Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rgab20

Ideological productions in human geography as an apparatus of the state/power

Nurettin Özgen

To cite this article: Nurettin Özgen (2022): Ideological productions in human geography as an apparatus of the state/power, Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, DOI: 10.1080/04353684.2022.2055607

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/04353684.2022.2055607

Published online: 27 Mar 2022.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rgab20

GEOGRAFISKA ANNALER: SERIES B, HUMAN GEOGRAPHY
https://doi.org/10.1080/04353684.2022.2055607

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Ideological productions in human geography as an apparatus of the state/power

Nurettin Özgen

Faculty of Languages and History-Geography, Department of Geography, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

ABSTRACT

… 'Humanity' is an apparatus that could be used ideologically (Schmitt 1963, 55).

This study analyses the ideological practices of the state/power -including panoptic surveillance and organic integrity practices- in the discipline of human geography through the lenses of *curriculum, scientific freedom,* and *autonomy*. Human geographers have long analysed the sociospatial traits of societies using scientific perspectives. However, in many socioeconomically less-developed countries like Turkey, human geography and other social sciences, portray social issues through the meticulously designed ideological expectations of powers, rather than universal scientific criteria. This ideological structure damages the scientific development of human geography and hinders students' abilities to practice coexistence with other groups by instilling a dependent consciousness.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 19 March 2021
Revised 25 February 2022
Accepted 16 March 2022

KEYWORDS
Human geography in Turkey; indoctrination; academic autonomy and freedom; curriculum and ideology; surveillance; organic integrity

Introduction

This study analyses how human geography is implemented in high schools and universities in Turkey through the frames of *curriculum, scientific freedom,* and *autonomy*. It also theorises the state's ideological activities of *panoptic surveillance* and *organic integrity*. In Turkey, the discipline of human geography does not rely on scientific and sociospatial facts. Rather, the state uses the field to instil a dependent consciousness in individuals, ignore the diversities of society, and challenge practices of coexistence and social cooperation. Human geography, sociospatial studies, and free pragmatic approaches can contribute to social enlightenment, the recognition of different identities, and the skill of coexistence, as exemplified by practices in Canada (The Ontario Curriculum Grades 2015, 2018) and Finland (National Board of Education 2004).

While all knowledge is power, scientific knowledge is an especially effective power. Educational institutions are the most important sites of scientific production and public outreach. Among these, universities produce the most competent and profound knowledge. The university -from the Latin *universus* meaning 'whole, all together, combined in one'- should be a place where scientific knowledge is produced and spread. Scientific knowledge seeks to expose universal truths by employing different perspectives and methodologies to determine universal validity and contribute to the development of society/humanity. However, almost all social sciences, including (human) geography, can also advance the ideological perspectives of the state/governments.

Etymologically, the state/power is a capable decision maker with control. To remain effective, this power must spread ideological thoughts and practices into the public realm. The state both makes use of knowledge and reproduces it; thus, the state/power and knowledge are mutually

CONTACT Nurettin Özgen Nurettin.Ozgen@ankara.edu.tr Faculty of Languages and History-Geography, Department of Geography, Ankara University, Atatürk Street, No: 45, Sıhhiye, 06100, Ankara, Turkey

© 2022 Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography

inclusive (Foucault 2011a, 18). Power functions through physical and economic forces, legal representation, the hegemony of science, norms and political technologies, and the reshaping of the body and the soul (Best and Kellner 1998, 70). Power is everywhere (Althusser 2015), including in families, school, science, associations, religious institutions, the country, and global practices.

Education systems are structurally organised by the state and thus shaped by nationalist, democratic, pluralistic, or homogenising fascistic practices. Education policies in Turkey are built around the nation-based ideologies of Turkishness and Turkish-Islamic Ideology (T&TI). Geography curriculum and textbooks in secondary and tertiary institutions are also based on T&TI. This nation-defining ideological approach emphasises concepts like language, race, homeland, native country, border and enemy, and strength and power- all built on the notion of Turkishness (Özgen 2011), the founding philosophy of the state. While Turkishness, or in Özkan's (2012) terms, 'Kemalist policies' lead this structure, the ideology of Islam generally functions as a supplementary power. According to Özgen (2016), this relationality combines secular Turkishness (LaSHAT: Secular, Sunni, Hanafi, Turkish) and conservative thought (MuSHAT/CoSHAT: Conservative, Sunni, Hanafi, Turkish) in education, training, and everyday life. Therefore, this article treats the concepts of Turkishness, Turkish-Islamic Ideology (T&TI), state, and power interchangeably.

This paper is based on an analysis of secondary and tertiary education human geography curriculum and textbooks and theoretical literature. I argue that the discipline of human geography in high schools and universities in Turkey is an ideological apparatus of the state. Following T&TI, the state indoctrinates knowledge about diverse cultural identities. I examine how these ideological productions facilitate social segregation by producing dependent consciousness and organic integrity, especially among young people in education. The state uses human geography to alienate various cultural groups in Turkey and impose a homogeneous culture in line with T&TI. This hinders a coexistence of difference and fosters 'othering and humiliation' among individuals and groups with different cultural affiliations.

Ideology and ideological production

Ideology, broadly, is a belief system that forms a political or social doctrine and guides related activities (Cevizci 1999). It is 'a common thought and world view of a social group' (Lapierre 1981). Ideology can be scientific or non-scientific and, thus, a correct or incorrect reflection of reality (Frolov 1991). For instance, Marx's 'manipulated thought/reality approach is based on negative ideology perception' (Purvis and Hunt 2014, 14). This article deploys ideology to describe the false consciousness and negative practices of the state/power in human geography.

