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The Lycée de Galatasaray or Galatasaray Lisesi (Galatasaray High School) is situated right in the middle of the İstiklal Caddesi, where the street’s pedestrian circulation takes a pause, making a slight turn en route from Taksim Square to the Galata neighbourhood. The early twentieth century neo-classicist building is largely hidden from the view of passers-by due to the imposing school gates, fences and tall trees in its front garden, making it one of the few – secluded – green spaces in the district. The Francophone school prides itself on its long history and reputation. As a Dutch acquaintance once explained: ‘I attended Galatasaray High School, but as it goes in the Turkish school system, Galatasaray is one of those reputable schools that you ‘win’ (kazanmak). I therefore won Galatasaray.’ The school currently holds 711 students with a teacher cadre of 68. The former high school building at the Bosphorus in Ortaköy has, since its foundation in 1992, housed the Galatasaray University. Similar to the high school, however, the historical description of the university makes claim to the earliest known history of tradition in the location of Galatasaray, claiming the historical ties of the high school with its Ottoman predecessor and even the Ottoman fifteenth century palace school. The university is part of the Galatasaray Education and Training Institution (Galatasaray Eğitim Öğretim Kurumu) which consists of the Galatasaray Primary School, the Galatasaray High School and Galatasaray University. The initiative to set up a university came in 1992 from a number of Galatasaray High School graduates, and the institution was founded as a French-Turkish University, with a French vice-rector and Turkish rector. Through the Galatasaray Education and Training Institution the primary school and high school adhere to the university’s rectorate. The objective of the foundation was to estab-
lish an integrated line of education from primary to higher education. With that idea in mind, the primary school was established in 1993 and currently resides in Şişli. Middle school level teaching also takes place within the high school’s premises.

The focus of this chapter will be on the high school and its building in Beyoğlu, the roots of which lie in the second half of the nineteenth century, though claims to a longer history hold some value, if only for the etymology of the High School’s name. As an effect of the Tanzimat reforms in the Ottoman Empire, the state’s educational apparatus was subjected to an extensive metamorphosis. Carther Findley points out that the major focal points of the Tanzimat reforms were legislation, education, elite formation, expansion of government, intercommunal relations and the transformation of the political process. These focal points are interconnected and though Findley is right to argue that legislation was the reform movement’s main instrument – with the introduction of the Gülhane decree of 1839, the reform decree of 1856 and the 1876 constitution, as well as integrating codes based on French models and religious (Islamic) legislation – the bases for the new Ottoman state were built in the new academies and colleges. Although earlier attempts at educational modernization had been made, the reforms of the Tanzimat resulted in the need for unprecedented changes in the educational system. These proceeded beyond the previously established engineering, medical and military schools aiming to bring the Ottoman Empire up to speed with its European counterparts. Zürcher argues that the Tanzimat also included a secularization campaign which had a major impact on the Ottoman judicial system. In 1839 Sultan Mahmut decided to found secular schools, the rüşdiye, which aimed to link the traditional Quran-school or mektep to professional schools and vocational training. Additionally, middle schools would start to appear from 1845 onwards. Findley, however, complicates Zürcher’s statement on the secularizing impact of the Tanzimat. He argues that religious legislation, the şeriat, was still present in the 1876 constitution and also points to the presence of clergymen in courts around the same time. Zürcher counters this argument by indicating that the influence of the şeriat was almost entirely limited to family law.

Whether or not the issue of secularization as a main characteristic of the Tanzimat is overstated, it seems valid to argue that secular-
ization posed a crucial reform of the Ottoman state’s educational system. Further nuance is provided by Findley’s agreement on the fact that it was in education that the loss of influence of the religious elite was most noticeable and Zürcher’s indication that the goals of the reformists were utilitarian, reflected by the absence of a university until 1900. Before that education was directed towards training bureaucrats and army officers in colleges and academies. These initial attempts to bring Ottoman education in accordance with that of the other major powers in Europe, however, did expose the growing Ottoman civil elite to foreign ideas and knowledge production. It is therefore not surprising that the first Young Turks were in fact graduates of the Ottoman military medical schools. Further exposure to foreign education would in various instances consist of sending promising students abroad to Prussia, France, and Great Britain. Many of them would turn out to become leaders in political, military, bureaucratic or scientific reform. Others would be perhaps less successful and Davison, himself not free of Orientalist tendencies, quotes the pun of an Ottoman statesman who said that some returned: ‘syphilized, not civilized’.

The dramatic growth of the bureaucratic apparatus – from approximately 2000 scribes in 1770-90 to 35,000-70,000 civil officials in the Abdülhamidian era at the end of the nineteenth century – necessitated the expansion of teaching facilities in an empire where literacy levels were still very low. The most important example of a school which aimed to train officials was founded in 1859, the School of Civil Administration or Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Fünun-u Şahane or simply Mekteb-i Mülkiye, which would be, following the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the basis for the Faculty of Political Science at Ankara University. Findley argues that the initial educational reforms resulted in elite formation, though there could be rather large differences within the degree of education or, as he points out, westernization marked by the officials’ mastery of French. The rüşdiye were complemented with the equivalent of middle schools, the idadiye, from 1845 onwards.
A NEW SCHOOL IN A NEW SYSTEM: THE MEKTEB-I SULTANIYE

