Republican approach holds the view that citizens should be raised with an identity that includes specific habits and behavioral patterns. Therefore, education plays a crucial role in developing the desired citizenship identity (Üstel, 2008a; Durgun, 2010). Through education, a citizenship that embraces and strengthens the values of the Republic will be created. This approach can also be seen in the early Republican period. In this context, education programs, textbooks, course content, People's Houses, and Village Institutes aim to foster Republican citizenship. Education was the most important tool for constructing a sense of citizenship during the Second Constitutional Era. It was also one of the ideological apparatuses used to form a community of citizens during the Republican Era. In this context, citizenship was attempted to be constructed through the curriculum. During the early Republican period, various ideas, approaches and ideological apparatuses were employed to establish the concept of citizenship necessary for building a modern nation-state and society on solid foundations. Similar to the Second Constitutional Era, this imagined citizenship included individuals who demonstrated mental and physical loyalty and obedience to the founding values of the newly established Republic. During this period, a multifaceted citizen identity was envisioned for everyone, from children and women to young people and adults, to meet the needs of the Republic and the modern nation-state. To this end, education programs, course content and ideological apparatuses were mobilized (Özcan, 2011; Üstel, 2008a; Kandiyoti, 2019; Sancar, 2012; Kaygusuz, 2005). Ideological Apparatuses bring forth citizens who share the values and beliefs of the imagined world and influence the legitimacy of the regime by producing citizen consent (Guttek, 2006; Althusser, 1991). The state uses ideological apparatuses to construct citizenship and turn citizens into political subjects. Citizenship becomes a phenomenon produced within a world of values and beliefs adopted and accepted through these apparatuses. The republic's vision of citizenship corresponds to an identity within its founding principles and values. Education policies and programs function as one of the most important ideological apparatuses for ensuring this construction. Curricula and course content are designed to encourage people to see themselves as citizens of an integrated nation (Parlak, 2005).

Within this framework, the curriculum and course content focus on essential themes such as homeland, love of homeland, nation, nationality, family, loyalty, morality, civility,

duties, responsibilities, diligence and productivity (Parlak, 2005). During the Second Constitutional Era, the Malumat-ı Medeniye course was renamed Malumat-ı Vataniye in the Early Republican Era. The course content was designed to instill the principles and values of the Republic in children through citizenship education (Üstel, 2008a). The first education program covering primary education in the Republican era was established in 1924. Under this program, the length of elementary school was reduced from six years to five. At the time, the Minister of National Education, Vasıf Bey, stated that the curriculum would be organized according to the principles and values of the Republic (Maarif vekili Vasıf Bey'in beyanatı, 1924). This approach aimed to foster the type of citizenship envisioned by the Republic. This civic identity included loyalty to the republic, protecting and developing it, being prepared to make sacrifices for it, possessing a national identity and consciousness, knowing and applying national and human duties and rights, participating in Western civilization, being hardworking and productive, complying with social etiquette, possessing the necessary knowledge and skills for life, and being moral, virtuous, and responsible (Aslan, 2011; Demir, 2018; Demir & Duman, 2018; Kandal, 2019).

Following the establishment of the Republic, the political center sought to produce citizens who embodied the values it had adopted through a specific educational program. As part of this process, the 1924 Orhan Fuad textbook *Musahabat-ı Ahlakiye ve Malumat-ı Vataniye* taught primary school students topics such as morality, virtue, civility, nationalism, the political regime, love of country, duties and responsibilities and life skills. The aim was to create a community of citizens compatible with the Republic, in accordance with the 1924 curriculum (Demirkaya, 2014). Gazi Mustafa Kemal's thoughts on civilization are noteworthy in that they explain why the curriculum emphasizes civilized citizens so strongly. "The people of the Republic of Turkey, who claim to be civilized, are obliged to prove and demonstrate that they are civilized in their thoughts and mentality. They must demonstrate their civilization through their family life and lifestyle" (Unan, 1952, p.212). This approach reflects the ideals of the Republic and commitment to a modern state and society. Over time, in 1926, the name of the "Malumat-ı Vataniye" course was changed to "Knowledge of the Homeland (Yurt Bilgisi)" with the First Primary School Curriculum Program. The Yurt Bilgisi course aims to enable children to become good citizens who are loyal to their homeland and nation. This course develops children morally and instills in them a sense of responsibility towards their families, nation and state. It establishes an organic relationship with these concepts and instills a love for the homeland. The course provides children with the knowledge and skills to become productive citizens and ensures they are knowledgeable about and loyal to the regime (Republic) under which they live. In response to the need for a modern nation-state, the Republic has developed educational programs and course content to foster a sense of citizenship and identity among children and young people.

The 1926 Elementary School Program aims to foster loyalty to one's homeland and nation; develop a national identity and consciousness, and promote knowledge of political, administrative, and social institutions. The program also aims to educate citizens about their rights and responsibilities, encourage adherence to moral rules, promote cooperation and solidarity, and foster good citizenship in harmony with one's environment. Additionally, the program aims to raise awareness of one's role and function in society (Demir&Duman, 2018). In this vein, the course National Information for Children of the Republic (*Cumhuriyet Çocuklarına Malûmât-ı Vataniye*), written by Muslihiddin Adil in 1926, covers topics such as personal development, rights and responsibilities toward one's family, society and nation; hard work; and moral behavior. It envisions a republican citizenship

that has acquired these values (Akagündüz, 2020). In line with the regime, the revised 1936 elementary school curriculum emphasizes the Republic's goals for educating citizens, including instilling a sense of homeland and patriotism, teaching about the Republic's revolutions, and fostering loyalty to the homeland and nation. The curriculum emphasizes raising knowledgeable, hardworking, disciplined, and moral citizens who embrace the principles of republicanism, secularism, nationalism, populism, statism, and revolutionism and who are loyal to their homeland and nation. This emphasis was prevalent in educational programs and textbooks, particularly in the 1930s and 1940s. In school courses such as homeland knowledge, history, and life skills, information is provided and awareness is instilled by referencing the Republic and its revolutions. National identity is produced within this framework (Tuğluoğlu & Tunç, 2010; Budak & Budak, 2014; Demir, 2018). Therefore, when designing an educational program aimed at building citizens loyal to the Republic, the goal is to develop human resources and a civic identity that will achieve the Republic's aims and objectives through the program. The 1929 "Primary Schools Instruction Manual" emphasized the need to raise children who are knowledgeable, well-equipped, disciplined, spiritually and physically committed to national values, and, moreover, to the regime so they can be useful to the state and nation. Thus, the role of schools in educating citizens is emphasized (Yanardağ, 2020; Kandal, 2019). For this reason, educational programs, course content, and apparatuses from the 1920s and 1930s were aligned with the regime and significantly impacted the education of citizens envisioned by the Republic.