Marxists define ideology as the ruling class' treatment and practices toward society. It is 'the prevalence of the views of the ruling class in society' (Marx and Engels 2011a, 48; 2011b, 46). This is reflected in human geography curriculum and textbooks as a product of 'the interaction between power and knowledge' (Foucault 2011a, 2011b). The sociocultural characteristics of Turkey society are homogeneously transmitted to students in line with T&TI. While Turkey is a multicultural country situated on the Anatolian peninsula at the intersection of three continents (as suggested in the main thesis of Ottomanism[1],[2] policy), information about these cultural differences is not provided in social sciences (history, sociology, literature, human geography) curriculum and books. Turkey society is especially homogenised around 'Turkish identity' which emphasises religion (especially the Sunni sect in the Muslim Contract[3]) and Turkish ethnicity in the Turkishness Contract[4] (Türklük Sözleşmesi) These ideological practices produce separation, not inclusiveness.

In education, 'basic approaches pertaining to ideology try to make clear how knowledge is dispersed and how the conditions and the lines of thinking of the individuals acquiring this knowledge is transformed' (Oçak 2018). In Turkey, the effects of Turkish-Islamic and Turkishness ideology permeate all areas of education, particularly the social sciences. Human geography content is designed around this ideology to create a dependent consciousness in individuals. This ideological relation also produces an *organic integrity* practice. As a result, the ideology-based human

geography curriculum excludes different cultures in Turkey. The curriculum emerges from an efficient cooperation between the state and 'effective agents' (organic intellectuals who support the homogenising ideology of the state and work in line with it). This is a practice of concealing the truth and 'hypnotizing individuals' (Lacoste 2004). Deep thinking and questioning skills are meticulously restricted in socio-political and cultural geography subjects to better control students. The state/power does not want individuals to ask profound questions; it only opens space for individuals and identities aligned with the T&TI. Within this citizenship profile, individuals are coded with specific identities, belonging, places, and patriotism. This dependent consciousness compels individuals to either sacrifice themselves or the Other for the sake of the country, creating a polarized landscape through binaries like 'we and the other' or 'friend and enemy'. The highly visible writing on school walls stating 'Turk, glory, work (hard), trust yourself' or 'How happy is the one who says I'm a Turk?' reflects the semantics of this dependent consciousness.

Curriculum: ideological construction of the state in human geography

Curriculum is the thematic content, scope, and sequence of education. It involves a particular plan and programme to reach the intended objective, alongside methods, techniques, and student outcomes. Human geography curriculum in most countries includes courses titled with the name of the subject country (e.g. Turkey Human Geography). These courses aim to teach the human geographic potential and the socio-spatial traits of the country. However, in Turkey, many human geography topics are disregarded in favour of the T&TI ideology. In particular, ethnic (e.g. Arab, Albanian, Bosnian, Circassian, Georgian, Kurdish, Laz, Pomac, Roman, Greek and Assyrian) and religious identities (e.g. Islamic Alevi culture, Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Gregorian, Jewish) are ignored (Özgen 2016, 140). T&TI indoctrinates students by refusing to include Turkey's cultural differences in high school and university geography curricula.

According to Giroux (2004, 500), 'education is an area of politics, power and authority after all' the pedagogic is political (Giroux 1988, 63). 'School, by its very nature, claims the right on students' time and energy and assigns the teacher the role of a preacher, a guide, a guard, and therapist' (Illich 2013, 22). Power, status, and prestige determined by the success criteria of the dominant ideology not only shape educational objectives but also the behaviour of teachers, students (Gutek 2001), and societies. Özkan (2012, 7) summarises the ideological constructions of education in Turkey:

> Since 1933, every morning, millions of students gather in primary school courts to take an oath together. They shout in unison that their primary 'principle' is 'to love the homeland and the nation more than my being' and that they will be ready to 'sacrifice my life for the Turkish being.' State buildings including schools, police stations, and army headquarters put up billboards on their outside walls that display mottos such as 'vatan (homeland) first' and 'who loves his vatan most is the one who fulfils his duty best.'

In Turkey, the state designs course curricula to encourage feelings and thoughts to reinforce the continuity of the established order. For this reason, 'power(s) especially try to answer the following questions when designing the curriculum' (Gutek 2001, 182):

- Which knowledge is most significant?
- To whom will the most valuable knowledge be provided?
- What are the national policies and priorities in teaching?

The institutions charged with this task are the Ministry of National Education (MNE) for primary (6-9 years old), secondary (10- 13 years old) and high school education (14-17 years old) and the Higher Education Council (HEC/ YÖK) for universities. Their activities inevitably align with the ideology of the state, not science, since the state/power oversees their legal arrangements, appointments, and funding. Therefore, university and school curricula 'assume the role of teaching norms, values, tendencies and the culture contributing to the ideological hegemony of dominant

groups' (Williams 1977, as cited in Apple 2012, 85) rather than universal criteria. In the first years of the Republic, the school apparatus was assigned the important duty of shaping citizen profiles sought by the nation-state (Özgen and Köşker 2016). In fact, Turkey geography curricula from the last period of the Ottoman Empire through today were designed around the Turkishness Contract, and students and teachers have been educated accordingly. These entirely ideological practices ignore existent diversity. In Turkey, there are many cultural identities, including the Kurds about 20% of the population (Buckley 1994), the Alevis (20-25 million people[5]), and Arabs, Circassians, Albanians, Laz, Pomaks, and Romani. However, none of these cultural identities are included in geography curriculum and textbooks, reflecting serious indoctrination originating from the Turkishness contract. This is meant to create Turks out of Muslim Anatolians to raise individuals who speak, think, feel and behave like Turks (Akyüz 1989, 375, as cited in Ünlü 2018, 192). The arguments for a homogeneous society support Turkishness ideology and efforts to create '*agreeable citizens*' (Üstel 2016) and campaigns such as 'citizens *speak Turkish*' (Aktar 1996, 17) persist.

