

ABDÜLHAMİD II AND
HIS LEGACY



STUDIES IN HONOUR OF
F. A. K. YASAMEE

Edited by
Ş. Tufan Buzpınar and
Gökhan Çetinsaya



THE ISIS PRESS
ISTANBUL

CONTENTS

Preface	7
1- Feroze A. K. Yasamee, <i>Spying on the Sultan: A Further Note</i>	15
2- Keith Wilson, 'Remember That You Are Dealing with an Eastern People. They Understand Nothing but Force.' <i>Imperial Germany, Great Britain and the Coercion of Abdul Hamid II (July-December 1895)</i>	27
3- Gökhan Çetinsaya, <i>Sultan Abdülhamid II's Domestic Policy: An Attempt at Periodization</i>	39
4- Gül Tokay, <i>The Ottoman Army during the Hamidian Period: An Assessment</i>	65
5- Azmi Özcan, <i>Anti-Ottoman Debates over the Caliphate in Britain (1870-1908)</i>	83
6- Ş. Tufan Buzpınar, <i>A Reassessment of Anti-Ottoman Placards in Syria, 1878-1881</i>	99
7- Oya Dağlar Macar, <i>Foreign Medical Aid to the Ottomans during the 1877-78 Russo-Ottoman War</i>	127
8- Ali Akyıldız, <i>The Extension of German Capital in the Balkans: The Salonika-Monastir Railways</i>	147
9- Hacer Topaktaş Üstüner, <i>Two Extraordinary Missions Welcoming the Tsar and Kaiser during the Reign of Abdulhamid II</i>	177
10- Odile Moreau, <i>Ottoman-Chinese Relations in the Early 20th Century</i>	193
11- H. Ozan Özavci, 'A Little Light in the Darkness': <i>The Mission of Charles Laurent and the Young Turks, 1908-1911</i>	203
12- Gencer Özcan, <i>The Prussian Impact on Turkey's Military during the Republican Era</i>	229
13- Behçet K. Yeşilbursa, <i>The Role of the Armed Forces in Turkish Politics (1950-1971)</i>	259

THE PRUSSIAN IMPACT ON TURKEY'S MILITARY DURING THE REPUBLICAN ERA¹

Gencer ÖZCAN²

Introduction

The reform programmes initiated at the end of the nineteenth century to re-structure the Ottoman army in line with the Prussian model had a long-lasting impact on the Turkish military - an impact that lingered during the first half of twentieth century. Fostered by the close relations between Germany and the Ottoman Empire, this impact did not only reshape educational institutions, training methods and the structural formation of the army but also framed the military's understanding of politics. Although the relations between the two armies were interrupted in 1918, the founding fathers of the new Republic remained loyal to the Prussian model in military affairs. While several aspects of the German model's impact on the late Ottoman army³ and the wartime alliance between the two armies⁴ have been thoroughly highlighted by military historians, its political implications are still understudied.⁵ This study sets out to identify areas where the Prussian impact lingered, to reveal traces of the

¹ This article is an updated version of my previous publications. For its earlier versions see, "Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ordusunda Prusya Etkisi," in Evren Balta Paker and İsmet Akça, *Türkiye'de Ordu, Devlet ve Güvenlik Siyaseti*, Istanbul, Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010, 175-222; "Der Deutsche Einfluss auf die türkische Armee" in *Am Rande Europas? Der Balkan -Raum und Bevölkerung als Wirkungsfelder militärischer Gewalt*, in ed. Bernhard Chiari, Gerhard P. Gross, Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2009, 241-258.

² Prof, Department of International Relations, Istanbul Bilgi University. I owe thanks to Serhat Güvenç, Mehmet Hacısalıhoğlu, Mehmet Beşikçi, Gül Tokay, Sacit Kutlu and İdil Özcan for sharing their valuable suggestions.

³ Salih Kış, *Osmanlı Ordusunda Alman Ekolü (1883-1895)*, Konya: Palet, 2017; Gerhard Grueshaber, *The German Spirit in the Ottoman and Turkish Army, 1908-1938: A History of Military Knowledge Transfer*, Berlin, De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2018.

⁴ Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Birinci Dünya Savaşı Sırasında Türkiye'de Bulunan Alman Generallerinin Raporları*, Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1966, 7-16; Hayati Aktaş, "Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Türkiye'de Görev Yapan Alman Subaylarını Faaliyetlerinin Bir Değerlendirmesi ve Türk Askerinin Konumu", *Yedinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri*, Volume. II, Ankara : Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2001, 413-428.

⁵ Hasan Ünder, "Goltz, Milleti Müselleha ve Kemalizmdeki Spartan Öğeler," *Tarih ve Toplum*, No: 206, February 2001, 45-54.

Prussian impact on the institutional memory of the Turkish Armed Forces and to discuss the way the Prussian model influenced the sense of perspective that the military had on political issues.

Mainstream republican historiography holds the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) administration responsible for letting the Ottoman army fight the war in line with the priorities that German general staff assigned regardless of Turkey's own priorities. Although there is a great deal of truth in this, republican historiography understates, if not ignores altogether, the transformation of the Ottoman army following the reforms designed by the German military mission.⁶ Instead, the official historiography highlights the reforms instigated by the republican administration almost claiming that the Turkish army was built from scratch.⁷ However, the German model, which was highly influential towards the end of the Ottoman Empire, played a significant role in the evolution of the Republican army. As the army was used during the Republican period as a tool to create a new citizen profile in line with the project of the nation-state, the Prussian impact was felt strongly both on the social and the political level.

To understand this impact, a multi-level analysis is required. First of all, the effects of this impact on the military occupation can be analysed in terms of military training, military ethics and the adoption of German military culture and traditions. In addition to these effects, by looking at systems of recruitment and mobilisation, as well as power structures, the question of how the model transformed the Turkish army can be answered. Secondly, the traces of the impact on the institutional memory of the Republican army can be analysed. In this regard, it is remarkable that emotional attachments such as camaraderie and admiration of the German army lasted until the end of the Second World War. Last but not least, one can look at the one aspect in which the Prussian impact had long-lasting influence, namely the transformation it brought about in the army's approach to social and political sphere, and thus evaluate the effects of the Prussian impact on the *weltanschauung* and political views of officers in late Ottoman and early Republican armies.

The Adoption of the Prussian Model

The last quarter of the nineteenth century was the beginning of a period in which many states, notably the USA and Japan along with the Ottoman Empire, admired and took as an example the Prussian army, which had defeated

⁶ Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Atatürk Hayatı ve Eserleri I: Doğumundan Samsun'a Çıkışına Kadar*, Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1990; Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi Volume IX, İkinci Meşrutiyet ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı (1908-1918)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1996, 392.

⁷ Cengiz Okman, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Dış Politika Ortamı ve Askeri Yapının Evrimi", *Dördüncü Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1989, 24-25.

both Austria and France.⁸ In this period, the Ottoman Empire closely scrutinized the organization and battle strategies of the Prussian army in order to avoid further territorial losses in Europe.⁹ The Prussian model was developed as a response against the possibility of a war fought on multiple fronts and intended that an army with high mobility would gain rapid results via rapid offences and tactical superiority. Although most armies share this aim, it was most strictly practiced by the Prussian army.¹⁰ Another aspect, which distinguished the Prussian model from other similar models, was its structure of the General Staff. Furthermore, the efficient use of the telegram and railway systems for instant attacks rendered the model more powerful. Germany lacked the natural resources, which would enable them to continue a long-term frontal war, made the German model more appealing to the Ottomans. Finally, the Prussian model also had its political and social dimensions. The Prussian army and the military education were significant ideological tools, enabling the authoritarian system to sustain and recreate itself by protecting the rule and prestige of the Kaiser and the entrenched priorities of the aristocracy. The army was expected to raise individuals who were devoted to the hierarchical social system at the top of which sat the Kaiser.¹¹ From this perspective, until 1908, the Prussian model seemed to fit in the Ottoman polity. Although the situation had changed somewhat after 1908, this time another aspect of the Prussian model appeared to correspond the political necessities of the Union and Progress Party's military wing¹²: the concept of a 'Citizen Army' or *Millet-i Müselleha* ('the armed people' in Turkish), as translated from the German *Volk in Waffen*, that the Union and Progress Party's top brass thought to serve best their political priorities.¹³ In light of these evaluations,

⁸ Malcom E. Yapp, "The Modernization of Middle Eastern Armies in the Nineteen Century A Comparative View", in V. J. Parry (ed), *War Technology and Society in the Middle East*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975, 339. Kazım Karabekir indicates that the historical change which forced the Ottoman Army to change its model started with the 1870-1871 France-Prussia war. Kazım Karabekir, *Türkiye'de ve Türk Ordusunda Almanlar*, İstanbul: Emre yayınları, 2001, 199. One of the courses that Mustafa Kemal registered to was "1866 and 1871 Prussian- Austrian, Prussian-French Wars" delivered by Pertev [Demirhan] Pasha. Ali Güler, "Harbiye ve Harp Akademisi Öğrenim Hayatının Mustafa Kemal'in Kişiliğinin Oluşumundaki Rolü", *Yedinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri I*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2000, 203.

⁹ Jehuda L. Wallach, *Bir Askeri Yardımın Anatomisi*, (Çev. Fahri Çeliker) Ankara: Genelkurmay Basımevi, 1977, 39-40.

¹⁰ Robert M. Citino, *The German Way of War: From the Thirty Years' War to the Third Reich*, Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2005, 306-307; Okman, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Dış Politika Ortamı", 21-22.

¹¹ Nicholas Staggart, *The German Idea of Militarism: Radical and Socialist Critics, 1864-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

¹² Handan Nezir Akmeşe, *The Birth of Modern Turkey: The Ottoman Military and the March of to World War I*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2005.

¹³ "Leonhard Jörn and Ulrike von Hirschhausen, "Does Empire Strike Back? The Model of the Nation in Arms as a Challenge for Multi-Ethnic Empires in the Twentieth and Early Twentieth Century", *Journal of Modern European History*, Volume 5, Number 2, 2007, 206-207.

one can now ask how the Ottoman army was renewed in line with the Prussian model.