Using education as an ideological tool to construct citizenship during the Early Republican Period increased the number of schools. The number of primary schools, for example, increased from 4,894 in 1923–1924 to 6,599 in 1928–1929 and 6,713 in 1931–1932 (Üstel, 2008a). This situation indicates a significant change in the material conditions of the Republic. During the Early Republican Period, the state faced many challenges and required substantial resources to address them. Having the resources to implement policies, as well as producing policies, was one of the most fundamental issues of this period. For a state that had emerged from a national struggle, ensuring economic development became a primary goal. Therefore, the emphasis on citizens being hardworking and productive stems from this. One of the founders' important goals was to instill the core values, worldview and beliefs of the social and political order in the people born into the Republic through a planned education program (Parlak, 2005). Schools, educational programs and course content play an important role in raising citizens who embody the Republic's vision. In this context, the interaction between educational apparatuses and official ideology enables the regime to create suitable citizens and ensure its own strong existence. Furthermore, the regime aims to use these apparatuses to make individuals conform to the expected mental and behavioral standards. The primary objective of citizenship education is to foster individuals who are loyal to the regime and recognize its legitimacy (Yeşilorman, 2003; Demir&Duman, 2018). Citizens are expected to participate in political and social life with an awareness of their rights and responsibilities.

Every citizen has the duty to obey the regime and its laws, vote, serve in the military, pay taxes, and contribute to the modernization and development of the country. They must also be loyal to their family, nation, and state, work for their benefit, ensure the continuity of their family, and be disciplined, hardworking, physically fit, morally upright, and honorable (Caymaz, 2007; Üstel, 2008a; Parlak, 2005; Çoban, 2021). Within this framework, civic education enables children to establish a connection with the values, ideas and beliefs presented to them. The citizenship envisioned by the Republic then becomes a reality. Therefore, during the Early Republican period, citizenship was not a founding subject,

but rather a constructed one. The construction of a conscious, disciplined citizenship that is aware of its rights and responsibilities and uses them in accordance with the Republic's aims, as well as the construction of a public sphere in which this citizenship is "subjectified," becomes a matter of concern. During this period, a strong link is established between citizenship and the public sphere. On one side of this link are the Republic's founding principles and values and on the other are the practices of modern life. Citizenship becomes synonymous with a public sphere that includes citizens who have adopted and accepted these facts, values and practices. At this point, Üstel (2008a) mentions "a regulated living space and citizenship identity."

Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's statements on education and ideological apparatuses aimed at shaping citizenship make it clear that the Republic sought to create a homogeneous citizenry. According to Atatürk, it is impossible to create a community of citizens with the same ideas and mentality without standardization (Tevhid-i Tedrisat) in education and teaching (Özgen, 2024). A citizenship constructed through ideological apparatuses acquires a representative function, becoming the visible face of the Republic's official ideology in the public sphere. In this process, citizenship identities formed on the Republic's philosophy and values become permeable to a public sphere shaped by secular and modernist representations. The Law of Unification of Education, the closure of tekkes and zawiya's, the alphabet and dress code reforms and the civil code are political and social symbols that significantly impacted political and social relations and daily life. These reforms produced serious practical results in both the formation of a citizenship identity and its inclusion in the public sphere. The impact of revolutions on creating standardized norms, values and structures for a homogeneous community of citizens is quite decisive in this process.

Populism is an important concept that establishes a close link between the imagined concept of citizenship and the public sphere, which encompasses a life based on rules. The populist idea of a classless, privilege-free society ensures a homogeneous public sphere. Furthermore, the public sphere is shaped by a positivist and secular way of life. It strengthens its connection with citizenship by being free from religious, traditional and cultural symbols and values (Yıldız, 2002). Populism carries ideological and political action in forming a citizenship appropriate to the Republic's nature (Gürkan, 2019). As a result of the official discourse that society is classless and without privileges, citizenship establishes a homogeneous identity while incorporating different identities under the umbrella of Turkish identity. This identity is built on a common language, religion, history and culture, which foster civic consciousness and a sense of belonging to the Republic (Kandeger, 2023). Thus, enlightened and obedient citizens of the Republic are an important target for political authorities to achieve their goals. Therefore, populism fulfills many important functions in the formation of a citizenship identity. An essential and unchanging definition of citizenship and a clear delineation of its framework are important for showing that citizens are formed within the ideals of the Republic. Within this framework, participation within defined limits and the duties assigned to citizens are accepted virtues. The rights granted to citizens are considered functional in that they enable citizens to fulfill their duties and determine their status. Therefore, rights and duties are important elements of the citizenship identity envisioned by the Republic. The concept of a classless, privilege-free society indicates a vision of citizenship based on homogeneity rather than differences. Accordingly, citizenship identity is produced within a political and social order that does not include pluralism (Parlak, 2005; Durgun, 2010). The majority consists of a homogeneous and integrated people. Thus, citizens who are similar to and integrated with the founding values of the regime become the

political subjects of the imagined world (Durgun, 2010). During this process, the ruling authority mobilizes political elites, intellectuals and professionals to construct the imagined political subject. According to Althusser (1991), in this context, “subjectification” means “subjugation.” The ruling authority primarily attempts subjectification through ideological Apparatuses. The book “Civil Information for Citizens,” published by the political authority, points to the building blocks of citizenship as envisioned by the Republic. First, the people are equated with citizenship. The people are imagined as a community of citizens with a modern, civil, enlightened and secular identity. For the founders of the Republic, the people constitute a community of citizens who have distanced themselves from traditional political, social and cultural values and embraced modern values. Thus, a state identity composed of national, civil and moral citizens is envisioned. Different ethnic and religious identities within the country are expressed as equal citizens with a common history, morality and law under the national (Turkish) identity (İnan, 1930). In this respect, it is possible to see a reflection of the Early Republican Period’s understanding of citizenship here as well.

According to Köker (2000), the sovereign political authority of the Republic does not represent the will of individual citizens, but rather a general will formed by individuals that stands above them. As the source of sovereignty, the people or nation play an important role in determining the legitimacy of the state and its regime. Similar to Rousseau’s (2006) understanding of sovereignty, it expresses a will formed above the will of individuals. The Republic’s founding power uses this sovereignty on behalf of the people. The founders of the Republic claim that sovereignty belongs to the people, while the people gather in front of the curtain. The founders imagine a people made up of citizens, while the people are indoctrinated to make this imagined citizenship possible. In this context, the 1921 (Article 1) and 1924 (Article 3) constitutions stipulated that the source of sovereignty was the nation/people. During the Republican era, the ruling power assumed broad representation of the general will and aimed to use ideological apparatuses effectively to transform children into citizens who embraced the Republic’s ideology.

During the Early Republican Period, citizenship was far from being a spontaneous political subject. Theoretically and historically, citizenship includes an identity as a political subject who participates in political and public affairs, has a say in the public sphere and acts. This subject has rights and responsibilities, expresses demands and criticisms and supervises and controls political power (Arendt, 1998; Marshall, 1992; Aristoteles, 2011; Habermas, 2004). The relationship that citizens establish with the state, political parties, social organizations, the press and mass media undoubtedly plays a very important role. However, during the period dominated by a single-party system, the absence of political parties and the dependence of civil society organizations, the press and mass media on political authority led to the confinement of citizenship within the prescribed framework (Zürcher, 2004; Karpat, 1996; Ahmad, 2008; Gevgilili, 1990). Structures that played important roles in shaping citizenship, such as associations, societies, political parties and the press, became dependent on the government or were shut down.