The Turkishness Contract's influence over geography curriculum can be categorised into two areas. The *first area* is the geography curriculum's prioritisation of physical geography subjects to obscure sociocultural differences and prevent in-depth consideration of sociospatial issues. For example, the High School Geography textbook (Aydın 1998) presents very limited information about human geography. The *second area* is that geography functions as an apparatus to propagandise racist and nationalist views (Yıldız 2013). For example, the book 'Coğrafyadan Vatana' *(From Geography to Homeland)* emphasises Turkishness when depicting Anatolia ([Arık 1955/1990], 63):

> For one thing, the homeland is Turkish homeland, the state is the Turkish state, and the nation is the Turkish nation. Just think that we waited for 900 years to feel in our bones and utter these facts that seem simple.

The book also praises the Turkish race: 'While mentioning Turkish name, bend a little' (Arık 1955/1990, 61) with reference to Abdülhak Hamit Tarık (who generally wrote on Turkish-Islamic thought) and 'I am a Turk! My religion and kind are noble/superior race!' (Arık 1955/1990, 62) with reference to Mehmet Emin Yurdakul known as a nationalist poet.

This book is considered one of 'a thousand fundamental books; by the Ministry of National Education and recommended to educators and students. The expanded edition was even republished by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (1990). Another remarkable example of distorted and indoctrinated information is the treatment of the city of Mardin. Arık argues that 'Mardin emerges purely and simply as a Turkmen asset. Look to the right: a Turk; look to the left: a Turk; look down: a Turk; look up: a Turk' (1990, 166). However, according to state data, the population of the historic city in southern Turkey near the border with Syria (in the beginning of the 1950s when the book was written) is composed of 69% Kurds, 24% Arabs, 6% Turks and other ethnic identities (Dündar 1999).

Such ideological reflections have been promoted from the first years of the Republic to the present day. For example, Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, the Minister of Justice from 1924-1930, made racist statements like;

> Both the friend and enemy shall know that the Turk is the master of the country. The ones who are not pure Turks have only one right in the Turkish homeland: the right to be servants, the right to be slaves (Cumhuriyet, September 19, 1930; as cited in Özer 2009, 63).

These politically fascistic practices were also implemented in geography. For example, after the military coup in 1980, the textbooks taught in secondary schools were retitled to 'National Geography' (Özgen 2016; Yıldız 2010; Akkan 1993, 1994; Ünal and Karaoğuz 1985, 1986). The use of 'national' in the geography curriculum and textbooks evidences an ideological obsession to deliberately overlook the cultural differences in Turkey. One might indeed wonder how topics in physical geography such as clouds producing precipitation by moving in the atmosphere (while crossing the borders) can be 'national'? Similarly, the textbook 'Our city Diyarbakır' (2021), prepared by the Ministry of National Education for primary schools, does not mention the Kurds or the Kurdish

language. Rather, the city's main language is likened to Azerbaijan Baku *Turkish* (Gazete Duvar, March 19, 2021).

Academic autonomy and freedom

The concept of autonomy originates from the ancient Greek *'autonomia',* meaning being independent, self-governing and self-controlled. In education, it first appeared in Medieval Europe's master and apprentice guilds, which led to the first universities in Europe. Scholar communities governed themselves but were funded by feudal lords or the Popedom (Jaspers 1959, 1, as cited in Bingöl 2012, 52). However, medieval universities governed themselves with their own funding; autonomy was based on the following principles (Bingöl 2012, 52):

- Having high levels of institutional autonomy against any external authority.
- Being financially self-sufficient.
- Having intellectual autonomy to show tolerance to new ideas and enable scientific freedom.

Within the social sciences, universities, the most profound institutions of education, are the primary site for ideological production and dissemination. However, countries supporting liberal scientific ideas and powerful scientific communities defending these ideas have not developed; rather, science is often used by political power (Altbach 2001, 205; Birtwisle 2004, 203). In Turkey, free scientific conception is restricted and academic freedom has been reduced in recent years (Balyer 2011, 138). Structural efforts to restrict scientific autonomy and freedom and to reconfigure almost every level of education to align with the T&TI include:

- The founding of the Higher Education Council (HEC) by law No. 2547, a product of the 1980 military coup,
- The appointment of rectors[6] by the president, not other stakeholders at the universities,
- The funding of the HEC and MNE by the government directly,
- The designing of education curriculum by political power/governments, not *the common demands and the opinions of educators.*

'*Academic autonomy*' is closely aligned with *university autonomy.* Throughout history, universities have defended *environments for free discussion* and *critical thinking.* All these processes are realised because of universities' *academic autonomy,* which guarantees academic freedom for scientific studies (Erdem 2013, 112). '*Academic freedom*' refers to members of an academic environment's freedom to research, analyse, discuss, document, produce, teach, acquire by explaining or writing, develop, and transmit knowledge individually or as a community (Declaration of Lima 1988). For universities to drive social development, scientists must share their studies, views, and thoughts freely despite political, religious and military pressure. In Turkey, however, after the 1933 reform, the 1946 and 1960 university laws, and the HEC law in 1981, universities were no longer free and autonomous. They were co-opted into the state's homogenised ideological apparatus (T&TI), and academicians with differing views were dismissed.

Universities with no freedom under tight government control will not develop quality life or opinions to guide social life because, as Said (2017, 69–70) notes, intellectual life is essentially related to knowledge and freedom. Ideological practices can limit or ban such kinds of life and knowledge production. For example, according to the Postgraduate Thesis database, no postgraduate thesis on the Alevis or Kurds has ever been written in geography departments in Turkey (HEC Thesis Centre 2021).[7] This is mainly because the state closely supervises the academy and other institutions. Additionally, foreign-sourced postgraduate theses that do not align with the T&TI can be rejected[8] by the HEC- affiliated Interuniversity Council (UAK).

