

This article was downloaded by: [University of Borås]

On: 03 October 2014, At: 03:53

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Middle Eastern Studies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fmes20>

Captive Turks: Crimean Tatars in Pan-Turkist Literature

Rory Finnin

Published online: 05 Mar 2014.

To cite this article: Rory Finnin (2014) Captive Turks: Crimean Tatars in Pan-Turkist Literature, Middle Eastern Studies, 50:2, 291-308, DOI: [10.1080/00263206.2013.870897](https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2013.870897)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2013.870897>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Captive Turks: Crimean Tatars in Pan-Turkist Literature

RORY FINNIN*

In September 2012, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and a retinue of government officials travelled to Ukraine for a series of high-level talks with President Viktor Yanukovych and members of his administration. The capital Kyiv was the first destination on Erdoğan's itinerary, but it was essentially secondary. During this visit, the centre of gravity was Ukraine's Autonomous Republic of Crimea, where Erdoğan headlined the annual Yalta European Strategy (YES) meeting and conferred on more than one occasion with Mustafa Dzhemiliev (Mustafa Cemiloğlu, aka Mustafa Abdülcemil Qırımoğlu), the leader of the Crimean Tatar parliament, the *Mejlis*. A Sunni Muslim Turkic-speaking *ethnie* whose khanate ruled the Black Sea peninsula and its environs for over three centuries, the Crimean Tatars today boast a diaspora in the Republic of Turkey numbering well over 3 million.¹

Flanked by allies and associates, Dzhemiliev and Erdoğan engaged in a set-piece encounter in a conference room near Yalta adorned with the *ay-yıldız* (crescent and star) of Turkey's national flag.² Dzhemiliev pressed for increased Turkish investment in and assistance to the Crimean Tatar people, who have been struggling for decades to resettle in their ancestral homeland after a brutal deportation to Central Asia at the hands of Stalin's NKVD (*Narodnyi komissariat vnutrennikh del*, People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs) in 1944. For his part, Erdoğan spoke warmly of the Crimean Tatars, not for the first time, as a 'bridge' joining Turkey and Ukraine and fostering productive Turkish–Ukrainian relations.³ He invited Dzhemiliev to attend the convention of his Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*) in Ankara later in the month.⁴

Times have changed. In the Soviet period, when he was a dissident in Uzbekistan fighting for the return of his people to Crimea, Dzhemiliev received no attention whatsoever from Turkish heads of state. Cold War *realpolitik* intervened to keep prominent elected officials in Ankara, according to Peter Reddaway, 'passive' in the face of Crimean Tatar suffering.⁵ Even in the mid-1970s, when Dzhemiliev endured a 303-day hunger strike that prompted Ukrainian dissident Leonid Pliushch to appeal to 'all the world's Muslims' for assistance, the Turkish political elite was notably quiescent.⁶ Reacting with indignation to a false report of Dzhemiliev's death from starvation, the leaders of the nationalist youth organization *Ülkü Ocakları* (The Hearths

*Ukrainian Studies, University of Cambridge, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge CB3 9DA.
Email: ref35@cam.ac.uk

of Ideals) complained of this ‘regrettable silence’ to former (and future) Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit in a telegram in 1976.⁷ The document may be said to confirm the conventional wisdom that, in the words of Alan Fisher, Turkey ‘ignored the plight’ of the Crimean Tatars or that, in the words of Isabelle Kreindler, ‘[n]o Muslim country, not even Turkey, took a particular interest in the plight of the Crimean Tatars’.⁸

This narrative of Turkish passivity, silence, and indifference with respect to the Crimean Tatar ‘question’ overlooks a corpus of material that tells something of a different story. This corpus is literary. In the Soviet period, the Crimean Tatars figured centrally in Pan-Turkist poems and pulp fiction novels as protagonists whose victimization by the Communist regime was represented in order to provoke outrage and action, not silence and passivity. Conceived by Yusuf Akçura in 1904 as an ethnic nationalism encompassing ‘all the Turks found scattered over a large swath of Asia and Eastern Europe’,⁹ Pan-Turkism or *Türkçülük* entered the mainstream of Turkish politics in the second half of the twentieth century, promoting irredentism as a central policy objective.¹⁰ The literary texts featuring Crimean Tatars as an object of concern in Pan-Turkist publications accordingly seek to elicit in the reader what I call ‘irredentist solidarity’, a convergence of fellow-feeling that involves a total identification of the Other as the *same*. This solidarity may have had little political purchase among policymakers in Ankara, but it circulated among a variety of audiences nonetheless – including, as we shall see, the Turkish military.