It would take another 23 years before the first high school or lycée was then opened, the Mekteb-i Sultaniye at Galatasaray, right at the heart of Pera. Historically, this area had already been the location of a school since 1481, when Sultan Bayezid II opened a palace school at the site. The foundation of this first school is the subject of various legends and even described by the author of one of the most famous pieces of Ottoman travel literature, Evliya Çelebi in his Seyahatname as well as by the nineteenth century Ottoman historian Tayyarzade Ata Bey in his Tarih-i 'Ata. İsfendiyaroğlu states that Ata Bey describes how Sultan Beyazit II travelled around the area of Galata and Tophane which was used as a hunting ground when he encountered an old man, who is sometimes claimed to be a dervish, known by the name of Gül Baba. The encounter is reputed to be linked directly with the building of a new school: as the capacity of the three palace schools, at Edirne, Topkapı Palace and the Old Palace at Beyazit was not able to provide the required numbers of officials and clerics, Gül Baba recommended to Beyazid to set up another palace school in the area. This encounter is immortalized on a plaque commemorating the foundation of the school that was installed in the garden of the Galatasaray High School on the occasion of the school’s 100th anniversary in 1968. This legend (drawing a direct link between the 15th century palace school and the Galatasaray High School) can, due to the allegorical nature of the account and shifting variations in its narrations, rightfully be designated as an invented tradition in the definition coined by Eric Hobsbawm.

Formally, the school founded during Beyazit II’s reign would be called the Galata Sarayı Enderun-u Hümayunu (Imperial Palace School of Galata). For purposes of analyzing identity formation and tradition making, however, it is salient that the school and site were already referred to by the name ‘Galata Saray’ (Galata Palace), long before that name would become the formal name of the high school. Fethi İsfendiyaroğlu claims that it was used long before it was coined as the high school’s official name after the foundation of the Turkish Republic in the 1920s. The contraction of the proper noun and the word, ‘Galata’ and ‘Saray’ respectively, was made under the vernacularizing influence of foreigners: French-speakers would refer to the school as Galata-Sé-
rai or Galata-Serail whereas English and German-speakers opted for Galata Saray (excluding the mandatory adjective suffix -SI in Turkish) or simply Galatasaray. This school would have been an extension of the palace schools at Topkapı and Edirne providing training to the devşirme (the collecting of non-Muslim boys as tribute) as Janissaries, palace officials or servants.

It should also be noted that the Ottoman rulership presented the site as the palace at Galata, despite of the fact that the school’s location was well beyond the former Genoese and Venetian settlement known as Galata and its walls, positioning it in what would become known as Pera. The Ottoman rulership apparently referred to the area, at least initially, as Galata at large. The palace school’s establishment would provide the name of the area around it and the name of the lycée during the republican period. In the period between the opening of the page school in 1481 and the founding of the Mekteb-i Sultaniye in 1868, the school was allegedly used as a medrese from the reign of Sultan Selim II’s reign onwards. It is said that his father and predecessor Süleyman I had more interest in the school, although the education of the devşirme was largely concentrated at the Topkapı during his reign. All activities related to the court, from statecraft, to the harem and page training were brought to the direct vicinity of the sultan due to the development of Süleyman I’s meticulous court culture during the second part of his rule.

With regard to the historical usage of the school, it is interesting to consider İsfendiyaroğlu’s reference to Earl Paul Rycaut’s The Present State of the Ottoman Empire (1670). Rycaut was special envoy of Charles II (1630-1685) to Mehmet IV (1642-1693). He writes that during his posting formerly Christian boys, to which he refers as ‘Ichoglans’ (İçoğlanı – page), were educated at the Seraglio of Pera, Adrianople (Edirne) or the Grand Seraglio of Constantinople (the Topkapı Palace. He writes:

‘But these Youths before they are admitted, are presented before the Grand Signor, whom according to his pleasure he disposes in his Seraglio at Pera, or Adrianople, or his great Seraglio at Constantinople, which is accounted the Imperial feat of the Ottoman Emperours. For these are the three Schools or Colleges of Education. Those that are preferr’d to the last

named, are commonly marked out by special designation, and are a near step to degrees of Preferment (...).’

He thus indicates that the best pages were placed at the Topkapı Palace and simultaneously points out that the Galata Saray was around the second half of the seventeenth century, during Mehmet IV’s reign, indeed used as a Palace School. According to sources published by the Galatasaray High School the premises were used as a medrese and palace school in an alternating fashion for 144 years until 1714. A library, comparable to those found in the Fatih and Hagia Sophia libraries, was added by Mahmut I in 1741. Joseph von Hammer mentions in his Constantinopolis und der Bosphorus (1822) that with Galata-Serai the second half of Pera’s main street begins, showing that despite many city fires and urban renewal in the nineteenth century, the integrity of the urban plan has largely remained the same.

The school’s building was initially a timber construction, which was destroyed in 1819 during Mahmut II’s reign as a consequence of one of the many city fires in Istanbul. Mahmut II ordered the reconstruction of the building and when it was reopened in 1838, it housed the Tibbiye-i Adliyye-i Sahane, combining a hospital with a medical school. The school burned down once again during the reign of Abdülmecit in 1862, after which it was decided to build the reconstruction in stone. This building would house the Mekteb-i Sultaniye from 1868 until 1873, when it was assigned to the Medical School again. The Mekteb-i Sultaniye moved to a building in Gülhane, but after three years moved back once again to the building in Galatasaray. The wooden inner construction was destroyed again in a fire on 6 March 1906 or 22 February 1907 (different dates are used in different sources), when a fire in the kitchen of the French director’s apartment broke out and would destroy the library that was a gift from Napoleon III, as well as the museum, which allegedly held the skeleton of a mammoth. Lessons were transferred to the premises of the Beylerbeyi Palace, while the building was reconstructed, this time entirely in stone. The reconstruction that was finalized in 1909 is the building that stands on the spot today. It is particularly interesting to note how the continuity from the Palace School to the present-day High School is continuously stressed in the history writing on the high school in general and in the publications linked to the institutions of the Gala-
tarsaray Foundation and High School in particular. The roots of the present-day educational institution are continuously retraced back to the fifteenth century, although there is in fact little in common between the buildings and objectives of the Enderun school and the current high school.