The HEC, which oversees and controls universities, was established after the 1980 military coup. According to HEC law, It is argued that '*universities have scientific autonomy according to the Higher Education Law numbered 2547 Article 3 and sub-Article d*'. Yet, the Ninth Development Plan Higher Education Specialized Commission Report suggests:

- The most important factor in the discussions on the issue of autonomy in universities is that universities are exposed to excessive central control.
- Unlike western universities, our universities do not have administrative and financial autonomy.
- Attempts to align higher education policies with government policies lead to a significant weakness.
- Our universities do not have environments and structures where autonomous and liberal knowledge could be produced.
- Performances of faculty members are not taken into consideration and obedience culture is attempted to be established (State Planning Organization 2006, 77–78),

In Turkey, both institutional organisation and finance directly affect academic freedom and create a culture of *organic integrity,* considerably restricting the boundaries of scientific practices. As Adorno (2012, 121) writes, 'one who mentions culture, knowingly or unknowingly, talks about governance'. Political practices motivate how (educational and scientific) culture is formed. The failure to acknowledge Turkey's ethnic-religious differences in human geography studies (Özgen 2015) reflects the political culture of the T&TI. As a result of the T&TI's pressure, geographers in Turkey persistently avoid dealing with new research issues 1968 world revolution created in the field of social sciences, especially after the 1980 military coup (Bekaroğlu 2016, 140). In other words, Turkish society has been deprived of both democratic society norms and scientific thought traditions (including different paradigmatic approaches emerging in the field of geography) developed in the western world.

This hesitance in human geography is undoubtedly the result of the political climate and Turkish and Islamic tradition, that is the 'conservative line' (Tekeli 2012, 353; Özgen 2016, 146), starting with the construction of nation in Turkey. After the restructuring of the MNE and the HEC, universities' main scope and mission changed, which affected geography programmes and course content (Özgen 2011).

The liberal and autonomous scientific criteria serving as the basic requirement for academies are almost unattainable for Turkey academia. Some ongoing problems with human geography are noted in the following concerns:

- Why are spatial differences reflecting sociocultural and socio-political traits (social belonging, identity, inequality and social behaviour etc.) of regions not included in high school and university Regional Geography textbooks? (Şahin 1996; Şahin 1997).
- Regional geography lessons in Turkey detail physical geography while ignoring the sociocultural dynamics like spatial context, power and spatial interaction, regional production-consumption, and fair distribution. Why are these sociospatial and political knowledge/dynamics (particularly ethnic and religious ones) not included? (see Atalay and Mortan 2008; Özcan, Başlı, and Fırıncı 1998). As Durgun (2010, 248) explains, 'The details about Eastern and South-eastern regions including different cultural identities (Kurdish, Circassians, Assyrian etc.) are short descriptions of landscapes and the structures of mountains and rivers.'
- Is a human geography curriculum that ignores regional sociocultural (ethnical and denominational) traits, while meticulously teaching physical geography themes (morphography, hydrography, vegetation etc.), sufficient? (see Özcan 1999; Şahin, Doğanay, and Özcan 2010).

The answers are clear: Turkish-Islamic, and especially the Turkishness ideology policies, aim to expand and reinforce the political territory rather than contribute to social development and

enlightenment. Thus, it is not considered necessary for citizens to become aware of scientific knowledge. By incorporating the academy into an *organic integrity* practice through the human geography curriculum, the state can ideologically develop its masses. The academic geography agents who partner with the state to ensure organic integrity do not aim for social knowledge, representation and awareness, but adopt a win-win approach. As Gramsci (1986, 15) states, 'the dominant group becomes the governor when it establishes its hegemony through its intellectuals' and seeks to maintain its ideological productions. For Gramsci, '*organic intellectuals'* are central in reproducing the ideology of the dominant class and, thus, its hegemony struggle (Portelli 1982); '*organic intellectuals'*, which every new class needs (or whom different groups need), establish a new social order (Anderson 1988, 9). Organic academicians teaching geography curricula organised in line with the T&TI do not teach the multicultural structure of Turkey. This is an injustice to groups who cannot learn their identities, culture and tradition through education and it leads to social disintegration and hinders coexistence.

Human geography as the apparatus of panoptical surveillance and organic integrity

Human geography curriculum in Turkey's high schools and universities helps raise individuals based on the T&TI political codes. In this process, *agents* in the state and human geography contribute to the development of organic integrity as well as surveillance and supervision. Scholars who step out of the pre-determined topics or who conduct academic studies with a critical scientific apprehension are disciplined, taken under supervision, 'restricted or even prohibited' (Öksüz 2020, 89). Geographers avoid sociocultural issues for fear of being supervised and profiled by the state. Many academicians stay out of the *fire zone!* (Doyduk 2020, 152) and avoid meddling in political decisions to protect themselves (Özgür 2018). This is the result of the state's pressure and fear. A homogeneous structure is formed by removing different voices and 'the dismissal of hundreds of academicians; especially after the university reform and coups (1933, 1946, 1960, 1980 and 2016) (Alkan 2017; Özdemir Taştan and Ördek 2020). People who value truth, freedom, and justice are declared marginal (Chomsky and Albert 2005), so universal intellectuals avoid certain knowledge to stay within the '*Turkishness Contract*' (Ünlü 2018, 225). Academicians practice self-censorship and generally ignore social problems under the philosophy, 'see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil'. They fear the surveillance state and its panopticon reflections.

The power aims to create a society of obedient individuals through self-control (Foucault 2011c, 126) surveillance practices. Certainly, surveillance is not everywhere -*this is a utopia*- but it is a frequent means of exclusion and blockade against the discipline (Wood 2007, 248) and a kind of social order (Donaldson and Wood 2004). Hence, for the state, all kinds of schools drum knowledge and discipline and condition students to obey (Baker 2013, 61). This creates a chain of surveillance: the student watches the teacher; the chair watches the academician, and vice versa. This leads to a distant approach to scientific knowledge as the state attributes meaning to scientific geographic knowledge, not free and autonomous scientists.

