



A Failed Project in Turkey's Sports History: The Law on Physical Education of 1938

Sait Tarakçioğlu

To cite this article: Sait Tarakçioğlu (2014) A Failed Project in Turkey's Sports History: The Law on Physical Education of 1938, The International Journal of the History of Sport, 31:14, 1807-1819, DOI: [10.1080/09523367.2014.940906](https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2014.940906)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2014.940906>



Published online: 29 Jul 2014.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 307



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

A Failed Project in Turkey's Sports History: The Law on Physical Education of 1938

Sait Tarakçıoğlu*

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey

The aim of this article is to analyse the Law on Physical Education of 1938 to demonstrate the state interventions in Turkey's sport history. The Law was claimed to be the first one in the world which made physical education (PE) and sports obligatory to its citizens and was created on the verge of the Second World War. It was prepared by Carl Diem under the direction of Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey. According to the Law, male citizens aged between 12 and 45 years, and female citizens between 12 and 30 years would be required to perform PE and sports regularly. For the execution of the Law, a General Directorate of Physical Education was founded. Many grand plans such as creating sports complexes, and training teachers and staff were made without taking the socio-economic conditions of the country into consideration. Ultimately, due to the effects of the economic and political conditions of the nation and the wider world, the Law failed to fulfil the expectations of its creators. Two government-supported journals named *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* and *Ülkü* are examined here as primary sources to see how the Law was enforced and how they reflected the Law and the period.

Keywords: Law on Physical Education; sports; history; Turkey; politics; citizens; the war

Introduction

K.H. Karpat argues that 'the modernization of Turkey during the first three decades after the establishment of the Republic in 1923 dealt primarily with the form of the political structure, the modern nation-state'.¹ In this process, many reforms were carried out to introduce comprehensive changes in a wide range of areas, affecting both public and private spheres. The reforms were concerned with cultural phenomena such as education, language, the dress code and translation activities.² In this sense, great duties were expected of the people as well. Especially the years 1939–1945, the war years in the world, was a period in which young Republic of Turkey demanded more devotion from its citizens. During this period, called 'the years of war economy' throughout the country and when the possibility of entering the war was present, the taxes were increased and the obligations of working on roads and mines were heavily implemented.³ Due to both the economic and political situation of the world and the internal dynamics of the country, 'mobilizing the youth and the masses via physical education became crucial for the Republic'.⁴ In the Foucauldian sense, 'bodies need to be physically educated so that they can be productive. Given this requirement, it is perhaps not surprising, that physical education has long been a core curriculum subject within schools in most Western states'.⁵ Hence, the Republic, which was founded on the legacy of the Ottoman Empire defeated in

*Email: sait.tarakcioglu@ege.edu.tr

the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) and the First World War, passed a Law on Physical Education on June 29, 1938, with the purpose of both restoring the desperate condition of sports in the country and meeting the military demands for the approaching war. The Law, claimed to be the first one in the world obligating physical education (PE) to the citizens, was prepared by Carl Diem, a German sports administrator, on the demand of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938), the founder of the Republic of Turkey.⁶ For the execution of the Law, a General Directorate of Physical Education (GDPE) was founded and made dependent on the prime minister with a supplementary budget and legal entity.⁷ General Cemil Taner, who became the general director of this establishment, described the purpose of the Law as ‘conducting games, gymnastics and sports that improve the physical and moral capabilities of the citizens in accordance with the national and reformist principles’.⁸ The Law ascribed such a great importance that on May 19, 1938, the Youth and Sports Day, the Interior Minister of the time, Şükrü Kaya addressed:

Atatürk has given the orders to educate Turkish youth as strong, robust, cheerful, good-tempered; ready for work, war, life; high and distinguished-featured people at home, at school, in the army, on the fields, in workshops and factories. The citizens, the Republican Party, the government of the Grand National Assembly will realise the ideal of the Great Leader in the shortest time as always.⁹

During the negotiations on the Law in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on June 29, 1938, the same minister addressed:

Sports is a matter of state. In this sense, we transfer the issue fully with its committees to the state. In any case, the state with its power and endless generosity should organize all of its sources for a field beloved by our nation. The new Law is the first significant step that our revolution takes regarding sports.¹⁰

However, the fact which makes the Law more important was the willpower behind it. It was Atatürk who is still the foremost figure in Turkey.

The aim of this article is to analyse how the so-called Law came into being and ended up a failure in terms of its political and sociological dimensions. In this regard, the state interventions in sports may be understood better in the context of Turkey’s sports history. To this end, first, the brief history of PE and sports culture of the country until 1938 will be related so as to comprehend why the republican regime needed to proclaim the Law at issue. Second, the Law itself will be presented in a general manner. Third, two important journals *Ülkü* and *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor (BTS)* will be examined as the primary sources to see how the Law was enforced and how they reflected the Law and the period. Finally, discussing the reasons why the Law failed, the article will come to a conclusion.