This article is organized into two sections. The first reviews by way of background a number of Pan-Turkist journals which cast the Crimean Tatars as representative ‘captive Turks’ (*esir Türkler*) and deploy lyric poems to agitate for their freedom. The second focuses on pulp fiction based exclusively on the Crimean Tatar tragedy, ‘penny dreadfuls’ that relentlessly highlight the victimization of the Crimean Tatars at the hands of the Soviet regime and harrass readers over their past ignorance and inaction. Throughout this discussion, I am guided by Wolfgang Iser’s observation that, as an ‘occurrence without reference’, literature does not principally document empirical reality but rather generates a virtual reality by stimulating the reader’s own constitutive, ideating activity.¹¹ For Iser, this experience or event is one of ‘repositioning’ and ‘boundary-crossing’ in which the reader dislodges preconceptions and assumptions, disrupts the prevailing demands of the social and cultural systems around him, and ‘stages’ new versions of the self.¹² In other words, it ‘teases [him] out of thought’ and into action.¹³

Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, the ‘first nationalist poet of Turkey’, concludes a prominent section of his epic poem and Pan-Turkist ur-text ‘Ey Türk Uyan’ (Awake O Turk!, 1914) with the following quatrain:

Sen bunları düşün, titre, hiddetlen;
Hangi ırktan olduğunu hatırla;
Bir boğucu deniz gibi kuvvetlen
Ve kendini inkılâba hazırla!...¹⁴

(Consider these things, tremble, become angry; / Remember the race from which you come; / Grow strong like an all-consuming sea / And prepare yourself for revolution!...)

Yurdakul's call echoes in a slogan – 'Ey Türk, titre ve kendine dön!' (O Turk, tremble and return to yourself!) – propounded by the *Milli Hareket Partisi* (Nationalist Movement Party, MHP), whose ideological exaltation of Turkic brotherhood and rabid anti-Communism mark the texts under study in this article.¹⁵ His words *bunları düşün* (consider these things) also gesture to an antecedent series of people, events, and phenomena elaborated and enumerated over the course of many stanzas: among them, 'orphans', 'the weeping poor', and 'the sick', all of whom suffer beyond the bounds of the Ottoman Empire but within the mythical expanse of Turan, a Pan-Turkist Shangri-La extending from Anataolia to the Altai Mountains. Who are these poor souls? Yurdakul answers gravely:

Şu köylerde hayvan gibi ot yiyenler Türk'türler;
Şu inlerde yaşayanlar, post giyenler Türk'türler.¹⁶

(These are Turks, eating grass like beasts in the villages; / These are Turks, wearing animal hides and living in caves.)

For Yurdakul and his followers, Turkey's true borders envelop 'every city, every civilization / Speaking the Turkish tongue'.¹⁷ The Turkic-speaking peoples living under foreign rule – Kazakh, Uzbek, Kazan Tatar, Crimean Tatar – would therefore become known as 'captive Turks' (*esir Türkler*) in Pan-Turkist journals published after the Second World War.¹⁸ On a cover of *Toprak* (The Land, 1954–76), one of a number of Pan-Turkist monthlies with a triadic orientation on 'thought, art and ideals', their captor is depicted as a vicious serpent being strangled in the hand of a 'Türk Milliyetçisi' (Turkish nationalist).¹⁹ The serpent is the Soviet Union, which after the war encroached upon Turkey's eastern provinces and professed designs on the Turkish Straits.²⁰