It is extremely difficult to conduct academic research on sociospatial belongings due to surveillance and fear fostered by the state. As Ortaylı (2004) notes:

> Human geography of Turkey is in an amazing condition and it has not been examined as much as physical geography. More interestingly, the knowledge on soil types, water sources, vegetation and animals albeit superficial has not been acquired on languages and beliefs in the country.

The book *Ethnic Groups in the Republic of Turkey* by ethnologist and anthropologist Peter A. Andrews (1992) seemed to fill this gap. Though its Turkish translation (1992) omitted many chapters, its publication still had repercussions. The book included information on numerous ethnic groups in Turkey and the beautiful mosaic they form. The representatives of the Turkism ideology reacted harshly, emphasising Turkishness using the metaphor of a marble, 'What mosaic? …

marble, marble … ' (Gazete Duvar, July 5, 2021). Additionally, no study on cultural identities (other than Turkish) and differences appears in any of the six geography journals[9] published in Turkey. To avoid punishment by the state, they do not challenge ideologies, instead they are partners in the organic integration and take advantage of benefits the state provides.

General evaluation and conclusion

In Turkey, *landscape geography* with its pictures, maps and graphs dominates high school and university textbooks which are influenced by both the dominant classical regional geography tradition and the state-determined curriculum. However, this is a descriptive tradition with few human topics. Geography as a discipline is defined by visuals, not awareness-raising practices for students, it is simply landscape (mountains, valleys, beaches etc.) cultural identity and differences (otherwise included in human geography) become invisible. This indoctrination is purely ideological, with no representational basis for any scientific goal. Academic geographers who veer away from research on social differences, cultural identity and belonging harm the scientific identity of human geography and the social reliability of the discipline. Human geography's basic objectives and responsibilities should include research on the cultural qualities of Turkey's society through different paradigmatic approaches as well as presenting findings to the public.

In Turkey, even academic geographers are sometimes unaware of the different ethnic and belief-related identities in their society. Students graduate mostly unaware of this wealth, which results in a dependent consciousness on the state/power. For example, some academic human geographers might confuse the *Pomac* people, a Slavic race living in Anatolia and Trakya, with *pamuk* (cotton) (Özgen 2016). What could make a human geographer/ academician so ignorant of the society s/he lives in? The state's ideological practices in education foster indoctrination, dependent consciousness, and academicianship of organic integrity.

The state's ideological design and 'sociospatial indoctrination' (Köşker 2014) in human geography, as in other social sciences, seriously limits the introduction of different pragmatic approaches. The knowledge marketed as scientific knowledge through indoctrination and manipulation is produced by *organic intellectuals* participating in the ideological structure the state designs. It only includes the ideological knowledge serving a certain race, ethnic, belief or class whose boundaries are carefully determined by power. One reflection of T&TI is the map of the Turkish World in Turkey Human, Turkey Regional and Turkey Physical Geography books (Arslan 1996; Şahin 1996, 1997). The map spans the Balkans, Central Asia, and the Arctic Ocean almost to the Sea of Okhotsk in the North of Japan. Its place names and symbols are meticulously designed as an apparatus of power. However, Turkey's ethnic, religious and sociocultural geography is disregarded in curricula and scientific studies. This contradictory situation could also lead to a 'narcotizing' (Lacoste 2004) and imposition of culture (Said 2012). A student in high school or a geography university student must take these compulsory courses to graduate. Teachers within academia consider this state of obligation to be ordinary for various reasons: for some, it is ignorance, dependant consciousness or scientific blindness, while for others, it is self-censorship, suppression and intimidation practices. To not produce knowledge about restricted topics and approaches is an injustice to cultural belonging and the affected social identities. Moreover, it seriously damages human geography's academic identity and development in Turkey.

The 2021 textbooks continue to carefully emphasise Turkish ethnic identity under the title, 'Turkish Culture.' Even the frequency of the concepts of Turkish (82), Islam (19), and Turkish-Islam (8) in the 11th-grade geography textbook illustrates its thematic scope. The book emphasises the prevalence of the Turkish language in the world and describes Turkish architecture, coffee, sports and other cultural features. However, other cultural identities of Turkey society are never mentioned. More seriously, geography books include Kurdish land in the Middle East (Iran, Iraq, and Syria) within the Turkish region (Commission 2021). Laws now perpetuate these ideological productions. After all, 'it is the authority that makes the law, not the reality' (Hobbes 2001). A

typical example is the use of expressions like 'Turkish nation, Turkish citizen and Turkish society' but not the 'nation of Turkey' in the first three articles of Basic National Education Law (2021, no.1739). These practices frustrate social union by refusing to represent cultural differences.

Scientific geography should reflect the unity of social differences and contribute to social pluralism and development by analysing these differences through various paradigmatic approaches, not an authority's ideological instrument. The principle of geography is to protect and understand differences through the universal language of science, not destroying or ignoring social differences, belongings, identities, and cultural values. The geographic approach should include pluralist and 'mutual cooperation' (Kropotkin 2001). The discipline should teach the perspectives of the weak and powerless from all layers of society. However, in contemporary Turkey, geographers are unlikely to freely teach or study belonging, identity or social values.

In today's technologically-advanced societies, people can more easily access information related to social belonging, identities, and cultures (despite all the restrictions of the authority or state). Since information dissemination methods have developed quickly, *inconsistencies about knowledge transmitted to or imposed on individuals through education by power* could easily be exposed and questioned. Furthermore, these processes could pave the way for social opposition and disturbance, or poison social unity. Struggle might be inevitable among those who become aware of the ideological-oriented policies of power and claim their sociocultural identities and values and those who remain loyal to the *dependant consciousness*. Geography might play an instrumental role in perpetuating the ideology of power; (human) geography can become an apparatus for disregarding the cultural wealth and contributing to the poisoning of social unity through one-sided curricula based on the ideology of power, not social consciousness and representation. Human geography, as an apparatus of state/power ideology, is used to produce a dependent consciousness. The limits of this consciousness are carefully determined according to the ideological designs of power rather than universal scientific norms. At the same time, this situation is a careful limitation of researching the socio-spatial characteristics of Turkey society, which includes different belongings and cultural identities, with a critical approach. In short, it is the ignoring of different social, cultural and political identities. However, the discipline of human geography can also analyse the human-space relationships embedded in local and regional differences. It can motivate academic progress and the development of a coexistence consciousness that reflects equality, pluralism, and cultural differences.