Background of the Law

The Balkan Wars which all the Balkans fought against the Ottomans had been a great disaster for the Ottoman Empire. This caused the Ottoman intellectuals and people to search for the reasons why they had been defeated and why their enemy had achieved.¹¹ Apart from political reasons, the defeat was particularly attributed to a lack of education. For instance, a PE teacher of the time,¹² both knowing the Balkans very well and teaching there, Ethem Nejat says:

Our teachers are the loser and their teachers are the winner! Their schools helped them to win. And we lost because of our schools. The victors weren’t the armies of soldiers of the Balkans, but their armies of teachers.¹³

Nejat also linked the defeat with the physical weakness of the people, and for him the Balkan Wars showed how crucial the PE at schools and the military education in the army were. He suggested that kids be educated as soldiers, and if they cannot show a tremendous success in PE, they be failed the class.¹⁴

The progress of the Balkan nations on the field of education and accordingly the success they had in the Balkan Wars caused the collapse of the Ottoman education understanding, triggered the secularisation in education and influenced intellectuals on the occurrence of 'nationalism in education' idea.¹⁵ With the defeat in the First World War, the Ottoman Empire delivered one more blow especially in education, since its teachers, who were well trained after the Balkan Wars, died on the battlefield.¹⁶ In the last period of the Ottoman Empire when its decline accelerated, the most remarked catchphrase was 'Only education can prevent the state from collapsing'.¹⁷ Although it made several educational reforms,¹⁸ the Ottoman Empire could not escape from the bad end. In 1924, the government of the republican regime, which was aware of the disorganisation and deficiency in the field of education, proclaimed that the Law on the Unification of Education (*Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu*) 'established the conditions for a truly Western, secular system that would transform the Anatolian people into citizens of the Republic'.¹⁹ The main purpose was to create the new society and men for the young country.²⁰

As far as PE and sports culture is concerned, it is hard to say that the era before the Republic was productive. According to Sümer, pre-Republic sports was a hardly known phenomenon due to the difficult periods the Ottoman Empire had experienced and the special conditions in its last years. In that time, some initiative steps were taken in PE, scout-craft and some sports; however, an organisation in modern terms could not be constituted.²¹ Also, since the athletes and sports clubs belonged to the imperial elite, the rich and the landlords,²² and 'in the Ottoman educational system, physical education was limited with modern educational institutions, which only aimed at educating the imperial elite',²³ most people remained alienated from sports. The Ottoman understanding of physical immobility in its last period can also be considered among the reasons of backwardness in PE and sports culture. According to Niyazi Berkes, this understanding was as follows:

Until 1908, sitting was regarded, not only as the most natural, but also the most respectable posture of man. To stand and to stand erect was a sign of disrespect, arrogance, or rebellion—son bowed before father, wife before husband, peasant before urbanite, the people before the *effendi* (master), the entire nation before the Padişah.²⁴

In short, physical mobility was regarded as disrespect. Furthermore, the rules which prevent and restrict some sporting activities were established in the last period of the empire, and what is worse some sports were banned by the emperor.²⁵ For instance, in the era of Abdul Hamid II, the 34th sultan of the Ottoman Empire, like many other social activities, football matches were also banned and the players were being chased by the detectives of the time.²⁶

According to Lüküslü and Dinçşahin, 'with the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, physical education and sports became a major factor in constructing the image of the enlightened citizen'.²⁷ To them, 'the Republic, which wanted to get rid of its Ottoman image as the "sick man of Europe", had a high priority to the construction of healthy citizens through physical education'.²⁸ Hence, shortly after the declaration of the Republic, the Union of Turkish Training Associations (TICI), whose grounds had been laid about two years before, was activated. The aim of this establishment was declared to improve PE and sports which were disorganised and disconnected from the people in the

young Republic, and also to represent them both inside and outside.²⁹ Continuing its activities until 1936, the TICI comprised the sports clubs and in this respect, it is regarded as a significant step in terms of democracy in sports of the time.³⁰ However, it would never go to the direction the regime wanted and it would be subjected to many complaints from the government. For example, in one of his speeches, İsmet İnönü, the prime minister of the time, and second man of the regime after Atatürk, blamed the TICI of being incompetent, inconsiderate and creating a state of anarchy which left the nation bereft of sports.³¹ So, from 1936, by seizing all sporting activities the state abolished the TICI and formed the Turkish Sport Association (TSK).³² The state along with the TSK established such a tight grasp on sports that all the athletes in the country were obliged to be a member of the only party of that time, the *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* (RPP).³³ Moreover, all the sports chairmen of the regions working in the countryside were compelled to resign. Instead of them, chairmen who were members of the RPP were appointed to vacant positions.³⁴ Yet, according to Fişek, the structure of the TSK could not be directed by the chairmen from the RPP. Especially, when the world was on the verge of a big war, all the failures of the TSK and sports were being reflected to the party.³⁵ So the prestige of the party was getting harmed. Thus, the TSK left its place to another institution in 1938.