Mapping the borders of Turan – 'Karkurum'dan Kırım'a' (from Karakorum [the Mongol thirteenth-century capital] to Crimea)²¹ – is a primary objective for *Toprak* and its counterparts (see, for instance, *Özleyiş* [Yearning, 1946–47]). Verse serves as a key cartographic tool. In a poem published in *Toprak* in 1955, for instance, the Tarsus-born poet Refet Körüklü declares by way of a telling end-rhyme that 'Turan' is a place where 'ırkdaşım artık perişan' (my race is now scattered).²² The discourse of such Pan-Turkist poetry is overwhelmingly first-person, a barrage of 'us' and 'ours' that circumscribes various Others and works to conflate them as the same. Two poems entitled 'Gelsin' (Let Them Come) by Halik Bikes Ulusoy and Göktürk Mehmet Uytun, published in *Toprak* in 1954 and 1956 respectively, employ the first person with constructive ambiguity, facilitating what could be both an appeal to the *esir Türkler* to emigrate to Turkey and an appeal to fellow Turks to join the Pan-Turkist movement. Here is Ulusoy:

Bayrak için, Vatan için,
Canı cana katan için,
Bu toprakta yatan için,
Bize *bizden* olan gelsin.²³

(For the flag, for the fatherland, / In order to join soul to soul, / In order to settle in this land, / Let those *who are one of us* come to us.)

And Uytun:

Eli ele vermek için
 Moskofu devirmek için
 Bu murada ermek için
 Bize *biziz*, deyen gelsin.²⁴

(In order to join together hand-in-hand, / In order to overthrow Moscow, / In order to fulfill this dream, / Let those who say ‘*we are the ones*’ come to us.)

Echoing Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s well-known words – ‘Biz bize benzeriz’ (We resemble ourselves)²⁵ – this collective ‘first-personalization’ is integral to the work of irredentist solidarity.

The conflation of Other as same receives its most evident expression in the common reference in post-war Pan-Turkist periodicals to *Kırım Türkleri* (Crimean Turks) rather than *Kırım Tatarları* (Crimean Tatars). An oscillation between *Kırım Tatarları* and *Kırım Türkleri* begins around 1905 with İsmail Bey Gaspralı (Ismail Gasprinskii, 1851–1914), the Crimean Tatar educator, journalist and civic leader based in Bahçesaray (Bakhchisarai) whose journal *Tercüman* (or *Perevodchik*, The Interpreter) played a singular role in promoting Pan-Turkist ideals in both the Russian and Ottoman empires.²⁶ For Gaspralı, the term *Türk* would become a means of circumventing the particular negative connotations elicited by *Tatar* in the Russian and Slavic contexts (e.g. *Mongolo-tatarskoe igo*, ‘The Mongol-Tatar Yoke’). ‘Although the Turks who were subjects of Russia are called by the name “Tatar”, this is an error and an imputation’, he writes in 1905. ‘Those peoples who are called by the Russians “Tatar” . . . are in reality, Turks.’²⁷

For Pan-Turkists in Turkey after the Second World War, however, the term ‘Kırım Türkleri’ is meant primarily to efface ethnic and linguistic difference and extol a homogenous Turan. For Crimean Tatar émigrés in Turkey, meanwhile, the term is meant primarily to communicate, in effect, that ‘we are one of you’ and to petition the Turkish public for support.²⁸ Here the second component of the ethnonym, a signifier of identity, is central.²⁹ By contrast, Crimean Tatar activists in the Soviet Union like Dzhemiliev – who after 1967 had to contend with Politburo Decree No.493, which labelled them ‘the Tatars formerly resident in Crimea’ (*Tatary, ranee prozhivavshie v Krymu*) – employ *krymskie tatary* (and, if necessary, *Kırım Tatarları*) to appeal to the Soviet public and the international community for the right to return to their homeland. They underscore the first component of the ethnonym, a signifier of territory. As Aleksandr Nekrich suggests, this mixed situational usage may have hindered the transnational coherence and outreach of the Crimean Tatar movement as a whole.³⁰ The usage remains contested to this day.³¹

