



National Museums in the Republic of Turkey: Palimpsests within a Centralized State

Wendy M. K. Shaw

Summary

This study considers how the various forms of the museum within the Turkish context serve in the production of a decentralized national narrative that becomes replicated to reify Turkish identity through multiple, non-hierarchized heritage sources. Through the overlay of institutions established during these periods, contemporary Turkish museums, whether public or private, serve as museums of the nation not because of their conceptual cohesion or administrative centralization, but because through this layering, they express the many competing threads through which national culture and heritage construct a complex, and at times contradictory, national narrative which enables competing segments of the population to coexist. The study provides a chronological survey of the development of museums with a special focus on five key case studies that each reflects changing relationships between the state, the nation, and the concept of the museum in various eras of Turkey's history.

In the Republic of Turkey, the Ottoman emphasis on museums of archaeology and military spolia became transformed into an emphasis on historic museums as a means of glorifying early imperial history and differentiating the republic from its Ottoman past; ethnographic-archaeological museums as a means of inscribing a unified historical and ethnological map of the country, particularly Anatolia; and, more recently, using art (in lieu of archaeology) as a signal of participation in European cultural practices, particularly among urban elite audiences. As explored in this report, these types can be best understood as a complex palimpsest of the four historical eras of national identity production during which different museum typologies were introduced for different needs: the late Ottoman era (1839-1922); the early Republican era (1922-1960); the era between two eras of military rule (1961-1983) and the current era (1984- 2010). The study will also focus on five key case studies that each reflects changing relationships between the state, the nation, and the concept of the museum in various eras of Turkey's history: the Ottoman Imperial Museum (1846); the Topkapi Palace Museum (1924); the Ethnographic Museum (1928); the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations (1968) and the Istanbul Modern Museum of Art (2004).

Summary table, Turkey

Name	Inaugurated	Initiated	Actors	Ownership	Type	Values	Temporal reach	Style Location
Ottoman Imperial Museum	1869	1846	Ministry of Education	Ottoman Empire	Archaeological	Territorial	Prehistory-18 th c.	Purpose-built on former palace grounds, Neo-Classical style, Istanbul.
Topkapi Palace Museum	1924	1910	Ministry of Education	Republic of Turkey	Historical	Territorial	15 th – 19 th c.	Historical site, Istanbul.
Ethnographic Museum	1928	1922	Ministry of Education	Republic of Turkey	Ethnographic	Territorial	18 th -20 th c.	Purpose-built, Neo-Ottoman style at former religious site, Istanbul.
Museum of Anatolian Civilizations	1968	1941 (as Hittite Museum)	Ministry of Education	Republic of Turkey	Archaeological	Territorial	Pre-history to 14 th c.	Historical site, purpose-built annex in universal modern style, Istanbul.
Istanbul Modern Museum of Art	2004		Eczacıbaşı Corporation	Eczacıbaşı Corporation	Art	Territorial	20 th c.	Former customs warehouse, Istanbul.

Introduction: Nation and museum in the Republic of Turkey

If we define the concept of a national museum as a single or limited network of institutions designated for and underwritten by the state for the express purpose of expressing issues of national identity, values, and ideals, then the Republic of Turkey has no national museums. At first glance, this may appear ironic for a highly centralized nation with highly ideological narratives of national cohesion. However, the lack of centralized cohesion in the museums of Turkey bespeaks a latent reluctance not only to adopt the paradigm of the museum as a primary node of collective identity production, but also to fix a singular narrative within the institution of a single museum. This paper will consider how the various forms of the museum within the Turkish context serve in the production of a decentralized national narrative that becomes replicated to reify Turkish identity through multiple, non-hierarchized heritage sources (Kushner, 1997; Zubaida, 1996). Through the overlay of institutions established during these periods, contemporary Turkish museums, whether public or private, serve as museums of the nation not because of their conceptual cohesion or administrative centralization, but because through this layering, they express the many competing threads through which national culture and heritage construct a complex, and at times contradictory, national narrative which enables competing segments of the population to coexist.

Turkey has numerous characteristics that would lend themselves to the formation of a strong national museum structure. Since its inception in 1923, a key characteristic of its state structure has been strong centralization. This is clearly expressed as one of the key defining policies of the country's first political party, the Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*, CHP), led by Mustafa Kemal (who received the moniker 'Ataturk' [father Turk] from parliament with the legislation of mandatory surnames in 1934) until his death in 1938 and, was the only political party in the country until after World War II. The CHP expressed its national vision through six 'arrows', understood as vectors towards the future ideal state. These were populism (conceiving the state as emerging from the populace); revolutionism (support for the War of Liberation ending in 1922, but also of the revolutionary modernizing reforms undertaken between 1928 and 1935); republicanism (support of the republic as the proper state structure for the nation); laicism (placing religious institutions under the aegis of the state and promoting a non-religious outlook as the defining feature of modernity); nationalism (participation in the Turkish nation, defined both ethnically and as a willingness to take up the national designation of being a Turk) and statism (faith in a corporate state as the economic hub of the nation). The first decades of the regime were characterized by dramatic reforms that legislated these changes through new social structures (Webster, 1939; Pfaff, 1963). State support of numerous cultural institutions, such as the establishment of state theatre, orchestra, ballet, and state control over museums, established both during the Ottoman and republican eras, points to the strong deployment of cultural institutions in the construction of a cohesive state. However, while a national museum was conceived during the complex era of nation formation, instead a network of multiple museum types came to serve the function of preserving and exhibiting the material culture of the nation under the rubric of heritage.

Rather than relying on epistemologies in which an object functions as a symbol for an idea integral to its own culture, or a synecdochal relationship with an Enlightenment project towards universal knowledge, the impetus behind Ottoman and later Turkish museums can be understood as a translation of European forms in an effort to participate in modern cultural systems. Thus, although often conceived as spaces of conditioning citizens, they often function more effectively for foreign visitors enculturated with the museum ideal. As translations, such institutions have relied on select examples from Europe, primarily those of France, Germany, and England, while also responding to local political impulses. The types of collections housed in Turkish museums thus differ considerably from dominant trends in European counterparts. Instead of focusing on museums of art, science/industry, and history, Ottoman museums focused on archaeological preservation and military exhibition. In the Republic of Turkey, the Ottoman emphasis on museums of archaeology and military spolia became transformed into an emphasis on historic museums as a means of glorifying early imperial history and differentiating the republic from its Ottoman past; ethnographic-archaeological museums as a means of inscribing a unified historical and ethnological map of the country, particularly Anatolia; and, more recently, using art (in lieu of archaeology) as a signal of participation in European cultural practices, particularly among urban elite audiences. As explored in this report, these types can be best understood as a complex palimpsest of the four historical eras of national identity production during which different museum typologies were introduced for different needs: the late Ottoman era (1839-1922); the early Republican era (1922-1960); the era between two eras of military rule (1961-1983) and the current era (1984- 2010). The study will also focus on five key case studies that each reflects changing relationships between the state, the nation, and the concept of the museum in various eras of Turkey's history: the Ottoman Imperial Museum (1846); the Topkapi Palace Museum (1924); the Ethnographic Museum (1928); the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations (1968) and the Istanbul Modern Museum of Art (2004).