After the opening of the first sultaniye, another comparable high school was opened in Darüşşafaka. A year after the opening of the Galatasaray sultaniye, a new system of educational legislation was introduced with the Maarif-i Umumiye Nizannamesi (General Education Regulations). These regulations introduced a new system of primary education, high school education in every province and plans to open a university. The prospective plans projected in this legislation introduced a hierarchy of education from the primary to the university level and resembled to a significant degree that of the Ottoman Empire’s counterparts in Western Europe. With some exceptions these regulations would set the framework for the public school system until the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in 1923. Similar to the delay between legislation and execution of the plans to open a university, it would take a significant amount of time until Ottoman high schools were indeed set up in every Ottoman province.

The high schools at Galatasaray and Darüşşafaka would thus constitute the only materializations of the Ottoman state’s aim to introduce the lise level of education for a considerable amount of time. Yet even when other schools were introduced in different parts of the empire, the quality of education provided at the Mekteb-i Sultaniye was unrivalled. Roderic Davison argues that this was in part a consequence of the French involvement with which the school was set up, with the help of an expert of the French Ministry of Education. As had been the case in earlier examples of educational reform, such as in the case of military academies, the school’s model was based on the French system. The curriculum of the School of Military Sciences (Mekteb-i Harbiye-i Şahane – opened in 1834) in Constantinople for instance was in French and based on that of the French military academy Saint-Cyr.

Also in the case of the Mekteb-i Sultaniye the curriculum was based on the French model and entirely in French, with the exception of additional classes in Turkish and other local languages. The French part of the diploma would designate the school as Lycée Impérial de Galata-Serai. The headmaster and teachers were also in majority French when the school was opened. The school in Galatasaray would particularly cater to the children of the burgeoning Ottoman bourgeoisie and have a significant impact on the expansion and intellectual cultivation of the growing class of Ottoman bureaucrats. Fatma Müge Göçek makes the ironic observation that the exponential growth of the Western-style schools in the Ottoman Empire, initiated by the Ottoman dynasty, would in fact cause the radical transformation of the Ottoman state apparatus, transferring power from the Ottoman dynasty’s palatial household to a bureaucratic apparatus. It would be wrong to attribute this entirely to the upsurge in the foundation of schools from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, since, as Göçek argues, it was a process that had essentially its roots before the second half of the eighteenth century. With the foundation of schools like the Mekteb-i Sultaniye, however, the basis for institutional reform, i.e. education, started to reach its apex.

Davison notes that the school at its opening had 147 Muslim students against 194 non-Muslim students. Davison states that most of the Muslim students were ‘presumably Turkish’, but it should be noted that these categories had at least not formally crystallized yet within the Ottoman context. That is further confirmed by the desire of the Ottoman government to desegregate education, which was on the one hand considered necessary to retain the loyalty of the non-Muslim Ottoman population and on the other hand bring the literacy levels of Muslims up to the level with that of non-Muslim Ottomans. The number of schools of the Ottoman millets had been expanding in the nineteenth century and their quality of education was well beyond that provided to the Ottoman Muslims. Often supported by the University of Athens, Greeks abroad, Armenians in Russia and the Alliance Israélite, these schools would contribute to a growing dissonance in literacy levels between the Ottoman Muslims and non-Muslims.

It is therefore hard to understate the importance and the need the Ottoman rulership felt to create a new ‘Ottoman’ high school, which would later become the Galatasaray High School. The school’s graduates, particularly in the years of the Ottoman Empire and the early years of the Turkish Republic, would grow up to become the administrators, diplomats and politicians of the late Ottoman Empire and early Turkish
Republic - not to mention the legacy it would create as one of the most prestigious institutes of education in Turkey up to this date. Lewis argues that as much as it may have been initially set up as a school which would bring different Ottoman communities together, the school's profile started to change, becoming increasingly favoured by the ruling elite in the capital. He argues that this is a phenomenon that became apparent during the Hamidian period (1876-1908) in which the school became more Turkish in character, dropping Latin from the curriculum and with an increase in Turkish students. Apart from the complications of the anachronistic usage of Turkish ethnicity as a ‘national’ category in this context, the names of the graduates provided in the yearbooks and other publications of the Galatasaray Alumni Association render a much more complex impression of the school population at the Mekteb-i Sultaniye until well beyond the end of Abdülhamit II’s reign, following his deposition in 1909. This counters Lewis’ rather essentialist representation of the school’s student population beyond the Young Turk Revolution. In 1873 the first Muslim Ottoman name – Abdurrahman Şeref – is registered, among a total of 14 graduates, 13 of which – considering their names – represent different millets, mostly Pontic Greek, Armenian, Jewish or Levantine. Most notable is a change in 1885 where the graduation cohort is split into three groups, those who graduate with both French and (Ottoman-)Turkish degrees and those who graduate only with the French or (Ottoman-)Turkish degree. In that year five Muslim Ottomans, one Armenian and two Persians get a dual-degree, four Muslim Ottomans get a Turkish degree, and a total of nine – three of which can be identified as Armenian, two as Greek and two as Jewish – graduate with a French degree. It is only by the time of the First World War that the composition of graduates starts to change and by the time the Turkish Republic is founded and the Mekteb-i Sultaniye is transferred to the Turkish school system, the frequency of non-Turkish names drops drastically. In any case, considering the names of the school’s graduates, it is hard to draw general conclusions about the school population at the high school at all, or even observe a rapid ‘Turkification’.

