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Turkey has risen to sixteenth place in the economic ranking of the world’s states, while the United Kingdom slips to number seven. The Middle East’s only fast-growing non-oil economy, Turkey continues to develop its commercial and construction interests in Arab countries and also in central Asia where its influence has a different cultural dimension. To many of those caught up in the Arab Spring, Turkey’s particular mix of democracy and Islam is very appealing. Prime Minister Erdoğan envisions Turkey becoming a stronger regional power. His forthright stance is built on a trio of election victories each more resounding than the one before. He even risks displeasure in Washington D.C. when, for example, he calls for Palestine to have a seat in the United Nations. Closer to home, Turkey’s ties with both Syria and Israel are far from what they were while, looking towards Europe, popular support for membership of the European Union is declining – although still official policy. Cypriot Presidency of the EU from July will add a frisson – albeit temporary – to relations between Ankara and Brussels. Meanwhile within that island the cease-fire line of 1974 looks as durable as ever.

Within Turkey there is energy and activity but clouds over the indictment of generals, journalists and others are slow to clear. The AK Party aims to reduce the traditional influence which the military has had up to now but the very nature of the ‘Turkishness’ of the Republic continues to be debated, as is the position within it of Kurds, Alevi, and other minorities. Yet Istanbul and other cities now attract cutting-edge artists and others to a vibrant cultural scene of innovation building on the country’s heritage.

In this issue we are very pleased to include articles from our President, Michael Lake, sometime EU Ambassador to Turkey, and from Celia Kerslake, who chairs TASG and here reviews the current state of Turkish studies in the United Kingdom. We welcome Gamon McLellan’s update on Turkey’s political scene and hope this will be followed by more from him. In so doing we thank William Hale for his regular contributions on Turkish politics over several years. We continue to be indebted to other regular contributors: Ayşe Furlonger tells us about current events and Arın Bayraktaroğlu alerts us to new publications. Clement Dodd, who regularly updates us on Cyprus, in this issue also contributes a valuable article on the political life and legacy of the late President Rauf Denktaş.

Our new contributors add very welcome dimensions: so we get the impressions of a British-born Turk visiting for the first time her father’s family in Anatolia. This contact we owe in part to John Norton. A very experienced German-born Goethe-Institute worker enlightens us about German-Turkish attitudes and relations at a cultural and educational level.

Cultural aspects are also reflected in Arın Bayraktaroğlu’s interview with the artist Gülsün Karamustafa; re-living a fine contribution to the 2011 Symposium about the influential theatre diva Ninette de Valois. And we have a poem with her own translation by the author. Five varied book reviews again reflect the broad interest of our readership, one contributor being our former Editor of the Review, Belma Ötuş-Baskett.

We would like to invite any of you to contribute to the next issue to keep the tradition going of the Review as a publication that remains accessible to all people interested in Turkey and Turkish affairs.

Brian Beeley
Co-Editor

Sigrid-B Martin
Co-Editor
Noteworthy Events
by Ayşe Furlonger

THEATRE

Antony and Cleopatra – Oyun Atölyesi Production in Turkish
Shakespeare’s Globe; Saturday 26 May 2.30pm - Sunday 27 May 1.30pm & 6.30pm

Shakespeare’s Globe in London is bringing together artists from all over the world for its ‘Globe to Globe’ season that will see all 37 Shakespeare plays presented, each in a different language – including Zulu, Maori, Russian, Swahili, Greek, Hindi, Mandarin, Korean, Italian, Juba Arabic, Cantonese, Palestinian Arabic, Polish, Shona, Serbian, Albanian, Macedonian, Spanish, Armenian, Belarusian, Georgian, Portuguese, Japanese, Gujarati, Yoruba, Urdu, Turkish, Hebrew, Castilian Spanish, Dari, German, French, Lithuanian and English.

Oyun Atölyesi’s production of Antony and Cleopatra is part of the Globe to Globe and it will be performed in Turkish on 26-27 May. Haluk Bilginer and Zerrin Tekindor will play the title characters. Bilginer, one of Turkey’s most prestigious actors, is known in Britain from spending two years on the BBC series ‘EastEnders’. Tekindor is one of Turkey’s most respected actresses; she has had an award-winning career on stage at the state theatre in Ankara and in Istanbul.

EXHIBITIONS

Hajj: Journey to the Heart of Islam
British Museum; until 15 April 2012

The British Museum in London opened its doors to the first major exhibition in the world on Hajj, the Islamic pilgrimage to the heart of Islam. Using artefacts, video footage, personal audio recordings and photographs, the show explores the history, journeys and experiences of pilgrims who travel from around the world to reach the holy city of Mecca. Among the artefacts on display is a ‘Mahmal’, one of the ceremonial curtained palanquins in which the Sultans were carried from Cairo to Mecca in what is now Saudi Arabia, and a Koran from the eighth century. Also on show is ‘Milestone’, one of the stone slabs once used by pilgrims in Iraq to mark their route to Mecca, so they could find their way home. ‘Magnetism’, a minimalist piece of art by Saudi artist Ahmed Mater, of the Kaaba, the sacred site around which the pilgrims pray, adds a modern touch.

While a Country is Changing
Sakıp Sabancı Museum, Emirgan, Istanbul
Tuesday – Sunday 10:00–18:00; open until 20:00 on Wednesdays.

The Sakıp Sabancı Museum has put nearly a hundred paintings from its collection of Turkish art from the late Ottoman and early Republican periods on display, in a new permanent exhibition called While a Country is Changing’. There are works by significant Turkish painters, such as Osman Hamdi Bey, Halil Paşa, Abdülmecid Efendi and İzzet Ziya, Fikret Muallâ. The exhibition reveals the transition in the production of images and the alteration of the concepts of art and artist in Turkey and gives the visitor a chance to review the historical journey of Turkish Painting. The collection also provides a backdrop to the dramatic political upheavals of the period, showing a continuum of artistic styles in step with the fashions of Europe.

It combines chronological and thematic organization. Sometimes the artists are grouped by
generation and style, while elsewhere whole walls are covered in examples of still life, nude, portrait or landscape painting.

FESTIVALS

40th Istanbul Music Festival
www.biletix.com; 31 May-29 June 2012
The 40th year special programme of the Istanbul Music Festival, which hosted more than 40,000 artists from Turkey and abroad with nearly 3,000 performances in 40 years, has been announced. It will open with Beethoven’s 9th Symphony by Borusan Istanbul Philharmonic Orchestra under the baton of its artistic director Sascha Goetzel. The Festival will be held between 31 May and 29 June and will host more than 750 local and foreign artists in Istanbul including Fazıl Say, Giya Kancheli, Hélène Grimaud, Anne-Sophie Mutter, Milos, Gidon Kremer, Chamber Orchestra Vienna-Berlin and Warsaw Philharmonic Orchestra. Along with concerts, the Festival will present talks, educational workshops and speeches. Since 2011, the Festival has started to build its programme around a theme which – this year – will be Hope and Heroes. Concerts will be held in eight different venues including Hagia Eirene Museum, which has continued to host the Festival for the last 40 years, along with the Haliç Congress Center, Lütfi Kırdar International Convention and Exhibition Center, Garden of the Netherlands Consulate General, Süreyya Opera House, Cemal Reşit Rey Concert Hall, Istanbul University Rectorate Building and Istanbul Archaeological Museum.

Istanbul Tulip Festival 2012
During the month of April, thousands of tulips bloom all around Istanbul with the annual Tulip Festival. If you are in Istanbul during the tulip season you are sure to be welcomed by tulips blooms of many colours and varieties all over the city. For a real tulip treat and the International Istanbul Tulip Festival, head to Emirgan Park. It is one of the largest public parks in Istanbul with several tulip gardens. Although tulips are associated with Holland, commercial cultivation of the tulip or lale began in the Ottoman Empire. In the sixteenth century they were taken to Holland, and quickly became widely popular.

HISTORY

İstanbul University Opens Its Doors
Following the restoration project İstanbul University’s Beyazit Campus opened its doors to visitors who will be able to stroll through and see its historical entrance doors, Beyazit Tower, large sculptures and mansions – starting in May. The University contains the ‘Old Palace’ and old army offices that served the Ottoman Empire. The building first belonged to the Turkish army, which gave it to Istanbul University after the forces were relocated to Ankara. The campus also contains many flora and fauna characteristic of Istanbul. There are rare trees and plants in the garden of the University along with many bird species, including 21 local and 21 migratory birds. The migratory birds, including green parrots, nightingales, flycatchers, starlings and different types of warblers, all choose to stay at Rector’s building. The main campus with its landmark gate used to be the Ottoman War Ministry. Roman and Byzantine ruins are still visible on the grounds.
The University has 17 faculties on five campuses, the main campus being on Beyazit Square in Istanbul. It has a teaching staff of 2,000 professors and associates and 4,000 assistants and other staff. More than 60,000 undergraduate and 8,000 postgraduate students take courses offered by the school every year.

Göbeklitepe Excavation
The latest excavation in Göbeklitepe reveals that its inhabitants 12,000 years ago possessed a significant belief system and a defining culture. According to scholars, the remains show that there is much more to be discovered from those ancient people who engaged in agriculture, processed leather, made sculptures and rock accessories.

Göbekli Tepe is a Neolithic (stone-age) hilltop sanctuary erected atop of a mountain ridge in south-eastern Anatolia, some 15 kilometres northeast of the town of Şanlıurfa. It is the oldest known human-made religious structure. The site has been under excavation since 1994 by German and Turkish archaeologists. The site is vaguely reminiscent of Stonehenge, except that Göbekli Tepe was built much earlier and is made not from roughly hewn blocks but from cleanly carved limestone pillars adorned with animal reliefs – a cavalcade of gazelles, snakes, foxes, scorpions, and ferocious wild boars. The assemblage was built some 11,600 years ago, seven millennia before the Great Pyramid of Giza.

Reconstruction of Atatürk’s Father’s House
Kodzadzik village, Centar Zupa province Macedonia

The Macedonian house of Turkish Republican founder Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s father, Ali Rıza Efendi, will be reconstructed like its original and become a museum (in 2013). The restoration project is being conducted by a collaborative team of Macedonian and Turkish experts. As part of the project, the unique architecture of the Ottoman houses in the region has been examined in detail. Ali Rıza Efendi (1839 -1888) was the father of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the husband of Zübeyde Hanım. He was born in Thessaloniki (Salonica), then in the Ottoman Empire and worked as a customs official. He died in 1888, when his son was seven years old. The house, in which Ali Rıza Efendi was born and grew up, is located in Kodzadzik village in Zupa province. TİKA Skopje coordinator Ebubelir Çelik said a new house would be constructed on the foundation of the Ali Rıza Efendi’s house while a museum would be raised next to it.

Those who happen to be in Macedonia may also want to visit:

Atatürk Museum
75, Apostolou Pavlou St, Thessaloniki, Macedonia, Greece; Daily: 10.00 -17.00; (30) 2310 248452

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of modern Turkey, was born in this house in 1881, spent his childhood and part of his youth there. This historic house, after being restored and arranged as a museum, opened to visitors as ‘Atatürk House’. Dating from before 1870, it has three floors and a courtyard. It was repaired in 1981 and repainted to its original pink. Most of the furniture is authentic. Any missing items were replaced with furniture from Atatürk’s mausoleum and from Topkapi in Istanbul. There are photographs on all the walls of Mustafa Kemal at various periods of his life. This three-storey house is located in the corner of the garden where the Turkish Consulate is also situated, surrounded by a fence wall facing the main boulevard. Entrance is through double doors opening to the boulevard. There are a kitchen, cellar and a maid’s room on the ground floor. The first floor has a large sitting-room, Zübeyde Hanım’s room, and a kitchen. The most impressive room on the second floor is the one in which Kemal was born. It faces
another room, in which some of Kemal’s personal effects from Ankara are displayed. Documents relating to Kemal’s schooldays have been hung on the walls. A pomegranate tree planted by Ali Rıza Efendi still grows in the courtyard.

The art of letter writing among the Ottomans

by Christine Woodhead
Honorary Research Fellow, Department of History, University of Durham

Ottoman letter writing has been little studied beyond the official sphere of sultans’ correspondence. However, Ottoman libraries in Turkey and elsewhere contain a significant number of collections of ‘private’ letters, either as the work of one author or as compilations of letters by different writers. We can therefore deduce that letters by well known, well educated writers enjoyed a certain degree of popularity and that other people had copies of them made, often long after the death of the original writer. Educated Ottomans clearly took letter-writing very seriously, particularly in the 17th and 18th centuries. Despite this, private letter collections have been little studied by modern scholars, partly because as research material they fall between two fields of interest. For the historian they are too literary and contain little factual information; for literary scholars they are a minor prose sub-genre considered difficult due to the deliberately complex inşa prose style in which this type of private correspondence was written. Not being the sort of letter that ordinary people would write, these vignettes of rhyming prose with rhetorical flourishes, striking metaphors, subtle allusions, synonyms, antonyms, long convoluted sentences and snatches of poetry could, perhaps with some justification, be considered ‘flowery letters of compliment’.¹ A typical example is the following, in a letter from Nergisi, kadi of Elbasan in Albania, to his friend and colleague Veysi, kadi of Üsküb, probably written in late 1625.

What I ask most of God, the liberal provider of refuge and safety for all creation, is that the pages in the book of your honour and prosperity be always free from inappropriate flourishes of the letter characters associated with vexation, and that, through the ornament of approved signs of eternal value and respect, these pages may be associated with the golden orange ball of the sun which adorns the title page of the almanac of heaven.


If such letters are regarded as aesthetically contrived to the point of obscurity, or as formulaic and imitative expressions of commonplace greetings and sympathies, it could easily be concluded that the value of such collections for historical and literary research would be disproportionate to the effort involved in studying them. However, different questions must be asked, such as why were these letters were written in the first place, and why people continued to read them decades later. This article considers briefly three aspects of the production of Ottoman literary letters in the early seventeenth century: who the writers were, what kinds of letters they wrote, and why.³ It is part of a larger study about the social and cultural contexts in which literary letters were written, and about what could be learned from such letters about cultural outlook and patronage networks, and about patterns and meanings in friendship. Work on similar literary letters in 12th century and Renaissance Europe, and particularly in the Byzantine Empire, provides valuable comparative models.⁴

Letter writers and their correspondents
The best-known Ottoman letter writers in the 17th century were usually kadıs, generally somewhere in the upper or middle ranks of the judicial profession. They wrote mainly to each other as friends or as subordinates to their professional superiors. They sometimes also wrote to vezirs and other military-administrative officials, though presumably here without expectation of a reply in kind. Such kadıs were highly educated, widely read, readers and writers of Arabic and Persian, as well as of Turkish.⁵

One of the most proficient letter writers was Azmizade Mustafa Efendi (1570-1631), known also under his poet's penname Haleti. Indicative of a web of correspondence throughout the empire, his münşe'at (collection) includes both letters of friendship and letters to superiors as potential or actual patrons.⁶ Some near-contemporaries obviously span both categories. His surviving letters appear to date mainly from his years spent climbing the judicial hierarchy as kadı of Damascus (appointed in 1602), of Cairo (1604), Bursa (1606), Edirne (1611), Damascus again (1611) and Istanbul (1614). Roughly half of the fifty or so letters in this collection are addressed to a senior colleague, with at least two letters to each şeyhülislam of the period and several to his peers in the next rank. Some, especially those to the current şeyhülislam Es'ad Efendi (in office 1615-22), may relate to lengthy periods in waiting before a second appointment to Cairo (1618) or promotion to kazasker of Anatolia in 1623. Having reached the latter rank, and being then relatively settled in the imperial centre, Azmizade would have been more the recipient of other kadıs' courtesies and petitions than writer of his own. This indicates, unsurprisingly, that letter writing to fellow professionals was particularly common in mid-career, especially if this coincided with distant postings which meant leaving Istanbul for long periods of time. Letters were, above all else, and quite obviously, the product of separation (from person and/or place), of distance, and of ‘exile’.

² Transcription by J. R. Walsh, ‘The Esālībü'l-mekātīb (Münşe’āt) of Mehmed Nergısi Efendi’, Archivum Ottomanicum I (1969), 282. All English translations in the present article are my own.
³ Epistolography in the initial sense of official documents and manuals of letter-writing for chancery scribes is not addressed here.
⁵ On a group of six ulema letter writers, see my article ‘Circles of correspondence: Ottoman letter-writing in the early seventeenth century’, Journal of Turkish literature 4 (2007), 53-68.
⁶ Azmizade’s münşe’āt is unpublished. The manuscript used here is Istanbul University Library TY 1526.
Azmizade’s collection contains fourteen letters to vezirs, which represent a rather high proportion of military-administrative recipients (c. 25% in the manuscript currently used). This is a useful reminder of the fact that, at the top of the judicial hierarchy, patronage and useful networks involved the grand vezir in particular, and also his potential successors. However, what münşə‘at collections do not appear to contain are letters to the sultan. Literary gifts to the sultan on the occasion of a bayram, or the birth of a son or the marriage of a daughter were in verse, usually gazels. Why letters were not sent remains to be discovered.

**What kind of letters did they write?**

Ottoman literary letters contain, by and large, the usual social courtesies, though expressed in a particularly formal way. Among the many types of social communication the most common are letters of friendly enquiry (mahabbetname), letters of congratulation on appointment (tehniyet) or of condolence (taziyet) on the death of a near relation, letters of request, petitions (arzuhal) or complaint (şikayet), and ‘letters of exile’.

A fine example of the mahabbetname is Azmizade’s letter from Damascus, c. 1603, to Dukakinzade Osman Efendi in Cairo. Azmizade writes to ask why he has not heard recently from Osman Efendi, and sends his good wishes.

It is a long time since my pen has set down prayers for your health and prosperity, since my hand has knocked at the door of your favour. When you, the wise physician of friendship enquire about your miserable friends, wounded at heart, pray do not overlook the message of this wretched, distant pen and its writer who must live in the infirmary of resignation. When you distribute the reviving drugs of kindness, do not forget this patient.

Letter writers used a wide range of images and motifs. Medical analogies are common, but probably reflect the writer’s state of mind rather than his state of physical health.

Another letter by Azmizade to his colleague Abdülkerim Efendi is one of congratulation on the latter’s appointment as kadı of Yenişehir in 1611, his first judicial post after a teaching career as müderris.

I hear that you have recently been honoured with one of the high positions which are entered in the register of God’s preserved tablet and that you have knelt upon the prayer rug of the holy law. How wonderful is this news, as balm for the soul ...

It is fitting if my heart leaps at this good news
For these tidings bring comfort to my soul
May the testimony to your good fortune be in the honesty of your cheek, may the faces of your deceitful rivals be brought low at the door of disappointment, and may you take pride in the fact that you now lean upon the imperial throne.

The letter is fairly straightforward in style, and includes occasional snatches of verse, a common feature in all literary letters.

Azmizade’s münşə‘at also includes requests for himself and recommendations in various forms for advancement of a protégé. Among the former is a petition for a new appointment addressed to the seyhülislam Es’ad Efendi.

... the wall of grief and despair in the void of my heart, now restored and made firm again, like a hard rock renders the axe of patience and determination into a hundred pieces. The hand of hope is gradually drifting further from the skirt of ambition. ... In the mirror of my imagination I see only the determination to be established in a worthwhile position. [Otherwise] let me be a traveller dwelling in the hospice of sadness in the desert of disappointment, spending the rest of my uncertain existence wandering aimlessly in expectation of death.

This letter can probably be dated to around 1617 or 1618, but in general dating letters in a collection is problematic. Unlike the letters and documents contained in manuals of
correspondence, with their careful instructions on correct forms of address, salutation and farewell, many letters in private collections preserve only the body of the text without extended titles or formalities such as dates. The ordering of items often suggests that they are not necessarily presented in chronological order. What remain are short pieces of fine writing largely shorn of their context. It is clear that, for contemporaries, their primary value lay in the literary style for which they were selected.