After the achievements of the Prussian army and the heavy defeat in the Ottoman-Russian war of 1877-1878, the new Prussian Military Committee led by Colonel Otto August Kaehler was invited by Abdulhamid II to Istanbul and the reform process was initiated. After Kaehler's death in 1885, General Colmar Freiherr von der Goltz (1843-1916) took the chair. The Kaehler Committee set out to work by preparing internal memoranda that explained what needed to be done for the organization, education and training of a modern army based on *levee en masse* and Prussian type institutions.¹⁴ During the Kaehler/Goltz Committee period, the French education system that was being followed in the military academy was replaced by that of the Berlin Military Academy.¹⁵ During the Goltz period, when he was appointed Deputy Chief of Ottoman General Staff, the structure of the Ottoman General Staff was also reviewed in compliance with the German model and a new recruitment law was designed after the Prussian recruitment law dated 3 September 1814, and was put into effect as of 25 October 1886.¹⁶ Opening military junior high schools (*askeri rüştiye*) was another novelty of the period.¹⁷ In order to standardise military training, Goltz also initiated the establishment of sample regiments.¹⁸ While some of the proposals of the Goltz Committee were not accepted by Abdulhamid II, others were delayed because of unwillingness on the part of the conservative military bureaucracy. Due to his desire to maintain balance of power within the imperial bureaucracy, the Sultan was reluctant to put into action all the suggestions made by the Goltz Committee. It was apparent that Goltz was trying to exert an influence in the army in spite of the Sultan's efforts to limit German influence. For example, some ideas put forward by Goltz, such as mobilising the army against the palace by using his influence on the young officers and then stopping them, thereby obtaining Abdulhamid's trust, were not taken seriously in Berlin.¹⁹ Documents in Turkish military archives point out that the reforms introduced during Goltz's pe-

¹⁴ Wallach, *Bir Askeri Yardımın Anatomisi*, 39-40.

¹⁵ *Harpokulu Tarihçesi 1834-1945*, Ankara: Harpokulu Matbaası, 1945, 27; Feroz A. K. Yasamee, "Colmar Freiherr von Der Goltz and the Rebirth of the Ottoman Empire", *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Volume 9, Number 2, 1998.

¹⁶ Kış, *Osmanlı Ordusunda Alman Ekolü (1883-1895)*, 214-220; Erol Uğur, "Von Der Goltz Paşa'nın 1883-1895 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'deki Hizmetleri", *20nci Yüzyıl Başına Kadar Türk Askeri Eğitiminin Tarihi Gelişimi*, İstanbul: Harp Akademileri, 1983, 21-24.

¹⁷ Nurettin Türsan, 'Generalfeldmarschall Colmar Freiherr von Der Goltz'un Türkiye Yaşamı ve Hizmetleri', *20nci Yüzyıl Başına Kadar Türk Askeri Eğitiminin Tarihi Gelişimi*, İstanbul: Harp Akademileri, 1983, 37.

¹⁸ Selahattin Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, Volume III, Chapter 6 (1908-1920), first book, Ankara: Genelkurmay Basımevi, 1971, 145.

¹⁹ İlber Ortaylı, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Alman Nüfuzu*, İstanbul: Kaynak, 1983, 78.

riod remained largely at a theoretical stage and were not implemented successfully.²⁰

Despite the reluctance on part of the palace and the shortcomings in practice, it can be seen that the Prussian impact on both the restructuring of the army and the education system increased gradually.²¹ In this respect, the establishment of Sample Battalions in January 1907 can be considered a turning point. For instance, the establishment of the 6th Sample Battalion in Thessaloniki enabled the Ottoman officers who were educated in Germany to come to the front.²² Together with the 1908 Revolution, the German impact became more apparent as the officers who were either educated in accordance with the German model or were educated in Germany, came to power.²³ Mahmut Şevket Pasha (1846-1913), who wrote to his instructor Goltz that “[his] loyal students coerced the Ottoman government into ending their sinister autocracy and to accept the constitution”.²⁴ Mahmut Şevket Pasha expressed his opinion on this matter as follows: “The Greek had the British to reform their navy and the French for their army. Unlike us, they operated not with precautions but with full authority. So now we should also demand for our army a German reform committee with full authority and strength”.²⁵ The German influence on the late Ottoman army became more evident, and after 1909 the number of units directly commanded by German officers increased. The number of German weapons used in the Ottoman army also increased as

²⁰ Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, 145.

²¹ Karabekir, *Türkiye’de ve Türk Ordusunda Almanlar*, 199-206.

²² Wallach, *Bir Askeri Yardımın Anatomisi*, 75-79.

²³ Sina Akşin, *Şariatçı Bir Ayaklanma: 31 Mart Olayı*, Ankara: İmge, 1994, 270; Feroz Ahmed, *İttihat ve Terakki*, 1908-1914, İstanbul: Kaynak, 2007, 79-80.

²⁴ Before he came to Turkey, Goltz continued to give advices to his 'loyal students' through articles in the German press, especially during the suppression of the 31 March uprising. Probably, with the effect of this affinity, the success of the Army of Action (Hareket Ordusu) was seen as victory of Germany against England. Akşin, *Şariatçı Bir Ayaklanma*, 270-271.

²⁵ Kazım Karabekir, *Tarih Boyunca Alman İlişkileri*, 408; In the following days of him becoming grand vizier, Mahmut Şevket Pasha remarked the German effect on the army and stated to Cemal Pasha that this impact will continue to increase in the future: "For our army, I am of the opinion that we can no longer remain unfamiliar with German methods. Over thirty years, German trainers have been in our army, our military officers were trained completely in German military methods, our army is highly competent when it comes to the soul and instructions of German training... This is why, by bringing extensive German military mission, if necessary, by appointing a German General to one of the Turkish army corps, by appointing German staff and non-commissioned officer to each command of troops in the same army corps, my intention is to establish an exemplary army corps." Mustafa Gencer, *Jöntürk Modernizmi ve "Alman Ruhu"*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2003, 62-63. For a thorough evaluation of the underlying reasons to reform Mahmut Şevket Pasha's Ottoman Army in line with the German model, see also Naim Tufan, *Rise of the Young Turks*, London: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2000, 319-320.

German officers, in particular Goltz, pushed for greater sales by German weapons manufacturers such as *Krupps*, *Loewe* and *Mauser*.²⁶

The increasing German influence in the higher echelons of the army created among the young officers a growing discontent and aversion to the Germans and sometimes towards fellow soldiers who were educated in Germany.²⁷ Although some of this aversion was directed against the privileges granted to the German officers, it is clear that much of it was not purely personal. Indeed, these reactions intensified with the efforts of governing the army and the navy in accordance with the wishes of Germany during the First World War.²⁸ As mentioned above, the expectation of the Germans from this cooperation was to increase their influence over the Empire through the Ministry of War. Towards the end of 1913, when the new German military committee under the presidency of Liman von Sanders (1885-1929) left for Turkey, the Wilhelm Committee II was commissioned to enhance the 'Germanization' of the Turkish army by overseeing and commanding the activities of the Ministry of War directly, and after December 1913 German officers were appointed to key posts in both the General Staff of the Ottoman Army and the Ministry of War.²⁹ The then German Ambassador Baron Hans Freiherr von Wangenheim (1859-1915) also touched upon the significance of German education in the Ottoman army to establish German influence on the Ottoman Empire: "The most powerful force in Turkey will always be the one which controls the army. If we control the army, a government of enemies of Germany will never stay behind the steering wheel!"³⁰

Modernisation in the fields of military education and power infrastructure accelerated in the period following the 31 March Incident, and in the summer of 1909 the structure of the Ottoman army underwent a profound transformation. In this period, during which Ahmet İzzet [Furğaç] (1864-1937) was the Chief of Staff, military education, the Military Academy in particular, was restructured. This change was brought about by taking the German system as the model and by intentionally putting educational institutions under the German officers' responsibility.³¹ The thorough transformation of military education was the most significant factor which sustained the Prussian impact for decades to come. With the establishment of the General Inspectorate of Education and Instruction (*'Terbiye ve Tedrisat Müfettiş-i*

²⁶ Kış, *Osmanlı Ordusunda Alman Ekolü*, 214-221; Ortaylı, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Alman Nüfuzu*, s.79; Mehmet Beşirli, "II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Osmanlı Ordusunda Alman Silahları", *Erciyes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, No: 16, 2004/1, 121-128.

²⁷ Wallach, *Bir Askeri Yardımın Anatomisi*, 78,182.

²⁸ Ortaylı, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Alman Nüfuzu*, 24-25.

²⁹ Mazlum İskora, *Erkanıharbiye Tarihçesi*, Ankara: Harp Akademisi Matbaası, 1994; Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, 192-198.

³⁰ Gencer, *Jöntürk Modernizmi ve "Alman Ruhu"*, 62-66.

³¹ Metin Ayışığı, *Mareşal Ahmet İzzet Paşa (Akseri ve Siyasi Hayatı)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1997, 22-23.

Umumiliği) on 20 July 1909, the hope was that military education would be centralized. The military academies in Manastır/Bitola and Edirne were closed and moved to Istanbul, and the curriculum of the academy was thoroughly revised.³² The German field manuals were translated verbatim.³³ The army, made up of veteran battalions and regular army battalions each consisting of sixteen divisions, was reorganized along the lines of army corps.³⁴ Other innovations included preparing new mobilization plans and, starting as of 1909, executing manoeuvres at the corps level. While the suggestions of the German staff officers and especially of Goltz were taken into consideration on certain occasions, on many other occasions these suggestions were either not put into practice or were abolished after a while. A good example for this is the dissolution of veteran corps after the Balkan Wars³⁵

During the period that began after the Balkan Wars and lasted until the outbreak of World War I, the army underwent extensive transformation. Comprehensive reorganizations including the abolishment of veteran corps, a novel system of regional organization, a review of the recruitment methods and new arrangements both at the Ministry of War and at the Office of the General Staff were all carried out in this short period.³⁶ In light of suggestions by German consultants, a four-fold structure was established at the Ministry of War in accordance with the regulations of January 1914. In light of suggestions by the German Committee, this structure was rearranged once during mobilization and once more after the outbreak of the war.³⁷ In this period, the military museum was also renovated following the principles of German museology.³⁸

Although there was a diversity of opinions regarding the outcomes of German reforms, there was a relative consensus on the positive effects of the reforms made on the Ottoman army.³⁹ According to the young Ottoman offic-

³² Tufan, *Rise of the Young Turks*, 165-166.

³³ Türkmen, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde (1909-1919) Osmanlı Ordusunda Müfettişlik", 22.

³⁴ Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, 146; Okman, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Dış Politika Ortamı, 28-29.

³⁵ Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, 143; Uğur, Von Der Goltz Paşa'nın 1883-1895 Yılları Arasında Türkiye'deki Hizmetleri', 24.

³⁶ Erik Jan Zürcher, *Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2003, 103-104.

³⁷ Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, 256-257.