The left wing of the school’s building was used as a hospital by the Ottoman Red Crescent during the First World War, while lessons resumed in the other parts of the building. Until 1924 classes at the Mekteb-i Sultaniye would consist of 3 hours classes in French and 2 hours classes in Turkish. After 1924 the French and Turkish cohorts were brought together and only the Science and Literature classes in the final year were separated. Considering the names of the graduates from the 1920s onwards it appears that the school was no longer following the earlier mission of the Mekteb-i Sultaniye, i.e. to bring the different Ottoman communities together. The names of graduates from the transformation of the Mekteb-i Sultaniye to the Galatasaray Lisesi onwards are nearly exclusively Turkish. It should be noted, however, that apart from an occasional Levantine name in the graduation registers, some of the remaining members of the Ottoman millets chose or were forced to adopt Turkish names.

The high school at the old palace school would educate many and employ many illustrious figures from Ottoman history. It is in this legacy that the Alumni Association of the High School takes particular pride. At the pinnacle of the production of the imagined and embodied Galatasaraylı community and its history features Tevfik Fikret. A poet and thinker, Fikret is oftentimes together with Yahya Kemal presented as the founder of modern Turkish literature. Fikret was born in Istanbul in 1867 and would become a prominent figure in the revolutionary Young Turk movement to such a degree that Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet cite him as a major influence on the founder of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal. Some of his poetry allegedly was among the favourite work of Mustafa Kemal, Vangelis Kechriotis, Maciej Górny and Ahmet Ersoy describe Fikret in equally prasing terms and add, importantly, that Fikret’s philosophy of life centred around the secular, materialist and progressive ideas that would be framed by state ideologues in the 1920s as some of the founding principles of the Turkish Republic. Kechriotis, et al., however, also present Fikret as someone who looked down on nationalism and was an editor at the Servet-i Fünun (The Merit of Sciences), the Ottoman literary journal that was marked by its anti-establishment attitude as well as its liberal and progressive views. Within that setting, moreover they argue that Fikret was one of the most vocal critics against authority, conformism and tradition. As a consequence Fikret was celebrated as a ‘recurrent target of conservatives and an enduring icon for generations of Republican modernizers.’
not long after. He would part ways with the Mekteb-i Sultanîye for a while and started teaching at Robert College, a high school and university founded by an American missionary. His former house overlooking the Bosphorus – the present-day Aşiyân Museum – still bears witness to that period. In 1908 he would return to the Mekteb-i Sultanîye as the director. Not long after the building would be largely destroyed by a fire and Fikret would witness the building's renovation while the students moved to Beylerbeyi. In one of the sources this is presented as if it was Fikret’s effort that enabled the renovation and the students’ moving to Beylerbeyi, yet considering the year in which the fire took place – 1906 or 1907 – it seems unlikely that it was only Fikret who initiated these steps.

It is more generally interesting how in the publication on the history of the school, prepared for the occasion of the institution's centenary, Fikret's work as the director is so strongly emphasized. It is all the more remarkable considering the short period that he would be present at the school as its director: he would start on 20 December 1908 and leave the school again, after some cited discord with his superiors, on 28 February 1909. Considering the many other directors the school had in its relatively short existence, this is not necessarily remarkable, but even directors who stayed on for more than 10 years were not credited as much as Fikret. He is credited with giving the school and its students order and discipline as well as for the expansion of the building with a conference hall, laboratories and a library. The authors go on: ‘(...) Mr Tevfik Fikret of all the directors of the Mekteb-i Sultanîye in history, he was at the top of those who left a good reputation’. In a short historical overview of a book published in 1996 on the occasion of the class of 36's 60th anniversary, Fikret is described as a 'symbol of Galatasaray'. The school cultivates and memorializes him with an oil painting in the school's conference hall – named the Tevfik Fikret Salonu – a bust in the front garden, and a commemorative stone. Considering the remarks of Kechriotis et al., however, it seems less surprising that an institution which prides itself in being strongly embedded in a tradition of modernity and positivist education, would choose Fikret as its main figurehead.

The continuous association of the school, in both formal and informal history writing, with its most illustrious alumni and institutional
legacies are understandable. The school, for many decades, would educate the children of the elites, so it may seem as a logical outcome that the school or its alumni desire to share in the glory of legacies. As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, even in the educational context of Turkey where so much value is already attributed to the prestige of a school or university, the Galatasaray High School may be considered to stand on a different level. To say that one is ‘of Galatasaray’ (Galatasaraylı), invests many of its graduates with pride to be part of this community. This is clearly expressed in the Galatasaray High School’s Anthem, the so-called Galatasaray Marşı:

“Our path follows the tracks of Ekrem and Fikret
Our first goal is an advanced civilization
We are the pioneers of knowledge, work and innovation
We are western-minded, Turkish-hearted youngsters
We are from Galatasaray, we are from Galatasaray
with unmatched confidence and unmatched speed in service of the motherland
Our souls, our bodies are healthy
Our love, our knowledge, our compassion are profound
We came together, broke away and came from four parts of the homeland
We are western-minded, Turkish-hearted youngsters
We are from Galatasaray, we are from Galatasaray
with unmatched confidence and unmatched speed in service of the motherland”

The connection between the Mekteb-i Sultaniye and the Galatasaray High School on the one hand and sport culture on the other in the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic respectively is an apparent one. A long legacy of sport clubs who hold their roots in the school exists. The pride towards this legacy is actively cultivated: in a special issue for the 50th anniversary of the graduates of 1933 prepared by the Galatasaray Educational Foundation (Galatasaray Eğitim Vakfı) several pages are attributed to the renowned ties of the school with sports.