National museums and cultural policy in the Republic of Turkey

Ottoman museums (1839 – 1922) and their transition to the Turkish republic

With regard to the question of national museums in the Republic of Turkey, museums established during the Ottoman era need to be considered less as a prehistory to Turkish museums but as the first layer of the museological palimpsest in Turkey that establishes the conceptual foundations of the function of the museum in the country. While European museums largely developed from private collections of art and ultimately were often categorized through epistemological models rooted in natural history, Ottoman museums were rooted in military collections rather than in collections of art or other treasures, and branched out towards the collection of antiquities not through an interest in the works per se, but through an interest in territorial protectionism coinciding with military power (Shaw, 2003). Located in the former Byzantine Church of Hagia Irene, in the first courtyard of the imperial palace and in use as an arsenal since the sixteenth century, the Armory (*Dar ül-Aslibau*) served as the first space of display in the empire, featuring not only military spolia

but also relics inherited from the Byzantine era. Open to the perusal of private guests of the sultan, the collection served as a space of exhibition both through its viewing and through popular knowledge of the presence of relics within it. In 1846, the collection opened to the public in the new guise of the Magazine of Antique Weapons coupled with the Magazine of Antiquities, consisting of ancient inscriptions and sculptures salvaged by local administrators in response to a directive from the central government to protect such works from the predations of European travellers, collectors, and archaeologists. The 1869 renaming of the institution as the Ottoman Imperial Museum indicated an ideological shift towards national representation coinciding with the progressive loss of the empire's provinces and its subsequent redefinition of its collective identity. The closure of the weaponry collection and the relocation of the museum to the nearby fifteenth century Tiled Pavilion of the palace marked an equally important shift in the expression of cultural, rather than military identity, and the desired affiliation of that identity as one coincident with the heritage of Europe rather than one defined by conquest and conflict with it. This vision for an Ottoman identity tied to European heritage through a shared antique heritage grew between 1880 and 1910 under the directorship of the museum's first Ottoman director, Osman Hamdi, who broadened its scope in a purpose-built building, where the museum moved in 1891.

New directives for the museum's structure issued by the Council of State in 1889, as well as its organizational structure and catalogue information, suggest strong epistemological differences with European national museums. Although the directive called for the establishment of a collection of natural history, the conceptual backbone of many nineteenth century developmental display strategies, the museum administration actively resisted its realization. Even more surprising, despite Osman Hamdi's concurrent activity as one of the country's most renowned painters, the museum included no provisions for a museum of Western-style art. In addition, like the antiquities collections, the display of which followed a territorial rather than a developmental model, the Islamic collections established in 1891 emerged less as an attempt to use works as a means of expressing a broader cultural narrative through them than as a means of asserting territorial integrity and resistance to European practices of antiquities collection, understood as a form of imperial penetration. Although not explicitly part of the museum's program, the removal of objects from locations of worship for the purpose of protection shifted their meaning from a votive to a historical-aesthetic epistemology. Thus in contrast to the Western understanding of art, and the contextualization of antiquities within such an epistemological model, the Ottoman understanding of the museum did not regard the works within as metonymic expressions of a metanarrative viewed within the work, but rather regarded the museum institution as a whole as indicative of a metanarrative of modernization, collusion with Western civilization, and resistance to European imperial incursion. Nonetheless, in the framework of national museums as applied to the Turkish context, the Ottoman Imperial Museum has a unique place in that it is the only single museum that ever attempted a comprehensive representation of a national ideology, particularly through the inclusion of various departments and the establishment of branch institutions.

Although the Turkish Republic, founded by leaders of the Young Turk movement that gained power after the Second Constitutional Revolution of 1909, maintained this strong affiliation between

modernization and Westernization, the ethno-national emphasis adopted in the Turkish republic made this type of territorial appeal to a pan-European pre-history less pertinent in later eras. While it was only renamed as the Istanbul Archaeological Museum in the 1920s, its role as a center had already decreased in the 1910s as alternative exhibitionary institutions began to proliferate as part of the growth of civil society after the Second Constitutional Revolution of 1909 and the death of its powerful director (Osman Hamdi) in 1910. The reopening of an independent Military Museum in the Church of Hagia Irene in 1913 (where it remained until 1940), the 1914 segregation of the Islamic collections into a separate museum in a former school (madrassa) associated with the Suleymaniye Mosque (the Museum of Pious Foundations), the arrangement of the treasury and the collection of Chinese porcelains for purposes of exhibition at the former imperial palace (known as the Topkapı Palace), and the emergence of a collection of copies as part of the arts academy the same year serve as an early indication of the decentralization of museums which would continue to characterize the development of Turkey's museum even during its most heated era of national identity construction following the establishment of the republic in 1923 (Shaw, 2003; Shaw, 2011).

Museums and centralization in the early republic (1922-1960)

While museums of the Republic of Turkey maintained the general ideological outlook of Ottoman museums in that objects were used as metonyms for territoriality rather than being situated in an aesthetic discourse of art, the shift in focus from Greco-Roman to Anatolian antiquities and from military spolia to ethnographic artifacts underscored the ideological shift from imperial to ethnically based national identity. While in the early years of the republic, a national museum was part of a broader program of constructing this identity; the actual political and financial issues raised by the establishment of museums led to a series of institutions that function(ed) in concert in the construction of national identity.

In his *Essentials of Turkism*, published in 1923, the foundation year of the republic, one of the primary architects of Turkish nationalism, Ziya Gökalp, repeatedly mentioned the idea of a national museum as a core element in the formation of national culture. However, for him, it is the people themselves who are a "living museum" of national culture that the elite, educated through Western schools, need to visit in order to construct national identity. Metaphorically he explains that, "...thus the *Patrie* is a museum, an exhibit even, of the beauties of religion, morality, and aesthetics." Yet his understanding of a museum is also literal. "It is necessary," he writes, "to revive the coffeehouses where the military epics of the people are read, the nights of the holy month of Ramazan, Friday potluck dinners, and the joyous holidays for which children waited with impatience every year; and to collect the people's art and put it into national museums." His list of institutions necessary to "reveal national culture from the secret corners where it is hidden and place it before the eyes of the enlightened elites" includes a national museum, an ethnographic museum, a national archive, a library of national history, and a general directorate of statistics. While each of these institutions seem to parallel institutions familiar from their Western counterparts, they differ considerably in that he envisions them as emerging from the people rather than from the state. He points out that, in contrast to the Topkapı Palace Museum, which he understood as featuring works of European origin

displaying imperial wealth, a truly national museum would exhibit the “genius” of the national aesthetic through the exhibition of works of everyday use by and for the people that were being sold to Western museums: “curtains, carpets, shawls, silk fabrics, old carpentry and metalwork, tiles, calligraphic panels, illuminated manuscripts, fine bindings, and crafted Qur’ans.” He identifies such a collection in the Museum of Pious Foundations, which had inherited the Islamic collections of the Imperial Museum and had been reorganized by Fredrich Sarre, the future director of the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin, in 1911-1913. However, Gökalp points out that such a museum needs to be national, both in its scope and its address. He also differentiates this national museum from his rendition of an ethnographic museum, which would collect the contemporary life of the nation rather than its historical products, housed in the national museum, and would emphasize a regional scope for the collections. In addition, it would invest in all sorts of practices of recording: photographs of architecture, costumes, and practices; sound recordings of songs and tales; record keeping of games and dances. Implicit in such a program, of course, is the projected demise of such a contemporary culture, to serve as the root of a national aesthetic not for future reproduction, but for the inspiration of a modern national aesthetic.

However, before an Ethnographic Museum emerged as the first fully realized attempt at a national museum in the country’s new capital city of Ankara, at the time still a small provincial town, work towards a national museum housing historical military artifacts and antiquities preserved from the fighting, was already underway. Individuals working within the provisional republican government began to collect works for a national, cultural museum in the fortress, where they set aside two small rooms with some glass cases. The museum was envisioned as bringing together archaeological artifacts, historical signet rings, small collectibles, embroideries, lacework, printed fabrics, and costumes. Founded officially in 1921, in 1924 the museum was still seeking funding for the production of an inventory and a budget for purchasing works throughout Anatolia. When the collection opened in 1925, it had practically no contents. The same year, the Directorate of Culture was established with a mandate to “protect national culture and raise our youth within [it].” Under consultation with the Turcologist J. Mesaros, the director of the Hungarian National Museum who had taught at Istanbul University, the Minister of Public Education Hamdullah Suphi (Tanrıöver) took on the project of a museum that would begin with an ethnographic-anthropological orientation rooted in collections culled from throughout Turkey, but which would include archaeological research to establish a scientific dimension. Like the ethnographic museum envisioned by Gökalp, this museum project envisioned the populace as both the font of national culture and as facing eminent extinction under the inevitable tides of modernization (Shaw, 2007).