³⁸ Fahri Belen, *20nci Yüzyılda Osmanlı Devleti*, İstanbul: Remzi, 1973, 184-186; Nejat Eralp, "1908-1923 Döneminde Türkiye Askeri Müzesi'nin Batılı Anlamda Kuruluşu ve Kültür Hayatındaki Yeri", *İkinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1985, 289.

³⁹ Edward J. Erickson, *I. Dünya Savaşı'nda Osmanlı Ordusu: Çanakkale, Kutü'l Amare, Gaze ve Meggido Muhabereleleri*, translated by Kerim Bağrıaçık, İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009, 10, 19-22, 273-274; Ayşe Gül Altınay, *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism Gender and Education in Turkey*, New York: Palgrave Mac Millian, 2004, 21-24; Mesut Uyar and A. Kadir Varoğlu 'In Search of Modernity and Rationality: The Evolution of Turkish Military Curricula in a Historical Perspective', *Armed Forces & Society*, Volume 35, 2008, 188; Mesut Uyar

ers, the superiority of the German system in the reorganisation of the army was quite clear. Mustafa Kemal, in the preface to his translation of German General [Karl] Litzmann's (1850-1936)⁴⁰ *The Combat Training of the Squad* in 1909, talks about "burying" the old field manual alongside "erroneous customs and traditions that bind us with a rusty chain".⁴¹

The fact that German field manuals were put into practice without adaptation to the context of the Ottoman army was a subject of debate in the military literature of the Republican era. *The History of Turkish Armed Forces* published by the Turkish General Staff's Directorate of Military History (*Genelkurmay Harp Tarihi Başkanlığı*) reports that the *Field Service Regulation* (the *Seferiye Nizamnamesi*) was translated from German without any significant modification and published in 1900. However, it was not adopted by the Ottoman commanders until its re-edition in 1914. The use of *Field Service Regulation* caused serious problems during the Balkan Wars. In *The History of Turkish Armed Forces*, the official military history of the Republican Period, attention was drawn to the fact that problems arose while putting into practice the provisions of the German field manuals and it was pointed out that during the Balkan Wars, "those who presumed that the problem of developing the army can be resolved with a few field manuals and instructions translated from German into Turkish could not attain a positive result in spite of all their good intentions and self-sacrificing efforts".⁴²

The official history had limited interest in, and thus disregarded, the positive impact of the regulations implemented in accordance with the German model. An exception to this was Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. According to Aydemir, "In contrast to the lack of order and discipline in the 1912-1913 Balkan Wars, the order and discipline the Ottoman Army displayed during the war of 1914-1918 despite the many hardships and poverty, is a result of this process of reform and rejuvenation."⁴³ Although with a more balanced approach towards Enver Pasha and Germans, İnönü, too, spoke admiringly of

and Edward J. Erickson, *A Military History of the Ottomans From Osman to Atatürk*, Santa Barbara: Praeger Security International, 2009, 206-231.

Mesut Uyar and Edward J. Erickson Muzaffer Özsoy, 'Dünü ve Bugünü İle Türk Savunma Stratejisi', *Türkiye'nin Savunması*, 41-82, Ankara: Dış Politika Enstitüsü, 1987, 55-56; Ortaylı, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Alman Nüfuzu*, 84-86; Okman, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi Dış Politika Ortamı; Aktaş, "Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Türkiye'de Görev Yapan Alman Subaylarını Faaliyetlerinin Bir Değerlendirmesi".

⁴⁰ General Karl Litzmann, who was head of the Berlin War Academy between 1902 and 1905, wrote *Beiträge zur taktischen Ausbildung unserer Offiziere [Contributions to the Development of Our Officers' Tactical Skills]*, translated by Mustafa Kemal chapter by chapter, probably while on duty (Leipzig: Lang Verlag, ty.). Litzmann was called for duty during the First World War. Due to his outstanding success on the Russian front, he was awarded one of the highest medals of the German army, *Orden Pour le Merites*. In 1932, Litzmann became a member of parliament from the NSGWP.

⁴¹ Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk], *Takımın Muharebe Talimi*, Afet [İnan], *Atatürk'ün Askerliğe Dair Eserleri*, Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Atatürk ve Devrim Serisi in Chapter IV, 1959, 3-4.

⁴² Karatamu, *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Tarihi*, 295-297 and 455.

⁴³ Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *Tek Adam*, Fourth Edition, Istanbul: Remzi, 1969, 189.

the army's mobilisation and preparations for combat, and stated that the army "was prepared with the best training and order one can think of."⁴⁴

Among the Prussian officers who worked in Turkey for the modernization of military education, General Freiherr Colmar von der Goltz holds a special place.⁴⁵ The symposium organized by the Military Academy on 23 July 1983 to "celebrate and commemorate the centenary of his appointment to the Ottoman army" is an indication of how much his influence is still present.⁴⁶ The most profound reforms of the Ottoman military education, which took the German military education system as a model, were introduced in his period of service.⁴⁷ In his almost 12 years of service, he initiated the publication of nearly 4000 Turkish course books, removed outdated modules from the curriculum and redesigned the courses in a such a way that they consisted mostly of practice rather than theory.⁴⁸ Goltz is also remembered as a reformer who introduced to the Ottoman army innovations such as the General Staff trip to Macedonia and war exercises with maps (*haritalı harp oyunları*).⁴⁹ Immediately after publication, Goltz's book *Volk in Waffen* was translated into Turkish as "*Millet-i Müselleha*" found many readers among students of the Military Academy.⁵⁰ Although most of his ideas were first and foremost meant to serve the German imperial interests rather than those of the Ottomans, Goltz succeeded to inspire a new generation of military officers by introducing fundamental changes in the military education system.⁵¹

Ali Fuat [Cebesoy], a classmate of Mustafa Kemal, spoke highly of Pertev [Demirhan] Pasha⁵² and Colonel Hasan Rıza -both students of Goltz-

⁴⁴ İsmet İnönü, *Hatıralarım - Genç Subaylık Yılları* (1884-1918), Haz. Sabahattin Selek, İstanbul: Burçak, 1969, 137.

⁴⁵ Nurettin Türsan, "Generalfeldmarschall Colmar Freiherr von der Goltz'un Türkiye Yaşamı, 38. Wallach underlines the significant effect Goltz had on Turkish officers. Also see: Wallach, *Bir Askeri Yardımın Anatomisi*, 54. Ebbuziyya Tevfik writes about Goltz's arrival in Turkey again in 1909 in *Mecmua-i Ebbuziyya* and compares Goltz to Moltke. "With respect to special skills and more particularly to an understanding of the necessities of our time, he is preferred to Moltke." Karabekir, *Türkiye'de ve Türk Ordusunda Almanlar*, 238.

⁴⁶ *20nci Yüzyıl Başına Kadar Türk Askeri Eğitiminin Tarihi Gelişimi*, İstanbul: Harp Akademileri, 1983. Nurettin Türsan, who organised the symposium, indicated in his memoirs that the meeting was organized in commemoration of Goltz's 150th birthday. Nurettin Türsan, *Anılar: General Nurettin Türsan*, İstanbul: Arma, 2008, 9. See also: Faruk Yılmaz, *Yirminci Yüzyıl Başlarında Osmanlı-Alman İlişkileri: "Golç Paşa'nın Hatırası"*, İstanbul: İz, 2012.

⁴⁷ Karabekir, *Türkiye'de ve Türk Ordusunda Almanlar*, 213.

⁴⁸ Wallach, *Bir Askeri Yardımın Anatomisi*, 53.

⁴⁹ Türsan, *Anılar*, 41.

⁵⁰ Akmeşe, *The Birth of Modern Turkey*, 69.

⁵¹ Fuat Dünder, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi: İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği (1913-1918)*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2008, 63; Şükrü Hanoğlu, "Yeniçeriler, Hür Basın ve Millet-i Müselleha", *Zaman*, 3 Ocak 2003; Akmeşe, *The Birth of Modern Turkey*, 23-33.

⁵² Pertev Demirhan Pasha was one of the leading persons among the officers with whom Goltz was closely engaged. In Demirhan's own words, "the relation and attachment was equal to the relation between son and father." Pertev Demirhan, "Birkaç Söz", *Goltz Paşa'nın Hatırası ve Hal*

and stated that Hasan Rıza in particular excelled as a staff officer, both in training and in the execution of his duties.⁵³ İnönü praised the manoeuvres executed by the armies of Istanbul and Edirne which were carried out under Goltz's supervision and which represented the Ottoman army's first military exercises in the modern sense.⁵⁴ For Kazım Karabekir, Goltz was one of the chief instructors amongst the Germans from whom he "benefited considerably".⁵⁵ Atatürk was never a student of Goltz himself, but was educated by a generation of instructors who had been personally educated by Goltz, and Atatürk had the chance to meet Goltz on one occasion in August 1909, during a manoeuvre in the Vardar valley. It is known that Atatürk had a copy of *Volk in Waffen* and had read Goltz's entire works.⁵⁶

It is remarkable to see how admiration for Goltz continued throughout the Republican Period and is still present today. Nurettin Türsan states that Goltz had a "great impact" on the generation of military officers in the early Republican Period.⁵⁷ One book on military history published in 1945 with several passages of praise for "Goltz Pasha" also stated that the army "benefitted greatly" from his books and the innovations he introduced for the "reorganization and reform" of the army.⁵⁸ Goltz's ideas not only affected the young Ottoman officers in terms of their profession and their military duties, but also changed their perception on their relationship with society, which in turn had an impact on their political views. An article by Goltz, titled 'The Strengths and Weakness of the Ottoman Empire' published in Germany was translated into Ottoman Turkish ('*Devlet-i Aliye'nin Zaaf ve Kuvveti*'). The article impressed many in the Union and Progress Party and functioned, in Fuat Dündar's terms, as a "road map" for the party.⁵⁹ Goltz's famous book *The Armed People/The Nation in Arms (Millet-i Müselleha)* was translated into Turkish immediately after its publication and became a reference book for the officers of the period. Şükrü Hanioglu argues that the idea – as adopted by the Union and Progress Party – that the army should play a more influential role in the social and political life was merely an interpretation of Goltz's understanding of *Millet-i Müselleha*.⁶⁰ The new generation of officers

Tercümesi, Istanbul: K.K.K. Istanbul Askeri Basımevi, 5; Pertev Demirhan, *Generalfeldmarschall Colmar Freiherr von der Goltz: Das Lebensbild eines frossen Soldaten*, Göttingen: Göttinger Verlansanstalt, 1960.

⁵³ Ali Güler, 'Harbiye ve Hark Akademisi Öğrenim Hayatının Mustafa Kemal'in Kişiliğinin Oluşumundaki Rolü', *Yedinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri I*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2000, 204.