The roots of one the top teams in the Turkish premiere football league, Galatasaray Spor Kulübü, lie with the school. The catalogue of an exhibition which was on display in 2010 at the Galatasaray Art and Cultural Centre in Beyoğlu, the football club’s founder Ali Sami Yen, explains how the club was founded in 1905 on the initiative of Ali Sami, Asım Tevfik, Emin Bülend, Celal, Bekir, Tahsin, Reşat Şirvani, Cevdet, Abidin, Kamil, Milo Bakiç and the Robenson brothers. Ali Sami, son of the Albanian Ottoman writer and philosopher Sami Frashëri who was a key figure in the Albanian National Awakening Movement, attended the school between 1902 and 1906. Together they would found the first Turkish football club, which was admitted to the Istanbul Football League or Constantinople Football Association League in 1906, founded by James La Fontaine and Henry Pears as the Istanbul Sunday League. The club would win three of seven titles in the Istanbul League following the introduction of Turkish professional football in 1952, 20 titles in the Turkcell Super League since 1959 and 16 titles in the Turkish Cup since 1962. Its greatest success was winning the UEFA Cup and UEFA Super Cup in 2000. Nowadays the Galatasaray Spor Kulübü is represented in a wide range of sports from basketball and volleyball to waterpolo, judo, motorsport and chess.

The connection to club sports has contributed considerably to the feelings of pride and adherence to the Galatasaraylı community some graduates undoubtedly experienced. In the 50th Anniversary edition of the 1934 graduates, the authors write that ‘sports is the most important of everything at Galatasaray and a Galatasaraylı is from all perspectives a true sportsman’. They go on by claiming that Western style sports in Turkey started at Galatasaray. Demet Lüküslü and Şakir Dinçşahin retrace the origins of modern physical education back to Selim Şirri Tarcan, who they argue was indeed inspired by the gymnastics
classes he took during his short period of attendance at Galatasaray High School. It thus seems justified to make the claim that the Mekteb-i Sultaniye had an important role in the development of a Western-style sports culture in the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic, although it should be stressed once again that it would take a significant amount of time until physical education became commonplace in other schools around the country as well.

The emphasis on body culture in the imagining of the Galatasaraylı reflects a broader phenomenon rooted in nation building projects. In the Ottoman context, Cüneyd Okay describes processes initiated by the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) in 1913 to promote physical education with the aim to ‘improve the health of Turks, reinforce their physical strength, and raise active generations as a contingency in times of hardship’. The efforts were organised in a paramilitary substructure of the CUP, called the Association of Turkish Strength (Türk Gücü Cemiyeti). The association focused on promoting national sports which seem to reflect some of the contemporary historical imaginings of ethnic Turks; Okay mentions horse riding, archery, shooting exercises, wrestling and sword fighting. Additionally he also mentions the prescription of a ‘national costume’ in the associations by-laws. The Association’s mission is quite similar to Friedrich Jahn’s initiatives of the Turnverein in nineteenth-century Germany. Joep Leerssen describes how Jahn in the first half of the nineteenth century developed training sessions which would form the basis for radical nationalist militia. He adds that many nationalist movements in the decades to follow would copy his model. In the context of English public schools, Sudipa Topdar argues that there was an intricate relationship between school games and ideas of discipline, masculinity, militarism and patriotism. In the colonial setting of British India, however, it served three different purposes: bringing improvement to the ‘weak’ bodies of native children; disciplining bodies for purposes of combating lack of hygiene and order; and finally depoliticising bodies through obstructing them from participation in political activism. As such they fit into broader schemes of colonial suppression and disciplining on the one hand and conceptions of a mission civilisatrice on the other.

Vladimir Tikhonov points out how beyond a colonial context European ideas on body culture and manhood would also trickle down to, for instance, Korea as an effect of the country’s modernization efforts. He argues that, quite similar to the German situation, the Korean nation would be represented primarily as a group of healthy, strong and disciplined men. It should be noted, however, that for instance in the German context from the years of the German Empire onwards initiatives were developed to also combine physical education with the arts, described by Christine Mayer as efforts to emancipate and educate rather than to drill. Marion Kant, in addition, emphasises that the roots of twentieth-century modern dance in fact lie within nineteenth-century gymnastics and Turnen.

GALATASARAY LISESI IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The official name-change of the former Mekteb-i Sultaniye took place in 1924, with the integration of the school in the newly established Turkish school system. By 1930 the school building at Galatasaray had proven to have insufficient capacity to provide for all the students and part of the Feriye Palace in Ortaköy – other parts being used by the Kabataş High School for Boys – was taken into use by the school as well. The school was visited by dignitaries such as Mustafa Kemal and later by France’s President Charles De Gaulle in 1968 to celebrate the school’s centennial, cultivating a continuity between the Ottoman and Turkish institution. On the occasion of De Gaulle’s speech then director Muhittin Sandıkçıoğlu prepared a speech which bear testimony to the belief of Galatasaray’s community in being the champion of Turkey’s modernization and progress. Parts of the director’s speech also bar witness to the feelings of indebtedness the director felt, or at least wanted to present to have felt, towards French culture:

‘Monsieur le Président, (...) nous sommes honorés et fiers de votre visite qui illustre les fêtes du Centenaire de ce Lycée, vieux d’un passé qui s’identifie avec l’histoire même de notre culture. J’ai parlé de modernisation dans le sens occidental, mais pour nous, l’Occident s’identifiait à la France. (...) C’est dans la vie intellectuelle et sociale française que les mouvements intellectuels, littérai-
Given the considerable amount of studies, popular and academic, regarding Galatasaray’s history until the first half of the twentieth century, and until the 1920s in particular, it is remarkable how little material has been produced on the school’s more recent history. This is particularly intriguing considering the importance the school and its community attribute to its role as forebears of modernity in Turkish society.