Although at the foundation-laying ceremony of 1925, the museum was still referred to under several names – the Imperial Treasury, the Museum of the People, the National Museum, and the Culture Museum, by its public opening in 1930 it had become the Ethnography Museum. Located on an important hill overlooking the new city on the site of a former open site of public prayer and beside the new building of the Turkish Hearth, an organ of the ruling People’s Republic Party, the museum housed everyday items collected from the populace in all regions of the country as well as historical works from dervish lodges which had been forcibly closed in 1924. Whereas in Istanbul,

the Museum of Pious Foundations displayed similar works under the rubric of Islamic Art, the first museum of the capital, the Ethnographic museum, presented costumes and items from everyday life alongside objects of religious utility as sources for a national culture in a framework that would historicize them against the modernizing impetus of the city and the national ideology. The secularization of signs of religious devotion by shifting the act of the gaze from one of worship to one of aesthetic appreciation was part and parcel of the secularist ideology of the republican regime, and was inscribed not only by the Ethnography Museum, but also through the establishment of the Konya Museum of Antiquities in 1927 at the site of the tomb of Celaladdin Rumi, a thirteenth-century poet acknowledged by many as a spiritual master. While the establishment of the museum was presented as a means of preserving the cultural heritage embodied by the tomb, the transformation of such a site of worship from a holy to a secular site was also a clear statement against the powerful religious brotherhoods that had traditionally provided an alternative to the centralized power of the state. Likewise, the establishment of the Museum of Hagia Sophia in 1935 not only used the policy of secularism to cast the building less as a palimpsest of religious practices than as one of cultural histories, where Byzantine and Ottoman legacies were to be shown side by side and equally defunct (Shaw, 2002). A similar phenomenon can be observed with the downplaying of the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art when it reopened after its protective wartime closure in 1939 to a less central site (again a former madrasa) near the Valens Aqueduct in 1949. In contrast to the under-attended Ethnography Museum or Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art, however, the Mevlana Museum (renamed from the Konya Museum of Antiquities in 1954, during the populist regime of the Democratic party), the Museum of the Tomb of Hacı Bektaş (established in 1964), and the Hagia Sophia Museum remain among the most popular museums among Turkish visitors because of their continuing religious associations (Özbey, 2011).

The integration of center and periphery affected by the museum was emphasized by its proximity to the Turkish Hearth Building, the central node in a network of People's Houses established by the CHP in each city in order to inculcate the populace with republican ideologies (Karpas, 1974). Through these People's Houses, people were encouraged to help contribute to the local museums often established to collect artifacts from local archaeological sites. Thus people learned to identify their land with a narrative of national history as had been expressed in the Turkish Historical Thesis and popularized in national histories derived from *A General Outline of Turkish History* (1930). Throughout the country, small collections of archaeological artifacts established in regional centers were designated as museums, although many never actually opened until the further centralization of regional museums in the 1960s. [Table 1]

The 1935 of proto-Hittite sites in central and northern Anatolia led to the emphasis on Hittite identity as a model for Turkish autochthoneity, which like its ethnography, was mapped onto the Anatolian landscape. This association was strengthened with the opening of the Hittite Museum the Ankara fortress in 1945, the regional model that coupled ethnographic and archaeological collections as the two divisions of a normal museum became was established through two separate institutions in the capital. Like the Museum of Pious Foundations, the museum was originally organized by a European specialist, the Hittitologist Hans Güterbock, who saw it as an unparalleled opportunity for

a comparative history of Hittite history. The museum was conceived at the apogee of the Turkish Historical Thesis, which posited the Hittites as proto-Turkic, thus implying Aryan and autochthonous roots for modern Turks (Shaw, 2008; Tanyeri-Erdemir, 2006).

While the museums of the early republican era naturally emerged in the capitol city Ankara as a means of constructing national identity, with its vastly larger population and ponderous legacy, Istanbul remained the cultural capitol of the nation. As such, the new state had to negotiate the legacy of the Ottoman Empire: to glorify its accomplishments while vilifying its decline and naturalizing its demise (Zürcher, 1992). The first museum established in the Republic of Turkey was thus the defunct Topkapı Palace Museum, which opened to the public in 1924. By emphasizing early Ottoman history, the Topkapı Palace Museum glorifies the Ottoman legacy for the modern nation while disassociating it from the modern destruction of the empire by the republic.

However, as an era of populism that moderated many of the revolutionary impulses of the early republican era under the leadership of the CHP, the 1950s under the leadership of the Democratic Party of Adnan Menderes initiated a partial restitution of the late Ottoman period through new museums dedicated to the Ottoman era, including its later years. These included the Dolmabahçe Palace Museum, opened in 1952; the Istanbul Tanzimat Museum (1952), dedicated to the era of Ottoman reform between 1829 and 1976; the Istanbul Rumeli Hisar Museum (1958), the Istanbul Yedikule Museum (1959), dedicated to key fortresses associated with the conquest of Constantinople. The opening of the Bursa-Iznik Museum (1960), associated with the pre-conquest Ottoman era; and the Karatay Porcelain Works Museum (1955), affiliated with the pre-Ottoman, Seljuk era) also suggest a shift in emphasis from the apogee of Ottoman power towards an expanded national historiography. Similarly, the redesignation of the tomb of Celaladdin Rumi as the Mevlana Museum in 1954 signaled a relaxation in the revolutionary secularism of the early republic (Gerçek, 1999, pp. 441-447).

The late establishment of a museum of art, as well as its absence from the capital, suggests the vast difference between the institution of the museum as premised on an epistemology of art and that of the Republic of Turkey remained, even after the demise of the Ottoman Empire. Although arts played a significant role in the ideological program of the state from the beginning, and visual arts were promoted through regular state exhibitions held in the capital, an arts museum was not established until 1938 in Istanbul. Housed in the former apartments of the heir apparent at the Dolmabahçe Palace, the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture became the first permanent space devoted to the collection and display of Western-style Turkish art. Nonetheless, it remained underfunded and underattended, and was the sole museum of art in the country until the establishment of the Izmir Museum of Painting and Sculpture in 1952 (remodeled in 1973), and the Ankara Museum of Painting and Sculpture at the Turkish Hearth Building in 1981. The establishment of the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture outside the capital, in a wing of the nineteenth century Dolmabahçe Palace in Istanbul, and the relatively late proliferation of other art museums in the country underscores the relative unimportance accorded to art production in the definition of national identity through museums in Turkey (Shaw, 2011). Rather than conceiving of national culture as something linking the past with the present, Turkey's national museums have

served to identify various aspects of the past and historicized popular and religious culture as disconnected elements of a national heritage disassociated from the creation of culture.

If any single museum of the first republican era is to be considered as a predominant national museum, it would without a doubt be the Ethnographic Museum, the centrality of which was underscored when it became the temporary tomb of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk at the time of his death in 1938. However, with the temporary reduction of his stature as an iconic forefather to a political leader that characterized the rule of the Democratic Party from 1950 to 1960 and his reinterment at his permanent tomb, called Anıtkabir, in 1954, the importance of the museum decreased. With a complex architectural legacy determined in the 1940s by its architects Emin Onat and Orhan Arda, the tomb merged the kinds of devotional functions once reserved for the tombs of saints with an architectural vocabulary culled from antique Greece, Sumeria, and fascist monumentalism and decorated with Byzantine, Hittite, Sumerian, and folk motifs. A museum devoted to Atatürk opened at the tomb in 1960 underscores its function as a site of exhibition as well as one of remembrance. Along with the Ankara War of Liberation Museum (1961), the museum within Anıtkabir signals the continuing strength of Atatürkist ideology even during the 1950s when the country was first led by the oppositional Democratic Party. As the single site which all state visitors to Turkey must visit, the tomb may not officially be a national museum, but it perennially serves as the primary exhibitionary institution of the nation (Roy, 2006; Çınar, n.d.; Gerçek, 1999).