⁵⁴ İnönü, *Hatıralarım-Genç Subaylık Yılları (1884-1918)*, 83-84.

⁵⁵ Karabekir, *Türkiye'de ve Türk Ordusunda Almanlar*, 211.

⁵⁶ Türsan, *Anılar*, 38.

⁵⁷ Türsan, *Anılar*, 9.

⁵⁸ *Harpokulu Tarihçesi 1834-1945*, Ankara: Harpokulu Matbaası, 1945, 27.

⁵⁹ Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, 64.

⁶⁰ Şükrü Hanioglu, *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, 294.

began to see themselves as members of a privileged class, the elite of society, one that consisted of people of high character. In this context, modern wars morphed into a phenomenon that could be mastered only by a soldier class that possessed these 'superior' or 'super human' qualities. Şerif Mardin states that Ahmet Rıza, one of the first leaders of the Young Turk movement, had the following idea from *Millet-i Müselleha*: "military high officials should have the duty of an elite to warn the people and the people should always be kept in a state of mobilisation."⁶¹

It is quite clear how these ideas appealed to a new generation of officers who were eager to rise and prosper by freeing themselves of the limitations of the old order. In order to understand this impact, one may examine the writings of Pertev [Demirhan] Pasha, who was known for his devotion to Goltz. Pertev Pasha, who was appointed during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 as the official observer of the Ottoman Army⁶² and whose writings expressed his admiration of German and Japanese militarism, greatly affected Mustafa Kemal and other young officers of his generation.⁶³ For instance, Mustafa Kemal extensively quotes from Pertev Pasha's memoirs to explain the admiration of young officers for the Japanese army in *Zâbit ve Kumandan ile Hasb-i Hal*.⁶⁴

Another key aspect in Goltz's ideas was his belief that the army should remain apolitical yet, at the same time, distinct and above the political realm. For Goltz, military service was a realm in which politicians should not intervene.⁶⁵ This proposition, which created tension between the politicians and soldiers, was adopted by many young officers in the Ottoman army of that time. As these approaches became more widespread, the army's view on society also began to change and this army-society interaction took on a more complicated and ambivalent shape. Although Prussian military culture seemingly envisioned the army to remain at a distance to daily politics, it also expected the army to function as a tool to maintain the order on top of which the Kaiser sat. The army was expected to remain *above* party politics, while soldiers, especially the younger officers, were expected to stay away from daily political arguments and to remain loyal to the chain of command, without

⁶¹ Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri (1895-1908)*, İstanbul: İletişim, 1999, 216.

⁶² Akyüz, *Bir Osmanlı Kurmayının Gözünden Rus-Japon Harbi*.

⁶³ Akmeşe, *The Birth of Modern Turkey*, 72-78.

⁶⁴ Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk], *Zabit ve Kumandan ile Hasb-i Hal*, Ankara: ATASE, 1981, 56-57. Mustafa Kemal wrote *Zabit ve Kumandan ile Hasb-i Hal* [Conversation with Officer and Commander] after the chapter titled 'Taaruz Fikri' [The Idea of Offensive] in *Zabit and Kumandan* [Officer and Commander] by Nuri Conker. (Nuri Conker, *Zabit ve Kumandan*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1981, 137-138) It can be understood that Mustafa Kemal benefited from the conference "*Rus-Japon Harbinden Alınan Maddi Manevi Dersler*" [Moral and Material Lessons from the Russo-Japanese War] given by Pertev Pasha in 1910/1911. (Pertev Demirhan, *Japonların Asıl Kuvveti- Japonya Niçin ve Nasıl Yükseldi?*, 47-48)

⁶⁵ Hanioglu, "*Yeniçeriler, Hür Basın ve Millet-i Müselleha*".

establishing any organic relationship with political parties. However, when we look at the process by which the Union and Progress Party came to and remained in power, it can be seen that the military wing of the party first assumed control over the party itself and then over political life.

Mahmut Şevket Pasha, who believed that the army should not be involved in daily politics, tried to take advantage of Goltz's influence on Unionist young officers in the days following the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. He wrote letters to Goltz asking him to write articles that would discourage young officers from becoming involved in politics. The aim was to make sure that these articles would be quoted in the Ottoman press and that the young officers would thus be exposed to them. Another expectation Mahmut Şevket Pasha had of the Prussians was for them "to use training and instruction to keep busy those officers that idly sit around the barracks and talk politics".⁶⁶ In this regard, one can observe that the issue of keeping soldiers away from politics was a significant topic on the political agenda of the period. For example, the manifesto of the *Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası* (Freedom and Accord Party) contained a clause that banned not only officers but all civil servants from becoming members of a political party or any political association. Interestingly, it was not the Union and Progress Party but the Freedom and Accord Party that supported Mahmut Şevket Pasha's motion to amend the Military Penal Code to ban soldiers from politics.⁶⁷

Millet-i Müselleha, which proposed to eliminate the distinction not only between soldiers and citizens but also between society and army, was also influential in attempts to establish paramilitary youth organizations in the late Ottoman era. As Goltz had set up a similar organization in Germany before he was assigned to his post for the second time in Turkey in 1913, his ideas were influential in the establishment of these organizations, which were regarded as "reserve armies" consisting of young people who were not yet old enough to be recruited as soldiers.⁶⁸ The *millet-i Müselleha* provided a doctrine for the organizations, which aimed to ensure that the youth acquired the physical and intellectual standards demanded by the military before they actually reached the age of recruitment. The militarization of the youth, justified by the rationale of compulsory military service, was one of the first steps to blur the distinction between the army and civilians. The 'Turkish Power' (*Türk Gücü*)

⁶⁶ Cezmi Eraslan, "Atatürk Döneminde İktidar-Ordu İlişkileri", *Ordular: Oluşum, Teşkilat ve İşlev*, ed. Feridun M. Emecen, Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2008, 538.

⁶⁷ Şerafettin Turan, "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Ordu-Yönetim İlişkileri", *İkinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1985, 76-77.

⁶⁸ In 1911, Goltz obtained permission from the Kaiser for the organization called the *Young German Union*. Associations aimed to keep especially workers and young away from the social democrat propaganda. Associations that held conversations about war games, gymnastics, sports and nationalism reached 67.000 members in three years. Nicholas Stargart, *The German Idea of Militarism: Radical and Socialist Critics, 1864-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 130; Mustafa Balcıoğlu, "Osmanlı Genç Dernekleri", *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa'dan Cumhuriyet'e*, Ankara: Nobel, 2001, 182-193.

fraternity/association, established in 1913, was replaced by the 'Ottoman Power Associations' (*Osmanlı Güç Dernekleri*) in 1914. In 1916, this organization gave way to the Ottoman Youth Association. In accordance with the related law, it was obligatory for children between the ages of 12 and 17 to join such associations as "rookies" and for young boys between the ages of 17 and above joined these associations as "cadets".⁶⁹ 'The Children's Army' (*Çocuklar Ordusu*) which was established by Kazım Karabekir, Goltz's staff officer, and which functioned between 1919 and 1922 in the eastern part of Turkey, can also be seen as an extension of the aforementioned paramilitary organizations.⁷⁰ All schools in the region were expected collaborate with the Children Army Corps established in connection with the corps on the Eastern Front.⁷¹

In order to demonstrate the consequent influence of Prussian officers on the Republican army, a symposium was held on 13 October 1983 at the Military Academy to commemorate the 100th year of Goltz's appointment in the Ottoman army. At the opening speech of the symposium, Major General Recep Ergun emphasized the special sympathy Turks felt towards Germans and gave numerous examples of the impact Goltz had on the republican army, citing the fact that "Goltz Pasha had raised valuable instructors like Pertev Pasha, Hasan Rıza Pasha and Yakup Şevki Pasha." He went on to say that it was "these historic figures who went on to become mentors to the founders of modern Turkey, that is Atatürk, İnönü and Çakmak."⁷²

Before tracing the Prussian impact that continued into the Republican Period, there are two points to take into account: On the first hand, problems experienced with Great Britain and France during the first years of the Republic allowed relations between Turkey and Germany to grow closer, and facilitated the German influence on the army to prevail. After an interruption lasting approximately six years following World War I, relations between Turkey and Germany were re-established with the Turkish-German Friendship Treaty on 3 March 1924.⁷³ Both the international situation and tensions with Britain over Mosul helped mutual relationships between Turkey and Germany to prosper in fields such as arms procurement, training, and military cooperation. On the other hand, however, there were also other factors that constrained cooperation between the two countries. Firstly, Turkey's increasing proximity to Britain and France in the thirties brought limitations on the cooperation between Germany and Turkey, thereby restricting German influence on the

⁶⁹ Yiğit Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar: Erken Cumhuriyet'te Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2004, 135-137.

⁷⁰ Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi*, 67-68.

⁷¹ Kazım Karabekir, *Çocuk Davamız*, Volume 1, İstanbul: Emre, 1995, 88.

⁷² *20nci Yüzyıl Başına Kadar Türk Askeri Eğitiminin Tarihi Gelişimi*, İstanbul: Harp Akademileri, 1983, 2.

⁷³ Cemil Koçak, *Türk Alman İlişkileri (1923-1939) İki Dünya Savaşı Arasındaki Dönemde Siyasal, Kültürel, Askeri ve Ekonomik İlişkiler*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991, 11.

Turkish army. Secondly, amongst members of the last generation of Ottoman staff officers, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), İsmet İnönü (1884-1973) and Fevzi Çakmak (1876-1950) were perhaps those who remained at the farthest distance from German impact, thus limiting this impact on the army in later years.⁷⁴ These statesmen who were central to the governance of the country were not educated in Germany, their knowledge of German was rudimentary and their personal experiences in Germany were limited. Far from being German admirers, they quite clearly maintained a distance from the Germans.⁷⁵ In a report dated 5 November 1913 that he wrote as military attaché in Sofia, mentioning Goltz in person, Mustafa Kemal claimed that German officers during the Balkan Wars had leaked Ottoman classified information to the Bulgarians.⁷⁶

Over the following years, Mustafa Kemal told his inner circle that the German army would not be able to win the First World War, an opinion he even expressed to Liman von Sanders, his superior in Gallipoli, as early as 1915.⁷⁷ Mustafa Kemal's relations with German staff officers were also problematic during the rest of the war.⁷⁸ Mustafa Kemal and İsmet İnönü were prominent among those who were opposed to granting the Prussian officers extensive prerogatives and raised objections to decisions on the grounds that these decisions served the interests of Germans rather than those of the Ottomans.⁷⁹ From this perspective, it is possible to regard Mustafa Kemal's report

⁷⁴ Falih Rıfki Atay is of the opinion that Atatürk personally kept his distance to the German military culture. "On the contrary to staff officers, he was not really interested in German. Even in his naïve youth, he proudly kept himself away from being a puppet of foreign education. He was a hundred percent a Turkish officer. In addition, as he is a great soldier, he never underestimated selected foreign commanders." Falih Rıfki Atay, *Çankaya: Mustafa Kemal'in Çankaya'sı*, İstanbul: Bateş, 1998, 552.