That being said, the publications of the Galatasaray Foundation provide a rich source corpus for studying Galatasaray High School’s position and history in Beyoğlu from the 1930s onwards, since its Alumni Association, the Galatasaraylılar Derneği, has made considerable efforts to protect, collect, archive and make sources available to its alumni and, partially, the public as well. The Galatasaray alumni can through the association’s website check the school’s yearbooks up to the 1930s; the magazines published at the school, the Galatasaray Dergisi, Aka
demi, i and Le Tambour, are available to the public. The Galatasaray Dergisi would typically contain short stories, poetry, essays and reports about news on the school. The association itself as well as the publications are examples of the importance and prestige that is attached to being a student at or graduate from the high school. The objective of the publications of the Alumni Association seems to be to cultivate and preserve the legendary status of the school, by emphasizing its role in sports and, through its graduates, politics, economics and culture. The yearbooks in particular provide valuable insights into what it meant to be a student at the high school and, significantly, what it meant to be a student in Beyoğlu from the 1930s until the 1990s.

The publications also provide insight into Galatasaray’s position in a national context which was dominated by Kemalist nationalism, the school being an example of the complicated nationalist discourse in which the supremacy of the Turkish nation was negotiated with an admiration for a positivist interpretation of ‘the West’ and its achievements. A graduate of the year 1942 describes how Galatasaray to him was a place where nationalism was always upheld. ‘I think that Gala-
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tasaray, in the Beyoğlu neighbourhood, which was the last to Turkify, was not just a hearth of knowledge where the most important and bravest sons of the nation were educated. At the same time, it was a sacred place where the masses who spoke with a variety of languages passed the iron fences were obliged to lower their voices. Yes, a sacred place. Even on the darkest days and the worst moments the children of the motherland were worshipping Turkishness there without losing any of the spirit and fire in their hearts. Others, at a later age, had different thoughts about this. A graduate of 1955 reminds his fellow graduates about the pogroms against non-Muslims in Beyoğlu and other parts of the city on 6 and 7 September 1955. He recounts how the diploma ceremony was delayed to October due to the pogroms, which he felt had turned out to be a huge plunder and campaign of destruction, describing it as ‘disheartening’. Others, at a later age, had different thoughts about this. A graduate of 1955 reminds his fellow graduates about the pogroms against non-Muslims in Beyoğlu and other parts of the city on 6 and 7 September 1955. He recounts how the diploma ceremony was delayed to October due to the pogroms, which he felt had turned out to be a huge plunder and campaign of destruction, describing it as ‘disheartening’.58

The memories of the graduates in the yearbooks and commemorative editions of the earlier years, recurrently remind of the darker episodes of Beyoğlu’s history, including episodes of nationalist violence and the involvement or attitudes of some students in it. In phrasing which leaves little to the imagination, a former graduate explains how on 3 March 1929 they attacked a Rum newspaper in Istanbul. The author starts that he wishes to explain how sensitive the students from Galatasaray were to national issues. He narrates how one of them decided to gather a handful of friends ‘to teach a lesson’ to a Rum newspaper which was hostile towards Turkey. On 8 March 1929 they were in class together discussing a newspaper called TaHronika. The author describes it as a ‘Rum newspaper which could not accept the trashing [of the Greek army] in Anatolia and exploited our incredible tolerance and was a piece of junk that did not let an opportunity slip to produce hostilities against Turkey in our lands’. The newspaper had published an article regarding ‘an episode about Anatolia’. The author and friends got agitated at a phrase which stated that ‘when Izmir changed hands to the Turks, a civilization was ruined’. The author goes on to say that a Turkish columnist had countered these words in another newspaper, but emphasizes his agitation at the fact that no response came from the government. A former graduate and student at the Medical School then gathered 8-10 ‘nationalist’ friends (8-10 milliyetçi arkadaş[...]) to ‘resolve the matter themselves’. They found out that the newspaper had their offices on the Şişhane Yokuşu and took the matter into their own hands: ‘they went to the printing house and destroyed and threw out machines, devices, tools, printer cases, documents and furniture, while giving 5 or 6 Rum who were inside a good beating as well. The Ta Hronika rag was no longer published after that day and its owner pissed off to Athens’ (sahibi de Atina'ya defolup gitti). Gürhan Yellice indicates that the newspaper was closed on 3 March 1929 on the decision of the Council of Ministers, since the word ‘agriotera’ had been used, which was translated as ‘brutal’. Later, however, the court case against Ta Hronika’s owner was reopened and it was decided that the word had been intended as ‘violent’ and would therefore not be considered as an insult to Turkishness. He argues that considerations on bilateral levels between Turkey and Greece, which tried to mend their ties, were at play in the case. In 1930 the newspaper was able to resume publishing.

The graduate’s testimony in the commemorative volume, however, does not need to be adjudicated based on its historical veracity. What is fascinating is that it is narrated by the author without remorse or embarrassment, but simply as a nostalgic story from his younger years as a student at Galatasaray High School, highlighting the profound tensions between different communities in the late 1920s and 1930s and the degree to which individuals felt at liberty to be vigilant. At the same time and at a different level – since this particular publication dates back to 1982 – it may also reflect the rising tensions between Greece and Turkey. Following the generals’ junta of Kenan Evren, instated after his 1980 coup, vitriolic nationalisms were flaring up and possibly seeped through to a commemorative publication of this elite Turkish high school. Apart from these sentiments, more light-hearted encounters also occurred when the basketball team of Galatasaray had a special match in 1949 with the team of the Greek Zoğrafyon high school around the corner on Turnacıbaşı Caddesi. The team of Galatasaray lost with 11-13. The cited reason was that the team of Zoğrafyon was composed of players from the youth teams of the predominantly Rum Beyoğluspor and Kurtuluş. Also in some of the yearbooks match results of the Galatasaray sport teams and the Zoğrafyon High School’s teams are cited, indicating that this was indeed not uncommon. Elsewhere students of graduation year 1933 argue against the occurrence of racism in the school. When one of the boys was running
around in the class room he bumped into another boy, who – judging from the narration – was Jewish. The boy who struck the other boy then exclaimed: ‘what are you afraid of you coward Jew?’. The author writes that all of the boys then stood up for the Jewish kid and the boy who made the racist exclamations then felt obliged to make ‘a thousand apologies.’