Letters to friends often tend towards melancholy, dwell upon feelings of loneliness and regret at separation from the correspondent’s reassuring company. In this sense, they can be considered ‘letters of exile’. Nergisi wrote to Veysi about his pleasure at meeting the latter as he passed through Üsküb on the way to his distant Albanian posting in Elbasan.

Meeting with you was like being in paradise. ... I picture to myself those wonderful days, which to men of true belief, especially those whose hearts and minds have little power or strength, were equal to thousand upon thousand feasts of sacrifice or new year celebrations; to truly discerning friends, men of taste and discernment, each hour of those days was better even than the perfection of the Night of Power.

... God knows how for men throughout the world remembrance of a passing encounter with noble company is a source of pleasure and delight.

In contrast to Azmizade, who was born into a well-placed Istanbul family and had good connections among the senior ulema, Nergisi, the son of a kadı from Sarajevo, had a much less successful judicial career. Azmizade served in the major cities of the empire, reached the second highest position in the ulema hierarchy and had he lived longer, was in line for promotion to şeyhülislam. Nergisi’s career was spent in middle-ranking Balkan kadılıks. His protestations of loneliness and lack of recognition certainly seem more genuine. On the other hand, being impoverished, and in a kind of exile, was a common theme in literary letters in other cultures and must be understood in that context.

**Reasons for writing**

Simply keeping in touch was of fundamental importance. Writing to a friend served to remind the recipient of your existence and to show that you had not forgotten his. Many letters either begin or end with apologies for not having written sooner. Equally, letters of condolence or congratulation must have been the kind of courtesy which you could not afford to neglect if you wished to cultivate a potential patron, particularly if he had just become şeyhülislam. Among Azmizade’s letters to the grand vezir Nasuh Paşa is one congratulating the latter on his appointment to that office, and another on his marriage to a daughter of Ahmed I.

Looking at a greater range of such letters will surely uncover much about both professional networks and personal relationships. Who knew whom, and how well? Were there reasonably well defined ‘circles’, either professional or cultural or household-linked? How did these ‘circles’ define and present themselves?

Although it is impossible to tell how often men wrote to each other, it does appear that letters were eagerly anticipated, certainly by those who, like Nergisi in the following letter to Veysi, felt themselves isolated and bereft of cultured company.

Each morning at daybreak, the fast-running eye darts quickly from side to side, hoping to catch sight of those things it desires, scanning intently the four points of the compass. Oh when will the much longed-for bright sunrise appear? To all sides I send scouts to [meet] those caravans of travellers who arrive on the morning breeze and bring comfort to the weak and lonely, but especially to those groups blown down the main highway from Üsküb, that joyous place. Remembering in what time of cheer was [news of] Joseph, much desired, flower-bedecked, brought by a fair breeze to the loving mind of the heart-stricken Jacob, I remain in turmoil between fear and anticipation.
The creative artistry involved in writing such literary letters may make them difficult for modern readers to appreciate, but was clearly a significant reason for their production, as shown by the images presented in another letter by Nergisi to Veysi.

In order to describe in detail the many degrees of pleasure which have affected my oppressed heart as a result of this fine gift, the broker of imagination was sent into the market of a mind already ransacked, and ran hither and thither in the storehouse of my thoughts. However, he/I did not succeed in finding beautiful, lustrous gems full of meaning which would be worthy of being offered on this small letter-plate to the master of the age and his assembled company. In the end, I was reduced to the inadequate practice of threading onto the knotted string of the written word these insignificant, worthless little black beads.

Reference to composition as a process of stringing fine jewels onto a necklace or other rich ornament is a very frequent image. Because of the level of artistry aimed for, most writers also confess themselves inadequate to the task: striving for effect is usually accompanied by apologies for falling short in the achievement. Nergisi’s letter to Veysi above continues:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The steed of my thoughts is kept on a tight rein} \\
\text{For he is still learning how to walk gracefully} \\
\text{If my style lacks finesse, don’t find fault} \\
\text{It is a first impulse of nature and is still immature.}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, two further aspects of letters as works of literary art should be noted. The first is that writers of literary letters enjoyed writing in this style, particularly to like-minded correspondents who would appreciate the images and use of language, and would reply in kind. Nergisi writes to Veysi that his letter produces ‘the kind of joy and delightful state of excitement felt in the heart of a child when he first sees and experiences something special’. The second aspect is that letters as works of literary art were also finely-crafted, handmade, personal gifts between individuals. Veysi’s reply to Nergisi reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{O rose of the gardens of perfection! If out of kindness} \\
\text{You would enquire about the condition of the nightingale of the heart, then ask!} \\
\text{The degree of my affection is such that without you I waste away} \\
\text{Speech is fleeting; all else is word-painting}
\end{align*}
\]

Interview

Arın Bayraktaroğlu

interviews

Gülsün Karamustafa, one of the most prominent artists in modern art in Turkey

Gülsün Karamustafa (b.1946, Istanbul) has had various solo exhibitions in institutions such as Kunsthalle Fridericianum, Kassel (2006), (Galerie Immanence) / Musée d’art Moderne de la Ville de Paris (2005), Museum Villa Stuck (2006), (Salzburger Kunstverein 2008,) (X-hibt) / Academie der Bildenden Künste Wien (2011),and Ifa Gallery Stuttgart / ( Berlin) (2011) and has participated in group shows in Philadelphia Museum of Art (2010), Martin Gropius Bau in Berlin (2009), Walker Art Center in Minneapolis USA (2004), Moderna Museet in Stockholm, Platform Garanti in Istanbul
(2003), and Istanbul Modern. She has been a part of Istanbul Biennial, Singapore Biennial, and Biennials in Sevilla and Gwangju (Artnews.org)

1. Dear Gülsün – Would you please briefly tell us the story of your progress in your profession as an artist? How did you start and where would you place yourself in the world of art today?

Dear Arın, you will no doubt remember, as being one of my secondary school friends, that during my childhood years I was fascinated with drawing and painting. In Ankara in those days I was producing paintings and having solo exhibitions whenever I had the chance. I must say, my parents had been extremely supportive of this but all that I did in this period was plainly amateurish. Things became more serious when I passed the entrance examination for the State Academy of Art in Istanbul and started attending a course in the Painting and Drawing Department. When I graduated from the Academy I knew that nothing in the world, except for art, would make me happy and this was the path I chose for myself. While I was still a student at the Academy, I became aware that art had a power to renew things, filling one with energy to move forward. I knew there and then that my life as an artist would progress in this way. I have always kept away from approaches which might have hindered my progress or driven me to repetition. This is the way I have always bravely tried to produce my work.

2. How did you reach your audience? What factors have been at the back of your mind in choosing the location and contents of your exhibitions?

My first solo exhibition as a professional artist was the one I launched in 1978 when I displayed my paintings, but these were liberated from the traditional boundaries of the ‘peinture’. At the time this was a novelty which people found hard to accept, as I was telling a social story in almost all these paintings. However, the same approach also brought attention to my work and most of the exhibited work was given a place in the collections. In the years to follow I was again courageous to try something completely new by going outside the medium of painting, and I exhibited my first installations. I think this might have been far too progressive in Turkey of the 1980s when the country was still introverted and had no interest especially in international art. Even those who spoke highly of my earlier paintings were alienated and thought that I committed a betrayal: they were expecting me to be consistent in painting and I was not. Regardless of the criticism, I was plodding on, producing work simultaneously with the rest of the world in full awareness of what was happening outside Turkey. So my art was not properly understood and appreciated until the paradigms shifted as a result of the radical changes in the 1990s with the Berlin wall disappearing, the Soviet system collapsing, and topics about ‘centre’ and ‘periphery’ in art being discussed. The first few years of the 1990s were the times when I juxtaposed myself with the international world of art and produced work with great enthusiasm and continuity.

Men Crying
13 Jan-26 March 2005 Paris, Galerie Immanence / Musée d’art moderne de la Ville de Paris
3. **What kind of a procedure do you go through in your creations? Do you produce your work consecutively or intermittently, allowing an idea or inspiration to develop between them? Where and under what conditions do you work?**

As mentioned earlier, since the beginning of the 1990s I have been working and producing my work at an international level, venturing into areas well beyond the frontiers of Turkey and living in different countries. During this period I have taken part in between fifteen and twenty group exhibits and Biennials or staged solo exhibitions every year. Sometimes I stay in a certain country for several months, living in a residence designated for artists, producing work as well as doing workshops for, and giving seminars at, art schools. Although my permanent home is in Istanbul, I cannot live in one place for any length of time. In some of the countries where I stay I am given a studio where I work and produce, but I must say that these creations are not specific to a certain place – they are developed in my mind wherever I am. This is one of the questions commonly asked of people in contemporary art. “Where and when do you create?” Well, I create at all times and everywhere, maybe in an aeroplane, on a train, in continuously changing hotel rooms, and so on. These are the places where ideas are developed but when it comes to production, of course one needs a place to put these ideas into action, and this requires time and a serious production team.

4. **What ideas have you formed for your future productions? Where are you planning to exhibit next?**

I have now reached almost the end of a very busy year of production. 2011 started for me with a solo exhibition in Vienna, spreading over a very large venue. Then came the Stuttgart exhibition, which was also newly developed. The Stuttgart display was repeated in Berlin after a period of three months. At the moment I have two works on display in the Istanbul Biennial exhibitions. One of these is again a new production in the form of a video film of 10 minutes. I also have work in the group exhibition at Istanbul Modern, but this latter is not new. Before the year is out one of my installations will be displayed at a newly opened art gallery in New York. The coming year will be similarly busy. I will be taking part in a travelling exhibition organised by the British Council, covering the Banaki Museum in Athens, the Sabanci Museum in Istanbul and Jerusalem Contemporary Art Museum. There are also other exhibitions and one Biennial in the pipeline.

5. **In your opinion, where does Turkey stand in terms of global standards in art? Do Turkish artists follow behind, progress simultaneously or are there any areas where they outshine others? Can you explain with examples?**
Art in Turkey is presently drawing a lot of attention. Of course this is partly due to the contacts my generation of artists started in the 1990s and have firmly kept in place, but we cannot dismiss the role played in this popularity by the new generation of artists who followed us and have become the focus with their interesting works of art. Turkish art has been on the agenda of the arts world since the Istanbul Biennials started in 1987. With every new event Turkey has strengthened her place and name and these Biennials are now among the most talked-about events in the arts world, after the Venice and Sao Paolo Biennials. The 12th Istanbul Biennial which started this September has so far been attended by about 5000 foreigners including media reporters, arts critics, curators, collectors and other enthusiasts, and these are in addition to the domestic ones of similar backgrounds.

6. How well are the arts and artists looked after in Turkey? Is there state protection? Are the artists provided for in their old age? Do they have professional unions or syndicates?

Now, this is a very nice question. Despite all this splendour, how much contribution does the state make to the arts in Turkey? Are the artists organised? How far does the act of solidarity go? Unfortunately we still have not even one modern state museum for contemporary art, similar to those existing in developed countries. The ‘Museum of Paintings and Sculpture’ in Istanbul has been undergoing restoration for more years than one can remember and therefore is not available. This is in contrast to private museums (e.g. Istanbul Modern, Sabancı, Pera, etc.) which have been sponsored by rich families and opening their doors one after the other to arts lovers. The institution which organises and sponsors the Biennials, IKSV, is a foundation. The financial support for the event is provided by the Koç group of companies. Similarly, two very important contemporary arts institutions exist thanks to privately organised support – SALT is backed by a bank and Arter by the Koç Foundation.

Since the beginning of the 1990s the artists in Turkey have attempted to join forces under the umbrella of The International Association of Art (AIAP) started by UNESCO. The Association can apply to the state for social security arrangements for a group of its members who are interested in getting this security. We consider this a blessing, albeit a meagre one.

7. Has there been any effect of religion on the arts in Turkey where the majority follow Islam? Does religion have any restrictions on Turkish art at the present time?

Istanbul, which is at the centre of my work, is an extremely lively place. Three quarters of modern art productions making a global impact come out of this city. Whether this is a healthy situation or not is disputable, but this is a reality. With 15 million inhabitants, it is more populous than all other European cities, or even some European countries. As
someone who knows this city well, I can say that all contrasts go hand in hand here. Different exhibitions display different approaches, sometimes leading to disputes and counter-disputes. In this dynamic city there has never been a time when an artist has had to live under religious restrictions. At least in my circle of artists nobody can complain about the coercion of religion. There are other types of production reflecting other viewpoints, but I do not think their producers are under any pressure either.

8. In an article entitled ‘Turkey’s bold new art scene makes a splash’ in *Time Magazine* (11 June 2011) it is reported that in the ‘Confessions of Dangerous Minds’ Exhibition launched at the Saatchi Gallery last April, half of the work by 19 Turkish artists had been sold even before the exhibition opened its doors to the public. In your opinion what is the reason for Turkish art suddenly becoming popular in Europe? What is the genesis of this popularity?

Works by artists from Turkey are indeed very much in the limelight at the moment. This is not only peculiar to Europe: the same is also true for exhibitions in the United States. Christie’s and Sotheby’s are organising auction sales for Turkish works of art and these items sell well. The stance of the Turkish collectors has also changed. Until now they had been concentrating on the domestic productions but now they are opening up to the world. This is the outcome not only of the effort put in by artists who have been breaking the moulds and going global since the 1990s, but also of the success gained by those individuals who have struggled to keep abreast of the changes in the world.

9. When we talk of contemporary art in the UK, one of the first names that springs to mind is Tracey Emin, whose father is a Cypriot Turk. What is your opinion of her as an artist?

Tracey Emin is an important and a charming representative of modern art. She also has been a regular visitor since the first Biennial she attended in 1990s. She came to Istanbul many times, opened exhibitions here, and has works in some of the museum collections in the city, where she is very much liked. Recently she participated in an art fair and became the focus of the media. I can say that, as a nation, we consider Tracey Emin as one of our own, and appreciate and love her.

Thank you very much Gülsün. I wish you many more years of success and hope that you will put London at the top of your list of venues for future exhibitions.

A.B.

NB: A short video film made by Gülsün Karamustafa was bought by Tate Modern in October 2011 to be added to the museum’s permanent collection.
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From *Middlesbrough to the Yayla*

by Sheniz Tan

Partnership Manager, LionHeart In The Community (LITC) & Founder of Asaf

On every visit to Turkey, I am always surprised how the country, people and culture still have the ability to astonish me by its diversity, traditions and hidden secrets. My first visit in 2001, on a ‘grand tour’ to meet my Turkish family for the first time, remains the most vivid and
astonishing of all. As well as being the first occasion I met my Turkish relatives, it was the first time I experienced an extensive exposure to another country and culture and, although my Turkish father often spoke of this home country and had told me what to expect, my visit was nothing like I had imagined.

Having been brought up in Middlesbrough, where the vast majority of the people are English, many with Irish, Italian, or Pakistani origins, I considered myself to be quite cosmopolitan with my English/Turkish background. However, most people in my home town believed my Turkish father to be Italian rather than Turkish! Furthermore, my mother’s Anglo-Irish background and my father being a non-practicing Muslim led to my siblings and me being raised as Catholics – which only reinforced people’s belief in my father’s Italian blood. My upbringing in Middlesbrough influenced my ideas on Turkey, Turks and Turkish culture. I believed that Turkey was very much like western Mediterranean countries and this was further reinforced by my parents, my English family and even Turkish friends.

My home life was quite provincial; I socialized little outside my own family and never travelled abroad. My ideas of foreign countries primarily came from books, television and stories other people told me. What I heard of Turkey was usually negative. The country was backward, culturally intense, the men were mercurial, flamboyant and Romeo's, the women – the country's mothers – were repressed and uneducated. Turkey's infrastructure and industry were weak and there were no roads, no jobs, and most of the population still lived in rural communities. Such were my limited early impressions.

My father’s stories of his childhood and youth in his yayla (upland summer settlement and/or pasture), village and later in Mersin city in the 1950s and 1960s were both romantic and exotic to me. Tales of orange groves, migrations to the hills, snow picking, working in the fields and goat herding met my young ears. As well as stories about settling in Mersin, my grandfather becoming muhtar (headman) of their village, working in his father's shop, his father's lands and walking three miles a day to his school – all these tales developed a vivid rural image in my mind. The contrast with the highly industrial surroundings of my own home town enthused me to go out there and visit this pastoral land, where my grandfather's vineyards grew the most exotic fruits and, where in the summer it is so hot that the family has to travel up to the hills. My siblings and I begged our father to arrange for us to travel for a visit but he had never completed his military service (which prevented him from returning). This all changed in 1998, when his family convinced him to return to Turkey after more than 30 years in exile. Following this I visited Turkey in 2001 for the first time, and the romantic stories and quixotic ideas changed to overwhelming surprise, discovery and life-long ties. By this time my Turkish family had dispersed throughout the country for economic reasons and so my first visit was also a grand tour around Turkey.

Welcome and First impressions

My first destination was Istanbul, a city that entranced me and continues to surprise me with its secrets to this day. Arriving at Atatürk Airport at 2 o'clock in the morning, the first difference I detected was the heat and, while driving through the city, my surroundings seemed as I imagined how a war-torn east European city would look: decrepit and spartan. The infrastructure was totally different from the smart and organised towns, buildings and roads I grew up with in England. However, Istanbul’s dilapidated ambience only appealed to my exotic outlook.

Upon arriving at my Uncle’s house, the enthusiastic welcome with innumerable kisses, handshakes and hugs accompanied by the repeated greeting ‘Hoş geldiniz’ made me feel awkward. I was overwhelmed, as my English upbringing and even my interactions with my
own Turkish father had not prepared me for this extreme level of contact. Most of my Turkish family spoke English, so my lack of understanding of the language was not a barrier to communication. Their questioning almost became interrogation. Their interest in me and my family, I felt, was rather extreme for 3 o'clock in the morning! We were offered food and coffee and my refusal seemed to disappoint them. It was only later I discovered they had prepared all sorts of sweets for us, thinking we would be hungry after our journey. Throughout my trip, I became familiar with the rules of Turkish hospitality.

**Cultural differences**

My Turkish family seemed inherently different from my English relations and even from my Turkish father. They were very inquisitive about everything; most meals were spent questioning my father, my brother and me. I was quite taken aback by their directness and the number of questions asked of us, which ranged from money and religious belief to my father’s habits – such as his consumption of alcohol. One significant difference I observed early on was that most of the male members of my Turkish family spent their time sitting together, while the females were quite often alone in the kitchen cooking and taking orders from their family. This was very different from my own home, where my father did most of the cooking and was generally quite helpful around the house. This particular uncle I was staying with had become a legend amongst my English family, as once during a visit to my parents he had spent most of the time sitting cross-legged and ordering my mother to bring him tea (much to her annoyance). I had thought this peculiar to him but, as I travelled around Turkey, I realized it was quite common for Turkish men to be waited on by women who would take on the role of hostess. Being unfamiliar with different cultures, this behaviour rather annoyed me and, as a result I offered to help my female relatives. However, all attempts to do so were rejected and my surprised cousins would beg me to return to the living room. I was only to learn later that Turkish hospitality is sacrosanct with the roles of host and guest clearly defined.