Regional proliferation of the national model under a technocratic State (1961-1983)

The 1960 military coup and the gradual reestablishment of civil government which lasted until 1965 initiated an era of top-town technocratic leadership that aimed to strengthen the policies of the early republic and counter the perceived threats of populism that had emerged during the 1950s. While no major museums were established during this period, it is marked by a systematization and nationalization of the national museum program. Rather than centralizing the national museum endeavor, however, they increased the regionalization, ensuring a similar epistemological structure throughout the country.

Initially dedicated to reestablishing the dominance of Atatürkist ideology, many museums dedicated to Atatürk and to the War for Liberation and foundation of the republic were established during this era, particularly at sites that had particular significance for the revolution. [Table 4]

During the 1960s and 1970s, the archaeological and ethnographic collections in the capital became the model for museum programming that was replicated in cities throughout the country. In 1968, the Hittite Museum was renamed and reorganized as the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations. Building on the centralized regionalism implicit in the Ethnographic Museum and Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, during the 1960s, the local archaeological depots and museums established during the early republican period were revamped into a national system of regional museums that combined the model of the ethnographic and archaeological collections in the capital. The plans for most of the museums of this era were designed in the 1960s, with an enormous proliferation of museums taking place between 1968 and 1973. This period can be seen as culminating with the 1973 institution of new antiquities legislation, replacing that which had been in force since 1906. Often

situated in sites designated as depots but never opened to the public, many museums were (re)established in this period. In cities where museums already had a dual function, collections were often moved from historic to purpose-built sites. [Table 2] In larger cities, this dual function was often created in two separate institutions. This is most clear in Istanbul, where the 1981 relocation of the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art to a more centrally-located site at the Ibrahim Paşa Palace, an 18th century mansion of a grand vizier located on the hippodrome that had been under renovation since the early 1970s. Including a new ethnographic section that somewhat incongruously emphasized the nomadic origins of Turks within a high-Ottoman residential structure, the museum reframed Islamic art as affiliated with ethnographic practices, displaying classical carpets upstairs and nomadic practices downstairs. Similarly, in Bursa, the archaeological collections moved to the early Ottoman era Yeşil Medrese, which continued to function as an archaeology museum until 1972, when the Bursa Archaeology Museum opened in a custom building. The Bursa Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts opened in 1975, housing both regional ethnographic collections and works from the early Ottoman era. Similarly, in Konya, archaeological collections that had been removed from the tomb of Celaladdin Rumi in 1954 were placed on exhibit in a new Konya Archaeological Museum opened in 1962. The Konya Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts opened in 1975. The Izmir Archaeology Museum, established in 1925, moved in 1951, and again in 1984. The rise of tourism during this era also fostered an increase in site museums during this era. While not, strictly speaking, national museums, these deserve mention within the national museum project of Turkey as key sites of the national project of representing the nation in institutions distributed throughout the country. [Table 3]

With the destabilization of the government after the silent military coup of 1971 and the subsequent political instability of both the government and society, the minimal attention already paid to museums in Turkey decreased even further. While the lack of attention paid to museums during this period limits its importance in terms of the history of the production of a national museum project in Turkey, the regionalization and standardization of museums as a national practice continued to serve as an important model during the 1980s.

Privatization of national ideology during an era of liberalization and democratization (1984-2010)

The era since the 1980s has been characterized by two distinct, but closely related, phenomena. First, the years immediately following the 1980 military coup were characterized by a nationwide mobilization of the museum as a site for reestablishing Atatürk, and through him the ideologies of the early republic, as an icon for the state. Secondly, the economic liberalization promoted by the civil government placed in power by the military government began an era of museum privatization in which major corporate players establish private museums, increasingly devoted to art, that reiterate national ideologies but without state intervention. Since the rise of moderate-Islamist governments in the mid-1990s, the proliferation of such private museums devoted to art has provided a locus of ideological expression of a national, republican opposition in keeping with the ideologies of the early republic and in opposition to the populism associated with Islamism, however democratic its roots.

One of the most prominent cultural policies of the 1981 military coup was the suppression of right and left wing opposition through the reinforcement of the political values of the early republic, as embodied in the person of Atatürk. This was perhaps most notably embodied in the statement by Kenan Evren, the leading general of the coup dressed in Atatürk's symbolic tuxedo with a top hat, on the anniversary of Atatürk's hundred birthday: "Atatürk is 100, we are 1 year old" in 1981. Throughout the country, regional museums added sections devoted to the revolution and, wherever possible, included memorabilia about Atatürk's visit(s) to the city. Where no regional museums had been established, new museums including a revolution/Atatürk section were established during the 1980s. [Table 4] In contrast to the Atatürk Museums opened after the first military coup, those of the 1980s had weaker links with historical events of the revolution and focused more on the person of Atatürk. Along similar lines, in 1982, the harem section of the Dolmabahçe Palace opened as a memorial to Atatürk, featuring the room in which he had died in 1938. This has become a major site of annual remembrance on November 11, the anniversary of his death. The importance of the military was underscored through the revival of plans to open the Military Museum, essentially closed since 1940, in a cultural complex the planning for which had begun in 1967. The long delay in the execution of these plans, and the large expenditure that enabled the opening of a new museum and cultural complex in 1993, points to the increased fiscal power of the military and its increased desire to represent Turkish history by connecting the early Ottoman legacy of conquest and the republican legacy of independence. Just as national ideology had been regionalized in the 1960s-1970s through the dispersal of regional archaeological-ethnographic museums, in the 1980s, nationalization of state ideology was affected through the dispersal of Atatürk museums throughout the country. The shifting affiliation of the 'ethnographic' from one associated with ancient antiquities to one associated with the revolutionary period – a site where Atatürk had visited – suggests a reconceptualization of folk identity from one situated in pre-history to one that entailed a continuation with popular folk memory at a time when the last generation of those who had fought in the War of Liberation were dying.

As the country returned to a civil system (with a strong backing of the military) in 1983, neo-liberal economic policies emphasized state privatization while support of the state was encouraged through increased populism. Part of this populism and privatization involved the increased mainstreaming of approved forms of religious expression, particularly of the Mevlevi dervish order. With increased power for provincial parliamentary representatives, local religious sects also gained power. Increased latitude for public religiosity was evidenced by the reestablishment of 24-hour Quranic recitation at the Rooms of the Mantle of the Prophet at the Topkapı Palace in the late-1980s, a practice that had been discontinued with the museumification of the palace (Shaw, 2010). This part of the museum subsequently came to function as a site of prayer and even minor pilgrimage, with a majority of adult Turkish visitors coming to the museum with a primary purpose of worship.

Neo-liberalization policies also increased opportunities for large corporate families and banks to invest in private museums and art institutions for the first time in Turkey. The first such institution was the Sadberk Hanım Museum (1980), dedicated to the matriarch of the Koç family, at the time

the wealthiest family in the country. Perhaps because it was the first private museum, this museum was unique among private institutions in replicating the geographically differentiated ethnographic-archaeological museum model established in Ankara and regional museums, but absent in Istanbul. With increased wealth and power due to privatization, several private banks began to underwrite major arts initiatives, with the Yapı Kredi Bank Vedat Nedim Tor Museum opening in 1992 and the Akbank Arts Centre opening in 1993, Garanti Platform Centre for Contemporary Art opening in 2000, and the Ottoman Bank Museum opening in 2002. During the same period, two other private museums for the first time privatized special interest collections through the support of major corporate funding: opening in 2002 and underwritten by the Jewish-owned Profilo corporation, the small Quincentennial Foundation Museum of Turkish Jews became the first and only museum celebrating the national role of a minority group; and opening in 2001, the Rahmi Koç Museum became the first major museum in Istanbul devoted to industry. On the one hand, such museums were enabled by privatization laws and thus implicitly reflect a support for the state. However, their general liberal inclinations, in particular of contemporary arts institutions and in contrast to relatively stagnant state institutions, can also be understood as providing a channel for cultural opposition to state policies that is somewhat segregated from actual political practice. Despite a renovation of the fortress district of Ankara in 2003-2005, including a second Rahmi Koç Museum dedicated to technology, the vast increase in Istanbul's population during the 1980s and 1990s, rendering it by far the most populous city in the country, made it the clear choice for almost all privately funded cultural enterprises.