⁷⁵ Necdet Uğur indicates a point while he cites İnönü's speeches to a German ambassador: "Germans are not very successful in foreign policy. I told to the German ambassador: 'You, Germans, always find innovations in methods, techniques, science and you progress. At war, you first press with your scientific innovations. You succeed until others find what you found, and learn and execute the methods that you use. But in the end because of the rigidity of your politics and diplomacy, you lose.'" Necdet Uğur, *İsmet İnönü*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995, 29.

⁷⁶ "Bulgaristan'dan Gönderdiği "3" Sayılı Rapor' 5 Kasım 1913, (*Atatürk'ün Bütün Eserleri (1903-1915)*), İstanbul: Kaynak, 1998, 151); Hüseyin Kabasakal, 'Mustafa Kemal Sofya Askeri Ataşeliğinde', *Atatürk Haftası Armağanı 10 Kasım 1982*, Ankara: ATASE, 1982, 72.

⁷⁷ Erol Mütercimler, *Fikrimizin Rehberi: Gazi Mustafa Kemal*, İstanbul: Alfa, 2008, 266.

⁷⁸ Erik Jan Zürcher, *Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık*, 101-102; Mustafa Balcıoğlu, 'Birinci Dünya Savaşı'ndaki Türk-Alman İlişkilerinin Atatürk Dönemine Uzanan Gölgesi', 301; Mehmet Önder, *Atatürk'ün Almanya Gezisi 15 Aralık 1917-4 Ocak 1918*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1981, 91-92.

⁷⁹ Aydemir cites that at the end of the sixties, İnönü "finds the unmeasured authorization given to Germans [after the Balkan wars] strange". İnönü's remarks remind us of the discussions on Turkey-USA relations during the sixties. "All that could be considered as secret in the army, in politics, in the governing of the country was entrusted in foreign civil servants. And strangely, this foreign state was not even an ally state. Moreover, this state claimed one of the sides in world politics divided into two. The German reform committee was following what was happening in the country every day... There should be a line between interfering with the boundaries of responsibility and sovereignty in state governance. This line was ignored in the reform movements

dated 20 September 1917 criticising the order of battle in the Palestinian front by General Erich von Falkenhayn (1861-1922) as composed in line with the priorities of the German Chief of General Staff. Claiming that the German effort aimed to colonise the Ottoman Empire, Mustafa Kemal laid the blame on Falkenhayn, whom he described as "a commander who is authorized to decide on the fate of hundreds of thousands of people of Turkish blood", and asked him "to be brave enough to admit that he would put German interests above all".⁸⁰

The Prussian Impact on the Military Profession in the Early Republican Era

In the early Republican era, the structure of the Turkish Armed Forces and systems such as recruitment, mobilization and training, which had been established in accordance with the German model, were kept almost wholly intact. German military education guidelines and field manuals remained in effect, memorandums prepared by German staff officers were translated into Turkish, and German military literature continued to be the primary resource in Turkish.⁸¹ After 1925, German officers began to be appointed again to posts in the Turkish army and resumed work as instructors in the naval forces and at the Yıldız War Academy.⁸² It is interesting that these officers started working in Turkey not as a result of a bilateral agreement between Germany and Turkey but by signing personal contracts with the government.⁸³ While this was mostly related to offers of employment by the Republican army to officers left unemployed in Germany due to its disarmament as stipulated in the Treaty of Versailles, it is also clear that this cooperation was facilitated by the fact that the soldiers from both armies were professionally accustomed to one another.

at the end of the Balkan Wars..."(Aydemir, *Tek Adam*, 86). Atatürk openly demonstrated an anti-German attitude during his trip to Germany with the Crown Prince Vahdettin. Erik Jan Zürcher, *Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık*, 102; Önder, *Atatürk'ün Almanya Gezisi*.

⁸⁰ İsmet İnönü, *Hatıralarım - Genç Subaylık Yılları (1884-1918)*, 255-263.

⁸¹ Korgeneral von Kochenhausen, *Kıtaat Komutanı ve Yardımcıları İçin Tabiye Muhtırası*, translated by Nihat Bürhan, Ankara, Genelkurmay Matbaası, 1938; Oğuz Turan, 'Von Der Goltz Paşa'nın Stratejik Düşünceleri ve Eserleri', *20nci Yüzyıl Başına Kadar Türk Askeri Eğitiminin Tarihi Gelişimi*, İstanbul: Harp Akademileri, 1983, 30-34.

⁸² Serhat Güvenç and Dilek Barlas 'Atatürk's Navy: Determinants of Turkish Naval Policy, 1923-1938', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Volume 26, Number 1, March 2003, 17-18. A retired Brigadier General remembers his friends from 1928, who used to walk behind their German teacher singing the anthem "Ich hat einen Kamaraden" in the corridors of Halıcıoğlu Military High School. (İhsan Gürkan, *Bir Generalin Askeri ve Akademik Anıları*, İstanbul: Kastaş, 2002, 17).

⁸³ "Yavuz Özgüldür, "İki Savaş Arası Dönemde İngiltere ve Almanya'nın Türkiye'deki Siyasi ve Askeri Yatırımları", *Beşinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri I*, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1966, 494; Muharrem Mazlum Iskora, *Harp Akademileri Tarihçesi (1846-1965)*, Volume 1 Ankara: Genelkurmay Basım Evi, 1966, 134-136.

The German case was discussed in great detail in a report prepared by Fevzi Çakmak dated 3 June 1927 and entitled “The analysis related to the structure that the army of the Republic should take in the defence of our homeland” and which was presented to the Presidency to answer how the World War I had affected the relationships between the governments and armies of both countries. Taking into account the problems that had occurred during the war between the German Chief of General Staff and the Ministry of Navy, it was suggested in the report that “the administrative structures of all the defending forces should be subsumed under one command” by abolishing the Ministry of Navy.⁸⁴ In the reforms carried out in the early Republican Period, the main principle in the structuring of the navy was that ‘the infantry was central’, and this understanding guided all implementations and regulations until 1944, when Çakmak retired from the General Chief of Staff.⁸⁵ During the Republic’s formative years, the German model was analysed and taken as an example for the process of restructuring the General Staff Directorate and service commands. In *Erkân-ı Harbiye Tarihçesi* (‘A History of the General Staff’), published in 1944, Mazlum İskora underscores that the *Hidemat-i Erkânı Harbiye Talimatnamesi* written by the Germans in 1915, survived the Ottoman Empire and remained in use during the early years of the Republic.⁸⁶

The experiences obtained in the German army were an inspiration for the Turkish armies for many years.⁸⁷ The shared memories of the war years and the experience of working together facilitated the adherence to the German model in the early years of the Republic. In the Republican Period, the Turkish officers who worked with German staff officers became transmitters of the German model. Kazım Karabekir (1882-1948) in his work entitled *Tarih Boyunca Türk-Alman İlişkileri* (‘Turkish-German Relations throughout History’) dedicates a long section titled ‘With the German Officers at the Ministry of War before the Great War’ (*Harbi Umumi Öncesinde Erkan-ı Harbiyeyi Umumiye’de Alman Subaylarıyla*) to the practices he learnt from the German officers he had worked with. Karabekir was clearly impressed by the German officers’ character traits, such as their working habits, their orderliness and discreetness.⁸⁸ Although he deeply resented the way the German

⁸⁴ *Erkan-ı Harbiye-i Umumiye Re’isi Müşir Fevzi [Çakmak] Tarafından Hazırlanan Rapor* [Report prepared by the Chief of Staff Marshall Fevzi (Çakmak)], 1927, Başbakanlık Arşivi, 45/292/15 in Ek 5, 38/44, 3 Haziran 1927, Ek V.

⁸⁵ Hikmet Özdemir, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Rejim ve Asker İlişkisi Üzerine Bir İnceleme*, İstanbul: İz, 1993, 73-81.

⁸⁶ İskora, *Erkan-ı Harbiye Tarihçesi*, 37.

⁸⁷ Celalettin Yavuz, ‘Birinci Dünya Harbi Sırasında Osmanlı ve Alman Deniz Subayları İlişkileri’ *Yedinci Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildirileri*, Volume II, Ankara: Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2000, 250-251.

⁸⁸ Kazım Karabekir, *Tarih Boyunca Türk Alman İlişkileri*, İstanbul: Emre, 2001, 386-445; Karabekir, *Türkiye’de ve Türk Ordusunda Almanlar*, 213.

Chief of General Staff had conducted the Ottoman army during the war, Mustafa Kemal, too, talked respectfully of the German military art.⁸⁹

Among the experts on duty in Turkey was Gustav Wesemann, who was recommended to Ankara upon its request for "an experienced director who can ensure the efficient management of the Military Factories".⁹⁰ This request demonstrates the trust in German experts in the setting up and managing of operations in sensitive sectors such as defence as well as the perception of the German defence industry as a model. When we look at the initiatives taken at the end of 1925, although many failed, it is evident that Ankara wished the German arms industry to be given primacy when it came to establishing a Turkish national weapons sector.⁹¹ Needless to say, it was not unusual for an army that had been using German weapons for decades to choose German weapons.

In November 1934, Hans Rohde and Alfred Jodl came to Turkey as part of officers' exchange programme. For the German officers, a top-level welcoming ceremony was organized with Chief of Staff Marshall Fevzi Çakmak and his deputy Asım Gündüz in attendance. Later reports by German officers about the visit stated that the hierarchical structure of the Turkish army was similar to that of the Germans' and the education systems followed the German example. The reports also went on to state that Turkey "intended to increase and develop the friendly relationships between the two nations without becoming overly-attached to Germany in any way."⁹² Hans Rohde, who had been working in Turkey before, returned to Turkey in April 1936 as the first attaché serving in Ankara. The German officers who were on duty at the War Academies were asked to remain at their posts in Turkey until the Second World War and try to maintain German influence in Turkey in general, and in the Turkish Army in particular.⁹³

On the eve of the Second World War, the Prussian impact on Turkey's military remained conspicuous. Attesting to the strong support and sympathy amongst Turkish officers, the reports and remarks by German diplomats, most notably Franz von Papen⁹⁴, who was appointed as ambassador to Ankara in

⁸⁹ Lord Kinross, *Atatürk: The Rebirth of a Nation*, London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, 1964, 40.