**Religious differences**

Although I had read up a great deal on Turkish culture before my trip, it didn’t really prepare me for my long tour or for future visits. I was surprised how much Islam played an active role in my family’s daily life. As well as the five daily prayers, many ordinary daily tasks were influenced by Islam. For example, I was surprised to learn that the way they prepared, cooked and ate food was influenced by religious practice. This was not an unusual concept to me, being a Catholic, e.g. not eating meat on a Friday. However, I had not realized that Muslims only ate with their right hands, considering their left hand unclean. My own Turkish family went a step further: as strict Muslims and followers of Said Nursi, they made every effort to use only their right hand even when preparing food. And when they washed food, they ensured it was washed three times. Islam even influenced the way my relatives entered and exited their homes: for example after taking his shoes off my uncle always stepped in with his right foot first, especially when he visited friends as they would be insulted if he did not. These customs amazed me while also making me feel as if they only added to life’s complications.

The differences in Turkish fashion also fascinated me - in particular women’s fashion. My aunts’ and uncles’ wives and daughters all dressed in the manner that is referred to as a ‘closed face’, i.e. they wear a Muslim headscarf. At first they all seemed quite relaxed about
how they covered their faces and, inside the house and garden, wore their scarves more like bandannas than religious head-covering and didn’t bother covering their arms in private at all – wearing T-shirts etc. However, whenever they went outside, they changed into long flowing skirts, woollen long-sleeved tops and black ankle-length coats. Their headscarves were wrapped tightly around their faces, also covering their necks and brows. When I first saw these outfits, I ignorantly thought they would look foolish wearing so much clothing in such hot weather, particularly as their outer garments were a heat-absorbing black. It was only when we went into the city that I discovered their fashion was not unusual. It was the norm.

As I spent more time in Turkey, I realized that some Turks took their covering quite seriously, ensuring their heads were covered, especially in the presence of men, as well as their arms, necks and legs. Although one close friend of my family never donned the hijab, she wore her veil so tightly that it covered all of her face, except for her eyes which were shielded by a large pair of Dior sun-glasses. When my father’s brother married, he was very insistent that his new wife should wear the hijab or the çarşaf, but she refused to do so. All of my Turkish family lived in apartments with one informal sitting room and another more luxurious which they barely used. I always believed this formal room was for guests but, after spending quite a lot of time with them, I realized it was rather to ensure segregation of men and women. I often watched in amusement as the women quickly threw their veils back on with the arrival of a male guest and their attempts to open the door and provide him with coffee and sweets without being seen, while the men continued to chat while ensuring they avert their eyes from their hosts’ wife and daughters. During one such evening, it became so difficult for the women to behave conventionally that I started opening the front door to guests and distributed beverages. As a non-Muslim, I did not fall under the rules and could move freely amongst both parties without the male guests feeling embarrassed to see me. As well as segregation, other Islamic and old traditional customs were very popular with my Turkish family. For example, although they used modern medical services, they also freely incorporated Islamic and village traditions to cure ailments, one being hacamat, a technique similar to cupping and bleeding in order to solve a health problem. Hacamat involves a heating of a glass, placing it on the skin and the cutting of the blister. It is used to resolve headaches, muscular pain and general sickness. My Turkish family also actively visit a hoca (religious teacher) who also provides Islamic solutions to health problems. While visiting my aunt in Mersin, I suffered a mild illness. Unbeknown to me, she arranged an appointment for me with her hoca who suggested some prayers written on paper to wear on my clothing until, on discovering I was not a Muslim, he immediately re-considered his solution. He then advised that my health problem was due to the fact that I was cursed and only through submitting to Islam could I be cured. I didn’t make a second appointment.

Cities, villages and yaylas
My father’s brothers and sisters all live in cities: Istanbul, Ankara, Adana, Izmir and Mersin, having given up village and pastoral life in the 1960s. During my first trip, I came to understand what the terms cosmopolitan and metropolis actually mean. At that time I had never visited London and so Turkey’s cities, including Adana and Mersin, seemed grand and intense places. Like most visitors, I particularly enjoyed wandering around Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, if for very varied reasons. Istanbul, with its grandness, historical importance and intense atmosphere, mesmerized me from the very beginning. Ankara’s embrace of modernity, ease of living and an Uncle who was non-religious resulted in an enjoyable time there for me. And Izmir, with its ancient port, tragic past and surrounding areas of beauty, gave me an opportunity to relax and have a holiday rather than constantly meeting family members and answering the endless stream of questions.

My first trip allowed me to meet my father’s siblings and their families, observe their differences and similarities and get to know their way of life in Turkey. However, it was not until three years later that I learned more about my further extended family, who had chosen not to move to cities but to remain in their villages and pastoral settlements. Born into a traditional Yörük tribe (the Bahşiş) my father’s early beginnings were in a pastoral
settlement, living in black çadır (tents) and then in a village: Hebeli Köy. I had visited Hebeli Köy during my grand tour in 2001, welcomed as if I had always lived there by permanently settled Bahşiş residents, visiting their homes and my grandfather’s derelict house long since destroyed by an earthquake. However, my visit to the Balkar Dağları to research Yörük clans (aşiret) – in particular the Bahşiş – was the first time I ever visited a yayla and experienced life in a Turkish tribal community. The introductions and welcomes were far more formal on the yayla, with the obabey (tribal head/leader) and his family initially suspicious of our arrival. Instead of a smart apartment or a small village house, the Yörük lived in stone surrounded çadır with plastic and slowly rotting old black goat hair tents covering the outer frames. Like my uncles’ and aunts’ households, the men and women were segregated, with only me, as a foreigner and non-Muslim, welcomed into the male tent for a meal. Segregation continued to surprise me, even though by this time I had studied Islam for two years at the Institute for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies. However, when my father and I were in the presence of women, their attempts to ensure they were fully covered was not as noticeable on the yayla and they wore their headscarves in a relaxed fashion with many wearing short-sleeved T-shirts, something my female cousins would never do in front of my father in the cities. In fact, my Yörük relatives were more relaxed when it came to Islamic custom generally compared with my more ‘modern’ and sedentarised kinsfolk in Istanbul, Adana and Mersin.

Consequence

My first trip to Turkey had a considerable influence on my life, encouraged me to read Middle Eastern Studies and inspired me to make every effort to learn more about Turkey, Turks and their history. I gravitated towards my Turkish family, learning about their ways and engaging with the different elements of Turkish society. The feelings experienced on my first visit of constant surprise, confusion, and being an outsider eventually dissolved as I grew more accustomed to Turkish society. In fact through regular visits, travelling around the country and picking up the language, I now feel more comfortable in Turkey than in the UK. However, Turks, Turkish culture and religion still have the capacity to surprise and I remain eager to understand everything about the country. However, I now recognize this passionate inquisitiveness is actually connected to my recognition of kinship with Turkey, Turks and Turkish culture, rather than an orientalist’s addiction. And although Turkey was the first foreign country in which I travelled extensively, it is only these family links that have kept my intense interest alive, as a connection less established would have burnt out a long time ago.

Where does Turkey stand?
Explorations in German Foreign Cultural and Educational Policy

by Sabine Hagemann-Ünlüsoy
formerly at the Goethe-Institutes in Istanbul and Ankara

This report about intercultural projects in Ankara is not a reflection of German-Turkish cultural co-operation in all its aspects. Therefore the normal everyday cultural exchange – the hallmark of any cultural institution – like information about exhibitions, film evenings, language courses etc does not form part of this article. This is about projects that are controversial and demonstrate in a socio-cultural context where German-European-Turkish points of contact coincide or differ. This direct approach enables, as it were, an insight into the inner being of Turkey, which is only possible if such projects are carried out on an equal
basis. Even in times of globalisation foreign cultural and educational policy may turn out to be a challenge that can open doors but also shut them.

The author expresses her thanks to all Ankara artists and academics for their positive engagement on this intercultural co-operation project with the Goethe- Institute. These projects do not come into being by someone sitting at a desk and pondering or by the work of a single cultural institution but by organising in partnership German-Turkish events that are genuinely relevant to both sides. Cultural meetings of this kind are an assured way to develop close links. Because of this valuable aspect of German foreign cultural and educational policy a good number of cultural institutions have been founded in other countries.

Turkish ambivalence towards the West

With the country being situated at the cross-roads between Europe and the Middle East, is Turkey’s pro-Europe inclination still in force or is there deep down already an anti-European mentality, even pre-empted by cultural considerations? A co-operational seminar, organised by a university in Ankara, a youth foundation in Istanbul and the German Cultural Institute entitled ‘Europa im Verfassungsstreit’ (Europe caught in constitutional argument) for postgraduate students of political science can perhaps throw some light on the answer to this question: The assessment at the end of the two-day conference started with the outcry of a PhD student from Ankara: “Where is the German Ambassador? I would like to ask him, why he demanded in his opening speech: ‘I hope that you will say one day: Ne Mutlu Avrupalıyım Diyene.’ I am a Turk and proud of my country. I won’t let anybody take away my Turkishness!” This resulted in general approval especially from the Ankara student elite. But then a PhD student from Izmir stated that she would be able to combine being a Turk and be of service to her country with being a European. She foresaw no problem there; Europe would just be an addition and surely the ambassador hadn’t demanded any abandonment of Turkishness. Although the tension calmed somewhat nobody actually publicly agreed with her statement. These statements have to be taken very seriously as they come from the future power elite in the shape of these seminar members. They are politically engaged postgraduate students from various Turkish universities, specially selected and head-hunted. These negative emotions about the mutual exclusion of Turkishness and Europeanness came as a surprise but were evidence of deep-rooted anxieties, possibly a little exaggerated but to be taken into account. This happened in 2007 and not here and now as a consequence of wide spread scepticism in Turkey about Europe.

There is a deeply rooted fear of a loss of Turkish values through Westernisation, even among young students. The historic origins for this are in the fight against colonisation after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the hands of European Powers. Even Atatürk felt certain ambivalent feelings towards ‘The West’. He built the Republic of Turkey with a Western orientation but at the same time he instilled a strong Turkish nationalism. The Turkish specialist Prof Kreiser entitled one of his articles characteristically: ‘Atatürks Reisen nach Europa. Was er dort sah, begeisterte ihn wenig’ (Atatürk’s travels to Europe: he was not keen about what he saw there).

Turkey is above all introspective

Ever since Atatürk’s reforms the concept of culture has a political but even more an educational agenda: culture is not so much a mirror of reality but rather a ‘moral institution’. This attitude has an effect particularly on the theatre but also on Turkish film and excludes to a large extent documentary theatre performances and youth theatre and documentary films are right at the bottom of the list. In a project discussion, a woman painter commented: “We Turks are like the Chinese, we are always inward looking”. This clearly identifiable attitude –
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7 Atatürk’s original quote: Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyene – ‘How lucky is the one who can say: I am a Turk’. The Ambassador altered this to ‘European’.
rather kept secret in the otherwise so open-minded Istanbul – is very noticeable in Ankara. It is at the root of the refusal of the national Television Company TRT to accept any offers of collaboration with the international Input-Conference towards quality TV. Turkish TV doesn’t want to be subjected to quality criteria of outsiders. Among other things criticism of the Nobel Prize conferral on Orhan Pamuk originates from this attitude. Implicitly – and occasionally explicitly – it is felt and expressed in words that Turkey should have been able to choose their own Turkish award winner and not live with a ‘wrong decision’ by the Nobel Prize committee. Apart from fear of Western dominance there is an uncomfortable feeling of not being understood, not being respected by the rest of the world. Since Orhan Pamuk faced court procedures as traitor and denigrator of his own country, conspiracy theories infiltrated ministerial circles. “Orhan Pamuk received the Nobel Price merely because he belittled Turkey in front of the whole world”, explained the Turkish Minister of Justice on national television.

**International cultural co-operation as nationalistic provocation**

It certainly was an obvious challenge in this heightened atmosphere to organise a literary project entitled, ‘The reception of Orhan Pamuk in Germany’ and to have on the panel two Turkish literary scholars, the German translator of Pamuk’s work and the German OP-publisher. The panel traced the young author’s career via Paris and the Prix Goncourt to the translators’ competition run by the German Business Arts & Culture Foundation and ultimately to being under the auspices of Hanser Publishers in Munich. There were representatives of the Ministry of Culture in the audience who made comments behind the scenes as well as pc OP-books objectors and students of the 13 universities in Ankara who denied any quality whatsoever in Pamuk’s writing. This was a forum where the typically oriental or indeed also Turkish ‘harmony’ went by the board and was replaced by public, controversial and fierce arguments.

How very different attitudes are in Central Europe and in the Republic of Turkey became clear again and again in the series of lectures initiated by Unesco Chair Professor of the Philosophy of Human Rights, Ioanna Kucuradi, entitled, ‘Freedom of Thought – what does it actually mean?’ During this lecture series which lasted for several months the meeting between the two Vice-Presidents of the Constitutional Courts in Ankara and Karlsruhe was particularly revealing. A murmur went through the ranks consisting largely of experts when the German team discussed the then topical Mohammed caricatures from a legal perspective and agreed that the quote: “Soldiers are murderers” is covered by the ‘Freedom of Opinion’. This stance – so very unthinkable in Turkish public life – was openly aired in this forum against all existing taboos. This was the big moment of alternative thinking.

**Inward Thinking: Self-Perception**

A basic principle in the Turkish constitution and legacy from the French revolution, ‘laicism’ is controversial in Turkey as far as its interpretation is concerned. On the whole modern intellectuals and artists see themselves as convinced laicists and thus determine the public discourse in Turkey. Whether current Turkish art is moulded by Islam is not part of this discussion. But it became an important matter for artist and art-historian Prof Jale Ersen whose weekend seminar on ‘Islamic aestheticism and modern Turkish ar t’ brought together German scholars of Islam and Turkish artists. The introductory scholarly seminar paper about aspects of Islamic aestheticism demonstrated and interpreted great international Islamic works of art, a huge challenge for the self-questioning Turkish artists faced with it.

**Turkish Migrants’ Art**

Turkish artists abroad – film producers, choreographers, painters, graphic artists, and others – from Europe and particularly from Germany (and still very much aware of their Turkish roots) are able to demonstrate possible varieties of transformations which rejuvenate any latent potential in Turkish culture. Examples are: whirling dervishes as a central part of a performance, by a young female Turkish-German dancer – in other words a woman, films by
Fatih Akin with her outcry against fossilised family attitudes, poetry and prose texts about life in Germany, or an impressive documentary film about the escape from Turkey from a forced marriage and the return of the lost daughter who finds a new relationship to her father. These are just a few expression of a new creativity based on Turkish culture.

**Civil Society mobilises**
The Turkish women's movement is strong and much is demanded from it. The aid of the international women's movement enables Turkish women to stand up for themselves and to gain higher esteem. For this, use is made of art and culture projects – often with women migrants included, networking with migrant women and appearances side by side in the media. One very successful example of a project for this co-operation is the use of the aforementioned documentary film against forced marriages shown in East and South Anatolia, accompanied by a Turkish psychologist from Ankara. This project was designed and carried out by the NGO in Ankara. The pictures of the film ‘Der fliegende Besen’ (The Flying Broomstick) and the resulting discussion made people aware of the importance of love and care even at the expense of what is traditionally known as ‘honour’.

**At an eye level with children**
Outside school and home, culture projects for children and youngsters can lead to moving experiences, free from angst and taboos. The following two projects show how this group can get enthusiastic about unfamiliar art. The contents of the first project (targeting year six schoolchildren) was an introduction to semi-abstract photographic images from the Germany of the 1950s. In preparation the youngsters had to create abstract portraits of a group of friends by taking portrait pictures with a Polaroid camera. They then cut these up and made up new groupings and supplied explanations with them. After that they saw the actual exhibition. It was interesting to see how a small group formed that took its time and kept stopping to analyse the photos and take an interest in smaller details. This way these 12-13 years old developed an eye for the unusual of this particular art and thus a basis for art appreciation.

Another example: children aged 7-8 were on a visit to the Barlach exhibition in the museum of Anatolian culture. They left the school bus noisy and scrapping, typical of any group of school children in the world. After being asked to choose their favourite sculpture and to try to imitate the sculpture’s posture they became ever quieter. The children started to focus, became thoughtful, exchanged ideas quietly, and gave each other advice also at a choreographic level concerning the correct posture. These children from largely well-to-do backgrounds, attending private schools showed a capacity to understand these fairly ‘deprived’ Barlach figures and they wrote about this in a letter to the sculpture of their choice. Many of them enthusiastically thanked the artist himself too. So there was a respectful silence in the face of great art. Thus a young generation found a way to love and appreciate art via an intercultural project in a learning and experience curve.

**Turkey is Europe (too)**
International cultural co-operation is in the interest of Turkey as well as of Europe. It is not just an add-on to Turkey's path to Europe, because Turkey has belonged to Europe for a very long time. Experts know something that is largely unknown to the European as well as the Turkish public, namely that the Turkish capital was built by European architects; Ankara’s universities had an input by European scientists; and the theatre and the music scene have European roots. Atatürk expert Prof Suna Aksin explained in his lecture on the occasion of Atatürk’s Memorial Day in 2011 that the aim of the kemalist revolution had been...
enlightenment, for Turkey to become a European country. However a lot of this has been lost since then.

What the level of Turkey's Europeanness is in comparison with her 'otherness' is an experience – for the path in the future – that has to be shared not only by Turkey herself but also by Europe. In conclusion there is the hope that European cultural institutions from France, Germany, Spain, the UK and elsewhere will find their counterparts in Turkish cultural institutions, where Turkey culturally can turn to Europe and at the same time can explain herself.

Translated from the German
by Sigrid Martin-Wünscher

POSTCARDS FROM ISTANBUL
by Jill Sindall,
Ottoman Historian

I first visited Istanbul in 1994. Having studied aspects of the late Byzantine and Ottoman Empires, I was overwhelmed by the experience of seeing the city upon which both were founded. Added to the excitement of visiting the places which had stirred my imagination were the delights of jumping on and off ferries which zigzagged up and down the Bosphorus and stopping off at small restaurants to eat delicious and cheap fish meals; exploring menacing back streets lined by dilapidated houses and shops; visiting ancient mosques with their slightly creepy graveyards. Istanbul was magical and I was entranced. However, I was not prepared for the pollution deposited by the smoke spewed out by ferries and domestic heaters; the stink of the sewer-like Golden Horn; nor the rather ground-down and shabby appearance of Istanbul's inhabitants, often looking at us askance with a resentment we could not fathom.

A couple of years later, on a fleeting visit, I found myself in Istanbul on a miserable, wet winter day. I was researching relations between the Church of England and the Greek Patriarch at the turn of the 19th century and was keen to see what has been the seat of the Greek Orthodox patriarch since the 17th century. I found the place with great difficulty, walking through the poor and dismal area of Fener (traditionally the Greek area of Istanbul). When I saw the complex (we walked downhill to it so saw it from above), I was shocked and saddened. The surrounding walls were topped with barbed wire, and the overall impression was one of crumbling neglect, as if those who administered it had given up through lack of funds or loss of hope, or both. We went inside the richly ornate church, passing through an area of collapsing outer buildings and general detritus. I felt I had witnessed something that was slowly but irredeemably dying while trying to keep the world at bay. I sensed that we were the only visitors for a long time.

In 2010 I revisited all the old sights and haunts, staggered by the flood of tourists. At St Saviour at Chora, for example, the numbers were such that the whole place had become organized like military barracks, with computerised ticket machines (which did not work),
guide ropes, and uniformed security guards. By contrast on my first visit to this legacy of the Byzantine philosopher, Theodore Metochites, with its superb frescoes and mosaics, we had been the only tourists so could absorb the atmosphere in blissful silence. I was also amazed at how much more prosperous the citizens and their city appeared. Gone was the smog, gone was the dirt, not a trace of litter to be seen, renovation work on old buildings was vigorously under way, and – above all – gone was the stench from the Golden Horn so that one could eat a delicious freshly grilled fish sandwich by the Galata Bridge with relish. Walking along İstiklal Caddesi in Pera, the locals smiled, looked so much healthier, were dressed in good quality clothing and their faces were friendly and open to foreigners.