One of the students recounts how they would not understand their Armenian biology teacher to be Armenian when he was speaking French, but that they would get it when he was speaking Turkish. He goes on by saying: ‘He was entirely Turkified. He was a person who adopted Turkishness.’ A graduate of 1955 recounts: ‘we were all Kemalist, but none of us were racists. We never looked down on the minorities. We did not differentiate between Turkish-Kurdish, Sunnite-Alevite, Jew, Rum or Armenian. We were raised without the pressure of faith.’

Nonetheless, some of the boys at times also referred to ethnicity or religiosity, without realizing the implications of making such statements. Another graduate of 1955 tells an anecdote about a teacher who would collect some cents from every student who spoke a word of Turkish in the French class. The teacher would collect the cents in a box and the boys would guess during their breaks how much money was in there. After some arguments one boy supposedly exclaimed: ‘Give me a break, the Jew opens the box and steals from it!’. The author then explains: ‘When he said Jew, he meant no-one but our teacher Arditi, whom we had learned was Jewish.’ In the yearbook of 1959 it is explained that a boy was often called ‘Salomon’ by his friends since he was so good at doing impressions of Jews.

Sources from the High School also provide more light-hearted examples of the feelings of pride Galatasaray High School instilled in its students. In an issue of the Galatasaray Dergi from August 1947, a student explains how they felt obliged to defend the reputation of their school when an American group came to Istanbul and visited the school. The author writes that he thinks the Americans were misguided by preconceptions about the city and explains that he and his classmates showed what an imposing place the school and Beyoğlu were. ‘Our school is a centre like Beyoğlu, it is a place where foreigners wander around the most.’

They showed them around the school, and the author indicates how impressed the Americans were by the building, the gardens, the school’s facilities and the prizes won by the various sports teams connected to Galatasaray. It seems that the students aimed to showcase how great a school Galatasaray high school was and that the school and its students were successful examples of modernity. He concludes with
a letter he received from the American visitors: ‘(...) You taught these Americans who thought they knew everything that there are many things that they do not know and should learn(...) with your being a Galatasaraylı to us you are the best specimens of Turkish schools and Turkish youth. If all your schools resemble Galatasaray, Turkey can boast about its schools and youth.' The author appears pleased with these words, confirming Tevfik Fikret saying that Galatasaray was the first window of the East to the West.

In the article numerous references are made to the quality of the school’s building by the author and the impression it made on outsiders: ‘A large building which rises up in the middle of a well-cared for and orderly garden, which a majestic gate and thick walls work to surround as if they do not want to show it to the outside world out of jealousy, took the American sailors’ attention and these guests, who disembarked with the intention to not let anything slip their eyes anyway, wanted to understand what was going on here.’ These and numerous instances in various publications of institutions related to Galatasaray refer to the qualities of the building. One student, a graduate of the class of 1937, remembers what kind of an impression the school building had on him when his parents took him there for his admission:

‘One day they took me by the hand and said: “you’re going to take an exam” and brought me in front of a big building. From between the high fences, it was a building which only revealed a big clock towering over the green trees. We went into the garden, and the school now lay fully in front of my eyes. This majestic building left me in awe. I though to myself: “I suppose I will grow up in this big city’s schools”.

Elsewhere in the yearbook of the graduates of 1968 an equally colourful memory is brought to the fore in a description of one of the graduates:

‘If you enter the Galatasaray Sultani through the gate you will see the school building with all its majesty across of you. (...) Sometimes, you will see someone playing football in grand toilette, with brand new polished shoes, with a suit, starched shirt and tie. Don’t be surprised. This person who stands next to the other players in shorts is no-one but Hüseyin. (...) Despite him being from Kayseri he dresses chic.’

Beyoğlu as an ambiguous place of memory, nostalgia, recognition and belonging is a recurring theme in the yearbooks of the imagined and embodied community of Galatasaray graduates. Yet the memories of the graduates when they were at a younger age are not always particularly cheerful. One of the graduates of 1942 remembers how imposing or even terrifying an experience it was for the young boys to be in the school. The building’s giant classrooms, dark corridors and restrictions, its crowdedness and sheer size scared them. They were, among other things, not allowed to approach the gates and tall iron fences, sealing the school grounds from the rest of the area. He explains how they felt much more at ease when they were moved to the school’s building in Ortaköy, presently the building of Galatasaray University. Elsewhere in an issue of the Galatasaray Dergi from March 1949, Metin Toker, renowned journalist and graduate of 1942, explains that they in fact found the building very appealing. They were still young students, and the school’s gardens, Grand Cour and flower gardens were reserved for the older students. Yet, he explains, ‘forbidden places appeal to people and these forbidden gardens attracted us like bees to honey’.