The Law on Physical Education No. 3530, 1938

In 1938, Atatürk invited German expert Carl Diem to Turkey and shared his PE and sports idea with him. He asked Diem to constitute a project according to this idea.³⁶ Actually, Diem was a famous figure in the sporting life of the nation. In the 1930s, some German experts were invited to Turkey to improve the PE system, and Diem was one of them. He travelled to many cities to observe the PE culture in the country and prepare a report. The report, according to Akın, was significant in terms of reflecting the PE and sports understanding of the politicians. Diem made some suggestions about mountaineering, skiing, founding youth organisations, which meant a kind of preparation for any prospective war.³⁷ The youth model suggested by the report was very similar to the Hitler Youth (*Hitlerjugend*) model.³⁸ Afterwards, this report became the structure plan of the TSK in 1936.³⁹ His articles had also been published in the journal *BTS* which was issued officially by the government, and which propagandised the Law.⁴⁰ Such being the case, the structure of the Law prepared by Diem was enacted in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on June 29, 1938.⁴¹ Hereby, the GDPE was founded and the Law made PE and sports obligatory to the citizens between certain ages. The Law consisted of 28 articles at the beginning⁴² and the GDPE was established by the state to execute them and made dependent on the prime ministry. According to Fişek, this was a great contribution by Turkey to the world sports community, as there was no other country that organised sports in such a way at that time. Only the Soviet Union handled sports organisation through a state committee that was above the ministry level but under the cabinet.⁴³ In this context, the importance of founding the GDPE was based on the fact that PE and sports came to be considered a 'public service' and became established among the public duties of the state.⁴⁴ In addition, from that point on, all the chairmen of sports federations including the staff in the smallest regions working for the Law would be regarded as government officials.⁴⁵

Rather than giving the full text of the Law here, explaining some articles which are the core elements of the Law will be sufficient to comprehend it.⁴⁶ Article 1 dealt with the GDPE, which was founded solely for the aim of conducting games, gymnastics and sports that improve the physical and moral capabilities of the citizens in accordance with the

national and reformist principles.⁴⁷ Article 4 made it obligatory for 'young people' to take exercise in their spare time.⁴⁸ The general director Cemil Taner declared in his long speech on the Law that the ages of the so-called young people were between 12 and 45 years for men, and between 12 and 30 years for women.⁴⁹ According to Article 10, every province was a PE region and the province governor was in charge of the issue. Also, PE and sports activities would be directed by mayors, district governors and village headmen in their regions.⁵⁰ Article 13 stipulated that sports clubs which would be formed in accordance with the Law were in charge of training the young people. In a district, village, town or city, apart from school and military, sports clubs would be formed if there were more than 50 young people. If there were less than 50 young people, sports groups would be formed instead of the clubs.⁵¹ Article 14 made the People's Houses responsible for teaching gymnastics, fencing, wrestling, tracking, team sports, national folk dances, and so on.⁵² Actually, 'the People's Houses, (*Halk Evleri*) were established in 1931/32, as cultural and political centres designated to indoctrinate the masses with the nationalist, secularist and populist ideas of the Republican regime'.⁵³ In this context, the Houses were supposed to work as one of the most productive places in compliance with the Law throughout the country. Article 21 made it mandatory for factories, corporations or any institution employing more than 500 workers to form a sports complex and hire PE teachers or trainers to make the workers exercise and practice sports.⁵⁴

Reading the Law from the BTS and Ülkü

Two journals were of vital importance in explaining and comprehending how the Law reflected the period, and *vice versa*. They were *BTS* and *Ülkü*, which were published periodically each month. The *BTS*'s first number was issued in January 1939. It was assigned the duty of propagandising the opinions of the GDPE as indicated in the preface of its first issue.⁵⁵ *Ülkü*, actually, had been published from 1933 to 1950. It is asserted that *Ülkü* is one of the most important resources for researchers intending to seek the status of the government in the sports culture in Turkey. It was the one which formed the ideology and the principle of the state intervention in sports, and being the publication of the People's Houses,⁵⁶ whose 'political goal was to persuade as many people as possible in the countryside that Turkish nationalism was their new religion and Republicanism their modern political identity'.⁵⁷

At the beginning, the authors in both journals would announce the Law to the public in glowing terms. While praising the achievements of the Republican regime in sports, they would sharply criticise the Ottoman Empire's understanding of PE and sports culture especially in its last period. They argued that PE and sports had been in a terrible and desperate situation before 1923⁵⁸ and the institutionalisation in sports had begun with the Republic.⁵⁹ Rahmi Apak, a permanent author of the journals, claimed that the religion in the Ottoman Empire had been a major obstacle in doing sports, and thus caused 'the appearance of clumsy, turbaned, bearded religious men deprived of PE culture'.⁶⁰ While complaining of Ottoman leaders, they defined *Sadrzams* (Grand Vizier), commanders and other important figures as 'fat, clumsy and exhausted men who cannot move after their fifties'. They also asserted that the Republican regime was the first one that handled the issue thoroughly.⁶¹ In his speech published in *Ülkü*, the Interior Minister Şükrü Kaya announced what exactly the regime was intending:

Each regime creates a certain type of citizen suitable for its ideals ... The man of the Atatürk's regime is well-rounded, smart, brave, dignified, happy, serious, and defensive of his own people and ideas. This is what we are seeking for.⁶²