With the rise of moderate-Islamic led governments since the mid 1990s, several corporate families have used the opening of art museums to privatize the representation of national culture through the exhibition of art (Gülalp, 2001; Lombardi, 1997). During the 2000s, fine arts museums have emerged for the first time in the century and a half old history of museums in Turkey as a primary means of representing national identity, both through their contents and through their appeal to an elite, urban, and urbane clientele following European cultural norms. Particularly during an era of populism, such elite-supported institutions emphasize a vision of state identity affiliated with Atatürkism (Özyürek, 2004). Thus the Proje4L Istanbul Centre for Contemporary Art, underwritten by the Elgiz family opened in 2001; the Sakip Sabancı University Museum at the Equestrian Mansion, funded by the Sabancı foundation under the auspices of the Sabancı family that had become one of the wealthiest corporate families during the 1980s, opened in 2002; the Istanbul Museum for Modern Art, funded by the longstanding pharmaceutical moghuls of Turkey, the Eczacıbaşı family, opened in 2004; and the Pera Museum, funded by the Suna and İnan Kırac Foundation, underwritten by one branch of the Koç Family, opened in 2005. A smaller initiative initially tied to Istanbul Bilgi University, the Santral İstanbul Arts Centre, which includes an exhibit of Istanbul's first electric company, opened in 2007 (Artan, 2008).

During this period, state initiatives have focused largely on strengthening exhibitions that emphasize Islamic heritage. For example, the 5.5 million dollars in 2005-2008 devoted to an extensive renovation of the Rooms of the Mantle of the Prophet at the Topkapı Palace stands out as a unique state expenditure at the country's most visited national museum, where no other major

renovation projects have been recently undertaken. Similarly, the 2008 opening of the Islamic Sciences and Technology History Museum in Gülhane Park underscores a new mode of contextualizing Turkish identity within a pan-Islamic cultural framework (Kılıçkaya, 2010). The government also uses non-museological forms of display to address the public, as in the popular and inexpensive park of architectural models, Miniaturk, opened by the Istanbul Municipality in 2003 (Aronsson, 2011). In contrast to the regional/territorial focus of earlier museum projects, this park focuses on sites in a manner completely disembodied from geography. While the park overtly aims at an ecumenical approach, including as one of its smallest models one of the Balat synagogue, the inclusion of symbolically loaded monuments from the territory of the former Ottoman Empire, including the Dome of the Rock and the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem and the Mostar Bridge in Bosnia-Herzegovina, signal a political message appealing to religious conservatives who look to a glorified Ottoman past. At the same time, a panorama of the Battle of Gallipoli, added in 2005, appeals to a populist nationalism without emphasizing the person of Atatürk, and thus suggests a democratic means of commemorating national history.

Since the early 1970s, there have been relatively few changes in the program of nationally owned museums in Turkey. While several of these museums, in particular the Topkapı Palace Museum, the Hagia Sophia Museum, the Mevlana Museum, and the Cappadocia and Ephesus open air museums host a high volume of foreign tourists, local museum tourism (other than school groups) at public institutions is often geared towards religious observance (particularly at the Topkapı Palace, at shrine-museums, and at Hagia Sophia, which Muslim nationalists seek to reinstitute as a mosque signifying Islamic nationalism; Gerçek 1999, Shaw 2007). Located in the nation's cultural capital, private museums have emerged as a place of representing the Turkish nation as its urban elites would like to see it, often with Atatürkist connotations and in contradistinction to the increased populism espoused by moderate Islamic governments. Particularly in light of the close ties between contemporary corporations and the state, not only in Turkey, but also all over the world, the Turkish example suggests that the model of the national museum needs to be broadened to include not only state-funded ventures, but institutions that are enabled through corporate cooperation with the state.

Case studies in chronological order

Changes in the cultural policy from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey, and across its historical development to the present day has led to dramatic changes in the types of museums most representative of the nation in each of the eras outlined above. While the Ottoman Empire began the trajectory of Turkish museums through a national model dominated by a territorial interest in archaeology embodied in the Ottoman Imperial Museum (1869), the number and type of museums in the Republic of Turkey became increasingly diverse as cultural policy changed to suit new needs. As the first museum of the young republic, the Topkapı Palace Museum (1924), served to negotiate its relationship with a glorified imperial past in Istanbul, two museums in the capitol, the Ethnographic Museum (1928) and the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations (1968) reflected a national/geographic model centered in the nation's new capitol city of Ankara to negotiate a cohesive national identity across various factors such as history, geography, and ethnicity. With the

decline in state-operated institutions following the liberalization and privatization of the 1980s and 1990s, private cultural institutions and museums, most notably the Istanbul Modern Museum of Art (2004) have conceptualized the nation as modern through emphasis on art in the Western modality, projecting a mode of national identity production that favors elite, urban culture over the populist policies of the early republican era.

The Ottoman Imperial Museum has a unique place among Turkey's national museums in that it is the only single museum that ever attempted a comprehensive representation of a national ideology through the inclusion of various departments such as archaeology and Islamic arts. This is particularly interesting as the notion of a nation had not yet fully emerged at the time of its mid-nineteenth century emergence, so might rather be conceived as proto-national or productive of a cohesive state identity not rooted in national traits. Rather, as various provinces achieved independence from the Ottoman Empire, the museum responded to the need in the remaining center to devise a new identity for itself. This sensibility was perhaps best embodied in the unprecedented popularity of Namık Kemal's 1873 play, *Vatan Yahut Silistre* (*Patrie* or *Silistria*), which became a rallying cry for the deposition of the reigning sultan and the development of a constitutional monarchy. However, while he translated the sentiment of patriotism, the collectivity which remained for a post-imperial Ottoman entity was not yet clear, as Turkish ethnicity had not yet been conceived as a collective national trope and those who envisioned an Ottoman state conceived of it as still divided along ethnic-religious lines. Within this context, an Ottoman Imperial Museum focusing on archaeological heritage provided an alternative to ethnic or religious affiliations for the nascent nation, suggesting a means of identifying territoriality with traditions already incorporated into the European civilization in which Ottoman elites already participated through their educations (Göçek, 1993, pp. 526-527). When a purpose-designed building replaced the former Church of Hagia Irene and the former Tiled Pavilion of the Imperial Palace, where the museum had originally housed, the new building reflected both the museum's territorial focus and its Western aspirations: although broadly conceived in accordance with neo-classical museum architecture, the museum plan was purportedly derived from an architectonic sarcophagus discovered at a necropolis at Sidon, fixing the neo-classical architecture within an Ottoman territorial framework. The museum's aspirations to have a national affect can be seen as well in the dissemination of branches to key cities throughout the empire, including Konya (1902), Bursa (1904), and plans for Jerusalem, Salonica, Sivas, and Izmir (Shaw, 2003, p. 171). While these often served as local archeological depots and were not open to the public, their affiliation with the museum suggests that they were imagined as future outposts of a centralized ideology.

With the establishment of the republic, cultural policy shifted from the assertion of territoriality embodied in the Ottoman Imperial Museum towards a negotiation of the country's imperial legacy. The first museum established in the Republic of Turkey was the defunct Topkapı Palace Museum, which opened to the public in 1924. Although in disuse since 1856, two parts of the palace – the Rooms of the Mantle of the Prophet and the Baghdad Pavilion – had been part of annual religious ceremonies conducted by the sultan. In the interest of secularism, only the later was initially opened (the Room of the Mantle of the Prophet opened in 1962). During the 1940s, an extensive renovation

of the palace was undertaken, largely erasing later eras of construction of the palace and returning it to an idealized sixteenth-century form representing the apogee of the Ottoman state. As one of the most visited Turkish museums, the Topkapi Palace remains one of the country's most important museums in representing national identity. Although, and in a sense because, the museum excludes the modern era, the Topkapi Palace Museum provides the nation's most important site through which to negotiate its imperial history. The nation of Turkey has to mediate a careful dialogue with its imperial past. Unlike many former empires, such as Great Britain or France, Turkey's modern identity is based on a split with its imperial past. On the one hand, that state was overthrown, and with it the capitol changed and the political structure shifted from monarchy to republic during a very short period in the quite recent past. On the other, Turkey harnesses the history of Ottoman imperial might and breadth both as part of national pride and as part of international political strategies. By emphasizing early Ottoman history, the Topkapi Palace Museum glorifies the Ottoman legacy for the modern nation while disassociating it from the modern destruction of the empire by the republic.