⁹⁰ Koçak, *Türk Alman İlişkileri*, 189-190.

⁹¹ Koçak, *Türk Alman İlişkileri*, 51-55.

⁹² Ramazan Çalık, *Alman Basınında Milli Mücadele ve Mustafa Kemal Paşa (1919-1923)*, Ankara: Basın ve Yayın Enformasyonu Müdürlüğü, 2004, 109.

⁹³ Johannes Glasneck, *Türkiye'de Faşist Alman Propagandası*, translated by Arif Gelen, Ankara: Onur, ty., 15, 76-77; Özgüldür, "İki Savaş Arası Dönemde İngiltere ve Almanya'nın Türkiye'deki Siyasi ve Askeri Yatırımları".

⁹⁴ Franz von Papen (1879-1969) was accused of being a spy and was announced a persona non grata while on duty as a Military Attaché in the USA before World War I. During the war, he fought in Palestine. He decided to continue in politics and served as Chancellor in 1932. During the *Anschluss*, he served as the German ambassador in Vienna. On the eve of war, he was appointed ambassador in Ankara. After the war, while he was on trial in Nuremberg, İsmet İnönü sent a letter to the court asking for forgiveness. He was released in 1949 and died in 1969. (Cemil

1938, provide further evidence of the extent of Prussian impact in military circles.⁹⁵ One of his reports dated 20 May 1939, von Papen states that “the Turkish army and navy were trained by German experts in accordance with German education methods”. In the same report, he draws attention to the point that the German General Ritter von Mittelberger was in charge of the organization of the Turkish General Staff.⁹⁶ The German Embassy reports of the late 1930s underlined “a strong sympathy for Germany in the Turkish army”, observing that “German military power and talent was seen with great interest and curiosity”.⁹⁷ Admiration for the Prussians was prevalent not just among the former generation of generals but also among the cadets. For instance, the German soldiers present at Atatürk’s funeral “fascinated” the Military College students with “their flawless appearance as Prussian soldiers and their boots and big steel caps” and with “their proud, upright goosestep”.⁹⁸

Most probably for these reasons, there were many officers in Turkey who followed with admiration the achievements of the German armies in the first stages of the Second World War. In November 1940, at a group meeting of the Republican People’s Party in the Turkish National Assembly, Kazım Karabekir quoted from the German field manuals adopted by the Turkish army and extolled the triumph of German armies over the French armies by drawing attention to the superiority of Germans and their “spiritual preparedness”.⁹⁹ This admiration was not limited to the older generation either. In his memoirs, a military college student named Adnan Çelikoğlu describes how impressed the cadets at the academy were by the successes of the Wehrmacht: “Upon hearing that France had been defeated in fifteen days, our admiration for the Germans had already doubled.”¹⁰⁰ Here it should be emphasised that during the Second World War, German influence on İnönü and his inner circle was limited and that the groups who admired the Germans were not influential in any decision-making. Rather, these groups were skilfully used by İnönü in order to please Berlin.

In the Turkish army, the explicit effect of the German education model lasted until the late 1940s. In 1947, officers were sent to the USA for academy

Koçak, "H. Rohde'nin Türkiye Anıları Hakkında Oğlu Dr. Dieter Rohde ile Bir Konuşma", *Tarih ve Toplum*, No: 5, Mayıs 1984, 24. Papen was invited to Ankara in 1960, watched the Republic Day celebrations from the seats of honor, and stood up to listen in tears to the *Alten Kameradan*, played ‘inadvertently’ during the march. (Gürkan, *Bir Generalin Askeri ve Akademik Anıları*, 157-158).

⁹⁵ Glasneck, *Türkiye’de Faşist Alman Propagandası*, 77.

⁹⁶ Koçak, *Türk Alman İlişkileri*, 185.

⁹⁷ Koçak, *Türk Alman İlişkileri*, 187; Kemal Turan, *Türk-Alman Eğitim İlişkilerinin Tarihi Gelişimi*, İstanbul: Ayışığı, 2000, 180.

⁹⁸ Adnan Çelikoğlu, *Bir Darbeci Subayın Anıları 27 Mayıs Öncesi ve Sonrası*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010, 38.

⁹⁹ Kazım Karabekir, *Ankara’da Savaş Rüzgârları: II. Dünya Savaşı*, İstanbul: Emre, 1994, 241-242.

¹⁰⁰ Adnan Çelikoğlu, *Bir Darbeci Subayın Anıları*, 42-43.

teacher training, and in 1948, the American education system was adopted and put into practice.¹⁰¹ In the regulations drawn up after becoming a NATO member, the American system was taken as the model and from then on, attempts were made to carry the changes introduced in the American army over to the Turkish army.

Another area in which we can trace the Prussian influence is the intelligence service, which, at least during the early Republican Period, operated as an extension of the Turkish Armed Forces. The first intelligence service was established via a directive by Mustafa Kemal and for start-up operations, General Walter Nicolai, the former head of the German Military's Secret Service during the World War I, was appointed. In June 1926, a group of officers, among whom were Şükrü Ali Ögel, Hüseyin Rahmi Apak, Hasan Reşit Tankut, Kemal Güçsav, were sent to Germany and took classes related to the establishment of the national intelligence service.¹⁰² In October 1926, Nicolai visited Istanbul and gave seminars to the members of the Turkish intelligence service; in December, he went to Ankara with a skeleton crew and on 5 January 1927, initiated the service's operations.¹⁰³ German influence prevailed in the secret service until the second half of the forties. In a similar way, in the process of establishing the police department, the German model was taken as an example and experts from Germany were asked to "shape the police academy in the most up to date way possible."¹⁰⁴

Institutional Memory: Camaraderie in Arms

The "camaraderie in arms" between the German and Turkish soldiers has a very significant place in the institutional memory of the Republican Period—both as a specific consequence of the German model's impact and as one of the factors behind its longevity. Despite the unpleasant memories of the First World War, this camaraderie was not regarded negatively. Moreover, the negations of the mainstream historiographers did not prevent Turkish soldiers from respecting the German army. In his memoirs, İnönü points out that, thanks to the war, the soldiers of the two countries had an opportunity to know each other better. According to İnönü, in spite of "the conflicts between the Turkish and German staff officers", the Germans left Turkey with "good

¹⁰¹ Güvenç, "ABD Askeri Yardımı ve Türk Ordusunun Dönüşümü" in Balta Paker and Akça, *Türkiye'de Ordu*, 2010, 255-284.

¹⁰² Kaya Karan, *Türk İstihbarat Tarihi: Yıldız İstihbarat Teşkilatı ve Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa'dan MİT'e*, Istanbul: Truva, 2008, 213-214.

¹⁰³ Karan, *Türk İstihbarat Tarihi*, 110.

¹⁰⁴ Feridun Ergut, *Modern Devlet ve Polis: Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Toplumsal Denetimin Diyalektiği*, Istanbul: İletişim, 2004, 347-348.

impressions” and “when Turkish people began their struggle to save their country by themselves.... the Germans followed them admiringly.”¹⁰⁵

Intending to increase German influence on the Turkish army, “camaraderie in arms” became one of the most significant components of the discourse created by the Nazis in the period after they seized power in 1933. At a meeting organized by the Association of East Asian Warriors and Germans Abroad to celebrate the 10th year of the Republic, Deputy Prime Minister Fritz von Papen gushed over Atatürk while addressing “his comrades-in-arms with whom he fought shoulder to shoulder”:

“Coincidentally, I spent time with this great man. With many of my friends from the German army, I commemorate today the days we fought alongside him and under his command for a great common purpose. When I met him, his fame and his heroism in Çanakkale meant he had already written his name down in history. I met him when he was the commander of the Palestinian front against the British, who were superior both in numbers and in weaponry. My last memory of him was the meeting I had with him as defeat became imminent. He said to me in October 1918: ‘Fate has not chosen us. Each of us should look for a new way to save our people from this terrible predicament. The first act is over; the second is about to begin.’ The ‘second act’ has made history and today, we are rightly celebrating a great hero and statesman’s creation. The foundation of this ‘second act’ was for his country to awaken politically and to drift away from all that is not Turkish, which had been defectively influencing the people’s character.”¹⁰⁶

It was ensured that soldiers who had been on duty in the Ottoman army during the World War I were included in the German military committees sent to Ankara. The assignment of Fritz von Papen, who fought on the Palestinian front in the World War I, as the German ambassador in Ankara reflects these efforts. Events such as İnönü’s peace with the Unionists, who had been removed from the circles of power during the events of 1927, or the appointment of Kazım Karabekir as the Speaker of the Grand National Assembly increased the number of pro-German voices. The German propaganda circles cultivated intimate relationships with these retired generals like Ali Fuad Erden (1882-1957), Ali İhsan Sabis (1882-1957), Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkiilet (1883-1958), Nuri Killigil (1881-1949) and Şükrü Oğuz Yenibahçe (1881-1953) to have some leverage in Turkish foreign policy.¹⁰⁷ The fact that Ambassador Papen and the German military attaché, General Hans Rohde, served in the Ottoman army made it easier to reinvigorate the old relationships. In the

¹⁰⁵ İsmet İnönü, *Hatıralarım- Genç Subaylık Yılları (1884-1918)*, 141.

¹⁰⁶ S. Eriş Dülger, *Alman Basınında Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti (1910-1944)*, Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1995, 208-209.

¹⁰⁷ Günay Göksu Özdoğan, *Turan’dan ’Bozkurt’a : Tek Parti Döneminde Türkçülük (1931-1946)*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2001, 159-160.

summer of 1941, when the German army came close to the Turkish border, the phrase "camaraderie in arms" was being more frequently heard in Ankara lobbies.¹⁰⁸ Ali Fuat Erden, Commander of the Military Academy, and retired General Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkilet were invited to Germany between 15 October 1941-5 November 1941 so as to prove to them the inevitability of the German victory. Hitler opened the doors of his secret military quarters to his visitors, whom he described as "the first outsiders, apart from the allies, to come and visit this place".¹⁰⁹ In the summer of 1943, another military excursion to Germany was arranged, but this time the visiting group consisted of active officers. General Cemil Cahit Toydemir (1883-1956), together with a committee consisting of General Salih Erkuş, Colonel Hilmi Oray, Major Tahsin Berkman and Faik Yüngül, travelled to Germany, visited the entrenchments on the shores of the English Channel and received by Hitler.¹¹⁰

These relationships were instrumentalized by the İnönü administration to mitigate German diplomatic pressure, and in this regard, the activities of the German Embassy were tolerated. In an effort to revive sense of camaraderie, the German military attaché, General Rohde invited retired generals to several meetings held in German Embassy.¹¹¹ In one of these meetings held on 27 April 1942, the centennial anniversary of the birthday of Goltz was commemorated. The commemoration was attended by retired Turkish and German generals who had worked with Goltz.¹¹² Representing the German army in the ceremony, General Hans Guhr was invited by İnönü to Çankaya for lunch.¹¹³

Turkey's efforts to remain neutral also meant that the influence of German soldiers on the Turkish army not did reach a level that could affect Turkish foreign policy. Nevertheless, Ankara's pro-Allies stance did not lead

¹⁰⁸ Faik Ahmet Barutçu, *Siyasi Hatıralar: Milli Mücadeleden Demokrasiye*, Volume 1, Istanbul: 21.Yüzyıl Yayınları, 2001, 477.