The aim of the Law was to bear the duty of improving the aforementioned man physically and morally in compliance with national and revolutionary purposes.⁶³

Mythological Support for the Law

Emilio Gentile argues that myths are ‘a set of beliefs and ideas, ideals and values, which are condensed in a symbolic image that is capable of mobilizing the individual as well as the masses because it stirs up faith, enthusiasm, and action’.⁶⁴ Zafer Çetin also claims that ‘stories of the past are constructed tools to shape people’s sense of identity. Myths and memories play a crucial role in the creation, affirmation, and protection of cultural identity’.⁶⁵ During the 1930s there was a climate of extreme nationalism in Turkey, which ‘with the attendant creation of historical myths, was used as the prime instrument in the building of a new national identity, and as such was intended to take the place of religion in many respects’.⁶⁶ These myths were assigned the task of erasing Turkey’s Ottoman past and instead connect the new citizens with alternative Turkish ancestors.⁶⁷ One of them was *Güneş Dil Teorisi* (Sun Language Theory) which was created in accordance with Atatürk’s orders in 1935. As Eric Zürcher explains:

This theory held that all languages derived originally from one primeval language, spoken in Central Asia, that Turkish was closest of all languages to this origin and that all languages had developed from the primeval language through Turkish.⁶⁸

The other myth named *Türk Tarih Tezi* (Turkish History Thesis) was propounded in 1932. According to Zürcher:

This theory, which Mustafa Kemal emphatically supported, held that the Turks were descendants of white (Aryan) inhabitants of Central Asia, who had been forced by drought and hunger to migrate to other areas, such as China, Europe and the Near East. In doing so, they had created the world’s great civilizations. In the Near East, the Sumerians and the Hittites were really proto-Turks ... The theory aimed to give Turks a sense of pride in their history and national identity, separate from the immediate past, that is to say the Ottoman era.⁶⁹

The aforementioned myths penetrated into the texts of journals of the *BTS* and *Ülkü* to increase enthusiasm of the citizens for the PE and sports activities dictated by the Law. In the texts, authors frequently mentioned how Turks descended from strong ancestors, how they had created all civilisations and how they had founded the notions and many types of sports the world play today. For instance, it was claimed that the word ‘sport’ came from the Ottoman-Turkish word ‘sipahi’ (cavalry soldier), and got its eventual form of pronunciation by English men.⁷⁰ Many sports like football, boxing and polo were argued to be ‘gifts’ from the Turks to the world in the texts.⁷¹ More surprisingly, they regarded some sports as the creation of the ancient Greece. But then, they defended that this civilisation was originated from the Anatolian Turks who had come from Central Asia. If so, the Greeks were Turks! According to this logic, it meant that the sports were actually created by Turks.⁷² The Sumerians and the Hittites and the Huns, who were regarded as proto-Turks according to ‘Turkish History Thesis’, were narrated to have been the strongest and most beautiful men in the history as the proverbs of many nations say ‘as strong as a Turk’.⁷³ And their weapons were explained in detail to show their warrior characteristics, embellishing them with mythological stories.⁷⁴

In shaping a nation’s future, these discourses derived from the past, even from a fictional past parallel to National Socialists ‘and Italian fascists’. National Socialists who intended to form their future made references to their past claiming that the sciences, the arts and all the political establishments came from their Arian ancestors.⁷⁵ Dreaming of the Roman Empire, Mussolini made a speech to his people in same manner in 1922:

It is not a nostalgic contemplation of the past, but hard preparation for the future. Rome is our starting point and our reference point; it is our symbol, or if you will, our myth. We dream of a Roman Italy, which is to say: an Italy that is wise, strong, disciplined, and imperial.⁷⁶

Meanwhile, the achievements of National Socialists in PE and sports would appear in the journals.⁷⁷ The Hitler Youth (*Hitlerjugend*) and Mussolini's Fascist Youth organisations were glorified even by very important figures.⁷⁸ Especially, Mussolini was praised frequently, which was not a coincidence. Zürcher explains the reason behind this admiration as such:

The example of the most important dictatorship in the Mediterranean, fascist Italy, was certainly important to the Turkish leadership. The way in which Mussolini seemed to forge national unity and to energize Italian society impressed many in Turkey (as, indeed, it did in many other European countries), and a number of new laws promulgated under the republic were straight copies of Italian legislation.⁷⁹

In short, aside from sometimes admiring the Nazis and fascist Italy in the journals, the authors used their way of using historical myths to have the citizens embrace the Law of PE passionately.