Yet the nation was soon engaged in a far more comprehensive project of self-definition that combined centralized regionalism with modernizing secularism, embodied in the centrally-located Ethnography Museum in Ankara. Secularization in the Republic of Turkey not only meant the establishment of a laicist system of state control over religion, but also a shift in the language of diversity from the religiously-based *millet* system of the Ottoman era to one of geographic difference inscribed in the museum. The museum reduced religious and ethnic difference to regionalism and, at the same time musealized, and thereby historicized these cultures in contrast to the modern world represented by the everyday life of the newly constructed city outside. The purpose built architecture, designed in the so-called First National Style by the architect Kemaleddin, reflects the idea of a secular temple by coupling the domed architecture of a traditional religious structure with the longitudinal form of a European museum. By dividing the country into geographic regions and ascribing the various costumes and practices to each region, the museum constructed a model through which difference could be redefined in geographical, rather than ethnic, terms. Instead of considering various religious groups as millets, as had been common in the Ottoman period, people learned to affiliate their differences as regional rather than ethnic. This enabled the elision of the enormous cultural change which had taken place during the transition from the Ottoman to the Turkish era, including the loss, through massacre and the violent deportation of Armenian populations in Eastern provinces and the loss, through war and population exchange, of Greek populations in the West, including enormous populations in Istanbul and Izmir (Bloxham, 2003; Beeley, 1978). Regionalization of national dress and objects served as a metonym for the regionalization of history, enabling the erasure of differentiated ethnic compositions and regional histories in the country. Just as Atatürk's implicit definition of the Turkish citizen as, "How happy is (s)he who says, 'I am a Turk'" – anyone who declares his current identity as "Turk" rather than relying on an implicit ethnic or regional affiliation – objects from various regions in the country to declared themselves to be part of a variegated, but unified nation. Featuring customs such as the use of a floor table or a bed for a circumcision ceremony, the museum also served to categorize still common

everyday practices as historic, emphasizing that the contemporary identity of Turkey would look upon its ethnography as something made historical and thereby foreign. The very conception of local culture as ethnographic carried with it an implicit definition of the state, as a construct of urban elites, as one that gained its identity from the nation but which would also supplant archaic ethnographic practices with modern, universal ones. Although the Ethnographic Museum still exists, undergoing renovation in 2006, its original function as a showcase of regional practices has decreased, in part due to the increased acceptance of folk as mainstream culture as part of the populist democratization taking place in Turkey since the 1980s.

Complimenting the organization of the Ethnographic Museum, in 1968, the Hittite Museum was renamed and reorganized as the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations. While the Aryanist undertones of the original institution were subdued, the museum's emphasis on autochthonous ancient cultures became even stronger as the museum established a timeline for the growth of civilization in Anatolia from prehistory to antiquity, presented as though all of Anatolia could be considered through a cohesive narrative and thus naturalizing the geography of the modern nation. The temporal layout of the museum underplays the very local nature of the many civilizations described, thus underplaying the ethnic diversity that they imply, thereby also underplaying contemporary ethnic diversity. For example, while Urartu and Phoenician legacies have been associated with modern Armenians and Greeks through their nationalist historiographies, the museum subsumes these cultures into a broad Anatolian culture that overlaps with the territory of the modern Turkish state. In contrast to the site-based layout retained at the Istanbul Archaeology Museum, which underscores a shared ownership of the antique past with the West, the developmental narrative at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations emphasizes Anatolia (through its proximity to Mesopotamia) as the cradle of civilization as well as the cradle of the modern nation. The museum thus compliments the Ethnographic Museum's historicization of what are still often contemporary rural practices and, in mapping them into discrete regions, defines the diversity of the nation while erasing ethnic fault lines. The proliferation of ethnographic/archaeological collections throughout the country beginning in the 1930s, but institutionalized in the 1960s and 1970s, underscores the notion of regional variance within a national narrative centered in Ankara suggested by the larger institutions in the capitol.

The rise of a liberal market economy and the growing economic and cultural power of corporations following the 1980 military coup in Turkey resulted in the increasing privatization of the nation's most active cultural institutions, including the museums. While these new arts institutions all suggest a private, corporate model that engages the arts exhibition as a mode of promoting national identity on a local elite and global stage, probably the most internationally visible, and using the most national rhetoric, has been the Istanbul Modern Museum of Art, which claims to attract half a million visitors a year (Benmayor, 2011). The museum opened to great fanfare with a speech by the moderate Islamist Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. Although he made an aside that he didn't really understand art, thus appealing to his popular base, his official statements identified the museum and subsequent projects with ameliorating Turkey's international status. Although it is a private initiative, he emphasized his political role in supporting it and subsequent endeavors (anon., 2004). The state has continued to support the museum, as made evident by a

presidential award granted in 2010 (Hızlan, 2010). Although, like the other private museums, Istanbul Modern makes an effort to approach the general public through child education programs, the institution primarily addresses people who have already developed some interest in art through their education, and thus who often already are part of the middle or upper-middle class. While this closely resembles earlier studies concerning the relationship between status and art, it contrasts with the more populist and overtly nationalist narratives offered by state museums in earlier eras (Bourdieu, Darbel, & Beattie, 1997). This appeal is underscored by a recent six-week course offered by the museum in contemporary art collecting (Arna, 2011). Despite the museum's lip service to populism, however, its emphasis on artistic production over patrimony as a model for collective identity production suggests an alternative to earlier definitions of the nation and its relationship with museums. However, this shift towards elite-based institutions led by corporations rather than the state can also serve to exacerbate the growing divide between traditional secularist urban elites and the populist, moderate Islamist government.

Conclusion

In contrast to the museum institution in many countries with strong centralized states, the museum in Turkey has emerged as a polyvalent institution, comprising a wide variety of small institutions that reinforce various narratives of state ideology, heritage, and identity construction as these narratives have changed over the course of time. While this has enabled multiple competing narratives of collective identity, rooted in ideologies such as secularism, indigenism, Islamism, Turkism, Atatürkism, technocracy, etc., such apparent multiplicity has not encompassed all possible aspects of the national narrative to emerge. While Western critics of Turkish historiography have tended to emphasize one of the earlier examples of the conflict between Turkish nationalism and the earlier Ottoman millet system enabling multiple religious affiliations within a single state, the situation of Turkish minority populations is far more complex than any single example. The history of Turkish minorities – Armenians of Eastern provinces who suffered during the forced deportations under late Ottoman rule around 1915; Greeks of Anatolia, Thrace, and Istanbul whose numbers dwindled following three population exchanges and mass migrations in 1924, 1956, and 1974; Jews who suffered exorbitant taxes and sometimes internment during World War II, many of whom migrated to Israel after 1948; the Kurds, whose separatist movement and low-level civil war of the 1980s resulted in the destruction of hundreds of villages and mass migration to Turkish and European cities that has only recently subsided; and the limited freedoms given to Alevi Muslims, perceived as heretical under state-sponsored understandings of Islam – subsumed under the rhetoric of national Turkism, folklore, and regionalism during the republican period, is almost never mentioned in Turkish museums (Secor, 2004; Dressler, 2003; Baer, 2004).