The greatest shock of all was the Greek Patriarchate. The surrounding area is still poor, and now houses immigrants rather than old Greek families. But the compound itself was transformed. The barbed wire had been removed and the walls had been repaired; the decrepit outbuildings had been rebuilt and the paving under foot was well-laid; and two or three tourist coaches were parked in a smart parking area outside. Everything was polished, well-cared for and the general atmosphere was one of cheerful wellbeing. Who paid for this transformation, I wondered. Inside the church there were many visitors. I could not make out if they were East European or Greek, but they were reverently deferential and not merely there on a cultural visit to see the icons.

I was so thrilled to feel this upsurge in Istanbul’s fortunes. The downside for tourists is that the phenomenal improvement in the transport system has resulted in the demise of the little ferries which plied their way up and down the Bosphorus. One now has to take an organised tourist boat which sails to the most northerly point of interest, the Anadolu Kavagi (14C Byzantine Fortress) and back, with no other stops. One now has to take a tourist’s route. I sailed up, but returned on the bus. This was quite an adventure, and one of the bonuses was that the route took me through the new business suburb of Maslak, the existence of which I had been unaware. It was like suddenly being catapulted into a futuristic city on another planet: from the world of old yalıs (traditional wooden houses), 19th century palaces and small fishing villages to a world of 21st century architecture, whose towering buildings reflected a bold, confident, modern and innovative Turkey.

On this visit to Istanbul, I really struck gold. Somehow I found myself on Soğukçesme Sokaği, between Ayasofya and the gardens of Topkapı. This is the most charming tree-lined street, with old wooden houses which have been beautifully renovated, some to provide ‘boutique’ hotels. But best of all was the discovery of the Istanbul Library, housed in one of these lovely old buildings. I entered tentatively, to find myself in tastefully decorated surroundings, more like a home than a library. My lack of Turkish was infuriating, as the librarian spoke neither English nor French. But a charming Turkish man, reading at a desk, came to my rescue. He had studied engineering in England and married an Englishwoman, so spoke fluent English. The library was the brainchild of Çelik Gülersoy. His objective was to collect as many books, engravings, sketches and photographs of Istanbul in as many languages as possible and then to have them translated into Turkish to make them available to the wider Turkish public. The founder donated his own collection which comprised books published over the last 400 years. The librarian was extremely helpful, and emailed me the library’s catalogue. Donations of relevant books or money are very welcome.

On a visit to Istanbul in March 2010, a friend and I decided to explore the neighbourhood described by Orhan Pamuk in his semi-autobiographical novel, Museum of Innocence. Indeed, the house purchased by the author to house mementoes of his childhood was supposed to be open as part of the city’s role as European Cultural Capital in that year. But, as so often happens with such events, the Museum was not quite ready.

We walked away from Çukurcuma (now Istanbul’s answer to the Portobello Road), drifting towards Taksim Square, and reminiscing details of Pamuk’s extraordinary book. Then, in Akarsu Caddesi (number 30 to be exact), we noticed a sign which read ‘Orhan Kemal Müzesi’ displayed outside an old apartment block. On the ground floor was a bookshop, and
when we entered we found that it was entirely devoted to the works of this author. We were intrigued, but frustrated by our inability to communicate with the shop assistant. She was a charming woman who was in turn excited at our interest. Using universally recognisable hand signals which bad us to stay exactly where we were, she made a telephone call. After no more than three minutes, a tall man with a most benign smile, accompanied by a much younger woman, shyly approached us and shook our hands. The young woman spoke perfect English, and acted as interpreter. (It transpired that she was a neighbour who works from home and had been prevailed upon to help out.) She explained that this tall man was the son of Orhan Kemal and the curator of his father’s museum. We could not believe our luck when Mr Öğütçü (Kemal’s real surname) invited us to have a personal guided tour.

The Museum had been the family apartment, and it has been left exactly as it was on Kemal’s death: his writing desk, his chair, his bed – everything in place. The atmosphere was simple and almost Spartan. Only the many framed photographs and letters on the walls told the story of his political and intellectual activities and his extraordinary circle of acquaintances. Mr Öğütçü recounted the background to many of the photographs, and his young neighbour translated newspaper articles and letters. When we left and I bought the two works translated into English, I noticed that one (In Jail with Nazim Hikmet) had been translated by Dr Bengisu Rona, lecturer in Turkish literature at SOAS. When I told Mr Öğütçü that SOAS was my alma mater, and that I had met Dr Rona, he was beside himself with pleasure. I do recommend a visit to this fascinating museum which vividly recounts the turbulent life of one of Turkey’s greatest modern authors. Details are available on http://www.orhankemal.org

On my most recent visit to Istanbul in November 2011 I visited the newly renovated Pera Palace Hotel. I had first set foot in the place about 15 years ago, when it was rather run down in a sadly genteel sort of way, and set in what had become a rather seedy district. For me the visit was a bit of scene-setting: to picture passengers alighting at the enchanting oriental-style Sirkeci railway station from the Orient Express and either being transported by sedan chair to the hotel, or to the much grander, 19th century European-style Haydarpaşa station for onward travel across Anatolia. I was also keen to see the apartment which Atatürk kept there and which was now maintained intact as a museum. It was rather dusty and stuffed with furniture. Display cases made it even more cramped. However, the cases were treasure troves which housed notebooks containing examples of Atatürk’s work on transliterating Turkish from the Arabic to the Roman script. Like Orhan Kemal’s apartment, one had a real sense of the man in those rooms, and one could imagine him working there on this attempt to ‘purify’ and ‘modernise’ the Turkish language. One could picture him preparing for the speech he made in 1928 in Istanbul, below the Seraglio where his statue now stands, announcing the new alphabet and extolling the virtues of the change to the gathered crowd.

The neighbourhood surrounding the Pera Palace is now gradually being renovated, returning the district to its former elegance. Lovely old fin de siècle houses are being restored and the hotel itself is as grand as it must have been when first built. As I entered the lobby, the manager approached me and, when I explained that I had come to see the outcome of years of restoration work and to have another look at Atatürk’s apartment, he insisted on taking me on a tour of the hotel. He is extremely proud of the building, as well he might be. All the public areas, the lift, the stairs, the brass, the windows have been superbly restored, with consummate attention to detail. There are some changes: the basement has been given over to a spa as a nod to the (rich) modern day traveller’s requirements. However, one can still see the mechanisms for making the wonderful old lift function: this is still used to transport newly arrived guests and their luggage. We noticed some Christofle silver tableware in display cabinets, and the manager explained that, when renovating the hotel, workmen had opened up a false wall behind which were concealed piles of this last word in French table chic. They deduced that a large order had been ordered from Paris, greatly surplus to requirements, and had then languished in a cupboard, been forgotten and
then boarded up. The sedan chair, now put out to grass, still sits in a corner quietly observing the comings and goings of the modern clientele.

As far as I was concerned, the only change for the worse was Atatürk’s apartment. A lot of the original old furniture, ornaments and personal nicknacks which crowded the rooms has been moved out to create a sanitized, elegant, polished space with only one or two mementoes and a poster or two. Gone also are the display cases and their contents, much to my dismay. When I asked the manager about the fate of these items, he was unable to say. He, of course, had never seen them. I wonder if any TASG Review readers know what happened to these notebooks.

I highly recommend a visit to (or a stay in!) this lovely hotel with its exceptional views over the Golden Horn in conjunction with visits to both railway stations. For those who may not have visited the Sirkeci (under restoration in November 2011), there is a small but most interesting room adjacent to one of the platforms which contains fascinating photographs of the construction of the railroad across Europe and other relevant memorabilia. Hydarpasa Station (built as part of the planned cross-Anatolian railway line in 1873) is breathtaking in its cathedral-like proportions, and its overblown sense of self-importance seems to reflect more of Kaiser Wilhelm II’s ambitions than Sultan Abdul Hamid’s resolve to modernise his empire. Sean McKeekin gives an excellent account of the background of the railway in his book *Berlin to Baghdad Express: the Ottoman Empire and Germany’s Bid for World Power 1898-1918*.

On this trip I also visited the Jewish Museum in Karaköy Meydani, formerly the Zulfaris synagogue. It was conceived as a memorial to the peaceful coexistence of Jews and Muslims in Istanbul on the 500th anniversary of the Sephardic Jews’ expulsion from Spain and exhibits old photographs, articles, garments and other fascinating items relating to their life in the Ottoman Empire. As it happened, I encountered two Turkish Sephardic Jews on this trip. Both were very pessimistic about the present ‘Islamist’ government and what the future would hold for religious minorities in Turkey. I hope that when I next visit Turkey their fears will have proved totally unfounded.

**Turkey’s Politics since October 2011:**

**Turkey’s Politics since October 2011:**

**a Survey**

by **Gamon McLellan, SOAS, University of London**

Nine months after increasing its share of the vote for the third time in a parliamentary general election, Turkey’s ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP, or to use the Prime Minister’s preferred acronym, the AK Party) still dominates the Turkish political scene with little serious challenge from the parliamentary opposition. As William Hale wrote in the Autumn 2011 issue of this Review (No.18, p.9), a priority for the party is the preparation of a new constitution, to be drafted by the Parliamentary Commission chaired by the Speaker of
Parliament, Cemil Çiçek. In October, Deputy Prime Minister Bülent Arınç said that the new constitution should put an end to conflicts over Alevi and Sunni, Turks and Kurds.\textsuperscript{8}

Arınç has ruled out, however, Kurdish mother-tongue education in state schools, while the demands of the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) – the principal voice of the Kurdish movement within the Turkish political system – have become more strident, insisting on regional autonomy. The party’s most famous MP, Leyla Zana, went further in an interview in Germany in December when she said “at first we demanded autonomy, but today the Kurds in Turkey believe autonomy is not enough.”\textsuperscript{9} For many ethnic Turks, the failure of the BDP to differentiate itself from the aims of the PKK guerrilla organisation should disqualify it from the political process.

In November, the Prime Minister made a significant gesture by apologising for the brutal suppression of the Dersim rebellion of Alevi tribes in 1937 – not, however, omitting to stress that the Republican People’s Party (CHP) had been in power at the time. Alevi organisations noted that none of their principal demands had as yet been met: an end to compulsory religious classes in schools; the Alevi \textit{cemevleri} to be recognised officially as places of worship and the Madımak hotel in Sivas to become a museum.\textsuperscript{10}

Significant gestures have been made towards the non-Muslim minorities. Following Bülent Arınç’s example last year, Ahmet Davutoğlu visited the Oecumenical Patriarchate on 3rd March. He also met leaders of the Syriac Orthodox and Syriac Catholic Churches, the leadership of the Armenian Patriarchate and the Chief Rabbi. The process of returning non-Muslim minority properties to their original owners is slowly proceeding, although there has been no progress on the re-opening of the Greek Orthodox Theological School on Heybeliada. More positively, the Constitutional Commission has been hearing submissions from the Oecumenical Patriarch and the Head of the Mor Gabriel Monastery Foundation of the Syriac Orthodox Church, the first time such figures have formally addressed members of the Grand National Assembly.

Whether the new constitution when it finally emerges will involve an executive presidency is unclear – but there has been less talk of a presidential system since last year’s election, partly because the parliamentary arithmetic now requires the AKP to seek support from other parties in parliament for the new constitution, but also because the prospect of a strong executive president clearly does not appeal to some of the groups which have hitherto underpinned the party’s political success. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has repeatedly said that the 2011-2015 parliamentary session would be his last: AK Party rules limit the number of times an individual can stand either as a parliamentary candidate for the party or as party leader. It had been assumed therefore that he would seek election as President before the 2015 parliamentary election. A complicating factor, however, has been the Prime Minister’s health: he underwent a bowel operation in November and is understood to have had a follow-up procedure in February. In January, he denied in a television interview that he had cancer, but this did not stop speculation both about his health and about who in the party might succeed him. Ahmet Davutoğlu – in parliament since June – has established a strong profile both internationally and at home, particularly since the Arab Spring. In February, Hüseyin Çelik, Deputy AKP Chairman, indicated that if necessary the party could change its rule restricting how often a person could be a candidate, so as to allow Erdoğan to contest the 2015 election.

Speculation about the political succession intensified further in February, when a special prosecutor summoned Hakan Fidan, the Head of the National Intelligence Agency MİT, to give evidence about contacts his organisation had had with the outlawed Kurdish guerrilla organisation PKK – contacts believed to have been authorised by the Prime Minister. Such

\textsuperscript{8} 32. Gün, 15 October 2011 (Kanal D)
\textsuperscript{10} The hotel was the scene of an arson attack during an Alevi cultural festival in 1993: over 30 people died
a summons by special prosecutors has frequently resulted in the witness being arrested and remanded in custody: the government quickly responded by securing the passage through parliament of a law to exclude MIT from such investigations. The prosecutor’s move against the MIT chief was widely believed to have been inspired by the Fethullah Gülen religious community, thought to have members in the police and amongst the judges and prosecutors appointed since the September 2010 constitutional changes: did it signal a parting of the ways between the Gülen movement and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan? The movement’s support has been a key element underpinning the AKP’s electoral strength, but differences occasionally surface, most notably in 2010, when Fethullah Gülen expressed reservations about the flotilla’s attempt to break the Israeli blockade and deliver aid to Gaza.11

Meanwhile the length of President Gül’s term in office became a pressing issue: he had been elected by Parliament for seven years under the old system in 2007, but the constitutional changes later that year set the presidential term at five years and stipulated that Gül’s successor would be directly elected by the people. In January a law was passed stating that President Gül’s term would last seven years, until 2014. However, the opposition Republican People’s Party (CHP) has announced it will challenge the law in the Constitutional Court. The law will most probably be upheld, but if the challenge is successful, the Turkish electorate will vote for a new President this August. Despite their challenge, the CHP appears to have no idea of who their candidate might be.

The government’s expressed determination to implement its vision for the future direction of Turkish society is undiminished. As Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan told AK Party supporters: “It’s about bringing up a religious youth... We shall nurture a generation that is conservative and democratic, committed to the values and principles of its people and nation, the principles handed down by history.”12 This vision appeared to inform the party’s plans to reform the education system, changing the break-points between the different segments of schooling to enable greater choice at an earlier age: critics are worried that this will facilitate pupils’ moving to Imam and Preachers’ Schools at orta okul level and will make it easier for pupils to leave formal education after only four years, ostensibly to be “educated at home”.

There is widening concern about how this AKP vision is being implemented. The party seems determined to ensure the loyalty of all the key players in the public arena, and to silence or discourage opponents and potential opponents. There has been intense criticism at home and internationally that more than 100 journalists are now held on remand – others have been sacked or have resigned from newspapers which are either pro-Government or which are anxious to avoid further antagonising the ruling party. Significantly, some writers who have hitherto been supportive of the AKP’s struggle to assert civilian control over the armed forces and to combat Turkey’s so-called ‘Deep State’ have become disillusioned. In January, Mehmet Altan parted company from Star Gazetesi,13 complaining that his articles had been spiked when he wrote about alleged corruption cases involving figures close to the AKP and about the December killing in error of 34 young Kurds on the Iraqi frontier by Turkish military planes. In March, he criticised the AKP leadership, pointing out that while the coup leaders of 1980 are being put on trial, the apparatus of state control they bequeathed has been largely retained and deployed by a government that, like the 1980 generals, tolerates no criticism.

---

Increasingly it appeared that the party was intent on revenge against those it sees as its opponents – in particular those in the military. The party has not forgiven General Karadayı, the then Chief of Staff, and his fellow commanders who issued demands to Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan on 28 February 1997, precipitating events which led to the collapse of the Erbakan government and a widespread purge of perceived Islamists, including the imprisonment of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, then Mayor of Istanbul. Nor has the party forgiven other military commanders who challenged civilian governments. A case against Kenan Evren and Tahsin Şahinkaya – the two surviving perpetrators of the coup of 12 September 1980 – has been proceeding since last year. In a press conference on 12 January, Hüseyin Çelik, Deputy AKP Chairman, said:

“All these Pinochets have to be called to account. I don’t want to go into explaining the 12 September picture and so on. 1.65 million people were victims of that affair. I hope the start of these trials will once again shed light on this dark period... This has to be done for 28 February (1997) as well ... a Gestapo period, a time when mental torture was applied... OK, maybe weapons weren't pointed directly at anyone, but the tanks driven through Sincan were in reality driven over the national will. The same goes for the communication of 27 April (2007).”

This last comment refers to the “press release” posted on the Turkish Armed Forces website in 2007 after the first round of voting in parliament for a new President. It expressed the military’s concern at discussions about secularism during the Presidential election and stated that when necessary the armed forces “would express their attitude and actions in a very clear, explicit way.” This was widely interpreted as a threat to intervene in the process of choosing the head of state. On 2 February this year, a special prosecutor started an investigation into this incident. Two weeks earlier, shortly after Çelik’s comments, a formal complaint was made to the Ankara prosecutor about the military commanders’ actions on and after 28 February 1997.

In January, General İlker Başbuğ, Chief of Staff from 2008-2010, was arrested, charged with directing a terrorist organisation and remanded in custody: the prosecutor has demanded a life sentence. The suggestion that the top commander of the armed forces of a Nato country for two years had also been running a terrorist organization would be alarming if it could be taken at face value. Terrorism charges, however, are common in Turkey. Thomas Hammarberg, Commissioner for Human Rights at the Council of Europe, who visited Turkey last October and published his report on 10 January, reiterated concerns at the interpretation and application of the Turkish laws on terrorism and criminal organisations. Journalists, students and many others, including Kurds, have been charged because of non-violent statements supporting issues that apparently overlap with the aims of a terrorist organisation. Hammarberg’s report amounted to a devastating critique of much of the Turkish legal system. He highlighted in particular: excessive length of proceedings with people left in custody for long periods without legal remedies available; prosecutors exercising little restraint in initiating proceedings; excessive resort to remanding in custody – and excessive time on remand, up to 10 years; evidence not disclosed to suspects; use of secret witnesses and practical problems making the defence unable to cross-examine or even to summon witnesses. Hammarberg considered it imperative to tackle the “long-standing systematic shortcomings of the justice system” – shortcomings which had resulted in more than 2,200 judgements against Turkey in the European Court of Human Rights between 1995 and 2010. On 30 January this year, the Justice Minister presented a judicial reform bill to Parliament: Hammarberg cautiously welcomed the bill, but commented that the

---

14 The accusation that the government is seeking revenge has been made by several observers – e.g. Mehmet-Ali Birand, writing in Hürriyet on 31 December 2011
15 Cumhuriyet, 12 January 2012
http://cumhuriyet.com.tr/?hn=307254&kw="B%FCy%FCkan%FDfтан+da+hesap+soyulacak%FDr"  
16 Hammarberg, Thomas, Administration of justice and protection of human rights in Turkey, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 10 January 2012
proposed changes did not go far enough, and in some cases would make matters worse.\textsuperscript{17} The extraordinary complex of cases against those alleged to be involved in conspiracies to overthrow the Government – Ergenekon, Balyoz and others – have continued, and provide some of the most glaring examples of the legal issues highlighted by Hammarberg. So do the KCK cases against over 2,000 alleged PKK supporters. Contrasts have been drawn between the alacrity with which prosecutors were removed from the MİT and Deniz Feneri\textsuperscript{18} cases, while critics of the government such as the investigative journalists Ahmet Şık and Nedim Şener remain in custody. Students involved in demonstrations particularly against the Prime Minister have been beaten by police, arrested and charged with terrorism.