On the Execution of the Law

The general director's speeches and thoughts were published in early issues of the *BTS*.⁸⁰ They were mostly informative and motivational writings about the Law. Şükrü Kaya also wrote several articles about the plans and applications in *Ülkü*. For example, in 1938, shortly after the proclamation of the Law, Kaya indicated how many swimming pools and tennis courts throughout the country would be built, and how the expenses would be supplied in the following years. According to this, most of the money would be taken from the municipalities.⁸¹ They were supposed to spend 80% of their yearly resources to build the aforementioned sports complexes, and 20% of it for their administrations.⁸² In 1938, it was stated that there were 30 sports clubs in Istanbul with a population of 600,000, but there were supposed to be 600 in the very near future as required by the Law.⁸³ Also, in the same year, it was announced that a Higher Institute of Physical Education will be founded to train PE teachers soon.⁸⁴ As for the annual budget devoted to sports activities, it was 239,000 Turkish liras in 1938; however, it rose to two billion Turkish liras in 1939.⁸⁵ The number of the athletes throughout the country, 6000 in 1938, rose to 150,000 in 1941. Besides, it was stated that the productivity of the workers increased in some factories, and many athletes had undergone medical check-ups.⁸⁶ Moreover, some sports fields were announced to have been built in the People's Houses.⁸⁷

In addition to occasionally mentioning positive developments, the authors were mostly complaining about financial pressure and the lack of staff, PE teachers and sports complexes. Especially in 1940 and 1941, the complaints sharply increased. For instance, a permanent author related that it would be impossible for the state to form the demanded sports clubs, supply the equipment and the staff with the budget of 1940, since it could meet only 1% of the requirements.⁸⁸ In the last month of 1941, the general director also informed that there were not enough PE teachers since the Higher Institute of Physical Education was not established yet. According to him, even the existing sports clubs were lacking administrators. Furthermore, 45,000 villages and towns still did not have the sports fields, clubs, etc. The citizens could not make time for the sports activities. At the same time, there was a lack of discipline in the existing clubs resulting in poor implementation of the Law.⁸⁹ Even worse, during the congress speech a member of parliament, Dr Şevki

Uludağ, confessed that they should not have passed the so-called Law because it was deficient and improper for the reality of Turkey.⁹⁰

Failure of the Law

Even with all its shortcomings, the Law was in effect until 1945. However, it would never succeed as Atatürk had demanded. It should be asked why such a Law could not be executed despite huge political support, great propaganda by official journals, the creation of historical myths and the orders of the most important man in the country? The reasons may be found in the previous part to some extent. According to this, because of financial pressure, the sports complexes and institutions as required could not be established. The staff could not be employed. The authorities entitled to perform the issue could not be organised throughout the country. The Higher Institute of Physical Education could not be formed, so the number of PE teachers and coaches never approached the number required. The arms of the state could not reach the villages which made up about 80% of the population at that time.⁹¹ Yet, there were other reasons for the failure, which probably were not taken into account by Atatürk. First of all, Atatürk died in the same year the Law was enacted. According to Feroz Ahmad, 'when Atatürk died in November 1938, the new generation that had grown up in the Republic thought that everything they had known had died with him. It was difficult for many to imagine a Turkey without Atatürk'.⁹² It may be interpreted such that the Law had lost the willpower behind it. So, because of the lack of willpower, that was Atatürk, it might not have a chance to be fulfilled especially during the war period. Second, as Ahmad argues: 'The mood in Turkey had changed dramatically since Atatürk's death, and the party (RPP) that had played such a crucial role in the creation of the new Turkey was no longer trusted'.⁹³ In addition to that, the defeat of the Nazis and Italians in the Second World War had discredited the single-party regime in Turkey.⁹⁴ It may mean that the RPP had lost the power and ability to organise and enforce the terms required by the Law around the country at all. The defeat of the Nazis and Italians could also mean discrediting their youth, PE and sports culture which was a model for Turkey. Third, during the war years an economic meltdown had happened in the country,⁹⁵ which might be taken to mean that it would not be easy for the policy-makers to keep all the promises given before the wartime. Under those circumstances the non-functional Law that was enacted with great expectations was silently abolished by Vidan Aşır Savaşır who became the second general director of GDPE in 1945.⁹⁶

Conclusion

The subject of this article was the Law of PE no. 3530, 1938, which was shaped according to Atatürk's demands and which played an important part in PE and sports history in Turkey. It was one of the few political projects aiming at comprehensive changes in a wide range of areas such as education, language, the dress code, translation activities on the road to modernisation and westernisation of the young Republic. By the Law, PE and sports issues, which had not been institutionalised in the last period of the Ottoman Empire and early years of the Republic of Turkey, were aimed to follow the state directives. Hence, from the big cities to the smallest regions, the goal was to get all citizens between certain ages to take up exercise and do sports regularly. The main purpose was to raise the future's generation as healthy, disciplined, productive and ready for the prospect of war conditions like in Germany and Italy at that time. Thereby, a GDPE was formed, and a general was appointed to be the director of it. Many grandiose plans on training PE teachers and staff

and building facilities were made enthusiastically. The politicians and state-supported journals had intensely propagandised the issue. Still, due to both the internal affairs of the country and the effects of the Second World War, the purpose was never achieved as the goals had intended. The project could not be fulfilled, because the country's economy was not in a good state to meet the expenses as mentioned previously during the war years. Moreover, the PE and sports culture in Turkey was also not as improved as the one in Germany and Italy that it copied. Therefore, the people did not willingly participate in the activities. As B. Krawietz argues, 'The pushing of selected athletic disciplines perceived as modern and hence as desirable civilising means has become evident. However, this does not imply that the populace has wholeheartedly and actively accepted such offerings'.⁹⁷ And the project could not be fulfilled, mainly because the willpower behind it died shortly after it had been enacted. It was Atatürk who had made the following remarks in 1937:

All kinds of sports activities must be regarded as the core elements for the national education of the Turkish youth. In this regard, the government must act more seriously and carefully to train Turkish youth in terms of sports with a national passion.⁹⁸

In a broad sense, this article in the case of Turkey included a description of a direct relationship between PE and politics. Such a relationship has been a historical and well-known phenomenon. Here, it was constructed by the state, which has mostly occurred in totalitarian and authoritarian regimes. In the young Turkey, PE was used as a tool for the politicians to shape the people, so the agent was not the public but the state. This intervention by the state on the bodies of its citizens in order to construct healthy and strong generations may be interpreted better with the frequently repeated Foucauldian terms: 'The body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs'.⁹⁹

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Safer Elmas from Marmara University for providing the sources of the article and for his helpful feedbacks and comments.

Notes on Contributor

Sait Tarakçıoğlu is a research assistant at the Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Ege University, İzmir Turkey. His research interests focus on the philosophy and history of sports and political aspects of sports in Turkey. He was a visiting scholar under the guidance of Dr Arnd Krüger at Göttingen University, Germany, in 2008–2009, and under the guidance of Dr Daniel Frankl at CSU, Los Angeles, USA, in 2009–2010.

Notes

1. Karpat, "Society, Economics, and Politics," 51.
2. Gürçağlar, *The Politics and Poetics*, 13.
3. Fişek, *100 Soruda Türkiye*, 100.
4. Lüküslü, *Türkiye'de Gençlik Miti*, 35.
5. Markula and Pringle, *Foucault, Sport and Exercise*, 47.
6. Atabeyoğlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 32–4; see also Fişek, *100 Soruda Türkiye*, 125.
7. Akyol, *Ana Çizgileriyle Cumhuriyetin*, 6.
8. Taner, "Beden Terbiyesi Teşkilatının Çalışma Esasları," 2.
9. Atabeyoğlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 30–1.
10. Kaya, "B. Şükrü Kaya'nın Nutku," 481.
11. Akyüz, *Türk Eğitim Tarihi*, 251.

12. Ibid., 266.
13. Ibid., 252.
14. Ateş, *Asker Evlatlar Yetiřtirmek*, 184.
15. Yılmaz and Bakır, "Balkan Milliyetçiliđinin Türk," 57.
16. Akyüz, *Türk Eđitim Tarihi*, 256.
17. Tanilli, *Nasıl Bir Eđitim İstiyoruz?* 47.
18. See Lüküslü, *Türkiye'de Gençlik Miti*.
19. Lüküslü and Dinçşahin, "Shaping Bodies," 198.
20. Tanilli, *Nasıl Bir Eđitim İstiyoruz?* 49.
21. Sümer, *Sporda Demokrasi* 2, 20.
22. Sümer, *Sporda Demokrasi*, 26.
23. Lüküslü and Dinçşahin, "Shaping Bodies," 198.
24. Berkes, *The Development of Secularism*, 402.
25. Yıldız, *Türk Spor Tarihi*, 270.
26. Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar*, 53.
27. See Lüküslü and Dinçşahin, "Selim Sırrı Tarcan."
28. Lüküslü and Dinçşahin, "Shaping Bodies," 202.
29. Yıldız *Türk Spor Tarihi*, 282.
30. Sümer *Sporda Demokrasi* 2, 21.
31. Atabeyođlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 27–8.
32. Ketten, *Türkiye'de Spor*, 41.
33. Atabeyođlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 26.
34. Ibid., 27.
35. Fişek, *100 Soruda Türkiye*, 123.
36. Atabeyođlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 32.
37. Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar*, 69–71.
38. Atabeyođlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 15.
39. Ibid., 17.
40. Diem, "Stadyom İnşaatı," 29–34.
41. Anonymous, "Kanunun Metni."
42. Ibid.
43. Fişek, *100 Soruda Türkiye*, 125.
44. Akyol, *Ana Çizgileriyle Cumhuriyetin*, 7.
45. Apak, "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu," 66.
46. Anonymous, "Kanunun Metni."
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. Taner, "Cemil Taner'in Kanun," 3–4.
50. Anonymous, "Kanunun Metni."
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.
53. Karpat, "The Impact of the People's Houses," 69 (my italics).
54. Anonymous, "Kanunun Metni."
55. Ibid.
56. Fişek, *Devlet Politikası Ve Toplumsal*, 374.
57. Karpat, "The Impact of the People's Houses," 69.
58. Uludađ, "Spor Göreneđin Deđil," 432; see also Apak, "On Beş Yıl ve Türk Sporü," 229; and see Kaya, "Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu," 6.
59. Kırşan, "Beden Terbiyesi," 7.
60. Apak, "On Beş Yıl Ve Türk Sporü," 229.
61. Ibid., 230.
62. Kaya, "B. Şükrü Kaya'nın Nutku," 485.
63. Taner, "Cemil Taner'in Kanun," 2.
64. Gentile, *The Struggle for Modernity*, 2.
65. Çetin, "Tales of Past, Present, and Future," 348.
66. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 181–2.
67. Erimtan, "Hittites, Ottomans and Turks," 143.
68. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 190.