Notes

1. Turkey is a successor state to the Ottoman Empire (1299-1922) which included different religions and ethnic identities. Three different political thought plans to revive the Empire were devised by the İttihat ve Terakki (1889-1918), which was influential in government in the last period of the Empire. By that time, the Ottomans had lost control of all but the Anatolian peninsula.
2. The first policy was Ottomanism, a political view defending the existence of different religions and ethnic identities in equal conditions and under the governance of a non-centralist state. This policy was discarded by national movements of the non-Muslims and, especially, after the Balkan Wars (1912-1913).
3. The second policy separated the Anatolian peninsula from the Non-Muslims who were considered a threat. These policies and military plans enabled Muslims with different ethnic identities in Anatolia to gather against the non-Muslims. It is an (implicit) Muslim Contract (Ünlü 2018), with the principal concept of being a Muslim. 'While some non-Muslim groups (Greeks, Armenians) were excluded from the homeland perception, the Ottoman- Turk Muslim majority, albeit heterogeneous, were included in the homeland context and transformed into a uniform organic whole through homogenization' (Turk, Kurd, Cherkes, Laz) (Durgun 2010, 153).
4. The third and final policy distinguished Turks from Muslim Anatolians. 'The idea of a common Turkish homeland was used to invalidate the differences in the society' (Özkan 2012, 4). It was the Turkicization of non-Turkish Muslim communities (Kurdish, Arabic, Cherkes, Laz, Albenian, Greek, Pomak)- the Turkishness Contract. This contract is a political ideology considering and defending Turkish language, history, tradition, and culture as uniform (see: Ünlü 2018; Durgun 2010). In brief, Turkishness is an ethnic based ideology. Turkish-Islamic ideology, however, includes ethnic and religious hybridization. Though the

Turkishness ideology is dominant, both ideologies were needed to be effective. To consolidate power, Turkishness and Turkish- Islamic partial political partnership was chosen. I discursively combine these two ideologies with the power and the state, mutually complementing each other.

5. Minority Rights Group International. 'World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples'. http://minorityrights.org/ minorities/alevis/ Accessed: 11 August 2021.
6. For example, the rector appointment to Boğaziçi University was made by a Presidential Decree published in the Official Gazette on January 1, 2021 without considering the tradition or constituents of the school. The protests against this appointment are still (as of February 24, 2022) ongoing.
7. The database stores postgraduate thesis studies conducted in Turkey. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/ (accessed: July 3, 2021).
8. One doctoral thesis successfully completed in the US (The State University of New York at Binghamton) was rejected in 2021 by the UAK. The title of the thesis is: 'Who Rules Turkey Between 1980 and 2008? Business Power and the Rise of Authoritarian Populism' (Gazete Duvar, August 4, 2021). The thesis was not accepted due to its 'content and topic'.
9. - Türk Coğrafya Dergisi (1943-)
   - Ege Coğrafya Dergisi (1983-)
   - Coğrafya Dergisi (1985-)
   - Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi (1995-)
   - Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi (1996-)
   - Coğrafi Bilimler Dergisi (2003-)

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Nurettin Özgen http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9191-1579

References

Adorno, T. W. 2012. *The Culture Industry*, (N. Ülner, M. Tüzel, E. Gen, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim.
Akkan, E. 1993. *Milli Coğrafya 1 [National Geography]*. Ankara: Üner yayınları.
Akkan, E. 1994. *Milli Coğrafya 2 [National Geography]*. Ankara: Üner Yayınları.
Aktar, A. 1996. "Turkification Policies Implemented in the First Years of the Republic." *Tarih ve Toplum* 156: 4–18.
Alkan, MÖ. 2017. Üniversiteden Tasfiyeler: 147'ler olayı [The Purges from the University: Case of the 147s]. 1960_Darbesi_e%C3%9CniversitedenTasfiyeler147_lerOlay%C4%B1pdf (accessed July 5, 2020).
Altbach, P. G. 2001. "Academic Freedom: International Realities and Challenges." *Higher Education* 41 (1-2): 205–219.
Althusser, L. 2015. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, (A. Tümertekin, Trans). İstanbul: İthaki.
Anderson, P. 1988. *Gramsci: Gramsci: Hegemony, East / West Question and Strategy* (T. Günersel, Trans). İstanbul: Alan Yayınları.
Andrews, P. A. 1992. Türkiye'de Etnik Gruplar [Ethnic groups in the republic of Turkey]. (M. Küpüşoğlu, Trans.). İstanbul: Ant yayınları- Tümzamanlar yayıncılık. Akyüz Kitabevi.
Apple, M. W. 2012. *Education and Power* (E. Bulut, Trans). İstanbul: Kalkedon.
Arık, R. O. 1955/1990. *Coğrafyadan Vatan'a [from Geography to Homeland]*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı No: 538. Kültür Eserler No: 30.
Arslan, N. 1996. *Coğrafya 1 Ders Kitabı [Geography 1 Textbook]*. İstanbul: Serhat Yayınları.
Atalay, İ, and K. Mortan. 2008. *Türkiye Bölgesel Coğrafyası [Turkey Regional Geography]*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
Aydın, C. 1998. *Lise Coğrafya [High School Geography]*. Ankara: Doğan Yayıncılık.
Baker, C. 2013. *Refusing Submission to Obligatory School System* (A. Sönmezay, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
Balyer, A. 2011. "Academic Freedom: Perceptions of Academics in Turkey." *Eğitim ve Bilim* 36 (162): 138–148.
Basic National Education Law. 2021. https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.1739.pdf (accessed May 7, 2021).
Bekaroğlu, E. 2016. "An External History Reading for the Discipline of Geography in the Context of the Knowledge Structures of the Modern World-System." *Toplum ve Bilim* 136: 117–146.
Best, S., and D. Kellner. 1998. *Postmodern Teory* (M. Küçük, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
Bingöl, B. 2012. "The Changing Definition of University Autonomy and Reconstruction of Universities." *Hacettepe Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 2 (2): 39–75.