The government also came under fire in the autumn, when it attempted to change the make-up of the Turkish Academy of Sciences. Traditionally this has been an independent body of elected members who elect their own president – the norm in democratic societies. The government decided to triple the number of members, with most of the new members appointed by the Prime Minister or by YÖK, the Supreme Council of Education, and an appointed rather than elected president. Fifty-seven members sent in their resignations; at the time of writing, the Academy's website displayed letters of protest from equivalent bodies around the world.\textsuperscript{19}

The principal opposition Republican People’s Party (CHP), after the abortive boycott of parliamentary proceedings following the June election (see William Hale's survey in this \textit{Review}, 2011, No.17, p.19), has been pre-occupied with internal party struggles, culminating in an extraordinary party congress in early 2012. Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu, the leader, finally succeeded in asserting his authority. In the autumn, he had likened the prison in Silivri - where defendants in the Ergenekon and other cases, including those elected as CHP MPs in June, are being held – to a concentration camp. This prompted a prosecutor to seek to have his parliamentary immunity lifted so as to prosecute him for the remarks. Kılıçdaroğlu responded by inviting his opponents to lift his immunity so that he could face prosecution. More seriously, a prosecutor has demanded a jail sentence of 397 years for the CHP Mayor of İzmir, accused of being the leader of a criminal organisation.\textsuperscript{20}

Developments in the Middle East have reinforced popular approval of Turkey in the region. The Istanbul think-tank TESEV conducted a further survey of public opinion in Iran and the Arab world which confirmed that Turkey remains the most favourably thought-of nation (78\% of respondents), with 77\% rating it as the nation which had contributed most to peace in the region.\textsuperscript{21} This followed a survey in the Arab world a year earlier in which Recep Tayyip Erdoğan had emerged as the Arab world’s most admired world leader. All of this has helped the Prime Minister domestically: the public warms to a leader who ensures Turkey walks tall in the world, and was supportive of his strident defence of the Turkish position in his confrontation with President Sarkôzy over the Armenian bill in the French National Assembly. Erdoğan’s standing remains undiminished in the Arab world, and the government’s ability swiftly to reverse its policy of detente with Syria so as to lead the international calls for Bashar al Assad to go have reinforced his image as a world statesman both in the region and at home. Individual members of the government, along with much of public opinion in Turkey, are clearly appalled at the Syrian regime’s slaughter of its own citizens: Ahmet Davutoğlu has repeatedly drawn parallels with the massacres in Bosnia in the early nineties: though circumstances are clearly different, the connection is significant. Bosnia touched many families in Turkey directly. But while there is mounting public anger in

\textsuperscript{17} Hammarberg, Thomas, \textit{Comments on the Turkish Bill on judicial reform of January 2012}, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 20 February 2012

\textsuperscript{18} The “Lighthouse” case, involving alleged embezzlement of charitable funds by prominent figures close to the AKP leadership
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\textsuperscript{21} Akgün, Mensur and Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar, \textit{The Perception of Turkey in the Middle East 2011}, Istanbul, TESEV, January 2012 (Turkish and English)
Turkey as elsewhere, there is a realisation that the regime may not collapse very easily. Turkey has hosted the Syrian National Council – the largest exiled opposition grouping – and is keen to play its part in the diplomatic confrontation with Damascus, but there is awareness of the dangers of military intervention in Syria. Paradoxically, the crisis in Syria has brought the Turkish government much closer to Washington. Only a year and a half after Turkey found itself at odds with the United States over its efforts to find a solution to the problem of Iranian enriched uranium, Turkey is now seen as a key player in the Obama administration’s dealings with Syria and Iran.

The Iranian nuclear issue, and the possibility of an Israeli and/or American attack on Iran represents arguably the most serious risk facing the AKP government. The Iranian support for Bashar al-Assad has provided an excuse for Ankara to distance itself from Tehran: on 6th March, Deputy Prime Minister Bülent Arınç criticised Iran for keeping quiet about Syrian atrocities, questioning what kind of Muslims could not condemn the regime. However, an attack on Iran would not only risk wrecking Turkey’s diplomatic role in the region: the resulting oil price surge could raise Turkey’s current account deficit – already far too high – to an unsustainable level, threatening the government’s principal perceived domestic success, its delivery of an apparently thriving economy.

Two other potential threats lurk on the horizon. The Republic of Cyprus (the Greek Cypriots) will take over the Presidency of the European Union in July, raising to a more acute level the issue of recognition (Turkey declines to recognise the Republic as long as northern Cyprus remains isolated). The proximity of the Cypriot Presidency has not acted as a catalyst to a solution. In early March, the Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator Egemen Bağış said that as a final resort, annexation to Turkey was an option.

The Cypriot Presidency aside, European Union membership still remains a priority, according to the Government, but the attitudes of European governments and the uncertainties in the Eurozone mean this is not being pushed at present. Under EU law, any new member of the Union will be required to join the Euro. The plight of the people of Greece has reinforced feelings of relief that Turkey did not join earlier, and the questionable future of the Eurozone has vindicated the trend to greater diversification of Turkish trade beyond Europe. A Eurozone collapse, however, would threaten the AKP’s economic achievements.

Finally, from 15 March 2012 regulations will come into effect which will radically change a major aspect of urban life in Turkey. The markets (semt pazarları) where vendors set up their stalls on the streets once a week or so in a particular locality will be banned. Selling of wares on the streets is to be outlawed – and the familiar itinerant hawkers selling water-melons, vegetables, manure and the like from lorries and tractors will also be put out of business.

---


---
The period under review has been dominated by two developments both significant for the future of Cyprus, and not unconnected.

Hydrocarbon deposits
The first development, mentioned briefly in the last Update, is now confirmation that there are very large deposits of gas, and possibly oil, in an area of the Eastern Mediterranean to the south of Cyprus. Drilling by Noble Energy for the Greek Cypriot government has revealed in an area south of Cyprus the existence of between five and seven trillion cubic feet of natural gas. It has been found in a part of the sea that Cyprus has declared to be its Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) after consultation with Israel and Egypt, who are also involved in establishing their Exclusive Economic Zones for hydrocarbon exploration. The Greek Cypriot Ministry of Commerce has estimated the value of the find at €100 billion, though experts are cautious, one suggesting that over the 20 year expected lifetime of the well the return to the Republic of Cyprus would be in the region of €2.5 billion, still a very large amount.

There are developmental and marketing problems to be sorted out. A pipeline to Greece for onward transmission of gas to Europe would be very costly indeed. Another, and probably the most favoured option, would be to build a liquefaction plant in Cyprus, a project in which, it is thought, the Russian company, Gazprom, would probably be interested. A third option, and possibly the cheapest, would be to pipe the gas to Turkey for onward transmission through the projected Nabucco pipeline to Europe, but that is not expected to be in place for a number of years. It would also, of course, require prior solution of the Cyprus problem. Turkey would not deal with a state it regards as illegal.

The Turkish and Turkish Cypriot governments hotly contest the action of the Greek Cypriot government on two counts. First, and of prime importance, they insist that profits from hydrocarbon deposits in sea areas around Cyprus belong to all Cypriots, not just to the nationals of the ‘illegal’ Greek Cypriot state. Secondly, Turkey has not been consulted by the other Mediterranean powers as to its own claims to exclusive exploration in the Eastern Mediterranean. Responding to the first, and immediately more important, issue, on 21 September 2011 Turkey and the TRNC signed a Continental Shelf Delimitation Agreement for the exploration and exploitation of oil and gas reserves around the island. The area covered includes parts of the EEZ claimed by the Republic of Cyprus, and, not least, part of Block 12, the area where drilling has revealed the large reserves of natural gas. Presumably in order to make the point, the Turkish exploration ship, the Piri Reis, subsequently entered Block 12 accompanied by a Turkish naval escort, but did not engage in drilling.

There has been wide international recognition of the Greek Cypriots’ right to explore for hydrocarbons in its self-proclaimed Exclusive Economic Zone. Moscow’s support has been very pronounced. Russian involvement in development and marketing might well worry...
those European states dependent on Russia for their gas supplies, a worry the projected Nabucco pipeline is intended to offset.

Impact on the Cyprus conflict

Will this development have an important impact on attempts to solve the Cyprus problem? The presidents of both Turkey and the TRNC, Tayyip Erdoğan and Derviş Eroğlu, have condemned it, believing that the development should have been delayed until after a solution of the Cyprus problem. In response, the Greek Cypriot President, Demetris Christofias, has declared, in the UN General Assembly, that solution or not, the Turkish Cypriots will have a share of the profits from the gas find. Eroğlu has expressed his disbelief that this would happen. Some Turkish Cypriots suspect that profits from the gas deposits would be used as incentive to attract Turkish Cypriots to a solution of the Cyprus problem acceptable to the Greek Cypriots. It could be a powerful stimulus to the policy of osmosis, the gradual and natural fusion of the two communities that some Greek Cypriots have seen as the long-term way to a solution ever since the Turkish Cypriots opened the Cyprus border in 2003. Turkish Cypriots would presumably be less inclined to osmosis if significant hydrocarbon deposits were found in areas under their own control. This could happen: exploratory drilling has begun in an area in the Karpas Peninsula, not far from Famagusta.

UN pressure on the negotiations

The second major development has been the much greater emphasis placed now on reaching a Cyprus solution by the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-Moon. Readers will recall that in July 2011 the two leaders, Christofias and Eroğlu, met with the Secretary-General in Geneva. Requiring the two leaders to engage in intensive negotiation in the meantime, he invited them to meet him again in New York at the end of October. After that meeting the Secretary-General rather surprisingly reported ‘some encouraging progress on some of the core issues, with both leaders assuring him that they could finalise a deal’. It seems that he was referring to progress in the areas of economy, EU matters and internal security, since he also noted that much less progress had been made in the important areas of territory, governance, property, and citizenship. The Turkish Cypriot side expressed satisfaction after the talks, but Christofias said that the meetings had failed to provide a big push towards a solution. What did become clear to both sides was that the UN was pressing hard for an agreed solution, and soon.

The pressure exerted by the Secretary-General appears to have had only a very modest degree of success, and there have since been very few official accounts of progress made. The UN’s Special Adviser in Cyprus, Alexander Downer, has made brief reports from time to time, but has stressed problems still to be solved rather than agreements reached. From official and unofficial sources it seems that agreement has been restricted still to the easier issues, namely economic matters, including relations with the European Union, and the staffing and functions of a Cyprus Central Bank.

The major issues

On the large and difficult problems, territory, governance, citizenship and property (chiefly that abandoned by the Greek Cypriots in 1974), there seems to have been little or no progress after the October talks.
**Territory**

On territory the Greek Cypriot side has seemingly been looking for the complete return of Morphou, which the Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan has earlier stated will never be returned, although it was a predominantly Greek Cypriot area before 1974. Christofias has also proposed that with the surrender of Varosha, which the Turkish Cypriot side would probably accept, the town and port of Famagusta should also be ceded, but with provision for the port to be placed under EU management for use by both Greek and Turkish Cypriots. This sort of suggestion has often been made in the past, and as often rejected.

**Governance**

On the issue of governance the centre of focus has been the organization of the executive presidency. Christofias has claimed that in the negotiations with the former President, Mehmet Ali Talat, it was agreed that there would be a rotating presidency, as Talat proposed, but that in the election of a president a system of cross voting would be used, a system to which Christofias was sympathetic. Under this scheme Turkish Cypriot voters would be able to participate to some degree in the election of a Greek Cypriot president in a year when it was the turn of a Greek Cypriot side to provide candidates for office. Greek Cypriot voters would similarly be able to participate to the same extent when it was the turn of the Turkish Cypriots to elect a president. So each community would constitute 20 per cent, say, of the electorate on the other side, voting being weighted as necessary. The main effect of such a system would be to encourage election of less nationalist politicians. One could expect, for instance, that Greek Cypriot voters would opt for Talat over Eroğlu. Christofias claims that Eroğlu has backtracked on this agreement. The Turkish Cypriot side certainly does not favour cross voting, but nor do some leaders in the South: it could remove each side’s popularly elected leaders from the centre of affairs. Arguably it would not, therefore, be democratic, and could also cause trouble in the operation of the federal government.

**Citizenship**

The issue of citizenship has apparently also not been resolved. What is mainly at issue here is Greek Cypriot insistence that Turkish immigrants to the TRNC should be excluded from citizenship of the future federal state. In addition they want a large number of Turks to be returned to Turkey. In the December 2011 census the population of the TRNC is recorded as 294,906, a rise of 11.2 per cent over 2006. There may well, therefore, be rather more citizens now than the 178,000 recorded in 2006. The Turkish Cypriot side wants all its citizens to be counted as citizens of the proposed federal state. The Greek Cypriot side wants to exclude all Turkish Cypriot citizens born in Turkey though, to judge by 2006 figures, they probably do not amount to more than between 15 and 20 per cent of the whole. The Turkish Cypriot side will not agree to repatriate other Turks living in the North. In fact many of them are seasonal workers, students, and other temporary residents.

The principal stumbling block is undoubtedly the property question, on which there is so far reported to be no agreement. It relates closely with the also unsolved major issue of the division of territory, and the refugee problem that could arise from it.

**Continuing UN pressure**

Clearly the UN Secretary-General is very anxious to have a solution of the Cyprus problem before the Greek Cypriots, as the Republic of Cyprus, take over the EU presidency in July. On this issue the Turkish President, when recently in London, said that Cyprus was taking on the presidency as only half a country. ‘It was a half presidency leading a miserable union’. Turkey had previously stated that it would have no dealings with the EU during the presidency of the illegal Republic of Cyprus. However, in November 2011, presumably in order to show its willingness to move forward, Ankara announced that it would open up its ports and airports to the Greek Cypriots if the EU ended its isolation of the Turkish Cypriots. There has been no positive outcome.
In early January 2012 the Secretary-General told the two sides that he wanted them to do as much as was possible to reach agreement on the unresolved major issues before the next meeting to be held once again in Greentree, New York, in late January. ‘There is no deadline, as such,’ he said, ‘but there is not much time left before July.’ So he advised them also ‘to think about the possibility of moving towards the international conference that was announced by me at the conclusion of our meeting last year. July was a landmark date.’

On 17 January Christofias took advice, and instruction, from the Greek Cypriot National Council on what his policy should be at the January Greentree meeting. The Council agreed that there should be no timeframes, or arbitration, or any international conference without agreement first on essential issues relating to the internal aspects of the Cyprus problem.

The latest Greentree meeting took place on 23 to 25 January this year, but on this occasion the UN Secretary-General saw little on which to note progress. The Turkish Cypriot side reportedly made some proposals on the property issue, but claimed that they were not read at the time by the Greek Cypriot side. The Turkish Cypriots seem to be pinning their hopes on the international conference proposed by the Secretary-General, and which Alexander Downer clearly favours. He has recently come in for much criticism from the Greek Cypriots for his allegedly Turkish Cypriot bias. He was in real trouble when he said, ‘I think it is very important that the two leaders do make substantial progress and, as you know, the Greek Cypriots take over the presidency of the European Union on 1 July.’ He was sharply reminded that it was the legal and recognized Republic of Cyprus that was taking over the presidency!

The Greek Cypriots are being put under considerable pressure to come to an agreement, but it is not altogether clear why, or how, a multilateral meeting or international conference can bring it about. The Secretary-General is to report to the Security Council by the end of February, and will ask Downer for a review of the situation by the end of March 2012, in case by then the two sides will have come closer to an agreement. On the issue of a conference, the Greek Cypriots have earlier said that any such conference, which they seem not to want at all, would have to be composed of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, not of the Guarantor Powers, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom. They also see the purpose of any such conference would only be to ratify agreements made by the two sides.

There is some feeling in the air that with so little agreement between the two sides on a federation there is a general drift towards a two-state solution. At its seventeenth conference in January 2012 the Parliamentary Union of the Organization for Islamic Co-Operation (OIC) passed a resolution which, while concentrating on criticism of Greek Cypriot/Israeli co-operation on areas of hydrocarbon exploration, called on OIC members to develop relations with the ‘Turkish Cypriot state’ in order to lift the isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriots.

So at present a solution of the Cyprus problem is hanging in the balance, with little agreement on major issues despite much pressure, and encouragement, from the UN Secretary-General and Alexander Downer. Perhaps the Greek Cypriots sense that new opportunities may arise for them as a result of the riches that will be coming their way from the exploitation of their hydrocarbon resources. Certainly this impact on the Cyprus conflict cannot be overlooked. However, a very thoughtful and well-informed leading article in the Cyprus Mail on 12 February surprisingly argues that the two-state solution would now be by far the best outcome for the Greek Cypriots. The writer lists the usual benefits, though not

---

25 As reported in the Cyprus Mail, 8 January 2012
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28 Marios Papdopoulos, ‘A Solution beyond Utopia’. He is described as a pianist and conductor who in 1988 founded Oxford Philomusica, of which he is Music Director.
the obvious one that the Greek Cypriot state would be under no obligation to share its newfound wealth with the Turkish Cypriots. More important, perhaps, there would be no Turkish Cypriot input into Greek Cypriot foreign policy and, consequently, perhaps the incorporation into it of features unwelcome to Turkey, and to others with interests in Cyprus and the eastern Mediterranean.

The publication of this article in a leading Greek Cypriot newspaper, which is widely read abroad, suggests that the idea may be beginning to take root in the South, or perhaps is being promoted. The writer believes that, in their own interests, the Greek Cypriots must grasp this opportunity for a two-state solution now, before it is too late.

Turkey and the European Union

by Michael Lake

EU Ambassador to Turkey, 1991-1998

Negotiations between Turkey and the European Union towards an accession treaty which, subject to ratification, would bring Turkey into the EU as a member state are stalled. Of the 35 chapters to be negotiated, none of those remaining to be opened can be. Not quite halfway through the negotiating process it has ground to a halt. Of the remaining chapters 18 are blocked, 14 of them linked to Cyprus – eight suspended by the Council of Ministers because Turkey has not implemented the Additional Protocol which would, as required, extend its 1995 customs union with the EU to include Cyprus, and six blocked by Cyprus because of a bilateral dispute with Turkey relating to oil-drilling. France has blocked four chapters because they are criteria essential to accession – the purpose of the whole exercise – which President Nicholas Sarkozy opposes. It is a sad picture far removed from my long experience as an observer from within, or being directly associated with, enlargement negotiations since 1961.

Among many other consequences, the situation calls into question the good faith of the Union. It has also greatly undermined Turkish popular support for membership. Moreover, certain reforms needed in Turkey to meet the criteria for membership are no longer being driven by the accession process. And both sides have become deeply distracted, the EU by the euro zone crisis and Turkey both by the burgeoning Ergenekon case and by the Arab spring and continuing turmoil on its border with Syria. I remain convinced, however, that all these issues would be overcome if the political will to achieve accession were restored, particularly in the EU but also in Turkey.

The negotiations which have come to a halt are not really negotiations about the rules of membership, which any candidate country must accept in full, but rather are about short-term measures, usually transition arrangements, such as step by step implementation, timing and the duration of transition periods to give a new member extra time to put into effect expensive and wide-ranging policies, such as in the multifarious field of environmental policy. But the current holdup in these negotiations does not mean that the preparations on the ground for eventual succession have stopped. Last year the EU provided €781.9 million in pre-accession assistance to Turkey. Previously it had already provided several billion euros to help meet the criteria for accession, and this spending continues and adds up to a huge investment in Turkish membership by the EU taxpayer, authorised by the Council of Ministers when negotiations began in 2005. To help administer all this the EU delegation in

29 Some of this article is from a keynote speech made by the writer at Yaşar University, Izmir, in May, 2011.
Ankara – of which I was the head during the nineties with a staff of about 25 on one floor of a building – has a staff now of more than 125 on four floors, making it the biggest of any EU delegation in the world! Traditionally Washington was the largest, followed by Tokyo.