¹⁰⁹ Hüseyin Hüsnü Erkilet, *Şark Cephesinde Gördüklerim*, Istanbul: Hilmi, 227-228.

¹¹⁰ Rifat N. Bali, 'Ordu Komutanı Orgeneral Cemil Cahit Toydemir'in Almanya Gezisi: Hitler ile Görüşme', www.Rifatbali.Com/Images/Stories/Dokumanlar/Hitler_ile_gorusme.Pdf, 38-42. [11 October 2008].

¹¹¹ Koçak, "H. Rohde'nin Türkiye Anıları", 22.

¹¹² Ali İhsan Sabis lists the Turkish invitees who participated: Pertev Demirhan, Kazım Karabekir, Refet Bele, Naci Eldeniz, Kazım Sevuğtekin, former deputy of National Defence Committee Safet Arıkan, retired colonel and former deputy Edip, Kerametdin and Mürsel, from retired generals who live in Ankara." On behalf of the Turkish General Staff, Lieutenant General Hüseyin Kılıkış and Colonel Hilmi Onay participated. (Ali İhsan Sabis, "Von der Goltz Paşa", *Tasvir-i Efkar*, 11 May 1942). The fact that the majority of invitees consisted of retired generals who were dismissed as they ran counter to Atatürk or İnönü.

¹¹³ Guhr served as Lieutenant Colonel in Palestine, as division commander in İnönü's army corps. Memories of Guhr translated into Turkish. (Hans Guhr, *Türklerle Omuz Omuz*, translated by Eşref Bengi Özbilen, Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007.) İnönü speaks well of Guhr in his memoirs. "First Division Commander Lieutenant Colonel Guhr stayed at the battlefield until the war reached to an end and took important duties on the German army during ceasefire. He was a precious and experienced soldier. Our official and individual relations on the battlefield relied on trust and respect." (İsmet İnönü, *Hatıralarım-Genç Subaylık Yılları (1884-1918)*, 240.

to a loss of sympathy for the German army, at least among a significant number of Turkish soldiers. In fact, in the discussions on the policy towards Germany in the Second World War, the sense of camaraderie is frequently mentioned by the members of parliament with military backgrounds.¹¹⁴ When the pressure on Ankara to enter the war on the Allies' side was increasing, Kazım Karabekir argued that Turkish soldiers should not fight against their old comrades, especially not when the Germans were losing:

First of all, our government should comprehend this point well and know that neither the Turkish nation nor the Turkish army wants war. I was among them and I listened to them. Why? Dear friends, there are two important reasons. The first one is that the war is against the Germans. The children of this nation and the commanders living among them entered the First World War as an ally of Germany against the Russians and now you say you will throw members of that army into a war on the side of the Russians against the Germans? Neither an ignorant man nor an educated man could possibly make sense of this. This is a fact, one you would do well to grasp.¹¹⁵

As the war ended, the "camaraderie in arms" discourse was put aside as expected. Nevertheless, the remarks made by Deputy Chief of the Turkish General Staff Salih Omurtak to Rohde in August 1944 at their last meeting seemed to have gone beyond courteous diplomatic remarks: "The causes of the current situation between Germany and Turkey are contingent upon the prevailing military and political circumstances. But the events of the near future most certainly will not put an end to Turkish-German friendship; there will only be an interval. One day, in the future, the Turco-German relationship will be re-established and re-affirmed. Moreover, it shall be based on a solid foundation and thus even stronger than today..."¹¹⁶ The fact that West Germany became a member of NATO in 1955 affirmed Omurtak's predictions. A book published to commemorate the fourth year of Turkey's membership to NATO summed up the history of relations between the two armies so as to render that Turkish Armed Forces "owe so much to the German army".

The two nations, which are quite alike characteristically, gain recognition around the world for the bravery of their armies. Until 1950 our command and control procedures, education procedures and moral codes, and our weapons systems and principles were all German. Today, the soldiers of the generation that controls the command positions are all students of the old German military school. The two nations grew to know each other better and became friends fighting shoulder to shoulder for the same goal, sacrificing their lives

¹¹⁴ Karabekir, *Ankara'da Savaş Rüzgârları*, 241-242.

¹¹⁵ Karabekir, *Ankara'da Savaş Rüzgârları*, 436.

¹¹⁶ Koçak, "H. Rohde'nin Türkiye Anıları", 25.

side by side on the battlefield. That is why they admire each other so much. Upon seeing this soldierly and brave nation as an ally again, the delight of the Turkish nation is immeasurable. Because the memories of Lieutenant Helmuth von Moltke and Marshall von der Goltz Pasha and other precious German teachers who served the Turkish army at the Turkish Military Academy and service schools with great loyalty and morality are still alive in our hearts.[sic.]”¹¹⁷

Between the Army and Politics: *Millet-i Müselleha*

In the political culture of the early Republic, the embodiment of the Prussian impact was the *Millet-i Müselleha*. As illustrated by the examples above, Goltz's *Millet-i Müselleha* left a deep impression upon that particular generation and his ideas also had a considerable influence upon the Republic's conception of the citizen and the nation.¹¹⁸ Afet İnan's *Vatandaş için Medeni Bilgiler* ('Notes on Civilisation for Citizens'), with long quotations from the *Millet-i Müselleha* bears another testimony to the Prussian impact.¹¹⁹ The socio-political context imagined for the conceptualization of citizenry in the early republican years presents a striking similarity with the total war setting as envisaged by the *Millet-i Müselleha*. This setting prioritizes the state before the individual, brings to the fore the needs of the state by emphasizing civic duties, and curtails rights and freedoms at the expense of the interest of the state.¹²⁰

The militarisation of society during the first years of the republic was put in practise in line with the concept of total war as envisaged by the *Millet-i Müselleha*. Inspired by Goltz's ideas, the early republic attempted to found paramilitary youth organizations.¹²¹ The first attempt was to organize *Türkiye İdman Cemiyetleri İttifakı* (the 'Alliance of Turkish Training Societies') in 1923. The organization aimed to “encourage swordsmanship, horse-riding and

¹¹⁷ İhsan Yurdođlu, *Atlantik Paktı: Niçin ve Nasıl Girdik*, İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi, 1956, 48.

¹¹⁸ Ünder, 'Goltz, Milleti Müselleha', 45-46; Altınay, *The Myth of the Military-Nation*, 14.

¹¹⁹ Nurettin Türsan states that the pages 167-186 of *Vatandaş İçin Medeni Bilgiler I* were taken word for word from the pages 17 and 80-111 of *Millet-i Müselleha*. Türsan, *Anılar*, 10.

¹²⁰ Prime Minister İsmet İnönü made an addendum to the chapter "Ordu Mekteptir" [The Army is a School] in *Medeni Bilgiler*: "Since the beginning of time, nations are divided into two categories, foremost and before any other virtue, as follows: Nations capable of defending their independence by taking up arms and putting their lives at risk, were considered first class nations, and nations incapable of putting their lives in danger for their political existence, were considered inferior nations. A nation belongs to first class nations with their soldiery and their soldiership (Afet, [İnan], *Medeni Bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk'ün El Yazıları*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1988, 123).

¹²¹ Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar: Erken Cumhuriyet'te Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2004, 135-137.

seafaring operations".¹²² The expected outcome was to create a nation in arms that lay the responsibility to protect the homeland not only on soldiers but on all citizens.¹²³ In the latter part of the thirties after the Nazis instrumentalized paramilitary organizations to circumvent limitations of demilitarization imposed by the Treaty of Versailles, the German model took precedence over the others.¹²⁴ For the required arrangements, German experts were consulted and visits to Germany were organized. In January 1937, Baldur von Schirach, the head of the *Hitlerjugend* organization, visited Turkey and was officially received by Atatürk. In the summer of the same year, a committee, the majority of which consisted of soldiers and officials who were responsible for youth organizations in Turkey, was invited to Germany to attend a summer camp. Discussions and preparations reached a new level with the Physical Training Law passed in 1938. The obligation to undergo physical training as foreseen in the law led to preparations for the state itself to establish an organization to prepare the youth for war, the inspiration for which was the German youth organizations.

When the war began, a discourse, which regarded the youth as the first to be mobilized in order to create a *Millet-i Müselleha* became more widespread. Especially in publications prepared by writers with military backgrounds, international developments were underscored as a new evidence for the validity of the *Millet-i Müselleha* doctrine. In a book published during the Second World War, Pertev Demirhan, Goltz's closest student and disciple, draws attention to the similarities between Goltz's ideas and Japanese militarism.¹²⁵ In his study published in 1942, Demirhan was convinced that Japan would maintain the superiority it had attained during the first years of the war and he believed that these achievements were the result of the militarization of society as a whole. In the light of these experiences, he advocated the necessity of a Spartan education: "Like the Italians, the Germans and the Japanese, we should also inculcate military discipline in our children from a very early age."¹²⁶ It is very striking that Demirhan tries to beautify both war and death by expounding on the *hara-kiri* tradition in Japanese culture. "When necessary, like the Japanese, we should know how to die, and we should walk to death smiling and with joy and we should never be scared of approaching

¹²² Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar*, 153-154.

¹²³ Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar*, 158-159.

¹²⁴ Akın, *Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar*, 150.

¹²⁵ Demirhan's "*Japonların Asıl Kuvveti* [The Real Power of the Japanese]" was first published in 1937. In 1942, the work was extended with the addition of "*Şimdiki Cihan Harbinde Japonya* [Japan in the Current World War]" and "*Türk Gençliğine Birkaç Söz* [Few Words to the Turkish Youth]". The core of the study consists of lectures titled "*Rus-Japon Harbinden Alınan Maddi ve Manevi Dersler*" [Material and Spiritual Lessons from the Russo-Japanese War] delivered by Demirhan after the 1904-1905 Russo-Japanese war at which he was a military observer. Pertev Demirhan, *Japonların Asıl Kuvveti - Japonya Niçin ve Nasıl Yükseldi?* İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1942.