Birtwisle, T. 2004. "Academic Freedom and Complacency: The Possible Effects if 'Good men do Nothing'." *Education and the Law* 16 (4): 203–216.
Buckley, R. 1994. *The Kurds: Caught Between Nations", Understanding Global Issues, No: 94/3*. Berlin: European Schoolbooks Publishing Limited.
Cevizci, A. 1999. *Paradigm Philosophy Dictionary*. İstanbul: Paradigma.
Chomsky, N., and M. Albert. 2005. *Responsibility of Intellectuals* (N. Ersoy, Trans). İstanbul: BGST Yayınları.
Commission. 2021. *Ortaöğretim Coğrafya 11 [High School Geography 11]*. Ankara: Devlet Kitapları. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, No: 6659.
Declaration of Lima. 1988. Academic Freedom and Autonomy of Higher Education Institutions. World University Service (WUS). Retrieved from https://www.wusgermany.de/sites/wusgermany.de/files/ userfiles/WUS-Internationales/wus-lima-englisch.pdf (accessed July 5, 2021).
Donaldson, A., and D. Wood. 2004. "Surveilling Strange Materialities: Categorisation in the Evolving Geographies of FMD Biosecurity." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22 (3): 373–391.
Doyduk, S. 2020. "On the Possibility of Transcending Silent Obedience and Regenerating Hope at the Academy." *Birikim Dergisi* 369-370: 152–163.
Dündar, F. 1999. *Türkiye Nüfus Sayımlarında Azınlıklar (Minorities in Turkey's Census)*. İstanbul: Doz yayınları.
Durgun, S. 2010. Ulusçuluk ve Mekân: Cumhuriyet Söyleminde "Vatan": 1920–1950 [Nationalism and Space: "Homeland" in Republic Discourse: 1920- 1950]. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi. İstanbul.
Erdem, A. R. 2013. "Üniversite özerkliği: Mali, akademik ve yönetsel açıdan yaklaşım." *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi* 3 (2): 97–107.
Foucault, M. 2011a. *Il faut défendre la société* (Ş. Aktaş, Trans). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi yayınları.
Foucault, M. 2011b. *Dits et écrits (1954–1988) Seçme Yazılar- 2 [Özne ve iktidar]*. (I. Ergüden, O. Akınbay, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
Foucault, M. 2011c. *Dits et écrits (1954–1988) Seçme Yazılar- 3 [Büyük Kapatılma]*. (I. Ergüden, F. Keskin, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
Frolov, I. 1991. *Philosophy Dictionary* (A. Çalışlar, Trans.). İstanbul: Cem Yayınları.
Giroux, H. A. 1988. "Literacy and the Pedagogy of Voice and Political Empowerment." *Educational Theory* 38: 61–75.
Giroux, H. A. 2004. "Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Neoliberalism: Making the Political More Pedagogical." *Policy Futures in Education* 2: 494–503.
Gramsci, A. 1986. *The Prison Notebooks* (K. Somer, Trans). İstanbul: Onur Yayınları.
Gutek, G. 2001. *Philosophical and Ideological Perspectives on Education* (N. Kale, Trans.). Ankara: Ütopya.
Hobbes, T. 2001. *Leviathan* (S. Lim, Trans). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
Illich, I. D. 2013. *Okulsuz Toplum [Deschooling Society]* (M. Özay, Trans.). İstanbul: Şule Yayınları.
Köşker, N. 2014. Human geography and indoctrination of spatial information: Example of geopolitical position. Ankara Üniversitesi, TUCAUM VIII. Coğrafya Sempozyumu (ss: 429-438), 23-24 Ekim, 2014, Ankara.
Kropotkin, P. 2001. *Karşılıklı Yardımlaşma [Mutual Aid]*, (I. Ergüden, Trans). İstanbul: Kaos Yayınları.
Lacoste, Y. 2004. *La geographie ça sert, d'abort, a faire la guerre* (S. Sezer, Trans). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
Lapierre, J. W. 1981. *What is Ideology (F. Arslan, Trans.) In İlimler ve İdeolojiler*. Ankara: Umran Yayınları.
Marx, K., and F. Engels. 2011a. *Manifesto of the Communist Party (1888) and Principles of Communism (1847). As two Books Were Combined* (M. Erdost, Trans). Ankara: Sol yayınları.
Marx, K., and F. Engels. 2011b. *German Ideology* (E. Aktan, Trans). Ankara: Alter Yayıncılık.
National Board of Education. 2004. *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education.
Oçak, Z. 2018. "Marxist and Postmarxist Approaches to the Concept of Ideology: Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser]." *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Dördüncü Kuvvet Uluslararası Hakemli Dergisi* 1 (2): 56–74.
Öksüz, M. 2020. "Coğrafyanın çorabı ve pabucu: Bir coğrafya sözleşmesi olarak renk körlüğü [Sock and Shoe of Geography: Color Blindness as a Geography Convention Contract]." *Birikim* 378: 89–106.
The Ontario Curriculum Grades (11 and 12). 2015. Canadian and World Studies. Economics, Geography, History, Law, Politics. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/ 2015 cwslland12.pdf (accessed July, 10, 2020).
The Ontario Curriculum Grades (9 and 10). 2018. Canadian and World Studies (2018). Economıcs, Geography, History, Law, Politics Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/2018 cwslland12.pdf (accessed July 10, 2020).
Ortaylı, İ. 2004. Yurdumuzu nasıl tanıyoruz? [How do we know our country?] Retrieved from https://www.milliyet.com.tr/ pazar/yurdumuzu-nasil-taniyoruz-394140 (accessed 11.03.2020).
Özcan, Ö. 1999. *Coğrafya 1- Genel Fiziki Coğrafya [Geography 1- General Physical Geography]*. İstanbul: Sürat yayınları.
Özcan, Ö, İA Başlı, and Ö Fırıncı. 1998. *Coğrafya 2, Türkiye Bölgeler Coğrafyası [Geography 2- Turkey Regional Geography]*. İstanbul: Sürat yayınları.