The annual report which the European Commission makes on every new candidate country (reports which start even years before negotiations begin) provides a great deal of detailed background to the work going on. The latest report on Turkey\(^\text{30}\) says:

> [In the last 12 months] “Turkey continued improving its ability to take on the obligations of membership. Progress was made in most areas. Alignment is advanced in certain areas, such as free movement of goods, anti-trust policy and State aid, energy, economic and monetary policy, enterprise and industrial policy, consumer protection, statistics, Trans-European Networks, and science and research. Efforts need to continue towards alignment in areas such as environment, public procurement, freedom to provide services, social policy and employment and taxation. Enforcement needs to be strengthened in areas such as intellectual property rights and anti-money laundering. As regards the Customs Union and external relations, alignment needs to be completed, particularly in areas such as the general system of preferences. A number of longstanding trade irritants remain unresolved. It is essential that Turkey fully respects its commitments under the Customs Union. For most areas it is crucial that Turkey improves its administrative capacity to cope with the acquis.”

This gives in abbreviated form a good picture of what is involved, backed up by many pages of much more detail covering the different sectors. The work involved by staff of the Commission and the Turkish authorities, including the Turkish Parliament, which has to pass roughly 5000 pieces of legislation (much of it in packages), affects thousands of people in all walks of life, in both the administrating public sectors and the private or civic sectors affected in cities, towns and villages, right down to the level of abattoirs, local sewage treatment, urban and regional developments, tourism, gender equality and the new EU-wide rules on light bulbs. An EU pre-accession project in the Kurdish south-east of Turkey, recently highlighted in The Guardian, is aimed at bringing out of their households women – wives and daughters – who often stay at home, and turn them into taxi drivers and bus conductors, thus providing them with legitimate jobs to increase family income and upgrade their hitherto low social status.

For several years now hundreds of projects all over Turkey have been supported by the multi-million euro pre-accession funds which are scrupulously managed by teams of staff on both sides, by independent committees governing the awards of contracts, all of them intensively monitored and finally audited. Unspent funds are clawed back. The reason I can write about this with some confidence is that after leaving Turkey I was the EU ambassador in Budapest for the four years covering the bulk of Hungary’s accession process. I have supervised much of this kind of work. It is very detailed, covering the entire country and most of its institutions and people and it is relentless. In Turkey it continues, not far below the surface, but is largely ignored by the media.

In Brussels there is a concomitant effort by nearly all the specialist services of the Commission (covering aspects of the 33 chapters for negotiation), by regular meetings of the appropriate level of the Council of Ministers (usually medium-management officials), by the European Parliament and, whenever anything newsworthy happens (usually trouble), the media, especially the Turkish media, some of whom have been covering Turkish – EU relations for decades.

\(^{30}\) TAS Review readers can find the latest report on Turkey, published in September, on the European Commission’s website, (clicking steadily forward to ‘enlargement’ and, on the right hand side, a box-point to all the latest country reports).
In spite of the longstanding paralysis in the negotiations, the Commission intends to work to launch a new virtuous circle in the accession process with Turkey. Based on a pragmatic approach, the Commission says in its annual strategy paper (published along with all such reports on candidate countries) that a fresh and positive agenda should be developed to produce a more constructive relationship. This agenda should cover a broad range of areas, including intensified dialogue and cooperation on political reforms, visas, mobility and migration, energy, the fight against terrorism, the further participation of Turkey in Community programmes such as ‘Europe for Citizens’, and town twinning. Also included will be trade and the Customs Union, aiming to eliminate ongoing trade irritants, seek closer coordination in negotiations on the free trade agreements and explore new avenues to make full use of the joint economic potential of the EU and Turkey. Alongside the accession negotiations, the Commission intends to enhance its cooperation with Turkey in support of that country’s efforts to pursue reforms and align with the acquis, including on chapters where accession negotiations cannot be opened for the time being. The Commission will continue informing the Council as soon as it considers that Turkey has met relevant benchmarks – at which point the relevant chapter should normally be eligible to be opened (thus highlighting the deliberate foot-dragging elsewhere).

In the EU more generally daily work goes on at all levels, in all areas, largely unreported because of the turmoil in the markets and anxiety over the future of the eurozone and the euro itself. Almost all this work is carried out under the so-called ‘Méthode Communautaire,’ which is the treaty-based system of law – increasingly under attack by the larger countries, notably Germany, France and the UK, which prefer government agreements to community law. Under the Community Method the European Commission makes all proposals: co-decisions are taken by the European Parliament, to which the Lisbon Treaty has given more power, and the Council of Ministers. These decisions have the force of law and are interpreted and upheld by the European Court of Justice. Compliance by the Member States and their citizens is obligatory. This system is what determines that the EU is a community of law, backed up by the European Court of Justice. It works.

The unprecedented number of inter-governmental summits over the eurozone crisis during the past year leading to ever-lower expectations and ever-higher costs of rectification draws attention to the way the crisis is being handled under the Inter-Governmental Conference system. The IGC is a form of cooperation among governments, without reference to the elected European Parliament and so no public accountability, and thus no force of law beyond persuasion. Cooperation is not law. It is not subject to the Court of Justice. It does not always work. This is why, or rather how, the biggest countries in the eurozone, Germany and France, were the first and the worst to break the rules governing deficits and interest rates. This is why now, belatedly, Germany and France are leading the way to a new binding concord, outside the EU framework, which will force them and other members of the eurozone to obey its rules.

For some time the latter form of governance, the intergovernmental way, has had the upper hand in the EU which, in my view, has contributed to its continuing weaknesses. So long as governments persistently and routinely allow domestic short-term imperatives to take precedence over desirable, even essential long-term objectives, the EU will stumble on, constantly hostage to vagaries and changes in domestic political opinion and to the next elections – not even national elections, but local or regional elections which can hobble the entire EU. As the long-serving Prime Minister of Luxembourg, Theo Junker, famously said: “We know what we have to do – what we don’t know then is how to get re-elected.” The Community Method was invented in order to succeed in overcoming this problem. For example, not only does the principle of solidarity come into play but, often in explaining difficult decisions to domestic public opinion, member states blame Brussels. The intergovernmental method provides no such cover, and the deliberate weakening of the Commission by some bigger states removes protection from the smaller ones, less able to stand up to bullying and, I would argue, adds to the lack of confidence within the markets.
Meanwhile in Turkey the public mood is far from one of eager anticipation or expectation of early membership. Both there and in the EU there is increasing consternation and growing concern at the expanding number of people still being arrested, some detained for long periods, under the so-called Ergeneken case, notably (but not only) past and present military officers and journalists. In the same week in January which saw prosecutors arrest the previous Chief of the General Staff, General İlker Başbuğ, and launch an investigation into the Leader of the Opposition after remarks he made following his visit to a prison where detained journalists are being held, the Council of Europe (not the EU) published a report which, among other criticisms, pointed out that the rights of Turkish defendants were being undermined by pre-trial detention which can last up to ten years without charge. The Council recognised the steps Turkey had taken to give greater respect to human rights, but complained of “long-standing shortcomings in the administration of justice in Turkey [that] adversely affect the enjoyment of human rights.” It said that the judicial system in Turkey seemed to have blurred “the frontier between terrorism acts and the rights to freedom of thought, expression, association and assembly.” Turkey is currently holding more journalists in detention than China or any other country, some for nearly a year, and at severe disadvantage to defending lawyers.

In recent annual reports on Turkey the European Commission has expressed its own concerns. Last September its report said:

“Progress has been made in the area of the judiciary. The adoption of legislation on the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors and on the Constitutional Court provides the framework for enhanced independence and impartiality of the judiciary. Measures have also been taken to improve the efficiency of the judiciary and address the increasing backlog of pending cases.

Further steps are still needed in all areas, including the criminal justice system. Turkey has a large backlog of pending criminal serious cases while a large proportion of the prison population is not finally sentenced. In addition, implementation needs to be monitored, as measures taken to date have divided the country’s legal community and civil society. Judicial proceedings are not sufficiently transparent. Courts and prosecution offices do not inform stakeholders or the public at large on issues of public interest. The judicial reform strategy needs to be revised. Frequent use of arrests instead of judicial supervision, limited access to files, failure to give detailed grounds for detention decisions and revisions of such decisions highlight the need to bring the Turkish criminal justice system into line with international standards and to amend the anti-terror legislation.”

This is serious criticism. Moreover, recent developments on the Kurdish front, including many arrests, have increased tensions and severely damaged the hope of real and sustained progress here which the ruling AKP brought to its first administration. Part of the problem lies with the catch-all nature of the remaining terrorism laws, which require constitutional change – which is promised.

Internal and rising tensions come at a time when many countries both in the region and beyond are looking to Turkey to provide a model of Muslim democracy for those fighting under the banner of the Arab spring for human rights, including freedom of expression, association and assembly. An editorial on the growing concern in the EU published in The Financial Times in January, said: “This may be why Ankara’s western allies have been muted in their criticism of recent developments. Yet silence serves no one’s interests.” The FT is one of the UK’s most internationally respected newspapers. And the UK is one of Turkey’s strongest supporters in its quest for membership.
More and more people are worried about the apparently increasing authoritarianism of the Turkish authorities, the absence of progress on important and promised constitutional improvements and, more recently, signs of stagnation in a previously booming economy.

The two sides (Turkey and the EU) cannot and should not ignore each other. Indeed they work together on a day to day basis on the accession programme and on foreign affairs. Turkey consistently consults the EU regarding its general adherence to the EU chapter on foreign and security policy. In spite of some divergences of policy which have led some, mostly in Washington, to worry that Turkey is moving away from its traditional allies. Ankara remains well-anchored to the West and its institutions. The EU has remained by far Turkey’s most important and engaged partner. Turkey shares roughly half its trade with the EU, while by far the greatest proportion (about 80-90 per cent) of its foreign direct investment comes from the EU. Some 3-4 million Turkish nationals live within the EU. Turkey’s air and other transport links are the most dense with EU destinations. Currently about 36,000 Turkish students and scholars participate every year in EU programmes on education, culture and research. All this goes with Turkey’s almost complete network of institutional relationships with Europe, from NATO, the OECD and the Council of Europe to the Eurovision Song Contest and the European Football Union. When Turkey became a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council last year, with the highest number of votes, it came from within the European group.

This background contributes strongly to a sound basis for Turkey’s EU membership. But the long delay is corrosive, and urgently needs attention.

---

**Dame Ninette de Valois**

**The Founder of the Turkish Ballet (1898 – 2001)**

by Figen Phelps

Film maker & former Istanbul State Ballet dancer

I took part in a conference at the Royal Ballet, London, held on 1-3 April 2011, on the 10th Anniversary of the death of the Ninette de Valois, the founder of The Royal Ballet School. The conference was entitled *Dame Ninette de Valois: Adventurous Traditionalist*. My presentation, a ten minute film of an interview with Dame Ninette held in 1995, was on 2 April and created interest by the little known fact that that very Ninette de Valois was also the founder of the Turkish ballet!

Why did I choose to interview Ninette de Valois?

I met her properly in 1995, having telephoned the Royal Opera House and asked to be given her details for a documentary on the History of the Turkish Ballet. She replied to my letter immediately and invited me to an interview. Madam, her nickname, walked into the room with a very straight back. She was lively, full of beans. She spoke at length and in great detail, remembering the names of her old students. It was my admiration of Madam and her direct contribution to the creation of Turkish Ballet that led me to conduct this interview with her. The world knew about her work with the English Royal Ballet but her being the founder of the Turkish State Ballet...
was less known. Another consideration was to show to the world that Turkish ballet is world class.

I am involved with developing the theme of Dame Ninette de Valois and Turkish ballet on film. Of course funding is needed now to take my work to fruition. My film is the very first factual documentary on Madam’s life. I am also very thankful to Metin And who provided archive materials about the early days of Turkish ballet. Additionally, I thank Yaşar Saracoğlu, Engin Aksan Oytun Turfanda, Oktay Keresteci, Efsa Topçu, Ogulcan Borova, Sibel Kasapoğlu, Aysun Aslan and Pamir Rimap (and also Travis Kemp – a ballet teacher at the Ankara State Conservatory for twenty years), who opened their archives to provide various documents, films and photographs.

I am still working on Ninette de Valois’s documentary. The 10 minute short film shown at the conference in April and subsequently at the Turkish Area Study Group’s Symposium in Cambridge in May 2011 gives only a glimpse of what is still to come. In this film, I show the progression of Turkish ballet from its inception to the present day with contemporary dancers and choreographers. The doyennes of English ballet were surprised to observe the world class performances of Turkish dancers. The full documentary will be 45 minutes long. Besides Madam, there will be an interview I made with Joy Newton some ten years ago. She was the first ballet teacher that Ninette de Valois sent to Turkey. There will also be an interview made by me ten years ago in Amsterdam with Angela Bayley, another teacher in Ankara.

I want to interview past and present dancers in Turkey such as Meriç Sumen, Ozkan Aslan, Hüsnü Sunal, Evinç Sunal, Oktay Keresteci, Hulya Aksular, Sait Sokmen, Muride Sun, Kadir Okurer, Binay Okurer, Rengin Tas, Aysun Aslan, Sibel Kasapoğlu, Ogulcan Borova, Zeynep Sunal, Aysem Sunal and choreographers – in addition to Turkish dancers performing on the international stage as prima dancers.

There are also interviews with British dancers and choreographers who have contributed to the development of Turkish ballet, among them Ashley Page, Richard Glasstone, and Barbara Fewston. To explore the details of how Dame Ninette de Valois came to Turkey, one can refer to the autobiographical work The Lives and Times of Molly Lake and Travis Kemp written by Naomi Benari. According to Benari, the priest of the British Embassy was an important part in the invitation of Dame Ninette. Originally Father Hutchinson was priest of the parish in which the Old Vic Theatre was situated in London. He was also a ballet lover, and a constant member of the audience of Dame Ninette de Valois’s company in London. So he took the post at the British Embassy in Turkey.

During a cocktail party Father Hutchinson had met with the Minister of Education who was also responsible for the theatre and suggested a national ballet company and that Ninette de Valois should establish the Turkish ballet school. The Minister agreed and Dame Ninette de Valois was invited in 1947. During that year Dame Ninette was accompanied by Halil Vedat, the director of the Fine Arts Administration, Dr. Phillips, the British Council representative to Turkey, and Mübeccel Argun, the British Council’s Turkish advisor. Ninette de Valois became the principal director of the school which was officially opened by the mayor of Istanbul, in January 1948 in Yeşilköy. Recently it has been stated that the official approval could not be obtained from the Ministry of Education for those two years in Istanbul. After that the school was transferred to Ankara and became a part of Ankara State Conservatory in 1950. The first teachers in the Yeşilköy School were Joy Newton and Audrey Knight. Both were close associates of Dame Ninette de Valois. Joy Newton was from the Sadler’s Wells Ballet and Audrey
Knight was from the Royal Academy of Dancing. Dame Ninette, Joy Newton and Audrey Knight selected 32 students.

The conservatory was both a boarding and a day school. Beside ballet courses which had been based on Sadler's Wells' programme, there were also Eurhythmics courses in the curriculum. For the first twenty-five years, the school had British teachers. When the former ballet teacher Joy Newton had left, Beatrice Appleyard-Fenmen had been appointed. She was one of the former dancers of Sadler's Wells, later to be married to one of the most prominent Turkish pianists, Mithat Fenmen.

After Beatrice Appleyard, Dame Ninette de Valois sent for two other teachers, Travis Kemp and Molly Lake. Kemp was one of the former Sadler's Wells dancers and his partner Molly Lake was one of the dancers of the Pavlova Ballet Company. Lake and De Valois had grown up together but their paths diverged when Lake moved from the Academy. During the 1950s, the Royal Academy of Dancing curriculum was similar to that in the classes De Valois had instigated at the Sadler's Wells School, so the training in Turkey was just right for performing the Sadler's Wells repertoire. When they first arrived, they were surprised to find the school with only fifteen small children. Lake and Kemp observed that in Turkey, for most people, ballet dancing meant belly dancing, so they wanted to start creating performances to show what ballet actually is, and not only in Ankara but throughout Turkey. As cited in Benari's book, Molly Lake and Travis Kemp asserted: “We had to start at once to show the Turkish public what ballet actually was when produced in theatre spaces as big productions.” In fact, they realised their wish of performing ballet pieces frequently during their teaching at the Conservatory. Molly Lake and Travis Kemp continued to work as teachers and directed the Ankara State Conservatory of Ballet for twenty years.

In the meantime, Dame Ninette was constantly looking for ways to found a company. Manuel de Falla's *El Amor Brujo* had been staged as the first separate ballet piece inside the opera structure in 1960, and then Dame Ninette sent her assistant Ailne Phillips to stage *Coppélia* as a three-curtain ballet piece for the same season.

In fact, one can state that the artistic vision of the Ankara State Ballet was carefully constructed by Dame Ninette de Valois. She always invited foreign choreographers and teachers according to their suitability to the young company. She devised the artistic policy of the company and selected the foreign choreographers and teachers to work with it for every season, among them Claude Newman, Nancy Hanley, Dudley Tomlinson, and Richard Glasstone. Claude Newman came after Howard left to take the post of artistic director at the Rome Ballet. Nancy Hanley, a close friend of Dame Ninette, stayed in the company in the 1963-64 season. Joy Newton came back to Turkey accompanied by Dudley Tomlinson who was to become the Company's new ballet master for the next season. Richard Glasstone was invited by Dame Ninette to be the resident choreographer and principal teacher to the company in 1965 and stayed for four years. He expressed his memories in Turkey in various articles on dancing. I myself also had the chance to meet him on one of his visits when I arranged an interview. His memories related to the artistic activities of the company in 1965 and the 20th anniversary celebrations in 1967 were quite vivid to him.

Dame Ninette de Valois' belief in creating a national ballet based on national folk dance motives, folk themes and original musical composition proved to be the basis for the ballet piece *At the Fountain/Çeşmebaşı* created in 1965. Richard Glasstone, a close witness of this particular period in the ballet history of Turkey, mentioned the creation process of *Çeşmebaşı* in his various writings. In one of them, he stated that, by the example of *Çeşmebaşı*, it was possible to demonstrate that an 'indigenous' ballet could
be created – set around the fountain found on every Turkish village square, and using the music of Ferit Tüzün’s *Anatolian Suite*. Thus did Ninette de Valois set out to demonstrate how, using Turkish themes and music and drawing on the enormously rich language of Turkish folk dance, a truly indigenous ballet could be created.

---

**Uzak/Yakın Kavramlar, Üstüne Naif Şiir**

Ey mideyi düşündüren sevgili
sana çoban böreği (ingilizcesi: ‘Shepherd’s pie’)
pişirdiğim mutfak
mutlak bir tapınak olan varlığımla yaşlı
yalımların ustası olmak
gövde katında
hem yakın hem uzak

Ayarı değerimin döner döner de
değirmeninde öğüttüğüm zamanın
akar arak da enerji çeşmesi
örġü örģü orda burda

Birlikteymişcesine kozamız
kumsalında yoksluğun
kumaş kadar uzun ömrümüz
hepsi akılmışda kalacak
en sonunda

Sen gidersen, canın isterse
diyebilmeliyim artik
yüksek değilmiş bu ağac
yuva kuracak kadar
yürekli değilmişsin bağlanacak
Türkiye’ye ve olacak kadar bana yar

**Gülay Yurdal Michaels**

---

**A Naïve Poem on the Concepts of Far/Near**

O love that brings thoughts of the stomach of the kitchen where I cook for you the shepherd’s pie
in my ageing life the absolute temple to become an expert of flames
at the level of the body
both near and distant

The grade of my worth turns and turns
in the mill of time
the fountain of energy flows
in braids here and there

All will stay in my mind –
our cocoon as if we are together
on the sands of poverty
our lives as durable as cloth
at the end

I should be able to say after all
“as you wish” if you do go away
the tree was not high enough
to build a nest in
you did not have the heart
To connect with Turkey and be my love

**Gülay Yurdal Michaels**
Turkish studies in the UK: Progress or Regression?

A survey by Celia Kerslake, St Antony’s, Oxford

This article presents a brief survey of the current state of Turkish studies at UK universities, from the vantage point of a recently retired ‘insider’. In the 1960s, when I did my undergraduate studies in Turkish (and Arabic) at Cambridge, this was one of six British universities where the Turkish language, together with Turkish literature, culture and/or history, could be studied as the main or joint main subject for a BA degree. The other universities offering such courses were London (SOAS), Oxford, Manchester, Durham and Edinburgh, and in each case Turkish studies were part of a department of Islamic or Middle Eastern studies, sometimes under the larger umbrella of Oriental Studies. This reflected not only the geographical location of Turkey but also its historical location within the cultural domain of the Islamic Middle East.