¹²⁶ Demirhan, *Japonların Asıl Kuvveti*, 113.

death, regardless of its time.”¹²⁷ In the same period, another soldier, Kazım Karabekir, also voiced the need for similar bodies, such as Youth Organizations. When addressing the Parliamentary Group of the Republican People's Party, Karabekir reminded them of the Children's Army experience and vilified those youngsters who “loitered around near cinemas.”¹²⁸

The developments that took place after the World War II rendered it inevitable for the Turkish army to discard the German model. In the fifties, the word ‘Prussian’ would already become a negative term, even among soldiers, denoting an overly intransigent understanding of the profession. Nevertheless, Prussian impact did endure in different forms and was expressed via different concepts, especially in military-political relations. The social model developed by Goltz in *Millet-i Müselleha* inspired the conceptual framework that was used in discussions in military circles concerning the characteristics of a new world war that would possibly break out in the fifties. In publications in military circles, the key concept was *total war*, based on the militarising society and citizen. However, in the late forties, military circles articulated a novel concept to replace the notorious *total war*, which was identified with German militarism: *National Security*. The concept of national security could not be particularly differentiated from total war, except for the fact that it was adopted and used by -to use the Cold War jargon- “peace-loving nations”.¹²⁹

Giving up the Prussian Model

After Turkey became a part of the framework of the Truman Doctrine in 1947 and signed the Economic and Technical Cooperation agreement with the US, the Turkish army began adopting the American army model.¹³⁰ First of all, education, training, the structuring of power and weapons inventories were aligned with the US army and starting as of 1948, Turkey's national defence plans were scrutinized in order to synchronise them with US defence plans. As of 1950, American field manuals (translated into Turkish) were circulated instead of German field manuals.¹³¹ The educational systems established in accordance with the German model and implemented in the Military Academies, were transformed to be more in line with the American model. With the establishment of NATO, this process of transformation was accelerated and

¹²⁷ Demirhan, *Japonların Asıl Kuvveti*, 114.

¹²⁸ Karabekir, *Ankara'da Savaş Rüzgârları: II*, 326.

¹²⁹ “Türkiye’de Milli Güvenlik Kavramının Gelişimi”, in Balta Paker ve Akça, (derl.) *Türkiye’de Ordu*, 307-349.

¹³⁰ Güvenç, “ABD Askeri Yardımı ve Türk Ordusunun Dönüşümü”, 255-284; Dündar Seyhan, *Gölgedeki Adam*, İstanbul: Nurettin Uycan Matbaası, 1966, 9.

¹³¹ Ümit Özdağ, *Menderes Döneminde Ordu-Siyaset İlişkileri ve 27 Mayıs İhtilali*, İstanbul: Boyut, 1997, 40; M. Hikmet Bayar, *Yarım Asırlık Asker: Askeri Liseden Kuvvet Komutanlığı'na Anılarım*, İstanbul: O Kitaplar, 2006, 97.

field manuals were now directly translated in Turkish without any modification to meet Turkish army's specific requirements. Moreover, Turkey's defence plans were aligned with NATO's plans and, in order to receive more military aid, the Turkish army was allocated in its entirety to NATO.¹³²

Within this transformation process, changes that defined the political status of the army were also introduced. The army lost its autonomous position *vis-à-vis* the government and as of 1949, the army was gradually placed under (civilian) political rule. In order to monitor whether American aid was being properly used, the existing structure was amended so as to allow political scrutiny.¹³³ In studies carried out in the first half of 1949 to reorganize and reorder the Ministry of Defence, the High Council of Defence and the Supreme Military Council, which was, to say the least, inspired by the US model.¹³⁴ In his speech on the draft law to make changes in the establishment and duties of the Ministry of Defence on 30 May 1949, Cevdet Kerim İnce-dayı stated that the changes were introduced “just like in other modern armies” and went on to say, “Now we are restructuring our forces by benefitting from the experience of those countries that fought during the World War with vast forces and supplies at their disposal.”¹³⁵ Eyüp Durukan, speaker for the Military Defence Commission, stated that these changes would ensure the Turkish Armed Forces would “have an organization that matches the most modern armies” and would also ensure that “the Parliament, as the Commander-in-Chief of the army, could question and call to account the army at any time.”¹³⁶

With the adoption of the US model, a distinction emerged between old “Prussian” officers and young officers who evidently prefer American model. On one side were officers who were educated in the US, could speak English and keep up with the new technological developments; on the other side were officers who were only competent in weapons systems that dated back to the World War I, had difficulty in adapting to the new technologies and spoke German as a second language. While the new conditions limited the influence of the Prussian generation, they also made it easier for the new generation to prevail. The ‘Prussians’, previously referring to those who had modernized the Turkish army at the beginning of the century, now became a term designating soldiers whose blind devotion to a culture of discipline and obedience that resisted innovation caused the Turkish army to fall behind technological-

¹³² Güvenç, “ABD Askeri Yardımı ve Türk Ordusunun Dönüşümü”, 255-284.

¹³³ Oral Sander, *Türk-Amerikan İlişkileri 1947-1964*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1979, 41-42.

¹³⁴ “Milli Savunma Bakanlığının Kuruluş ve Görevlerine Dair Kanun Tasarısının Gerekçesi”, *TBMM Tutanak Dergisi*, B.95, 28 Mayıs 1949, Sevk Sayısı 223, 1.

¹³⁵ *TBMM Tutanak Dergisi*, 1062.

¹³⁶ *TBMM Tutanak Dergisi*, 1069.

ly.¹³⁷ For the new generation, Fevzi Çakmak was the epitome of 'the Prussians'. The obstinate character of the Marshall was held responsible for the situation the army found itself in during the Second World War. Indeed, despite his balanced tone, the views of General Fahri Belen (1892-1975), in fact himself a retired 'Prussian', provide an example for these accusations: "When the army was mobilized during the Second World War, the situation was clear for all to see. The morale of the army was shattered. The Marshall was blamed for allowing the army to grow old and for depriving it of modern weaponry... And those who said that the Marshall was committed to the old weapons were right. There were few airplanes in the army and no tanks. On top of this, there were very few anti-aircraft and anti-tank weapons. In order to avert dejection in the ranks, the Marshall recommended the use of old-fashioned mounted cannons against airplanes and for rifles to be set up against tanks."¹³⁸ Memoirs of young officers who witnessed the transition from Prussian to American model display abundant amount of accounts that highlight the conflict between the old "Prussians" and new "Americans". Talat Aydemir claims that the old system only raised a generation of 'yes-men' and that the old guard "was weak in terms of knowledge compared to those officers educated in the new system."¹³⁹ Dündar Seyhan, a member of the new generation, accused the Prussians of having remained negligent for years: "A new era had begun in the tactics and techniques of war. We were still trying to learn the basics of the First World War. The weapons we had were from that era, as were our techniques, and as for tactics, they were just irrelevant... Even with our parochial views at the time, it was impossible not see how the Marshall leading the Turkish Army left the Turkish Armed Forces more neglected than it had been even during the War of Independence."¹⁴⁰

This intergenerational conflict was resolved by the military coup on 27 May 1960 through the neutralization of the Prussian generation. However, the traces of the Prussian impact lingered in the institutional memory of the army. In 1960, a Turkish staff officer who encountered German soldiers for the first time in years was astonished to see soldiers with long hair and felt the need to ask a German Brigadier-General if this complied with "the Prussian militarism he remembered with admiration."¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ Osman Tiftikçi, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ordunun Evrimi*, İstanbul: Sorun, 2006, 70; Güvenç, 255-284; Mustafa Balcıoğlu, "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Gençliğin Savaşa Hazırlanması: İki Belge İki Görüş".

¹³⁸ Fahri Belen, *Ordu ve Politika*, İstanbul: Bakış, 1971, 20.

¹³⁹ Talat Aydemir, *Talat Aydemir'in Hatıraları*, İstanbul: Kitapçılık Ticaret, 1968, 23-24.

¹⁴⁰ Seyhan, *Gölgedeki Adam*, 9.

¹⁴¹ Gürkan, *Bir Generalin Askeri ve Akademik Anıları*, 140.

Conclusion

The Prussian impact on Turkey's military remained to be conspicuous in various areas even long after the German model was abandoned following the Second World War. Generally speaking, the Prussian impact was two pronged. The first dimension of the impact was evidently on the military itself. Through principles, modes of training, manuals and other military publications, the late Ottoman army was to a large extent Prussianized. The impact was inevitably inherited by the early republican army and remained alive in its institutional memory. The second dimension of the impact was on the military's position in politics as the Prussian model entailed militarization of society. This model was maintained as a template during the early republic to inform the modalities of relationship that the military envisaged to establish and maintain with various segments of society. The founding generation of the republic, who had been acquainted with the Prussian model in the early years of their profession, made sure that the concept of the nation in arms should remain as a versatile instrument for the consolidation of the new regime. Implying a power configuration in which the way the army operated would be reproduced in social life, the concept was favourably adopted and put in force by the new regime.

The dynamics that emerged after the Second World War led to a weakening of the Prussian impact on the Turkish army. First of all, the high-ranking officers who had received a German education and had fought together with the Germans either began to retire or were eliminated by the Democrat Party at the beginning of the fifties. Secondly, due to the international conditions emerged after the war; Turkey had to abandon the German model. German was replaced by English as English-speaking officers began to multiply, while the number of officers who spoke German was markedly decreasing. Although it was impossible to completely remove in such a short space of time the Prussian legacy formed over half a century, the American military culture succeeded in gaining the upper hand in the army.

During the period of transition to the US military model, this Prussian legacy itself went through a process of reincarnation. After an initial resistance in the fifties towards the American model, as Serhat Güvenç states, the Turkish Armed Forces seemed to adopt a hybrid of the German and American models.¹⁴² This reincarnation perhaps allows us to infer that the tenets of the US military model followed in the fifties were not given due attention at that time. When the new generation of officers trained according to the American model seized power on 27 May 1960, they seemed to be little the tenet of civilian superiority over the military - the one principle that the American model ostensibly upholds. Through the creation of the omnipotent

¹⁴² Güvenç, "ABD Askeri Yardımı ve Türk Ordusunun Dönüşümü", 283.

National Security Council which the junta envisioned as the fulcrum of the state, the military granted itself constitutional powers. Therefore, 'the national security state', institutionalized by the junta of the 1960 coup, stood as an embodiment of the Prussian impact over Turkey's polity for decades to come.