In a situation not unique to any single country, the polyvalence of Turkey's museums, augmented by the recent growth of private museums, may function with multiple narratives that enable competing narratives of identity to coexist, but does so within a paradigm that excludes as many stories as it includes. In large part, this can be understood as a double cultural difference from parts of Europe in terms of the utility of museums. Turkey's museums are founded on historical rather

than artistic or scientific paradigms. Such an emphasis may lead some Western observers to expect a critical outlook such as has developed in history museums in Europe, particularly in response to post-World War II historiographies of Germany and its allies and issues of multiculturalism in Britain and the United States of America (Harms, 1990; Hoffmann, 1994; Heuser, 1990; Karp & Lavine, 1991). However, historic or otherwise, Turkey's museums are implicitly understood as places of positive representation and the celebration of particular narratives, not of collective critique or of community building. In this sense, although museums have proliferated and modernized immensely in the last few decades, they remain spaces not informed by new historiographic or museological approaches and defined by a classical hegemonic paradigm where the narrativization of collective identity production is top-down, and thus is either informed by the state or by elite private actors often closely affiliated with it (Duncan, 1995). Nonetheless, particularly in light of a widespread concern over the Islamicization of Turkey, evinced both in Europe and by many Turkish urban elites, the ever-increasing variety of self-representation within Turkey's museums also reflects an increased democratization of the social and political spectrum.

Bibliography

- Alpers, S. (1991) *The Museum as a Way of Seeing*. In I. Karp, & S. D. Levine, *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institute, 25-32.
- anon. (2004, February 21) Erdoğan, müze açılışı yaptı. *Hürriyet*.
- Arna, S. (2011, 02 06) Son trend: Çağdaş sanat koleksiyonerliği. *Hürriyet Pazar*.
- Aronsson, P. (2011)' Explaining National Museums: Exploring comparative approaches to the study of national museums', in S. J. Knell, P. Aronsson, A. B. Amundsen, A. J. Barnes, S. Burch, J. Carter, et al., *National Museums: New Studies from Around the World*, New York: Routledge, 29-54.
- Artan, E. Ç. (2008) Consuming in Museums: Visitor Behaviours in Postmodern Era. *The International Journal of the Humanities* 6:7.
- Baer, M. (2004) 'The Double Bind of Race and Religion: The Conversion of the Dönme to Turkish Secular Nationalism', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46:4: 682-708.
- Bann, S. (1995) 'Shrines, Curiosities, and the Rhetoric of Display', n L. Cooke and P. Wollen, *Visual Display: Culture Beyond Appearances*. Seattle: Bay Press.
- Beeley, B. W. (1978) 'The Greek-Turkish Boundary: Conflict at the Interface. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers', *New Series* 3:3: 351-366.
- Benmayor, G. (2011) 'Istanbul Modern'e en çok ilgi gençlerden', *Hürriyet*, February 21.
- Bloxham, D. (2003) 'The Armenian Genocide of 1915-1916: Cumulative Radicalization and the Development of a Destruction Policy', *Past & Present*, 18, November: 141-191.
- Bourdieu, P., Darbel, A. and Beattie, C. a. (1997) *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, London: Polity Press.

- Bryson, N. (1983) *Vision and Painting: the logic of the Gaze*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Çınar, A. (n.d.). *Making the City, Imagining the Nation: Material Form as Symbol of Nationalism and Modernity*. In e. Alev Çınar and Thomas Bender, *Locating the City: Urban Imaginaries and the Practices of Modernity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dressler, M. (2003) 'Alevi Poetry in the Twentieth Century: The Fusion of Political and Religious Identities', *Alif: Journal of Contemporary Poetics*, 23: 109-154.
- Duncan, C. (1995) *Civilizing Rituals: inside public art museums*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Findlen, P. (1994) *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Flood, F. B. (2002) 'Flood, Between cult and culture: Bamiyan, Islamic iconoclasm, and the museum – Afghanistan', *Art Bulletin*, December: 641-59.
- Foucault, M. (1970) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gerçek, F. (1999) *Türk Müzeciliği*, Ankara: T. C. Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Göçek, F. M. (1993) 'Ethnic Segmentation, Western Education, and Political Outcomes: Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Society', *Poetics Today*, 14:3: Autumn: 507-539.
- Gülalp, H. (2001) 'Globalization and Political Islam: The Social Bases of Turkey's Welfare Party', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 33:3 August: 433-448.
- Harms, V. (1990) The Aims of the Museum for Ethnology: Debate in the German-Speaking Countries. *Current Anthropology*, 31:4, August-October: 457-463.
- Heuser, B. (1990) 'Museums, Identity and Warring Historians-Observations on History in Germany', *The Historical Journal* 33:2: 417-440.
- Hızlan, D. (2010) 'Büyük ödüle yakışan isimler', *Hürriye*, December 17.
- Hoffmann, D. (1994) 'The German Art Museum and the History of the Nation', in D. J. Sherman, and I. Rogoff, *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Karp, I. and Lavine, S. D. (1991) *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Karpat, K. (1974) 'The Impact of the People's Houses on the Development of Communication in Turkey, 1931-1951', *Die Welt des Islams* 15:1/4: 69-84.
- Kılıçkaya, N. Y. (2010) *Museums of Istanbul*, Istanbul: Uranus Photography Agency & Publishing Co.
- Kushner, D. (1997) 'Self-Perception and Identity in Contemporary Turkey', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 32:2, April: 219-233.
- Lombardi, B. (1997) 'Turkey- The Return of the Reluctant Generals?', *Political Science Quarterly*, 112:2, Summer: 191-215.

- Özbey, S. (2011) *Yerliler Mevlana'ya yabancılar Ayasofya'ya*. Hürriyet.
- Özyürek, E. (2004) 'Miniaturizing Atatürk: Privatization of State Imagery and Ideology in Turkey', *American Ethnologist*, August: 374-391.
- Pfaff, R. H. (1963) 'Disengagement from Traditionalism in Turkey and Iran', *The Western Political Quarterly*, 16:1, March: 79-98.
- Roy, S. (2006) 'Seeing a State: National Commemorations and the Public Sphere in India and Turkey', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 48: 200-232.
- Secor, A. (2004) "'There is an Istanbul that Belongs to Me': Citizenship, Space, and Identity in the City', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94:2, June: 352-368.
- Shaw, W. M. (2010) 'Between the secular and the sacred: a new face for the department of the holy relics at the Topkapı Palace Museum', *Material Religion*, 6:1, March: 129-131.
- (2007) 'Museums and Narratives of Display from the Late Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic', *Muqarnas*, 23: 253-280.
- (2011) *Ottoman Painting: Reflections of Western Art in the Ottoman Empire*, London: I. B. Tauris.
- (2003) *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (2008) 'The Rise of the Hittite Sun', In M. K.-Y. Phillip Kohl, *Selective Remembrances: Archaeology in the Construction, Commemoration, and Consecration of National Pasts*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 163-188.
- (2002) 'Tra(ve)ils of Secularism: Islam in Museums from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic', in e. Derek Peterson, *The Invention of Religion*, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Tanyeri-Erdemir, T. (2006) 'Archaeology as a Source of National Pride in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic', *Journal of Field Archaeology* 31:4, Winter: 381-393.
- Webster, D. E. (1939) 'State Control of Social Change in Republican Turkey', *American Sociological Review*, 4:2, April: 247-256.
- Zubaida, S. (1996) 'Turkish Islam and National Identity', *Middle East Report*, 199, April-June: 10-15.
- Zürcher, E. J. (1992) 'The Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic: An Attempt at a New Periodization' *Die Welt des Islams, New Series*, 32:2: 237-253.