Institutionalized Turkish studies in Britain had emerged as an offshoot of Islamic studies, which were rooted in the study of the Arabic language, Islamic religious texts, the history of the classical Islamic world and the vast body of scholarship and literature in Arabic. A subsidiary branch of the field was Persian studies, in which classical literature was the main focus. Within this context Turkish, the language of Ottoman government, was valued as the key to understanding the political success of the Islamic empire that had ruled over most of the Middle East and south-east Europe for five centuries. However, Atatürk’s success in creating a secular Turkish republic out of the ruins of that empire had also won widespread interest and admiration in Britain. In the period after World War Two, when Turkish studies began to acquire a visible presence in British academia, the Republic of Turkey was already well established, and the modernizing élite governing the country had done its best to reorient the people culturally towards Europe. However, despite the replacement of the Arabic script by the Latin alphabet, and the vigorous drive for language ‘purification’, a large portion of the Arabic vocabulary of Ottoman continued to be very much a living part of the Turkish language right down to the 1950s. Both historically and linguistically, therefore, the fact that degree courses in Turkish often involved either Arabic or Persian as a major component made good sense.

However, by the 1970s a number of factors had combined to make a rather different conceptualisation of Turkish studies possible. First, Turkey was now officially part of the Western world. It was a member of the Council of Europe, NATO and the OECD, and had an association agreement with the EEC. Secondly, the “catastrophic success” (to use Geoffrey Lewis’s famous phrase) of the language reform movement had achieved Atatürk’s goal of making Turkish largely ‘independent’ of Arabic and Persian. And thirdly, the growth of the social sciences had produced a new generation of Turkey specialists in Britain and other Western countries who approached the country from their own disciplinary base, whether in political science, anthropology, sociology or international relations. This last development was not, of course, confined to Turkey. It was part of the
new academic phenomenon of ‘area studies’, for which funding was provided by the British government following the Hayter Report of 1961.

British social scientists specializing on Turkey have, through their publications and public lectures, made important contributions to the international understanding of Turkey, just as their colleagues in Turkish language, literature and Ottoman/Turkish history have helped to advance the frontiers of those aspects of Turkish studies. The social scientists have also provided a special focus on Turkey in the teaching of their particular disciplines in their own institutions, and such appointments will no doubt continue to be made in future, but not in any predictable way. The posts that such people hold or have held are not designated as Turkey-focused, and when they fall vacant there is no guarantee, or even probability, that the next person appointed will have a special interest in Turkey. Moreover, the presence of a Turkey specialist in a social science department does not usually mean that there will be even one course module offered by that department that is devoted to Turkey. At most, Turkey may crop up frequently as a case study in general disciplinary courses at different levels. Partly for this reason it is not usually possible for undergraduates who are following a language-based programme in Turkish to take advantage of teaching on Turkish politics or society that may be available in other departments of their own institution.

Undoubtedly the best example of interdisciplinary provision in Turkish studies was the MA in Modern Turkish Studies that was set up by Professor Clement Dodd at SOAS in 1986, relying entirely on funding that he had raised from private sources. This one-year postgraduate course, which only continued in its fully fledged form until the late 1990s, offered options in modern Turkish history, politics, economic geography, economics and anthropology, and drew on the expertise and good will of a number of social science specialists on Turkey who lived within reach of London. Students on this MA programme were not required to know Turkish, but any who wished to include an element of Turkish language study in their course were able to do so.

In 2005 a highly significant event occurred in the history of Turkish studies in the UK, namely the announcement by the Turkish prime minister of the establishment of a Chair in Contemporary Turkish Studies at the London School of Economics and Political Science. This chair, the first of its kind not only in the UK but in Europe, is located in LSE’s European Institute, which in itself is a clear indication of the dramatic change that has occurred in the perception of Turkey over the last half-century. The chair is funded not by the British government but by an endowment provided jointly by five Turkish donors, some official and some private. The first holder, appointed in 2008, is Professor Şevket Pamuk, an international authority on the economic history of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. Under his leadership the European Institute at LSE has already emerged as a dynamic centre of research on modern Turkey. The chair’s independent funding makes it particularly well placed to bring international speakers to its weekly seminars, and to run frequent conferences and workshops. In the teaching field the impact of the chair is to be seen in the fact that an option on Turkey: Political Economy and European Integration is now available in a large number of the Masters courses on offer at LSE.

Apart from this felicitous development in London, the last thirty years have unfortunately seen a serious contraction in Turkish studies at British universities. The abolition of posts in Turkish language and literature at some of the universities that used to offer
undergraduate degree programmes in or including Turkish meant that, by 1990, SOAS, Oxford and Manchester were the only institutions where such provision survived. Since 2003 SOAS and Oxford have both lost posts in either language/literature or history, and are struggling to maintain their former range of course options, while at Manchester the situation is even worse: the loss of two further posts in 2011, after earlier retrenchment, has brought Turkish studies there to a sudden end. This contraction has occurred in spite of the fact that, both politically and economically, Turkey has undergone a developmental transformation during this period. Even if, for a wide range of reasons, the prospect of EU membership is now barely in sight, internal progress has been achieved in many of the areas identified by the EU as in need of reform, notably the elimination of the political role of the military. Turkey’s population has grown to around 75 million, about 70% of which is urban, and its per capita GDP has seen a staggering growth from $2000 in 1980 to over $14,000 in 2012. Turkey has also been pursuing an increasingly autonomous and self-assertive foreign policy, particularly in the Middle East and the Balkans, and establishing new diplomatic links and economic involvements all over the globe. Why, then, is Turkey’s increasing significance on the world stage not reflected in the coverage given to it at British universities?

The major reasons seem to be the following:

- The absence of any nationwide planning or funding for Turkish studies means that every institution takes its own decisions in isolation; even if there is some awareness of the national impact that staffing decisions may have, each institution is obliged to consider first and foremost its own priorities and the (often formidable) financial constraints to which government funding policies subject it. The humanities and social sciences have been placed under particular pressure with the withdrawal of all direct government support for teaching in these fields.

- Undergraduate degrees in Turkish studies do not attract the student numbers required to ‘justify’ posts in today’s brutally harsh financial climate. There is probably a greater potential demand for taught Master’s courses, but if these are to be run alongside BA courses, or with interdisciplinary scope, they require greater concentrations of staffing than any institution has so far been able to employ.

- In a globalized world in which English is becoming ever more dominant as the universal medium of communication, the downgrading of foreign language study in the British education system contributes to the unwillingness of young people to take on the very considerable challenges of learning a non-European language. Those that do have the courage and determination to do so are much more likely to see potential career prospects in Chinese or Arabic than in Turkish.

In concluding this brief survey of the current state of Turkish studies at UK universities, there are some positive points that still remain to be mentioned. One relates to the separate provision of teaching on Ottoman history. The history departments at the universities of Durham and St Andrews, St Mary’s University College, Twickenham, all have Ottoman specialists on their staff, and are therefore able provide courses on the Ottoman Empire to the relatively large numbers of undergraduates that history departments attract. Durham offers a second-year module The Ottoman World 1400-1700, while St Andrews has a module available to third- and fourth-year students on The Ottoman Empire from Medieval Anatolia to Süleyman the Magnificent. At the University of Birmingham, by contrast, Ottoman history is offered exclusively at graduate level, within the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek studies. There is a one-year Master’s programme in Ottoman studies, involving a dissertation as well as research training coursework, and the latter can be tailored to the particular interests and needs of the student. Applicants are expected to have some relevant historical
background, and in practice need to be fluent in Turkish in order to be ready for training in the reading of Ottoman source material.

Another slight compensation for the reduced provision of degree courses in Turkish nationally is that at two further universities, Edinburgh (Department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies) and Exeter (Institute of Arabic and Islamic Studies) first- and second-year course modules in Turkish language have become available in recent years, largely thanks to the contribution of staff seconded on a short-term basis from Turkish universities and paid for by the Turkish government. The same institute at Exeter also offers a module on Turkish Culture and Society. Additionally the University of Leeds (Department of Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies) has just begun to offer a module in Turkish for Beginners.

This article has concentrated on the provision of university teaching in Turkish studies. However, as in the case of all academic subjects, Turkish studies - in all its branches - draws its lifeblood from scholarship, research activity, and the intellectual cross-fertilization that is generated by conferences, seminars and workshops. Research and publishing in Turkish and/or Ottoman studies is being carried out at all the universities mentioned above, both by the academic staff themselves and by their doctoral students, a good proportion of whom come from Turkey. The Skilliter Centre for Ottoman Studies at Newnham College, Cambridge, founded by a legacy from Susan Skilliter (Lecturer in Turkish at Cambridge, 1965-1985) supports research on the history, literature and culture of the Ottoman Empire. It is the only research centre in Western Europe dedicated purely to Ottoman studies, and hosts frequent international conferences. Its director, Dr Kate Fleet, is the founder and editor-in-chief of a major scholarly journal, the Turkish Historical Review (published by Brill). Seminars on Turkey are a regular feature of the academic programmes at LSE and at SOAS (where they are supported by a Turkish bank). Turkey also features prominently in the activities of SEESOX (South East European Studies at Oxford), which is part of the European Studies Centre of St Antony’s College. SEESOX conducts research, seminars, conferences and publishing, and relies on external funding from a variety of sources, including, in recent years, a donation from the Turkish government that has enabled Turkish scholars to contribute to the programme for short periods. The main focuses of SEESOX as far as Turkey is concerned are on politics, international relations and European integration.

Doctoral research on Turkey is also being carried out, particularly by students from Turkey, in social science departments up and down the country. Although this is definitely part of Turkish studies in the wider sense, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to assemble anything like a complete picture of such projects, whether completed or ongoing. There may well be other omissions or inaccuracies in this article, and both the author and the editors of TAS Review would be very grateful if readers who notice any would draw attention to them, so that amendments can be included in a future issue.

The current state of Turkish studies in the UK presents a mixed picture, and there is certainly no room for complacency. The government needs to be reminded at every opportunity of the vital link between provision for Turkish studies in UK universities and the general level of understanding in the UK of this important and dynamic country. The Turkish Area Study Group has its own role to play in this, and the TASG Council took advantage of an invitation to make a submission to the recent inquiry of the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee into UK-Turkey Relations and Turkey’s Regional Role to make this point.
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
IMPERIAL LEGACIES IN A CROSS-CULTURAL
MEDITERRANEAN CONTEXT
23-25 September 2011

The Conference was organized by Rhoads Murphey of the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies at the University of Birmingham and hosted by Koç University’s Research Center for Anatolian Civilisations at its splendid premises in the Merkez Han on Istiklal Caddesi, Istanbul. Twenty-four papers were given covering topics as varied as the influence of Christianity on the idea of imperium in Late Antiquity, the ways in which the Byzantine emperors were presented, Sharia law versus Sultanic decrees, customary law in the Cyclades, the Ottoman legacy in Greece and the strategic importance of the Suez Canal to Britain. The conference ended with a ‘field trip’ to the Yedikule fortress/prison at the Marmara end of the famous triple walls and a traditional Turkish meal in a neighbouring restaurant.

Malcolm Wagstaff

Learning to Read in the late Ottoman Empire and the early Turkish Republic\textsuperscript{31}

by Benjamin C. Fortna


The activity of reading permeates every area and instant of our lives. Though the era of the printed book and the handwritten letter might be slowly coming to an end, reading itself is thriving with a whole new layer of textual paraphernalia in daily life in the form of e-books, emails, texts and tweets. In this fascinating study of children learning to read in Turkey in the half-century between 1880 and 1930, Benjamin Fortna makes the claim that reading – the condition of literacy – can be seen as constitutive of modernity itself, part of the definition of what it means to be modern. But, as he also remarks, despite – or more probably because of - its fundamental importance for our way of life, we tend to take it for granted – it is, in his words, “the victim of its own success”. The activity of reading appears to be neutral, capable of being “bent to an almost infinite number of cases”, and as such very difficult to isolate as an object of study if we want to investigate its inner workings and historical development.

\textsuperscript{31} Professor Fortna gave the TASS 2011 Annual Lecture on aspects of this subject (Review, No.17, pp.6-8)
Attempts to write histories of reading always seem to be on the verge of transforming themselves into something else – a history of literature, of education, of social mores and fashions, of religion, etc. On the other hand, this very instability can be turned into an advantage: handled skilfully, a study of reading can shed new and unexpected light on many different aspects of human society and history.

Fortna is a leading historian of the late Ottoman Empire during the second half of the nineteenth century up to its dissolution in the First World War, a restless period of territorial decline, political reform and social transformation. He has done earlier work on changes in state education during the long reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909), but his new book represents both a narrowing of focus on the process of learning to read and a widening of context as he tackles the protean aspects of the topic. His chronological framework (1880-1930) deliberately elides what is commonly perceived (and presented) as a watershed – Atatürk’s establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923 – since his study shows that there were highly significant continuities throughout the period in the drive to increase literacy among children. These included efforts to ameliorate the peculiar difficulties of Ottoman script (one proposed solution, decades before the actual language reform, was the adoption of roman characters), and the provision of reading material for them both in school and at home, as well as the moralising and nationalistic content of that material. Such continuities stand in ironic contrast to the new Republic’s comprehensive denial of any legacy from Turkey’s Ottoman/Islamic past, especially in the field of education. Fortna refers to recent work on learning to read in other countries during more or less the same period – above all in Russia and in France – but it is also abundantly clear that there are peculiar features characterising Ottoman/Turkish culture which make the subject to a large extent sui generis: its sheer linguistic complexity or its heavily symbolic investment in the perception of West and East, modern and traditional. In the context of reading, for example, there is the difference between sitting crosslegged on the floor to read from a ‘rahle’ and the ‘alafranga’ desks and chairs of Western classrooms and libraries.

Any study of the way children learn to read falls naturally into two parts: the content of the material written for them (the ‘what’) and the techniques employed to get them to learn and to continue reading (the ‘how’). These are often treated separately but it is one of the strengths of Fortna’s book – and a demonstration of his willingness to take on the inherent instability of the subject – that he is interested in both the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ and the things they reveal. For on both levels children’s literature provides a peculiarly vivid mirror of the changes in attitude and approach taking place in the wider world, as Fortna is the first to point out: “some of the clearest signs of the newly constructed world appear in children’s literature”. This is no doubt largely if not wholly due to the fact that such literature is controlled by adults – parents, teachers, schools, the state – and therefore reflects in an almost unmediated way their ideological purposes. But Fortna has also gathered numerous apparent counter-examples – though perhaps merely manipulative in a different sense - to this kind of quasi-propagandistic rigidity, especially from the burgeoning world of commercial publishing for Turkish children throughout the period, when a seemingly uncontrolled eclecticism of content and mild subversion of authority figures were cultivated.

This breadth of approach to the topic means that the study, though relatively short, covers a lot of ground, including such matters as the ways in which young readers are represented both verbally and visually during the period, a technical discussion of the development of reading primers, the use of illustrations, and the growth of children’s magazines, their content and distribution. Fortna calls this the ‘commodification’ of reading material aimed at individual boys and girls which stands in contrast to the traditional channels of group recitation and repetition in the mosque under the watchful eyes of the ‘hoca’ and within the family and which cuts across in interesting ways the state’s drive (both Ottoman and Republican) to control what children read and the way they read it within schools. There are also chapters where Fortna takes a broader more theoretical overview of all the material, such as the third entitled ‘Context and Content’, in which he applies four ‘thematic tensions’–
religious/secular; family/nation state; new/old; global/local – to the actual literature, with the perhaps predictable result that the reality is found to be a good deal more mixed and confusing than these binary oppositions would suggest. One reason why Fortna is able to show this springs from one of the book’s paramount strengths (and one which makes it particularly attractive and accessible to non-specialist readers) – the richness of its reference to the source material – books, magazines, primers, images – which he has examined in the course of his research. He also includes a chapter on accounts of learning to read In childhood found in the later autobiographies of prominent Turkish writers whose lives spanned the period under consideration, such as Halide Edib and Hüseyin Cahit who, in their often poignant individualism and particularity reinforce the sense the whole book seems to want to give of the irreducible complexity of the phenomenon of learning to read in this period of Turkish history.

In such a stimulating survey of all the perspectives a study of children learning to read can open up, it seems churlish to complain of omissions. These might be seen, more generously and appropriately, as the paths of new research to which Fortna’s innovative study points the way. But I should have liked to know more about certain topics which he discusses and which are directly relevant to the arguments in the book: for example, the mechanisms of the Ottoman and then Republican state’s relationship with publishers and the provision of school textbooks. Who chose the authors of the textbooks? Did the Ministry of Education formally approve and censor the books? Were there subsidies for commercial publishers? Or again: what was the organisation of the book trade and the geographical spread of libraries and the nature of their use outside the few urban centres in what was a predominantly rural country. The details on this which Fortna does provide are fascinating, especially on the growth of magazine subscriptions – did these, I wonder, thrive because of the lack of other fixed points of sale in the towns and villages of Anatolia? – or on the development of the characteristically Ottoman institution known as the kiraathane, ‘a mix of the traditional café, a literary salon and a men’s social club’ with, interestingly, close ties to publishing firms who provided the newspapers (and books?) which were read there (at no charge). Also welcome would be more on the influence and use of Western models of children’s literature in Turkish publishing (again the book has interesting information on the use of illustrations which were often borrowed from the West, even though that meant incongruous details like church spires appearing in the background – were they free of connotation and therefore ‘invisible’ in the way a minaret could not have been?). In connection with this last topic, I wonder how typical the case was of the translation of the Italian schoolchildren’s classic Cuore, by the writer Edmondo De Amicis, first published in Italy in the 1880s and in Turkish translation in 1911 as Çocuk Kalbi, the spirit of which – a moralistic and didactic tale for schoolboys, exhorting them above all to be patriotic supporters of their newly-unified homeland – closely matched home-grown Ottoman and Republican stories, even though the framework of reference was of course completely different. Though it is no longer much read – if at all – in Italian schools, new Turkish editions of the work are still being published each year, suggesting that at least some of the continuities Fortna has identified linking the late Ottoman state and the early Republic have not yet entirely run their course.

Stephen Parkin
This first book by the author, a barrister, makes excellent and compelling reading. It is well written and has a bibliography, an index, extensive notes and a list of English-language sources. There are three main parts to the book, respectively on Aleppo, Constantinople, and Alexandria but the linking theme throughout is the life and work of the Levant Company (1581-1825) of ‘Turkey Merchants’, as they were originally known. The Company’s men, as Mather puts it, “from the reign of Elizabeth I until well into the nineteenth century could be found hustling in the marts of the Ottoman Empire”. In these years the Ottoman world was as fascinating as it was commercially attractive. At that time Britons came to deal with Islam and with Muslims on a scale not to be surpassed until later British moves into the Indian sub-continent. As the relationship between Britain and the Empire proceeded Britons came into contact with the Sultans’ Greek, Armenian, and Jewish subjects, as much as with Muslims in the commercial centres where they did business and, as time advanced, settled. By the nineteenth century the Western industrial revolution was reinforcing and expanding the trading presence of Britain, France, and other European powers within the Empire. And all this was in place before British troops occupied Middle Eastern lands.