The poetic texts about the ‘Crimean Turks’ and the *esir Türkler* in Pan-Turkist journals like *Toprak* exercise a particular function. They are not ornamental or digressive; they do not offer respite from a long journalistic feature, for example, with brevity and topical contrast. Unlike the prose articles that strive for documentary authority, poems in these journals frequently serve to enshroud the Pan-Turkist cause in an aura of the spiritual. In the ‘Gelsin’ poems above, for instance, Ulusoy and Uytun both deploy the 4+4 syllabic metre, four-line strophe, and internal rhyme

common to religious folk poetry, particularly the *ilahi*, to cast the call ‘to overthrow Moscow’ and to free the *esir Türkler* in the hypnotic cadence of a hymn. They strive to jettison Pan-Turkist politics into the realm of the sacred.

Uytun also integrates this *ilahi* form with a Russophobic stance reminiscent of Yurdakul’s poem ‘Petersburg’a’ (To Petersburg, 1916) in ‘Garipsi’ (The Estranged), which was published in the journal *Emel* in 1961:

Dedi Moskof piçi nerde?
O düşürdü bizi derde. . .³²

(Where are those bastard Muscovites, he said? / They have plunged us into this misery. . .)

The journal *Emel* first emerged in Pazarçık, Romania in 1930 under the leadership of the Crimean Tatar lawyer Müstecib Ülküsal in order to ‘realize Pan-Turkism’ (*Türkçülük yapmaya çalışmak*), to draw attention to the suffering of the Crimean Tatars ‘in Siberia, Solovki, and Chekist prisons’, and to agitate for their liberation.³³ After nearly a 20-year hiatus, the journal reappeared in Ankara in 1960.³⁴

More than any other Pan-Turkist journal, the pages of *Emel* feature works by Crimean Tatar poets, writers, and civic activists: verse by Mehmet Niyazi, Bekir Çobanzade, Hasan Ortekin; plays by Mehmet Yurtsever; and historical essays by Edige Kırimal and Cafer Kırimer. Turkish-born writers like Uytun contribute as well, often helping to contextualize the Crimean Tatar tragedy as emblematic for all *esir Türkler* living under Soviet rule. In a work based on the *ağıt*, a verse of mourning derived from the popular *koşma* form of four-line strophes with a regular 11-syllable (either 6+5 or 4+4+3) metre, the poet Azmi Güleç condemns the Soviet Union as an enemy ‘without a conscience’ (*vicdansız*), cataloguing the suffering of the *esir Türkler* with a powerful anaphora underscoring distant exile:

Orda susturulmuş bütün ezanlar
Orda boğdurulmuş dertli ozanlar
Orda kurban olmuş kızlar, kızanlar
İcimde bir büyük vatan ağlıyor.³⁵

(There [in the Soviet Union] the call to prayer is completely silenced / There aggrieved poets are strangled / There girls and boys become sacrifices / And inside me the great fatherland weeps.)

Misery is not the only sentiment expressed by poetry in *Emel*. In accordance with its name – which connotes ‘hope’ and ‘longing’ – the journal sounds occasional optimistic tones:

Gök mavisi bulutlar dolar avuçlarımıza
İdil olur, Kırım olur şekillenir
Bir özge Türklük sarar varlığımızı
Tutsak ülkeler doğar yeni baştan, alev olur
Ve biter mutlu sabahlara dek bir koşu. . .³⁶

(Sky-blue clouds fill our palms / They become an idyll and take the shape of Crimea / A unique Turkishness engulfs our existence / Captive nations are born again, sparking a flame / And the race ends at the dawn of a happy morning. . .)