The gate and fences separating the school from what happened around them is something that features prominently in the place-making of the students, as it recurs throughout the years and memories. Both in a metaphoric and a spatial sense it separated Galatasaray and the pupils from Beyoğlu, being part and parcel of it and distinctively separate from it simultaneously. It is noteworthy that this is in fact quite similar to the way Beyoğlu itself is represented in the context of Istanbul: both an integral part of the city and its urban identity, yet also something distinctively different from everything and everywhere else. In one of the reunion albums for the graduates of 1955 most of the students were boarding students until around the 1950s and would not be able to go anywhere else during the week: ‘they could not even watch Beyoğlu from afar.’ From the other side of the fence memories also grew as graduate of 1964 and author İlhan Eksen writes:

‘in the early moments of my boarding school years, far from
The gates and fences facing Beyoğlu therefore seem to have become a metaphorical anchor point for some of the Galatasaray students. A picture in the yearbook of 1969 shows seven young men climbing the fences of the high school, with a caption that reads ‘the place where colourful Beyoğlu nights started and ended (Mahmut what are you doing here, you’re a married familyman)’. It appears that the policies regarding the crossing of fences of students became less strict through the years allowing the students to familiarize themselves with the nightlife of Beyoğlu. The reference of the caption’s author to their friend’s marital obligations (irony or not) is significant as it reveals the perception of the author, and possibly his friends, regarding the district. Beyoğlu at night was not a place for families, but for bachelors and, quite likely, male bachelors. When, during the weekends, the students were able to go out, the district provided the students with opportunities for experiences they would not have been able to acquire in any other part of the city. One graduate of 1955 states: ‘at Beyoğlu’s heart we had the chance to learn about the tests of life at an early age. (...) We did not miss the chance to be a gentleman of Beyoğlu when we left the school during the weekend. Nothing was exempted in the warnings of our teachers about the responsibility of being a student of our school’. Graduates of the year 1958 share insight into what this might mean while discussing one of their comrades: ‘[he] played the saz, but not with [eyes for the] scores. Always with a side-eye for the girls in Beyoğlu.’ Others seem to have been slightly more direct in following the impulses of their burgeoning sexuality, as a graduate of 1962 made it a habit to stick his head through the window of every car in Beyoğlu that would pass him and had a woman in it.

Accounts like these in which Beyoğlu and the school’s building feature as a point of reference and setting, for the memories of the boys, and from 1965 onwards girls, indicate what strong an imprint the
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The building’s site left on the students of Galatasaray. In 2002 three graduates discuss the results of a forum that was organized by the Galatasaray Community Cooperative. The first question that is discussed is: ‘what is the significance of the school’s presence in Beyoğlu for being a Galatasaraylı?’ The authors ask the reader whether the school could move to a new campus in a site outside of the old city? Those present argued that the school’s presence in Beyoğlu was of prime importance. They state that the outcome was that the graduates concluded that Beyoğlu was a symbol of their shared past and unity.82

‘The “Point Zero” is this district, this building. Beyoğlu if insisted is one of Istanbul’s, or even Turkey’s, most prominent and important cultural and social places. (...) The students of those schools [which moved outside of the city centre] only know the city and the society from the windows of the school buses that bring them to school. The students of Galatasaray High School learn the realities of society through living them.’83

They express the wish that the school will stay in the same place for the coming centuries and moreover feel indebted to the school. In conclusion they state that the school’s presence in the area of which it is the namesake is quintessential. They thus make a strong claim to the school’s right to be in its current place and the interconnectedness of school, building and site. Elsewhere, in a publication titled Bitmeyen Mektep (ever-lasting school) of the Ankara Galatasaray Birliği (Ankara Galatasaray Union), the issue of girls being admitted to the school is discussed. From 1965 onwards girls were accepted to the high school, which caused major upheaval at first. The girls who reached the high school level initially stayed at the building in Ortaköy, but gradually started to be admitted to the Beyoğlu building as well. The author states that this was significant, for ‘to be a ‘true Galatasaraylı” one needs to study in Beyoğlu’.84

The graduates of the high school thus felt their memories to be strongly connected to the place that is Galatasaray and Beyoğlu. Also in earlier instances than the quoted summary of the meeting organized by the Galatasaray Community Cooperative a strong connection to the school as a material site is visible. A picture featuring the back garden of the high school is accompanied by a comment describing its former beauty as a ‘flower heaven at the heart of Beyoğlu’ which was due to indifference turned into a ruin and a garbage dump. According to the authors it was waiting for the help of their foundation since the Ministry of Education would not provide the school with a gardener and allowance for it.85 Elsewhere it is indicated that the building had by 1986 not received any substantial renovations apart from the parts that were repaired by the state. In 1982, however, İnan Kıraç, a prominent businessman at Koç Holding, philanthropist and himself a Galatasaray graduate of 1959, would set up the Galatasaray Education Foundation which in four years time would donate 861 million liras to the school, which was complemented with 700 million liras from the state. With initiatives like these the many associations and foundations set up by graduates of Galatasaray High School try to preserve the school’s legacy for the future, cultivating ties with alumni through formal and informal networks. The most notable being the annual Pilaf Day, in which a rice dish is served for the school’s alumni on the school’s grounds. Alumni associations moreover exist in other cities, notably Ankara, and abroad as well, in France, Belgium and the USA.86 For all these alumni the Galatasaray building and ‘their Beyoğlu’ remains as the setting and point of reference for their childhood and adolescent memories. As much as they cherish the memories from their days at the high school, the presented cases also show that the students of Galatasaray reflected the shifting attitudes towards multiculturalism that existed within the framework of Turkish nationalism. Whereas some feel the need to stress that they were not racists, or cherish memories regarding their ‘Turkified’ Armenian teachers, other (older) graduates felt instilled with pride recounting memories or stories on attacks against Rum citizens. Such diversity in attitudes also makes the school a telling microcosm of more general tropes of representation of Beyoğlu, ranging from multiculturalist nostalgia to xenophobia.
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