Rather than having a reciprocal relationship with political authority/power, citizenship is constructed based on values, ideas, principles and beliefs that are unilaterally defined by political authority. In line with Hobbes’s (1993) approach, citizens are expected to obey sovereign authority. Sovereign authority aims to provide citizens with a “good life” and uses policies, institutions and ideologies to achieve this goal. Imagined citizenship is also constructed within this process. Ultimately, creating a community of citizens within

defined boundaries is considered necessary for the existence of the envisioned political and social order of the Republic. In this context, the 1931 circular issued by Esat Sagay, the Minister of National Education during the early Republican period, outlines the fundamental purpose of the education provided to children. The circular emphasizes that “every Turkish child who attends school must fully comprehend the psychology and ideology of the republican regime.” The importance of raising children to become useful Turkish citizens for the Turkish nation and the Republic of Turkey is emphasized. The 1930s were marked by intense “nationalism” rhetoric aimed at establishing citizenship. Children’s purpose was to become useful citizens for the “nation.” The impact of the rising nationalism of the 1930s on this approach is important to note. Therefore, the curriculum, schools and lessons became centers for producing the citizens that the Republic needed. The influence of Kemalist principles on the conception of the ideal citizen in the 1930s is evident (Kadıoğlu, 2008). Within this framework, the importance of raising citizens who are republican, nationalist, populist, statist, secular and revolutionary is emphasized. Ultimately, the concept of national citizenship emerges that is obedient to the state and political authority and has adopted the principles and values of the Republic (Üstel, 2008a). Within this concept, symbols such as national anthems, holidays, ceremonies, monuments, flags and student oaths serve to create a common sense of citizenship and memory (Çelik, 2022; Evirgen, 2019; Dağdelen, 2022).

People’s Houses and Village Institutes were the most effective ideological apparatuses of this period and played a crucial role in establishing the desired citizenship. These apparatuses fulfill functions that form the theoretical and practical basis of civic identity. The construction of citizenship is a broad process that encompasses both cities and villages. For this reason, People’s Houses and Village Institutes are ideological apparatuses that help build the envisioned citizenship. These apparatuses play an important role in homogenizing differences and diversity in society to ensure national unity and eliminate dynamics that would hinder the Republic’s goals. People’s Houses and Village Institutes were the most effective of the state’s ideological apparatuses in this process, assuming an important role in constructing the citizen the Republic envisioned. The first People’s Houses opened on February 19, 1932, in 14 cities. By June 24, 1932, they had expanded to 34 cities. Their number rose to 55 in 1933, 379 in 1940, 438 in 1945 and 478 in 1950. The People’s Houses were established as educational and cultural institutions comprised of the History, Language, Literature and Folklore Branch; the Public Tutorials and Courses Branch; the Social Assistance Branch; the Sports Branch; the Fine Arts Branch; the Representation and Theater Branch; the Library and Publications Branch; the Rural Life Branch; and the Museum and Exhibition Branch. The organization envisions constructing a modern citizenship that embraces the values of the Republic and possesses high levels of knowledge and skill (Çeçen, 1990; Oral, 2002; Karaömerlioğlu, 2009; Kendirci, 2023; Kabagöz, 2024).

The People’s Houses were established to create a political culture that would strengthen the Republican regime and foster a sense of common belonging based on citizenship. They aimed to implement multifaceted education and instill national, secular and populist ideas. Additionally, they sought to teach the knowledge and skills necessary to modernize the people (Oral, 2002; Özer, 2021; Komsuoğlu & Turan, 2007; Özdemir & Aktaş, 2011; Tuğluoğlu, 2005). The Republican People’s Party’s (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi) directive on the aims and objectives of the People’s Houses emphasizes that the purpose of the Houses is to foster competent citizenship that embraces the principles and values of the Republic. These ideological institutions are given an important mission.

The fundamental principles of our party's program are republicanism, nationalism, populism, statism, secularism and revolutionism. Our program emphasizes cultivating strong citizens with these qualities, elevating the national character to levels inspired by Turkish history, advancing the fine arts and strengthening national culture, scientific movement and activity as important means of achieving and perpetuating these fundamental principles. The People's Houses aim to be gathering places that unify idealistic citizens who work toward these goals (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi [CHP] Halkevleri Talimatnamesi, 1932, p.3).

The directive outlines the state's responsibilities in conveying the Republic's founding philosophy, principles and values, as well as modern forms of life and social development, to its citizens. In this context, People's Houses serve as an important ideological tool for creating the envisioned citizen through widespread, multidimensional education and for forming civic identity and consciousness (Ekinci, 1989). Prime Minister İsmet İnönü's speech on the opening day of the People's Houses is noteworthy in that it outlines the functions that the People's Houses should fulfill as an ideological instrument of political authority.

People's Houses are places where citizens can gather without any burden and where they can freely discuss matters concerning the country and the nation, especially the nation's high cultural affairs, as they see fit... The cultural policy pursued by the Republican People's Party through the People's Houses is to promote science and the fine arts through this medium and to disseminate the most up-to-date and accurate information about the politics and economics of this country (Halkevlerinin yıldönümü, 1933, p.6).

Recep Peker, an important figure in the Republic, emphasized the need to "educate" the people to create the community of citizens envisioned by the Republic. He pointed to the role of structures such as People's Houses in this process. According to Recep Peker, the People's Houses are institutions that promote national consciousness in accordance with the ideals of the Republic. They are closely tied to the Republican People's Party (Halkevleri açılma nutku, 1933). These institutions' fundamental mission is to create a citizenry that embraces the Republic's values and philosophy. In other words, they aim to build the envisioned citizenship by educating the people. Recep Peker's thoughts, as one of the party's important figures, point to this situation and indicate that ideological apparatuses will be mobilized.

The experience of recent years has demonstrated the benefit and necessity of providing citizens with a common public education... We consider it essential to continue providing a public education that is consistent with the progress of the new Turkey, in addition to classical education, so that the nation may attain the maturity to face every challenge. To this end, we will strengthen the institutions of People's Houses, public forums and public speakers (CHP Genel Sekreteri R. Peker'in Söylevleri, 1935, pp.6-7).

To this end, he stated that they would strengthen institutions such as People's Houses, People's Podiums and People's Speakers (CHP Dördüncü Büyük Kurultayı Görüşmeleri Tatalgası, 1935).

For this reason, one of these structures' important objectives is to quickly establish the highly competent civic identity and strong national consciousness that the Republic needs. To this end, they organize activities and events throughout the country. Speeches in public squares, conferences, concerts and screenings of films and plays are organized with this objective in mind. Between 1932 and 1940, for example, the People's Houses organized 23,750 conferences, 9,050 concerts, 7,850 film screenings, 970 exhibitions and

12,350 theater performances. These efforts became important apparatuses for instilling the public with the knowledge and experience necessary for achieving the envisioned citizenship. These events emphasized the principles and values of the Republic, including the national struggle, homeland, independence, national identity, nation, morality, virtue, responsibility and diligence. This was an attempt to foster the type of citizenship the regime needed and envisioned (Çeçen, 1990; Kendirci, 2024; Aydın, 1996; Şimşek, 2002; Başbuğ, 2010; Akar & Bingöl, 2023; Temel, 2015). These events and activities aimed to produce a consciousness and identity, which the various branches of the People's Houses sought to achieve, thereby creating a form of citizenship compatible with the regime. The Village Branch, an important branch of the People's Houses, aims to foster citizenship in villages.