Özdemir Taştan, İ, and A. Ördek. 2020. A Report on Academic Freedoms in Turkey in the Period of the State of Emergency (F. Öz, Trans.). Retrieved from http://insanhaklariokulu.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/A-Report-on-Academic-Freedoms-in-Turkey.pdf (accessed 15 July 2021).
Özer, A. 2009. A sociological perspective to the problem of multiculturalism and citizenship in the EU process, in Turkey (pp. 62–68). I. Uluslararası AB, Demokrasi ve Vatandaşlık Eğitimi Sempozyumu, Uşak.
Özgen, N. H. 2011. "The Endless Constructıon of 'Motherland' in Geography Curriculum in High School Education from the Beginning of the Republic of Turkey to Present." *Toplum ve Bilim* 121: 24–42.
Özgen, N. 2015. "Demographic Development and Some Cultural Characteristics of Anatolian Circassians." In *Turkey at the Beginning of 21st Century Past and Present*, edited by Recep Efe, Metin Ayışığı, Ömer Düzbakar, Mehmet Arslan, 394–422. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
Özgen, N. 2016. "A Critical Approach to Discipline of Human Geography as an Apparatus for State Hegemony in Turkey." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 40 (1): 131–153.
Özgen, N., and N. Köşker. 2016. "Dichotomic Production of Private Teaching Institutions: Is it a Public Service or is it a Societal Problem?" *Toplum ve Bilim* 137: 83–129.
Özgür, E. M. 2018. "Innovation trends in Turkish human geography: An Assessment from the perspective of agents of change." *lnternational Journal of Geography and Geography Education* 38: 142–170.
Özkan, B. 2012. *From the Abode of Islam to the Turkish Vatan: The Making of a National Homeland in Turkey*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Portelli, H. 1982. *Gramsci ve Tarihsel Blok [Gramsci and Historical Bloc]* (K. Somer, Trans). Ankara: Savaş Yayınları.
Purvis, T., and A. Hunt. 2014. "Söylem, ideoloji, söylem, ideoloji, söylem, ideoloji … [Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology …]. (S. Coşar, Trans)." *Moment Dergi* 1 (1): 9–36.
Şahin, C. 1996. *Türkiye Coğrafyası (Fiziki) [Turkey Geography (Physical)]*. İstanbul: Ders Kitapları.
Şahin, C. 1997. *Liseler için Coğrafya 2 [Geography 2 for High Schools]*. İstanbul: Ders Kitapları.
Şahin, C., H. Doğanay, and N. Özcan. 2010. *Türkiye Coğrafyası [Turkey Geography]*. Ankara: Gündüz Kitabevi.
Said, E. W. 2012. *Kültür ve Emperyalizm [Culture Imperialism]* (N. Alpay, Trans). İstanbul: Hil Yayınları.
Said, E. W. 2017. *Entelektüel [Representations of the Intellectual]* (T. Birkan, Trans). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
Schmitt, C. 1963. *Der Begriff des Politischen (1932)*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, ISBN 3-428-07306-1.
State Planning Organization. 2006. Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) Higher Education Specialization Commission Report. Ankara.
Tekeli, İ. 2012. Türkiye'de coğrafyacıların çok paradigmalı bir bilim dünyasında yaşamayı öğrenmesi gerekiyor [Turkey needs to learn to live in a world of science in the very paradigm of geographers]. TÜCAUM VI. coğrafya sempozyumu kitabı (s.348-354). Ankara.
Ünal, O., and C. T. Karaoğuz. 1985. *Milli Coğrafya 1 [National Geography]*. İstanbul: MEB Yayınevi.
Ünal, O., and C. T. Karaoğuz. 1986. *Milli Coğrafya 2 [National Geography]*. İstanbul: MEB Devlet Kitapları.
Ünlü, B. 2018. *Türklük Sözleşmesi: Oluşumu, İşleyişi ve Krizi [Turkishness Contracts: Formation, Operation and Crisis]*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
Üstel, F. 2016. *Makbul Vatandaş"ın Peşinde [On the Trail of "Accepted Citizen"]*. Ankara: İletişim.
William, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wood, D. M. 2007. "Beyond the Panopticon? Foucault and Surveillance Studies. Chapter 23." In *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, edited by J. W. Crampton, and S. Elden, 245–263. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Yıldız, M. Z. 2010. Kuram ve pratik açıdan Türkiye'de coğrafya eğitimine eleştirel bir bakış [Theory and practical aspects of a critical overview of the geography education in Turkey]. Küreselleşme sürecinde eğitim sorunlarının felsefi boyutu (ss: 411-424). Uluslararası eğitim felsefesi kongresi (6-8 Mart 2009), Ankara.
Yıldız, A. 2013. *Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene" Türk ulusal kimliğin etno-seküler sınırları (1919-1938), ["How happy is the one who says I'm a Turk": Ethno-secular boundaries of Turkish national identity]*. İstanbul: İletişim.