Annex tables, Turkey

Table 1: Case Studies of Key Museums of the Republic of Turkey

Name	Institution /Opening	Major Actor	Ownership	Type	Narrative Objectives
Ottoman Imperial Museum	1846/1869 Name changed to Istanbul Archaeology Museum, 1924	Ottoman Ministry of Education	State	Archaeological, with Islamic section 1891-1914	Integrate Ottoman Empire into narrative of Western Civilization while emphasizing archaeological territorial ownership against European imperial interests to prove inherent Ottoman belonging to Western civilization.
Topkapi Palace Museum	(1483-1856 use as palace); 1924 designation as museum	Republic of Turkey	State	Historical	Glorify Ottoman legacy while distancing it from modern era; secularize legacy of the sultan's caliphate embodied by relics of the Prophet.
Ethnographic Museum	(1922) 1928	Republic of Turkey	State	Ethnographic	Use ethnographic collections to replace ethnic with regional difference; secularize religious objects; use both collections to create a distinction between the historicized objects inside the museum and the modernizing real world outside.
Museum of Anatolian Civilizations	1941 (Hittite Museum); name and organization change, 1968	Republic of Turkey	State	Archaeological	Use artifacts to transform regionally significant civilizations in Anatolia into a single historical trajectory that creates a unified prehistory for the nation.
Istanbul Modern Museum of Art	2004	Eczacıbaşı Corporation	Private	Art	Replace patrimonial with creative models of national identity, thus promoting Turkey as participant in Western culture not through history but through cultural production and practice.

Table 2: Regional Museums in the Republic of Turkey¹

Location (Alphabetical)	Institution as Depot/Directorate	Public Opening in historical building	(Re)opening in custom building ²	Two sections ³	Extensive renovations or new museums
Adana	?	1924; 1935 (ethnographic)	(1966) 1972	Yes	1994
Afyon	c. 1929	1933 1948 (ethnographic)	(1966) 1971	Yes	
Amasya	1925	1962	(1969) 1972	Yes	
Antakya	1932	1948	1970 (1975)	Yes	
Antalya	1919	1922	(1964) 1972	Yes	1985
Burdur			(1967) 1969	Yes	
Bursa - Iznik			1969	Yes	
Çanakkale	1911	1961	1984	?	
Çorum	1937		(1962) 1968		
Diyarbakır		1934	1988	?	
Edirne	1925	1936 (ethnographic)	(1969) 1971	Yes	
Elazığ	1965		1982	Yes	
Eskişehir	1945		1974	Yes	
Erzurum	1942	1947	(1964) 1967	Yes	Ethnographic Museum added 1994
Gaziantep	1944	1958	1969	Yes	Ethnographic Museum added 1989
Izmir-Bergama	1934	1936	1964 (annex to 1936 building)	Yes	
Izmit	1938		1967	?	
Kahramanmaraş	1947	1961	(1970) 1975		
Karaman			1962	?	
Kars	1959	1964	(1971) 1981	Yes	
Kastamonu	1943	1950	1980 (1981)	Yes	

¹ This table only includes smaller museums with relatively unexceptional histories.

² Parenthesis indicates planning start date

³ Two sections, referring to the pairing of Archaeological and Ethnographic collections established in the 1960s

Kayseri	1928	1938	1969	Yes	
Kütahya	1945		1982	Yes	
Malatya			(1962) 1977	Yes	
Manisa	1935	1943	1963, 1972	Yes	
Nevşehir- Hacıbektaş ⁴			(1975) 1988	Yes	
Niğde	1936		(1971) 1977		
Samsun			(1976) 1981		
Şanlıurfa	1948		1969	Yes	1987
Sinop	1925		(1966) 1970	Yes	
Sivas	1922	1934	1968	Yes	
Tekirdağ		1967	1987		
Tokat	1926	--	(1976) 1983	?	
Van	1932		(1968) 1972	Yes	

⁴ Not to be confused with the Nevşehir Hacıbektaş Museum, located at the former dervish lodge made into a museum in 1964, this listing refers to the Archaeological and Ethnographic museum in the town.

Table 3: Museums in Small Towns Associated with Archaeological Sites

Location (Alphabetical)	Institution	Opening	Two sections⁵
Ankara (Gordion)		1966	No
Antalya-Side (Aspendos Theater)		1962	No
Bitlis Ahlat		(1968) 1971	?
Çorum Alacahöyük (Hittite)		1982	
Çorum Boğazköy (Hittite)		1966	No
Izmir Selçuk-Efes (Ephesus)	1930	1960 (1964)	?
Izmir-Tire	1936	1971	Yes
Isparta Yalvaç (Antioch)	1947	1970 (1975)	?
Kayseri Kültepe (Hittite)		1968	No
Muğla-Bodrum Underwater Museum		1964	No
Nevşehir Ürgüp (Cappadocia)	1965	1971	?
Trabzon (Hagia Sophia)		1964	No

⁵ Two sections, referring to the pairing of Archaeological and Ethnographic collections established in the 1960s

Table 4: Atatürk Museums in the Republic of Turkey

Location	1930-1960	1961-1980	1981-2011
Ankara Anıtkabir	1954 (tomb) 1960 (museum)		
Ankara Museum of the War for Liberation		1961	
Ankara Museum of the Republic		1981	
Antalya Alanya Atatürk House and Museum			1987
Antalya Atatürk House Museum			1986
Bursa		1973	
Çanakkale Bigalı Çamyayla		1973 (purchase)	1984
Denizli Atatürk and Ethnographic Museum			1984
Diyarbakır	1939		
Atatürk Room at Dolmabahçe Palace Museum			1982
Erzurum Atatürk House Museum			1984
Eskişehir		1970	
İçel Silifke Atatürk House Museum			1987
Istanbul Atatürk House Museum	1942		
Izmir Atatürk and Ethnographic Museum	1941 (Atatürk House Museum)	1978	19886
Kayseri			1986, 1995
Konya		1964	1982
Konya-Akşehir		1966	
Rize			1985
Samsun		(1960) 1968	
Sivas			1990
Uşak Atatürk and Ethnographic Museum			1981

⁶ The Ethnographic Museum became independent in 1988.

Table 5: Chronological table of major non-regional museums and exhibitionary institutions

	Name of Institution	Location	Dates
1846-1922	Magazine of Antique Weapons & Magazine of Antiquities	former Church of Hagia Irene, Istanbul	1846
	(renamed) Ottoman Imperial Museum		1869
	(renamed) Istanbul Archaeology Museum	purpose-built building, 1891	1881
	Military Museum	Church of Hagia Irene, Istanbul	c. 1922
	Museum of Pious Foundations	former medrese (school) of the Suleymaniye Mosque foundation, Istanbul	1913-1940
1923-1960	(renamed) Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art	(relocated) small former medrese, Istanbul	1949
	Topkapı Palace Museum	Istanbul	1924
	Ethnography Museum	purpose-built building, Ankara	1930
	Konya Museum of Antiquities	Tomb of Cellaleddin Rumi, Konya	1927
	(renamed) Mevlana Museum		1954
	Museum of the Tomb of Hacı Bektaş	Hacıbektaş, Nevşehir	
	Museum of Hagia Sophia	former Church/Mosque of Hagia Sophia, Istanbul	1935
	Anıtkabir (Tomb of Atatürk)	Ankara	1954
	Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture	former apartments of the heir apparent, Dolmabahçe Palace, Istanbul	1938
	Hittite Museum	Ottoman han and purpose-built building, Ankara	1945
1961-1982	(renamed) Museum of Anatolian Civilizations		1968
	Dolmabahçe Palace Museum	Dolmabahçe Palace, Istanbul	1952
	Izmir Museum of Painting and Sculpture	Izmir	1952
1983-2011	Sadberk Hanım Museum	Istanbul (private)	1980
	Ankara Museum of Painting and Sculpture	former Turkish Hearth Building, Ankara	1981
	Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art	(relocated) İbrahim Paşa Mansion, Istanbul	1981
	Military Museum	Purpose-built building, Istanbul	1993
	Sakıp Sabancı University Museum	former mansion, Istanbul (private)	2002
	Miniaturk	Istanbul	2003
	Istanbul Modern Museum of Art	remodeled customs depot, Istanbul (private)	2004
	Pera Museum	remodeled building, Istanbul (private)	2005
Santral Istanbul Arts Center	Former electric company and purpose-built building, Istanbul (private)	2007	