Village branches of the People's Houses were established to improve education in rural areas, promote economic, cultural, and social development, bridge the gap between urban and rural populations, and advance the regime's founding values and philosophy. These structures carry out important activities, such as raising awareness and enlightening villagers, as well as imparting knowledge and skills. They embody the Republic's vision of creating a community of citizens by modernizing and developing villages (Karaömerlioğlu, 2006; Karaömerlioğlu, 2009). The theater branch, an important part of the People's Houses, plays a significant role in constructing citizenship and forming a national consciousness. Theater plays that cover topics such as the national struggle, the war of independence, the virtues and values of the Republic, the construction of the people and nation, national identity, modernization, the homeland, independence, hard work, responsibility, enlightenment, and individuals and villages are staged in an attempt to produce the imagined civic identity. Thus, the regime establishes a strong bond between the desired citizen and the state and society (Başbuğ, 2010; Akar & Bingöl, 2023).

Another ideological tool of the state was the Village Institutes. Established on April 17, 1940 (Resmi Gazete, 1940, Nisan 22), the Village Institutes played an important role in establishing the envisioned citizenship identity for villages. Villages were one aspect of citizenship as envisioned by the Republic. They are places where political authority focuses its attention and where many problems need to be solved. Most importantly, the majority of the population lives in villages, so they must be taken into consideration and policies must be developed for them. To this end, the state adopted an approach to prepare villages and villagers for modern life, instill the Republic's philosophy and values in them, teach them modern production techniques, enhance their knowledge and skills and ensure their mental and physical development (Üstel, 2008a). Village Institutes play an important role in creating citizens who understand the ideals, values and principles of the republic, spreading this awareness to villages and spreading modernization and development throughout the country (Anık, 2006; Bilir, 2003; Parlak, 2011; Toksoy, 2007). Within this scope, these structures carry out educational and instructive activities to impart knowledge and skills in areas such as agriculture, animal husbandry and handicrafts. Simultaneously, educational and developmental activities are carried out in subjects such as civics, language, history, geography, health, culture, theater, cinema and music. These activities aim to foster competent citizenship in accordance with the regime (Karaömerlioğlu, 1998; Parlak, 2011; Yıldız & Akandere, 2017). Ensuring close relations and interaction between villages and the political center will also create citizens in line with the Republic's ideals (Boybeyi & Sallan, 2008; Parlak, 2011). Although the People's Schools were established to spread education, raise their level and create the community of citizens envisioned by the Republic, they had important functions (Aysal, 2005). However, both the People's Houses and Village Institutes were established with a broader scope. They aimed to achieve multidimensional objectives and functions that encompassed a much larger segment of the

population. The People's Schools (Resmi Gazete, 1928, Kasım 24) aimed to spread education throughout the country and instill the Republic's values to foster citizenship. (Yüceer, 2002; Şahin, 1992; Avcı, 2013). These structures were envisioned as an important tool in the literacy campaign, but remained inadequate due to material shortages. Village Institutes, on the other hand, aimed to foster a close relationship between the state and villagers.

During the Ottoman and Early Republican periods, villages and villagers were an integral part of the environment but remained distant from the beliefs and values of the central government. This reality established an identity based on the beliefs, values, production relations and life practices of the villages, which constituted the majority of the population. Therefore, during the Early Republican period, villages were considered important places for establishing the republican regime and its founding philosophy, as well as the modern state, societal identity, development, progress and ultimately, a citizenship identity within this framework. Ismail Hakkı Tonguç was a pivotal figure in addressing the educational challenges of the era and in shaping the educational programs, structure, operations and ideological foundations of the Village Institutes. Hailing from a family of Balkan immigrants, Tonguç observed the alienation between administrators and villagers. He emphasized the need for education to promote the villagers' material and spiritual development (Gümüsoğlu, 2014; Parlak, 2011). In this context, efforts were made to establish Village Institutes to enable the development of villages, educate village children and transform them into conscious citizens. According to Tonguç, these structures formed the consciousness of citizenship in the Republic. Tonguç's ideas encompass the concept of political authority.

Starting from the village and extending all the way to the Grand National Assembly, we must involve the villagers in the administration of all branches of the state without requiring any conditions other than their current qualifications. This will nourish state affairs with elements drawn from reality and shape them in a manner appropriate to the true structure of the country. It is necessary to awaken the consciousness of republican citizenship in a way that can be translated into action (Tonguç, 1946, p.212).

The Republic established Village Institutes to address the educational needs of rural communities and the shortage of teachers. The Republic's vision of providing its citizens with a multidimensional educational experience formed the basis for its creation. An important goal to be achieved through these structures is the creation of a community of citizens with a common national consciousness and sense of belonging who have embraced the Republic's founding philosophy, revolutions and modern ways of life. Within the scope of Republican citizenship and on the basis of equality, the aim is to enable the village population to become a community of citizens. This will be achieved by providing them with professional knowledge and skills in a wide range of subjects, such as agriculture, animal husbandry, handicrafts, life and citizenship, language, history, geography, health, sports, culture, music, theater and more. While striving to instill a national identity through an educational approach that combines theory and practice, intensive efforts are made to break down traditional structures and enable modern social life and development.

These ideological apparatuses were created to help achieve the Republic's goals and objectives. They carry out important educational and instructional activities. They play a crucial role in modernizing and developing villages by equipping their residents with professional knowledge and skills. The aim is to create an imagined citizenry that is well-equipped,

productive, highly educated, and cultured (Geray, 1969; Makal, 1979; Anık, 2006; Parlak, 2011; Öztan, 2021; Aysal, 2005; Kartal, 2008; Yıldız & Akandere, 2017). These structures aim to integrate theory and practice and are essential to creating a modern republic by instilling the elements that build imagined citizenship, in addition to knowledge and skills. The goal is to build a community of citizens aligned with the ideals of the republic, making them key agents of modernization and development through political, economic, cultural and social means. Similar to the People's Houses, the Village Institutes were ideological instruments designed to achieve these objectives. Through educational activities, the Institutes sought to instill values such as discipline, training, national and common consciousness and duty and responsibility. Thus, they attempted to create a civic identity as envisioned by the Republic. This identity encompasses citizenship that embraces the Republic's founding philosophy and principles, the values of modern and secular life and a national identity. The People's Houses and Village Institutes' ideological apparatuses that emerged within the single-party system, especially during the Early Republican Period, played important roles in constructing this civic identity.

Conclusion

During the Constitutional Era, fostering citizenship as a rational part of the modern state was essential. In this context, developing citizenship through educational programs and apparatuses was an important approach. Education programs and course content were developed with a strong emphasis on rights and freedoms during this period. These programs and content had a fairly broad repertoire and were linked to the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship toward the state. These ideas and approaches continued into the Early Republican Period. The difference between this period and the previous one was the use of ideological apparatuses in addition to educational ones. Two fundamental ideological Apparatuses, the People's Houses and Village Institutes, played a significant role in constructing citizenship during the Early Republican Period. These apparatuses sought to foster a citizenry that would embody the Republic's ideals, be knowledgeable and be equipped with the fundamental principles and values of the Republic. They aimed to promote modernization and development and encourage collective action within this framework. Therefore, the Republic's vision of citizenship resembles the type of citizenship that emerged with the modern state. This is because the modern state creates a homogeneous citizenship identity through ideological Apparatuses. During this period, however, elements that enabled interaction and mutual influence between citizens and the state such as rights and freedoms, political participation and civil formations based on pluralism did not have an arena in which to act and strengthen the regime, creating a strong community of citizens. Nevertheless, the modern state also recognized the importance of citizens' rights and freedoms as a significant phenomenon. Considering the legacy of disintegration and fragmentation inherited from the Ottoman Empire, it is understandable that duties and responsibilities took precedence over rights and freedoms during the early Republican period.