69. Ibid., 19.
70. Gür, "Spordan Beklenenler," 10.
71. Türk, "Türklerin Spor Tarihine," 5.
72. Şapolyo, "Sümer ve Etilerde Spor," 11; see also Katurcıoğlu, "Sami Felsefesinin İrkçı Vasfı," 267.
73. Şapolyo, "Hun Türklerinde Spor," 7.
74. Vandemir, "Eski Türklerde Kuvvet Anlamı."
75. Sabine, *Yakınçağ Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi*, 384.
76. Gentile, *The Struggle for Modernity*, 60.
77. Osten, "Nasyonal Sosyalist Almanya," 17–21; see also Halit, "Yurd Müdafaasında Sporun Ehemmiyeti," 7–9.
78. Tarcan, "İtalya'da Halk ve Gençlik Teşkilatı"; Apak, "Türk Sporunun Yeni Yükümleri"; and Apak, "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu II."
79. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 186.
80. Taner, "Beden Terbiyesi Teşkilatının Çalışma Esasları," 14–5, "Beden Terbiyesi Teşkilatının Çalışma Esasları II," 1–2, "Cemil Taner'in Kanun," 2–9.
81. Kaya, "B. Şükrü Kaya'nın Nutku," 482.
82. Ibid., 485.
83. Apak, "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu II," 43.
84. Apak, "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu III," 124.
85. Ibid., 124.
86. Anonymous, "Büyük Millet Meclisinde," 12–3.
87. Taner, "Halkevleri ve Spor Kulüpleri," 550.
88. Baba, "Halkevlerimizde Sporun Yeni Veçhesi," 352–3.
89. Taner, "Sporda ve Beden Terbiyesinde," 3–4; and Baba, "Türk Köylüsü ve Spor," 437.
90. Anonymous, "Büyük Millet Meclisinde," 3.
91. According to Tanilli, in 1935 the people lived in the villages made up 82% of the population in Turkey. See Tanilli, *Nasıl Bir Eğitim İstiyoruz?* 68.
92. Ahmad, *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*, 94.
93. Ibid., 101.
94. Ibid., 99.
95. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 199.
96. Atabeyoğlu, *Sporda Devlet mi?*, 46.
97. Krawietz, "Sport and Nationalism," 9.
98. Baydar, "Devlet ve Spor," 3.
99. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 25.

References

- Ahmad, F. *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003.
- Akın, Y. *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlattlar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.
- Akyol, A. *Ana Çizgileriyle Cumhuriyetin Ellinci Yılında Türkiye'de Beden Eğitimi ve Spor*. Ankara: T.C. Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Yayını, 1976.
- Akyüz, Y. *Türk Eğitim Tarihi (Başlangıçtan 1993'e)*. İstanbul: Kültür Koleji Yayınları, 1994.
- Anonymous, "Büyük Millet Meclisinde Teşkilat ve Bütçe Kanunlarının Müzakere Zabıtları." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 3, no. 31 (1941): 3–29.
- Anonymous, "Kanunun Metni." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 1 (1939): 39–41.
- Apak, R. "On Beş Yıl ve Türk Sporu." *Ülkü* 12, no. 69 (1938): 229–234.
- Apak, R. "Türk Sporunun Yeni Yükümleri." *Ülkü* 6, no. 35 (1936): 345–347.
- Apak, R. "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu." *Ülkü* 12, no. 66 (1938): 517–519.
- Apak, R. "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu II." *Ülkü* 12, no. 67 (1938): 42–44.
- Apak, R. "Yeni Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu III." *Ülkü* 12, no. 68 (1938): 123–125.
- Atabeyoğlu, C. *Sporda Devlet mi? Devlette Spor mu?* İstanbul: Türkiye Milli Olimpiyat Komitesi Yayınları, 2001.
- Ateş, S. Y. *Asker Evlattlar Yetiştirmek*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2012.
- Baba, N. "Halkevlerimizde Sporun Yeni Veçhesi." *Ülkü* 16, no. 94 (1940): 347–353.
- Baba, N. "Türk Köylüsü ve Spor." *Ülkü* 16, no. 89 (1940): 436–438.
- Baydar, N. "Devlet ve Spor." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 1 (1939): 3–4.