In the account of Constantinople, we see the Company’s traders and agents enjoying special capitulatory privileges – notably in Galata and Pera – but then, as Ottoman power waned the Europeans increasingly used such special rights to pursue their own national interests – political as well as economic. All this while the British, French, and others were also competing with each other for commercial and political influence in the Empire. European powers became colonisers and occupiers rather than traders, travellers, or entrepreneurs. Mather sees “the colonial interlude”, when Britain came to rule much of the Middle East – and many of the world’s Muslims beyond – as a sad sequel to the more equal relationships and the “more fluid cultural boundaries” of the earlier centuries. Indeed that very fluidity which Mather identifies in the operation of the Levant Company enabled it to become, in its later years, as much a vehicle for British political influence as it was a competitor for trade in the Ottoman Middle East. But already, long before that, many of the Company’s members had come to regard the great Ottoman trading nodes as home, with substantial communities of long-term resident British developing in Constantinople, Smyrna, Beirut, and elsewhere. Some of this even endured well into the twentieth century, long after the Company’s consuls and traders in the Empire had been replaced by a colonially-minded British push into the eastern Mediterranean, starting with the lease on Cyprus in 1878 and the occupation of Egypt in 1882. Though never as powerful or indeed as substantially organised as the East India Company (with its own armies and territories) the ‘Turkey Merchants’ in their day were the effective face of Britain across the Sultans’ domains. The Levant Company negotiated directly with those Sultans until its power waned through the eighteenth century to the point where Company merchant voices were progressively ignored by the government in London. As British power grew the Company became a largely irrelevant remnant of its ascendant peak during the seventeenth century.
A strong feature of this welcome volume is the 33-page section of detailed notes which support the information-packed text. This, together with the substantial bibliographic list, constitutes an impressive indication of the range of the author's enquiry and is a comprehensive basis for further study of the Levant Company and into the lives and work of the traders, consuls, and agents (and their families) who were a front line of British commercial efforts in the Ottoman realm for so long.

Brian Beeley

The Transformation of Ottoman Crete:
Revolts, Politics and Identity in the Late Nineteenth Century
by Pinar Şenisik


Crete became an Ottoman province with the fall of Candia (Irakleion) in 1669. While most of the population adhered to their Christian faith, over time a significant minority converted to Islam and became ‘Turks’, though they remained Greek-speaking. According to the census of 1887 Turks formed 30 per cent of the total population of 294,000*. They were widely distributed across the island but with concentrations in the sancaks, and especially the towns, of Candia, Canea and Rethymnon**. The fate of the Cretan Turks is a major sub-theme of Pınar Şeníşık’s doctoral thesis now converted into a book. She tells the history of how Crete was transformed from an Ottoman province into a province of independent Greece (1895-98), a little known and poorly studied subject. The strength of her work lies in the use of Ottoman sources, particularly the official letters and reports sent by Ottoman officials stationed in Crete and by Ottoman diplomats abroad, as well as the papers of the island’s Muslim Council of Evkaf and Orphans. The result is a different perspective on the inter-faith violence in the island during the late nineteenth century which led first to autonomy and then to union with Greece from that based solely on western sources. Şeníşık demonstrates that the murderous strife between Christians and Muslims in the island was not the result of primordial hatred, as often argued by western officials. Although it fed on Christian discontent with aspects of Ottoman rule, in large measure it was engineered by the government of Greece and various irredentist communities in the island and on the mainland. Christians revolted in an effort to remove the Ottoman administration from the island. They had the uninformed but sympathetic and powerful support of western states throughout the nineteenth century; on this occasion they even introduced troops to the island. The Sultan had virtually no

diplomatic support but faced considerable hostility from the other European powers. As a result the Ottoman government was constrained in its response. Force to quell the revolts was ruled out. Concessions were made to the Cretan Christians at almost every turn of events, while diplomacy was tried abroad to resolve the crisis. Neither was successful. The Christians always wanted more. They played the great powers very successfully. The Cretan Turks were massacred, starved and forced to emigrate.

Pınar Şenışık’s book has a number of shortcomings. Its origin as a thesis is obvious, notably in discussion of previous studies of nationalism and ethnic conflict in Chapter 2. No use is made of the Ottoman yearbooks. Cuinet’s great compendium is cited at second hand, but his statistical material about the island in the 1880s is ignored. Karpat’s summary population statistics, however, are drawn upon. Mentioned should perhaps have been made to the view that the root of the problem lay with the failure of the original great power discussions in the 1820s about the extent an independent Greece to allocate Crete to the new state. Nonetheless, this is something of a pioneering study and as such it is to be welcomed.

Malcolm Wagstaff

**Loveswept:**
A cross-cultural Romance of 1950s
Turkey

by Engin İnel Holmstrom


I am happy to write that Loveswept is enjoyable and rewarding reading for anyone interested in Turkey and the Turkish way of life. After a career as educator, writer and painter, Engin İnel Holmstrom has turned to fiction in retirement and has created a well-rounded novel that makes interesting, intelligent and relevant comments on all areas of life in Turkey in the 1950’s.

I went to school with Engin and fiction writing did not appear as one of her ambitions at the time. She was a serious minded girl who wanted a career in education, which she accomplished with honours. She was always full of fun, too, with interest in many things. Then I got to see some of her paintings which she was doing with zeal and skill. Last year she gave me the first draft of her novel to read and comment upon. Now she has sent me the revised and published novel. I had great pleasure rereading Loveswept and amazed at how it had ‘matured’, deepened in every aspect. The expanded political, social events with their international dimension give a more thorough insight into social and political life in Turkey in the 1950’s. The sizzling emotions in the foreground do not fall into sentimentality.

The main character Neri is a liberally raised and educated girl in a country with traditional values especially at a time when the newly elected conservative government’s agenda includes bringing back traditional religious values, as opposed to the secularist reform values of Atatürk. In 1950 Menderes was elected Prime Minister when the Democratic Party came to power. The novel brings out all the dichotomies and polarities of life in Turkey at that time. The geographic expanse of the novel makes the reader see Istanbul as more secular and
liberal and not immediately affected by the social and religious policies of the government in Ankara. The action in the early parts of the novel takes place in Tekirdağ, a provincial town on the northern shore of the Marmara Sea, which is different from both Ankara and Istanbul.

The deepest dichotomies however are given through Neri’s personal reactions, a result of the storms raging in her. At every decision-making point in her life, she is pulled two-ways. Raised in a traditional atmosphere by liberal parents and studying at an American college, she knows how every girl is expected to behave – the good girls, the traditional girls, the wild girls, the bad girls – but, when it comes to deciding about her own course in life, she is tormented by the discrepancy between what she should do and what she wants to do. Neri has always been loved and respected by her circle of family and friends. Yet, when she expands her circle, she meets opposition and disapproval which she has to learn to deal with and eventually control.

Loveswept is a 'Bildungsroman' with the heroine suffering and learning and coming out on top of her world. Finally her questions about love and life are answered and her wildnesses smoothed over after much introspection and pain. This is a promising first novel which gives pleasure as well as insights. Neri in her fight for her identity, freedom and happiness is a good role-model for young women in parts of the world where traditional and modern values clash. Although the story takes place in 1950’s Turkey, even now the cultural clashes between the old and the new in Turkey and the Middle East have not disappeared – rather they have intensified. The book can give clues about politics and the position of women in those countries even to readers far away. With her intimate knowledge of East and West, Holmstrom has created an entertaining and clever story well-worth reading.

Belma Ötuş-Basket

John Henry Haynes

A Photographer and Archaeologist in the Ottoman Empire 1881-1900

by Robert G. Ousterhout


With 25 pages of supporting text, this remarkable collection of photographs from Greece, Anatolia, Syria, and Mesopotamia shows people, monuments, settlements and ordinary buildings. Some images reveal ancient structures which exist no more. Many allow us to see changes over some twelve decades. An 1884 shot of the citadel of ‘Angora’ is typically arresting; it shows none of the buildings which now cover the slopes. The rock-cut architecture of Üçhisar in Cappadocia reveals, in the mid-1880s, no hint of the later development which would make it a major attraction for visitors. Landscape shots of Palmyra, Nippur, Assos, Konya and many other places are as compelling as Haynes’ close-ups of groups of people and detail of building. The clarity and composition of the plates is impressive. For example, he captures the Roman text on the lateral façade of the Temple of
Augustus in Ankara (1884). In Konya, in the same year, he successfully contrasts the rough tombstones in front of the elegance of the Selim II Mosque and the Mevlana Lodge.

John Henry Haynes was born in rural Massachusetts in 1849. He later studied hard to become a high school principal. However, in 1880, he accepted the offer of a place on an project in Crete facilitated by the Archaeological Institute of America and led by William Stillman. A remarkable 1870 photograph of Athens, by Stillman himself, is included in this volume (p 12). Haynes set about advancing his own skills as a photographer in a number of archaeological digs and on his journeys between them. But photography was not his full-time role. He tutored at Robert College on the Bosphorus between 1881 and 1884. Then he moved to a missionary school in Gaziantep where he was teacher and treasurer until he was appointed to be the first honorary United States’ Consul in Baghdad from 1888 to 1892 – he was still on salary from the University of Pennsylvania. Haynes next returned for a third season with the Babylon Exploration Fund (1893-96) and then a fourth (1898-1900).

The compiler of this volume, Robert G Ousterhout, notes that John Henry Haynes valued photographs for their ‘information’ content, rather than for their artistic merit. Either way he has left a valuable visual legacy.

Brian Beeley
LITERATURE


POLITICS


SPORTS

Compiled by Arın Bayraktaroğlu

POSTSCRIPTUM

In Memoriam
President Rauf Raif Denktaş
(1924-2012)

by Clement Dodd

The obituaries in the world’s leading English language newspapers have shown a rather surprising appreciation of the former president’s immensely important role in the Cyprus conflict. They did not lay much stress on his reputation among the many national and international special representatives, who tried so hard to persuade him to accede to their plans for a reunited Cyprus. By many of them he was usually regarded as ‘intransigent’, as ‘Mr No’ or even ‘Mr Never’ to plans for a
solution to the Cyprus problem, but President Denktash often saw these plans as inspired more by international concerns, than by any proper consideration and understanding of the Cyprus problem itself.

A ‘Briefing’ distributed on the internet the weekend of his death summarized opinion of Denktash as ‘the last of his kind, a Cold War warrior, the old wolf of regional politics, a family man, a formidable opponent and lawyer, entertaining and charismatic. His legacy will be fought over but his death may allow all Cypriots to move forward’.\(^\text{32}\) In the same ‘Briefing’ a professor in the Eastern Mediterranean University in Northern Cyprus, Erol Kaymak, is reported as saying, ‘He was Mr TRNC. He was very much a man of his time . . . you could rely on him to stick to the ethno-nationalist line that he believed in’.\(^\text{33}\) This seems to reflect the post-modern enthusiasm for the EU that marked some members of the intelligentsia and the opposition political parties at the time of the 2004 referendums on the Annan Plan, a movement that did not distinguish greatly between nationalism and patriotism. In the same ‘Briefing’ a Greek Cypriot professor of history, Petros Papapolyviou, goes further, reportedly saying ‘Greek Cypriots saw him as a cynical adversary...who put the interests of Turkey above those of Cyprus’.\(^\text{34}\)

This last opinion has some truth in it, but not in the sense implied. Denktash was always aware of Turkey’s interests, but under every government Turkey’s major intent has always been to find a solution of the Cyprus problem in order to prevent its negative effects on its relations with the UN, NATO, and the European Union. For instance, Ankara continued to recognize the purely Greek Cypriot-constituted government long after 1964 when the UN Security Council in Resolution 186 referred to that government as the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. Then again, after the serious attack in 1967 on Geçitkale (Kophinou) by Georgias Grivas, the former EOKA leader, a very serious incident largely resolved by American diplomacy, Ankara exerted great pressure on Denktash to agree a settlement of the Cyprus problem with Glafcos Clerides, the Greek Cypriot negotiator. During these UN-led negotiations Denktash made concessions greater in some respects than those called for by Makarios in his 1963 constitutional proposals. The Turkish Cypriots were left with little but local government functions, but it was too much for Makarios, who vetoed the proposed settlement. Clerides believed that Makarios ‘prevented a solution of the Cyprus problem in December 1972’.\(^\text{35}\)

Then, in another vitally important issue, in February 2004, Turkey’s new government exerted great pressure on Denktash to agree in New York that the UN Secretary-General could be authorized to reconcile differences between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots on the Annan Plan for Cyprus. Against the grain Denktash had to agree. He later thanked President Papadopoulos, who had argued against the Plan, which the Greek Cypriots rejected in the 2004 referendum.

Why, despite Turkey’s restraining hand, did Denktash fight for a separate Turkish Cypriot state? Foremost in my mind, I think, was a deep distrust of the Greek Cypriots, a distrust that had deep roots. He had been brought up in Cyprus at a time when there was constant Greek Cypriot clamour for the uniting of the island with Greece, enosis. This had little or no regard for the Turkish Cypriot minority, the descendants of the Turks who had governed the island until 1878, when the Ottoman Sultan, Abdul Hamid,
consigned it to the care of the United Kingdom. Like most Greek Cypriots the Turkish Cypriots did not want British colonial rule, but this was overshadowed by their total opposition to enosis. They drew inspiration from the Turkish nationalism, or, better, the patriotism, that was one of the hallmarks of the Atatürkist ‘revolution’. The events of 1963-64, guided by the Akritas Plan, which intended to use all means to reduce the Turkish Cypriots to submission, confirmed all his fears. He also distrusted the British, especially when in March 1964 they went along with the UN Security Council’s Resolution 186, mentioned above, which ignored the Turkish Cypriots’ right to be part of the Government of Cyprus, as required by the Constitution that formed part of the 1960 settlement. In New York Denktas was in tears.

He was doubly incensed when, in 1983, the United Kingdom took the lead in calling on all governments not to recognize the Turkish Cypriot Declaration of Independence. He believed that the United Kingdom had not lived up to its obligations as a Guarantor Power of the 1960 settlement, and that, with the United States, was appeasing the Greek Cypriots on account of their concern for the British bases in Cyprus, which the Greek Cypriots regarded, and still do regard, as a denial of their sovereignty. He deeply resented that, even before the Declaration of Independence, at the behest of the Greek Cypriot government, the international community supported crippling economic and political embargoes on the Turkish Cypriots, embargoes that still persist.

Addressing the UN Security Council on 11 May 1984 after the Council had just adopted a resolution not to recognize ‘the purported State of the Republic of Cyprus’ and ‘not to facilitate or in any way assist the aforesaid secessionist entity’ he said,

I thank the Council. It has decided that my people, because they are fighting for their liberty, and do not accept colonisation by the Greek Cypriots, should be isolated in this world like lepers... Now, on their behalf, you are asking them to squeeze us out economically. We have lived on bread, on onions, on beans, for twenty years. We shall continue to do so, if necessary, but we shall not accept those who occupy by force the seat of Government as the Government of Cyprus’.

Later, President Denktas was much criticized for not joining with the Greek Cypriots in their application for EU membership: he did not share the view that the very act of joining with the Greek Cypriots in this enlightening adventure would somehow unleash a new and positive mentality that would create the atmosphere conducive for a solution. He kept his feet on the ground. He welcomed the Legal Opinion of Professor M.H. Mendelson QC, that the accession of Cyprus to the European Union was illegal since ‘it was laid down in 1960 in the Treaty of Guarantee that the Republic of Cyprus undertook ‘not to participate, in whole or in part, in any political or economic union with any state whatsoever’. According to Professor Mendelson participation would be contrary to the Treaty. Moreover Article 50 of the 1960 Constitution allowed the Turkish Vice-President a veto over the membership of Cyprus in any international organization unless both Greece and Turkey were members.

---

37 Quotations are from the Opinion of Professor M.H. Mendelson, Q.C. on the Application of the Republic of Cyprus to join the European Union’ prepared for the Turkish Government, 6 June 1997.
After Cyprus was admitted to the EU as a divided state Denktaş believed that for the Turkish Cypriots to join it would be to expose them to EU norms that would eventually obliterate the Turkish Cypriot identity in which he passionately believed. Under the Annan Plan the Turkish Cypriots were not given permanent derogations to preserve their independence in economic and other spheres, only temporary relief.

President Denktaş always prefaced talks with new national or international representatives seeking to solve the Cyprus problem with a history lesson. He also sought to enlighten them on Greek Cypriot politics: unlike his Greek Cypriot rivals, who generally did not know Turkish, he read and spoke Greek, and kept closely in touch with events on the other side. However, he believed that the powers involved in and around the Cyprus problem had their own agenda and that the future of Cyprus was dependent on international considerations that respected the aims and demands of Greek or Turkish Cypriots only in so far as they affected their grand designs.

What can one say about President Denktaş’s political make-up, his basic political attitudes? In my view he was most notably republican in conviction, in this respect following Atatürk, who seemingly took inspiration from the French Third Republic.38 In this regard, like Atatürk he was solidarist, denying the importance of economic and social divisions in society and politics. Consequently, his emphasis was on the nation, the people as a whole, and on the need for respect for the general will or interest. Yet, unlike Atatürk, he embodied something of the Ottoman patrimonial tradition. Whereas Atatürk might refer to Turks as the nation or the people, Denktaş often spoke of Turkish Cypriots as ‘my people’ when using English. As part of this patrimonial tradition, any person, however humble, might appeal to the Ottoman Sultan for help. In Northern Cyprus those with personal administrative problems sometimes came direct to Denktaş who, always sympathetic, rarely failed to help them if their grievance, or case, was good. This sometimes caused friction with the government, of which Denktaş, as President, was not a part. His task was to represent and protect the unity and integrity of the state, and only to see that public affairs were generally carried out in an impartial and orderly way by the government.

His life was essentially dedicated to achieving respect for the rights and liberties of his people, and for full partnership status in any union with the Greek Cypriots. On his deathbed he murmured in Greek, “Tell Christofias that this is an independent state”. “I am like a man”, he used often to say, “who has been dropped into the ocean. I am compelled to continue swimming – I don’t have the right to give up.” He never did.39

President Denktaş did not achieve his ambition of a recognized Turkish Cypriot state, but he certainly laid foundations on which, perhaps, something will be built. Thousands of Turkish Cypriots and Turks saw him to his last resting place, including the Turkish Cypriot President, the Prime Minister, members of the government, and representatives of all Turkish Cypriot political parties. All the leading Turkish statesmen, the President, the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Minister for Europe, and other ministers were also present. The British and other expatriate communities in Northern Cyprus, with whom President Denktaş was very popular, turned out in large numbers to pay him their final respects. There were also present official representatives from Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Qatar, Kosovo, Macedonia, and Pakistan. Straws in the wind? Perhaps, if there is not an agreed solution and the status quo persists.

STOP PRESS:

Enthusiasts of the work of film director Nuri Bilge Ceylan will be pleased to know that his latest film, *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia*, winner of last year's Grand Prix at the Cannes Film Festival, is now on release.

The film tracks the investigation of a murder over the course of one night. Derek Malcolm in the *Evening Standard* wrote: "(Ceylan's) films seldom make for easy viewing. And he's never made it harder ... (however) many who saw it at Cannes felt that it should have won the Palme D'Or.... The film, beautifully shot in ravishing countryside... watches its characters so intently throughout that it would be easy to say that their psyches are exhumed along with the body of the murdered man."

And Peter Bradshaw in *The Guardian* enthused: "... I can only say it is a kind of masterpiece: audacious, uncompromising and possessed of a mysterious grandeur in its wintry pessimism.....This is his greatest so far."                                      J S

---
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