The educational programs, textbooks, and course content of the Early Republican Era, as well as the activities and functions of the People's Houses and Village Institutes, influenced the development of responsible citizens who embraced the Republic's philosophy, values, and goals and worked to achieve them. These programs also fostered citizens loyal to the regime. For this reason, during the Early Republican Period, citizenship was defined more by obligations and responsibilities than by rights. This was due to the lack of organized

political and social structures, constitutionally guaranteed institutions and a public sphere within this scope where citizens could express their rights and freedoms concretely. Thus, citizenship during the Early Republican Period was defined by duties and responsibilities that played a central role in realizing the Republic's ideals. Rights and freedoms were considered legitimate only within the limits determined by political authority. One important reason for constructing citizenship with ideological apparatuses during the Second Constitutional Era and the Early Republican Period was the belief that strong citizenship could be created with these apparatuses. During the Early Republican Period, influenced by populism, the concept of citizenship was conceived as collective rather than individual because a community of citizens consisting of classless, privileged people required collective citizenship. In this context, citizenship during the Early Republican Period involved creating a "collective political subject." Considered a precursor to the formation of a national community, citizenship plays a predictive role in reducing societal deviations. The political authority/power's foresight in the Early Republican Period applies not only to citizenship, but also to state building, constitutional and legal regulations, political institutions and structures and economic and social order. Examples include the Parliamentary Government System, the Centralization Approach, the Treason Law, the Law on the Maintenance of Order, the State-Centric Ideology, the Absence of Opposition Parties and the Lack of Political Participation. These phenomena summarize the general structure of the period. These phenomena were adopted as anticipated phenomena and approaches. Therefore, within this ideology and approach, citizenship encompasses an identity constructed by the state through its ideological Apparatuses. This identity expresses a collective political subject interwoven with republican ideals under the leadership of positivist and secular values. It defines a citizen with a common consciousness and sense of belonging. During this period, citizenship is imagined on the basis of equality and includes a political subject that is not self-evident. This subject defines a national identity based on a common consciousness and acquires meaning and value within this world.

During the Early Republican Period, educational apparatuses such as People's Houses and Village Institutes served as ideological instruments for creating a collective political identity. These apparatuses transferred a set of values to the periphery, reducing the tension between the political center and the periphery during this process. These apparatuses played a crucial role in transferring and internalizing the values of the center to the periphery, thereby reducing the distance between them. The dissemination of education, one of the important functions of these ideological Apparatuses, as well as the enrichment of its content and improvement of its level, has been important in forming the citizenship required by the modern state. This is because the modern state and society require citizens to become educated, acquire knowledge and skills and establish a rational relationship with the state. The modern state seeks to meet this need through these apparatuses. In this context, it is necessary to evaluate the important effects and functions of these apparatuses in constructing citizenship in a multifaceted manner within the conditions of this period. In this process, the broad content and multifaceted functions of ideological apparatuses such as People's Houses and Village Institutes reveal a close and direct relationship and interaction between the envisioned citizenship of the Republic and the functions of these apparatuses. Ultimately, the existence of an identity and connection between the goal and the apparatuses has determined and influenced the content of the envisioned citizenship.

References

- Ağaoğulları, M. A. (2015). Fransız devrimi: Halk sahneye çıkıyor. İçinde M. A. Ağaoğulları (Ed.), *Sokrates'ten Jakobenlere Batı'da Siyasal Düşünceler* (ss. 597–632). İletişim Yayınları.
- Ağaoğulları, M. A., & Köker, L. (2020). *İmparatorluktan Tanrı devletine*. İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Ahmad, F. (2008). *Modern Türkiye'nin oluşumu*. Kaynak Yayınları.
- Akagündüz, S. Y. (2020). Cumhuriyet'in ilk yıllarında yurttaşlık eğitimi: Cumhuriyet çocuklarına Malûmât-ı Vataniye ders kitabı örneği. *Turkish History Education Journal*, 9(1), 109–131.
- Akar, B., & Bingöl, Y. (2023). Köy-kent ayrımında ulusal mekânı sahnelemek: Devlet tiyatrosu'nda ulus inşası ve mekân. *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19(38), 887-924.
- Akgün, E. (2013). Ortaçağ'da özgürlük arayışı. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(8), 120–134.
- Alakel, M. (2011). İlk dönem Cumhuriyet Türkiye'si ulus inşası sürecinde milliyetçilik ve sivil-etnik ikilemine dair teorik tartışmalar. *Gazi Akademik Bakış*, 5(9), 1–30.
- Alkan, M. Ö. (2008). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda modernleşme ve eğitim. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 6(12), 9–84.
- Althusser, L. (1991). *İdeoloji ve devletin ideolojik aygıtları*. (Y. Alp., & M. Özışık. Çev.). İletişim Yayınları.
- Anık, M. (2006). Bir modernleş(tir)me projesi olarak Köy Enstitüleri. *Divan İlmi Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 20, 279–309.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Aristoteles. (2011). *Politika* (M. Tunçay, Çev.). Bilgesu Yayınları.
- Aslan, E. (2011). 1924 İlk mektepler müfredat programı. *Elementary Education Online*, 10(2), 717–734.
- Avcı, C. (2013). Harf inkılabı ve millet mektepleri. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Akdeniz İnsani Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 43–60.
- Aybay, R. (2003). *Vatandaşlık hukuku*. Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Aydın, S. (1996). Türk tarih tezi ve Halkevleri. *Kebikeç Dergisi*, 2(3), 107-130.
- Aysal, N. (2005). Anadolu'da aydınlanma hareketinin doğuşu: Köy Enstitüleri. *Atatürk Yolu*

Dergisi, 9(35), 267–282.

Başbuğ, E. D. (2010). *Devlet ideolojisi inşaasında tiyatronun yeri*. [Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi]. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi.

Bayrak, M. B. (2014). Meclis tutanakları üzerinden 1924 Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu tartışmaları. *Memleket Siyaset Yönetim*, 21, 189–218.

Bilir, M. (2003). Köy Enstitüleri sisteminde toplum kalkınması süreci. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10, 1–15.

Blaufarb, R. (1995). The French Revolution: The birth of European popular democracy? *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 37(3), 608–618.

Boybeyi, S., & Sallan G., S. (2008). Cumhuriyet aydınlanmasının kısa tarihi: Köy Enstitülerini çevreleyen tarihsel ve toplumsal koşullar ve bugüne çıkarsamalar. *Toplum ve Demokrasi Dergisi*, 2(3), 67–92.

Budak, L. & Budak, Ç. (2014). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’ne ilkökul programları (1870-1936). *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 181(181), 51-68.