- Berkes, N. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964.
- Çetin, M. Z. "Tales of Past, Present, and Future: Mythmaking and Nationalist Discourse in Turkish Politics." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 24, no. 2 (2004): 347–365.
- Diem, C. "Stadyom İnşaatı." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 3 (1939): 29–34.
- Erimtan, C. "Hittites, Ottomans and Turks: Ağaoğlu Ahmed Bey and the Kemalist Construction of Turkish Nationhood in Anatolia." *Anatolian Studies* 58 (2008): 141–171.
- Fişek, K. *Devlet Politikası Ve Toplumsal İlişkileri Açısından Spor Yönetimi: Dünyada-Türkiye'de*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1980.
- Fişek, K. *100 Soruda Türkiye Spor Tarihi*. İstanbul: Gerçek, 1985.
- Foucault, M., *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. London: Penguin, 1982.
- Gentile, E. *The Struggle for Modernity: Nationalism, Futurism, and Fascism*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.
- Gür, A. R. "Spordan Beklenenler." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 12, no. 3 (1941): 10–11.
- Gürçağlar, Ş. T. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923–1960*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008.
- Halit, Y. "Yurd Müdafaasında Sporun Ehemmiyeti." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 12 (1939): 7–9.
- Karpat, K. H. "The Impact of the People's Houses on the Development of Communication in Turkey: 1931–1951." *Die Welt des Islams New Series* 15, no. 1/4 (1974): 69–84.
- Karpat, K. H. "Society, Economics, and Politics in Contemporary Turkey." *World Politics* 17, no. 1 (1964): 50–74.
- Katircioğlu, M. "Sami Felsefesinin İrkçi Vasfı." *Ülkü* 7, no. 40 (1936): 267–272.
- Kaya, Ş. "Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 1 (1939): 6–39.
- Kaya, Ş. "B. Şükrü Kaya'nın Nutku." *Ülkü* 11, no. 66 (1938): 481–485.
- Krawietz, B. "Sport and Nationalism in the Republic of Turkey." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 31, no. 3 (2014): 1–11.
- Keten, M. *Türkiye'de Spor*. İstanbul: Polat Ofset, 1993.
- Kırşan, N. "Beden Terbiyesi Kanunundan Önceki Spor Teşkilatımıza Umumi Bir Bakış." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 1 (1939): 7–32.
- Lüküslü, D. *Türkiye'de Gençlik Miti:1980 Sonrası Türkiye Gençliği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009.
- Lüküslü, D., and Ş. Dinçşahin. "Selim Sırrı Tarcan ve Beden Eğitimi." *Bilgi ve Bellek* 9 (2011): 44–64.
- Lüküslü, D., and Ş. Dinçşahin. "Shaping Bodies Shaping Minds: Selim Sırrı Tarcan and the Origins of Modern Physical Education in Turkey." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 30, no. 3 (2013): 195–209.
- Markula, P., and R. Pringle. *Foucault, Sport and Exercise: Power, Knowledge and Transforming the Self*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Osten, H. V. T. "Nasyonal Sosyalist Almanya Kalkınmasında Sporun Rolü." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 3 (1939): 17–21.
- Sabine, G. *Yakınçağ Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 2000.
- Şapolyo, E. B. "Hun Türklerinde Spor." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 6 (1939): 7–9.
- Şapolyo, E. B. "Sümer ve Etilerde Spor." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 7 (1939): 11–12.
- Sümer, R. *Sporda Demokrasi 2: Belgeler ve Yorumlar*. Ankara: Şafak Matbaacılık, 1988.
- Sümer, R. *Sporda Demokrasi 1: Belgeler ve Yorumlar*. Ankara: Şafak Matbaacılık, 1990.
- Taner, C. "Beden Terbiyesi Teşkilatının Çalışma Esasları." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 1 (1939): 2–15.
- Taner, C. "Beden Terbiyesi Teşkilatının Çalışma Esasları II." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 2 (1939): 1–2.
- Taner, C. "Cemil Taner'in Kanun Üzerine Konuşması." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 3 (1939): 2–9.
- Taner, C. "Halkevleri ve Spor Kulüpleri." *Ülkü* 13, no. 78 (1939): 550–553.
- Taner, C. "Sporda ve Beden Terbiyesinde Umumi Prensiplerimiz." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 3, no. 37 (1941): 2–4.
- Tanilli, S. *Nasıl Bir Eğitim İstiyoruz?* İstanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, 2004.
- Tarcan, S. S. "İtalya'da Halk ve Gençlik Teşkilatı." *Ülkü* 1, no. 3 (1933): 241–243.
- Türk, K. O. "Türklerin Spor Tarihine Yaptıkları Hizmetler." *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 3, nos 27–28 (1941): 5–6.

- Uludağ, O. Ş. “Spor Göreneğın Deęil Bilginin Eseri Olmalıdır.” *Ülkü* 6, no. 36 (1936): 431–439.
- Vandemir, B. “Eski Türklerde Kuvvet Anlamı.” *Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor* 1, no. 12 (1939): 3–6.
- Yıldız, D. *Türk Spor Tarihi*. İstanbul: Eko Matbaası, 1979.
- Yılmaz, Z., and K. Bakır. “Balkan Milliyetçiliğinin Türk Eğitim Sistemi Üzerine Etkileri.” *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 13, no. 1 (2009): 53–70.
- Zürcher, E. *Turkey: A Modern History*. New York: I.B.Tauris, 1994.