Caymaz, B. (2007). *Türkiye’de vatandaşlık: Resmî ideoloji ve yansımaları*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi. (1935). *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP) Dördüncü Büyük Kurultayı Görüşmeleri Tutulgası, 9-16 Mayıs 1935*. Ulus Basımevi.

Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi. (1932). *Halkevleri talimatnamesi*. Hâkimiyeti Millîye Matbaası.

Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi. (1935). *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP) Genel Sekreteri R. Peker’in söylevleri*. Ulus Basımevi.

Çeçen, A. (1990). *Atatürk’ün kültür kurumu Halkevleri*. Gündoğan Yayınları.

Çelik, F. (2012). Antik çağ ve Rönesans’da gelişen “evrensel yurttaşlık” anlayışının modern dönemdeki yansıması: Fransız yurttaşlığı. *Düşünce Dünyasında Türkiz*, 3(13), 88–104.

Çelik, O. (2022). *Ulusal kimliğin inşasında ulusal marşların rolü: Türkiye örneği*. [Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi]. İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi.

Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2008). 1908 Devrimi’nde kamusal alan ve kitle siyasetinde dönüşüm. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38, 125–140.

Çilingir, L. (2024). Augustinus’ta iki şehrin anlamı. *Tabula Rasa: Felsefe ve Teoloji*, 43, 28–42.

Çoban, F. (2021). Etno-sembolist perspektiften erken Cumhuriyet dönemi Türkiye’inde ulus-devlet ve vatandaşlık. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 22(1), 87-100.

- Dağdelen, M. Ç. (2022). Ulus-devletlerin özet metni milli marş tezahürleri. *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(30), 354–385.
- Demir, F. (2018). Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet döneminde ilkokul programları kapsamında yetiştirilmek istenen insan modeli. [Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Demir, F., & Duman, T. (2018). Türkiye’de Cumhuriyetin ilanı ile birlikte yetiştirilecek bireylere kazandırılması düşünülen temel nitelikler. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(25), 41-56
- Demirkaya, M. (2014). *Musahabat-ı Ahlakiye ve Malumat-ı Vataniye adlı ders kitabının transkripsiyonu ve değerlendirilmesi*. [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi.
- Dinçkol, B. V. & Işık, A. (2015). 1924 Anayasası döneminde yurttaşlık anlayışı. *Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 21(1), 13–43.
- Durgun, Ş. (2010). Cumhuriyetçi ve liberal anlayış çerçevesinde Türkiye’de vatandaşlık sorunsalı. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(1), 65–92.
- Ekici, Ö., & Şahin, İ. F. (2020). Modern vatandaşlık anlayışına göre Osmanlı devletinde vatandaşlık algısı. İçinde S. Berkün (Ed.), *Sosyal Bilimlere Multidisipliner Bakış* (ss. 155– 177). İksad Yayınevi.
- Ekinci, N. (1989). *Sanayileşme ve uluslaşma sürecinde toprak reformundan Köy Enstitülerine 1923–1950*. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Eraslan, C. (2003). *Yakın dönem Türk düşüncesinde halkçılık ve Atatürk*. Kumsaati Yayınları.
- Erdoğan, A. T. (2008). Osmanlılığın evrimi hakkında bir deneme: Bir grup (üst düzey yönetici) kimliğinden millet yaratma projesine. *Doğu Batı*, 45, 19–47.
- Eryılmaz, B. (1992). *Osmanlı Devleti’nde millet sistemi*. Ağaç Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Evirgen, B. (2019). *Meşrutiyet’ten Cumhuriyet’e ulusal bayramlar ve önemli günler (1908–1950)*. [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Mersin Üniversitesi.
- Gazi Hz. dün İstanbul’lularla temas etti. (1930, Aralık 20). *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*.
- Geray, C. (1969). Türkiye’de Köy Enstitüleri hareketi ve köy kalkınması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 197–200.
- Findley, C. V. (2011). *Modern Türkiye tarihi: İslam, milliyetçilik ve modernlik 1789–2007* (G. Ayas, Çev.). Timaş Yayınları.
- Gevgilili, A. (1990). *Türkiye’de yenileşme düşüncesi, sivil toplum, basın ve Atatürk*. Bağlam Yayınları.

- Gözübüyük, Ş., & Sezgin, Z. (1957). *1924 Anayasası hakkındaki meclis görüşmeleri*. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi İdari İlimler Enstitüsü Yayını.
- Guibernau, M. (1997). *Milliyetçilikler: 20. yüzyılda ulusal devlet ve milliyetçilikler* (N. N. Domaniç, Çev.). Sarmal Yayınevi.
- Guttek, G. L. (2006). *Eğitime felsefi ve ideolojik yaklaşımlar* (N. Kale, Çev.). Ütopya Yayınları.
- Gümüsoğlu, F. (2014). İsmail Hakkı Tonguç'un mektupları ve klasik eğitime karşı özgülleştirici eğitim. *MSGSÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10, 129–148.
- Güneş, İ. (2020). Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu'nun (1921 Anayasası'nın) yapılış süreci. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(2), 233–256.
- Gürkan, C. (2019). Aydınlanma ve ilk birikim çelişkisinde halk ve halkçı ekonomi politik. *Memleket Siyaset Yönetim*, 32, 1–30.
- Gürses, F. (2010). *Türkiye'de ders kitaplarında yurttaşlık: Cumhuriyet'in kuruluş yıllarından bugüne kavramsal dönüşüm*. [Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Halkevleri açılma nutku. (1933, Şubat). *Ülkü Halkevleri Mecmuası*.
- Halkevlerinin yıldönümü dün memleketin her tarafında tes'it edildi. (1933, Şubat 25). *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi*.
- Habermas, J. (2004). Kamusal alan. İçinde M. Özbek (Ed.), *Kamusal alan* (ss. 95–102). Hil Yayınları.
- Heater, D. (2004). *A brief history of citizenship*. NYU Press.
- Heper, M. (2018). *Türkiye'de devlet geleneği* (N. Soyarık, Çev.). Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Heywood, A. (2018). *Siyaset*. BB101 Yayınları.
- Hobbes, T. (1993). *Leviathan* (S. Lim, Çev.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Honohan, I. (2002). *Civic republicanism*. (Vol. 19), Routledge.
- İnan, A. (1930). *Vatandaş için medeni bilgiler*. Milliyet Matbaası.
- İrem, N. (2004). Jakobenizm-cumhuriyetçilik açmazında Kemalist radikalizm. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(2), 1–25.
- Jones, P. M., & Jones, P. (1995). *Reform and revolution in France: The politics of transition (1774–1791)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kabagöz, M. C. (2024). *Halkevleri ve gündelik hayat*. [Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi.

- Kadıođlu, A. (2008). Milliyetçilik-liberalizm ekseninde vatandaşlık ve bireysellik. İinde T. Bora & M. Gültekingil (Eds.), *Modern Türkiye’de siyasi düşünce: Milliyetçilik* (Cilt 4, ss. 284–292). İletişim Yayınları.
- Kandal, S. C. (2019). Atatürk döneminde yurttaşlık dersleri. *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 34(2), 387–412.
- Kandeđer, B. (2023). Reflections on “centralization and the civil administrative division” in the nation-state building process during the early period of the Republic. [Special Issue]. *Siyasal: Journal of Political Sciences*, 32, 57–79.
- Kandiyoti, D. (2019). *Cariye, bacılar, yurttaşlar: Kimlikler ve toplumsal dönüşümler* (A. Bora, F. Sayılan, Ş. Tekeli, H. Tapınç, & F. Özbay, Çev.; 6th ed.). Metis Yayınları.
- Karaömerliođlu, A. (1998). The people’s houses and the cult of the peasant in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34(4), 67-91.
- Karaömerliođlu, A. (2006). *Orada bir köy var uzakta: Erken Cumhuriyet döneminde köycü söylem*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Karaömerliođlu, A. (2009). Köy Enstitüleri. İinde T. Bora & M. Gültekingil (Eds.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm* (Cilt 2, ss. 286-297), İletişim Yayınları.
- Karpat, K. (1996). *Türk demokrasi tarihi*. AFA Yayınları.
- Kartal, S. (2008). Toplum kalkınmasında farklı bir eğitim kurumu: Köy Enstitüleri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 23–36.
- Kasımođlu, A. (2024). Cumhuriyetçi ve liberal bağlamda Hobbes ve Rousseau’nun yurttaşlık yaklaşımları. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 1649–1662.
- Kaya, E. E. (2015). Erken Cumhuriyet dönemi ulus inşa sürecinde ırk ve ırkçılık (1923–1938). *Akademik Hassasiyetler Dergisi*, 2(3), 21–64.
- Kaya, M. M. (2020). *İkinci Meşrutiyet’ten Cumhuriyet’e (1908–1961) vatandaşlık dersi öğretim programlarının deđişimi ve ders kitaplarına yansımaları* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi.
- Kaya, M. M., & Biçer, B. (2021). Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e vatandaş. *OPUS*, 18(44), 8025–8053.
- Kaygusuz, Ö. (2005). Modern Türk vatandaşlığı kavramının erken öncüleri: Milli mücadele döneminde ulusal vatandaşlığın kuruluşu. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 60(2), 195–217.
- Kendirci, M. (2023). Cumhuriyet’in yüzyılı ve 26 Eylül Türk dil bayramı. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 47(5), 175-210.
- Kendirci, M. (2024). Ah şu taşra; sessiz ve renksiz taşra. *Tezkire*, 33(87), 31-44.

- Kili, S., & Gözübüyük, Ş. (2000). *Türk anayasa metinleri: Sened-i İttifak'tan günümüze*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Komsuoğlu, A., & Turan, N. S. (2007). Türkiye'de ulus inşası sürecinde Halkevleri temsilcileri. *Bilgi Bellek*, 7, 88–113.
- Köker, L. (2000). *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve demokrasi*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Makal, M. (1979). *Köy Enstitüleri ve ötesi*. Çağdaş Yayınları.
- Mann, M. (1993). *The sources of social power: The rise of classes and nation-States 1760*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maarif vekili Vasıf Bey'in beyanâtı. (1924, Mart 9). *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*.
- Mardin, Ş. (2006). *Türkiye'de toplum ve siyaset*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Markus, R. A. (2006). *Christianity and the secular*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1992). Citizenship and social class. In T. H. Marshall & T. Bottomore (Ed.), *Citizenship and social class* (pp. 3–51). Pluto Press.
- Mumcu, A. (1986). 1924 Anayasası. *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 2(5), 383–400.
- Okandan, R. (1952). Devletin ortaçağ Avrupasındaki teorik tekâmülü. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 18(3–4), 627–663.
- Oral, M. (2002). Halkevlerinin kültürel ve toplumsal işlevleri. *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 18(53), 499–527.
- Osmanağaoğlu, C. (2004). *Tanzimat dönemi itibarıyla Osmanlı tâbiyetinin (vatandaşlığının) gelişimi*. Legal Yayıncılık.
- Ozan, H., & Kuş, Z. (2021). Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e vatandaşlık öğretim programlarında kimlik inşası. *Eğitim ve Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(2), 237–257.
- Özbudun, E. (2008). *1921 Anayasası*. Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Özcoşar, İ. (2003). Osmanlı Devleti'nde gayrimüslimlerin hukuki durumu ve millet sistemi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(7), 124–139.
- Özdemir, Y., & Aktaş, E. (2011). Halkevleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 45, 235–262.
- Özer, İ. (2021). *Türk modernleşmesinde Halkevleri ve Diyarbakır halkevi örneği*. Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Özgen, Y. (Ed.). (2024). *Atatürk'ün söylev ve demeçleri*. Cilt III. (1925-1938). Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü

- Öztañ, G. G. (2011). *Türkiye’de çocukluğun politik inşası*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Öztañ, G. G. (2021). 1961–65 arasında Türkiye solunda eğitim tartışmaları. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 76(1), 279–318.
- Parlak, İ. (2005). *Türkiye’de ideoloji-eğitim ilişkisi: Erken Cumhuriyet dönemi tarih ve yurt bilgisi ders kitapları üzerine bir inceleme* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Parlak, İ., & Kaftan, E. (2010). Osmanlı’nın tebaasından Cumhuriyet’in yurttaşına giden yol. *Doğu-Batı*, 54, 139–168
- Parlak, D. (2011). Uluslaşma sürecinde Köy Enstitülerinin yeri. *Muhafazakâr Düşünce Dergisi*, 7(27), 201–221.
- Peker, R. (1984). *İnkılap dersleri*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Pettit, P. (1997). *Republicanism: A theory of freedom and government*. Oxford University Press.
- Pierson, C. (2000). *Modern devlet* (D. Hattatoğlu, Çev.). Çiviyazıları.
- Platon. (2010). *Devlet* (S. Eyüboğlu & M. A. Cimcoz, Çev.). İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Poggi, G. (2009). *Devlet: Doğası, gelişimi ve geleceği*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Resmi Gazete. (1928, Haziran 4). 904 sayılı *Türk Vatandaşlık Kanunu*.
- Resmi Gazete. (1928, Kasım 24). 1048 sayılı *Millet Mektebi Talimatnamesi*.
- Resmi Gazete. (1940, Nisan 22). 3803 sayılı *Köy Enstitüleri Kanunu*.
- Reyhan, C. (2024). Kan bağı/jus sanguinis ve toprak bağı/jus soli: İmparatorluk’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye’de vatandaşlığın kurucu ilkeleri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 57(1), 37–68.
- Rousseau, J.J. (2006). *Toplum sözleşmesi* (V. Günyol, Çev.). İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Sağiroğlu, N. A. (2018). Klasik liberalism, yurttaşlık ve engelli kadınlar. *Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26, 341-356.
- Sancar, S. (2012). *Türk modernleşmesinin cinsiyeti: Erkekler devlet, kadınlar aile kurar*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Sandel, M. J. (1998). *Democracy’s discontent: America in search of a public philosophy*. Harvard University Press.
- Saygılı, A. (2010). Modern devlet’in çıplak sureti. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 59(1), 61–97.

- Sel, B. & Sözer, M. A. (2018). Cumhuriyet dönemi (1928-1948) yurt bilgisi ders kitaplarında çocukluğun politik yapılandırılmasına ilişkin bir araştırma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(2), 293-315.
- Serbestoğlu, İ. (2011). Zorunlu bir modernleşme örneği olarak Osmanlı Tabiiyet Kanunu. *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi (OTAM)*, 29, 193-214.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. Penguin Books.
- Somel, S. A. (2009). Osmanlı reform çağında Osmanlıcılık düşüncesi (1839-1913). İçinde T. Bora & M. Gültekinil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye’de siyasi düşünce: Cumhuriyet’e devreden düşünce mirası* (Cilt. 1, ss. 88-97), İletişim Yayınları.
- Şahin, M. (1992). Bir halk eğitim çalışması örneği olarak millet mektepleri. *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 213-234.
- Şentürk, S. N. (2010). Vatandaşlığın imparatorluk kökleri: Osmanlı’ya bakmak. *Doğu- Batı*, 54, 121-138.
- Şimşek, S. (2002). *Bir ideolojik seferberlik deneyimi Halkevleri 1932-1951*. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Tanör, B. (2018). *Osmanlı-Türk anayasal gelişmeleri*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Temel, T. (2015). *Modernleşme süreci Türk tiyatrosunda ideal bireyin temsili*. [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Başkanlığı İdari Teşkilatı. (2023). *Osmanlı’dan günümüze Türk anayasa metinleri* (M. A. Kumbuzoğlu, Yayın Koord.; A. Güler, Ed.; Ö. Kesikbaş, A. H. Kurnaz, Ş. İba, Eds.; K. Akar, H. Erkül, E. Ertüven, M. Çakmakçı, Ö. Yayıdemir, S. Yıldız Aybak, A. Çoşkun Tören, Yavuz S. Yıldız, & T. Tuna Kanar, Yayına Hazırlayanlar; B. H. Dağ, Tasarım). TBMM Basımevi.
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi. (2021). *Kabulünün 100. yılında 1921 Teşkilât-ı Esasiye Kanunu: Belgeler* (M. Şentop, Yayın Sahibi; A. Koçin, Yay. Koord.; A. Balıbey, A. H. Kurnaz & Ö. Kesikbaş, Ed.). TBMM Basımevi.
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi. (1924). *Teşkilât-ı Esasiye Kanunu* (Kanun No. 491). Haziran 30, 2025 de <https://www.anayasa.gov.tr/tr/mevzuat/onceki-anayasalar/1924-anayasasi/> den erişildi
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi. (1336, Mayıs 1). Devre 1, Cilt 1, İçtima 1.
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi. (1337, Kasım 26). Devre 1, Cilt 14, İçtima 2.
- Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi. (1923, Mart 1). Devre 1, Cilt 28, İçtima 1.
- Toksoy, N. (2007). *Halkevleri: Bir kültürel kalkınma modeli olarak*. Orion Kitabevi.

- Tonguç, İ. H. (1946). *İlköğretim kavramı*. Remzi Kitabevi.
- Toprak, Z. (1977). Halkçılık ideolojisinin oluşumu. İçinde A. Aksay & M. Pirili (Eds.). *Atatürk döneminin ekonomik ve toplumsal sorunları sempozyumu kitabı*, (ss.13-31). Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi, Mezunları Derneği Yayını
- Toprak, Z. (1988). 80. yıldönümünde ‘hürriyetin ilanı’ (1908) ve ‘rehber-i ittihad’. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 42, 157–173.
- Toprak, Z. (1995). *Türkiye’de toplum ve ekonomi (1908–1950): Milli iktisat-milli burjuvazi*. Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Tuğluoğlu, F. (2005). Türkiye’de halkçılık ideolojisi ve Halkevleri. *Erdem İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(42), 101–118.
- Tuğluoğlu, F. & Tunç, T. (2010). 1926 ilkmektep müfredatı ve Cumhuriyet dönemi eğitiminin ekonomik hedefleri. *Atatürk Araştırmaları Merkezi Dergisi*, 26(76), 55-98.
- Tunaya, T. Z. (2004). *Hürriyetin ilanı: İkinci Meşrutiyet’in siyasi hayatına bakışlar*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Ubicini, H. A. (1998). *Osmanlıda modernleşme sancısı* (C. Aydın, Çev.). Timaş Yayınları.
- Unan, N. (Derleyen). (1952). *Atatürk’ün söylev ve demeçleri*. Cilt II. Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Üstel, F. (2008a). *Makbul vatandaş’ın peşinde: İkinci Meşrutiyetten bugüne vatandaşlık eğitimi*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Üstel, F. (2008b). Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde resmi yurttaş profilinin evrimi. İçinde T. Bora & M. Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik* (Cilt 4, ss. 275–283). İletişim Yayınları.
- Üstel, F. (2009). II. Meşrutiyet ve vatandaşın icadı. İçinde T. Bora & M. Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye’de siyasi düşünce: Cumhuriyet’e devreden düşünce mirası* (Cilt 1, ss. 166– 179), İletişim Yayınları.
- Van Het Hof, S. D. (2010). Türk millî kimliğinin kuruluşunda Osmanlı’nın reddi. *Çankaya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 551–567.
- Weber, M. (2006). *Sosyoloji yazıları* (T. Parla, Çev.). İletişim Yayınları.
- Yanardağ, A. (2020). Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e ilk mektepler talimatnameleri (1915-1929). *Turkish History Education Journal*, 9(1), 89-108.
- Yaşar, T. F. (2018). II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde yurttaşlık, ahlak ve medenilik eğitimi: Malumat-ı Medeniye ders kitapları. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 52(52), 311–342.
- Yeşilorman, M. (2003). Siyasallaşma sürecinin yeniden keşfi: Siyasal eğitim kavramına kuramsal bir giriş. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 23–47.

- Yıldırım, Y. (2019). Fransız Devrimi'nde yurttaşlık ve etkilerine dair bir değerlendirme. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21, 251–271.
- Yüceer, S. (2002). Türkiye'nin aydınlanma sürecinde bir kültür devrimi: Millet mektepleri. *Atatürkçü Bakış Dergisi*, 1(1), 13–32.
- Yıldız, A. (2002). Kemalist milliyetçilik. İçinde A. İnel (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünce: Kemalizm* (Cilt2, ss. 210–234), İletişim Yayınları.
- Yıldız, N., & Akandere, O. (2017). Köy Enstitülerinin ideolojik yapısı. *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 17(35), 275–316.
- Zürcher, E. J. (2004). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin tarihi*. (Y. S. Gönen, Çev.), İletişim Yayınları.

Information About the Article/Makale Hakkında Bilgiler

The Ethical Rules for Research and Publication / Arařtırma ve Yayın Etięi

The author declared that the ethical rules for research and publication followed while preparing the article.

Yazar makale hazırlanırken arařtırma ve yayın etięine uyulduęunu beyan etmiřtir.

Conflict of Interests/ ıkar atıřması

The author have no conflict of interest to declare.

Yazar ıkar atıřması bildirmemiřtir.

Grant Support/ Finansal Destek

The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Yazar bu alıřma iin finansal destek almadıęını beyan etmiřtir.

Author Contributions/ Yazar Katkıları

The draft process of the manuscript/ Taslaęın Hazırlanma Sreci B.K., Writing The Manuscript/ Makalenin Yazılması B.K., Submit, Revision and Resubmit Process/ Bařvuru, Dzeltme ve Yeniden Bařvuru Sreci B.K.