This hopeful passage concludes Ferit Erdem Boray's poem 'Özüm koşu ozsa edi' (If My Horse Should Win the Race), the title of which comes from the medieval Tatar *destan* (epic) *Çorabatır*. The epic relates the exploits of Narik, aide to the Crimean Khan, and his son Çora, who grows into a heroic warrior *batır* and beats back one of Muscovy's incursions into Kazan in the early sixteenth century.³⁷ In 1905, Gaspıralı cited a passage from *Çorabatır* featuring the line 'Atım koşu ozsa idi' in response to members of the Young Tatar movement who took issue with the breadth of his Pan-Turkist position.³⁸ Implicit in Gaspıralı's allusion, which is unframed by commentary, is a message of steadfast resolve that envisions the Crimean Tatar struggle as an endurance test, a 'race'. This is a message shared by Boray's poem, which celebrates a store of 'hope' and 'health' in the 'captive nations' (*tutsak ülkelerden*) bound to prevail and flourish once again like 'a lemon blossom in our hearts'.

The work of *Emel* in keeping the hope of the 'Crimean Turk' cause alive in Turkey is praised by another Pan-Turkist journal, *Türk Birliği*, which appeared in Ankara in 1966 for a print run of five years.³⁹ Like its fellow travellers above, *Türk Birliği* (Unity of the Turks) advances a narrative of Turkish ethnogenesis characterized by unity and ascendancy and then ruin and dispersal with an almost biblical scope and tone. An early issue features a poem by Enis Behiç Koryürek, which hails the 'God-given strength' of the Turks and seeks to reunite them with the Türkmen and Tatar as 'one nation', as 'a single sword on the path of justice, always ready for war' (*Hak yolunda, yalın kılıç, hep sefer-beriz*).⁴⁰ This unity is undermined by the Soviet 'enslavement' of the *esir Türkler*. In an article entitled 'Türkleri nasıl parçaladılar?' (How Have the Turks Been Scattered?), the journalist and civic activist Tekin Erer condemns the 'continuous deportations' that have flung, for example, over 'six million' 'Crimean Turks' across vast expanses of Soviet territory. The number is of course grossly inflated – the Crimean Tatars in the Soviet Union numbered in the hundreds of thousands – perhaps due to the fact that, for the editors of *Türk Birliği*, 'Kırım Türkleri' serves not as an ethnonym denoting a people with a specific history, but as an ethnic *category* encompassing many Turkic peoples with histories on the Black Sea peninsula, from the Kumyk to the Karaçay and Karaim.⁴¹

Türk Birliği consistently rails against Russian and Soviet 'imperialism' from Ivan IV to Stalin, at one point using words from Mustafa Kemal Atatürk to defend its anti-Communist, irredentist position: 'Hürriyeti gasbedilen bir millet, ne kadar zengin ve müreffeh olursa olsun, medeni insanlık gözündeki itibarlı bir muameleye layık olamaz' (A nation that usurps freedom, no matter how rich or prosperous, is not worthy of privileged treatment in the eyes of the civilized world).⁴² At times poetry facilitates a translation of such even-handed admonitions into bellicose rhetoric. In 'Kahrolsun Komünizm' (Down with Communism), the Adapazarı-based poet Teymur Ateşli crafts a vision of Soviet Communism as the 'religion' of rabid creatures akin to Homer's Laestrygonians:

Milyonların kanından, kemiğinden, etinden,
Canavar gibi yiyip, beslenen vahşettir o, [. . .]

Türk kanıyla yıkandı Sibiryâ çölleri,
 Cesetle doldurdu o denizleri gölleri. . .
 O kahr-edilmedikçe huzur yok dünyamızda,
 Lanet o Komünizme, o kan içen cellada. . .⁴³

(It is a savage who eats like a monster and devours the blood, bones, and flesh of millions [...] / It has bathed the tundra of Siberia in Turkish blood, / And filled ponds and seas with corpses. . . / As long as it is not overthrown, the world will not know peace, / Damn Communism, damn this bloodthirsty executioner.)

Again, the mixed format of journals like *Türk Birliđi* – their juxtaposition of journalistic prose about the injustices wrought by Soviet Communism with accessible, recitative poems ultimately calling upon the reader to defeat Communism, as above – makes clear an appreciation of the power of the aesthetic to effect change in the world. When a taunt from Yurdakul’s ‘Ey Türk Uyan’ (e.g. ‘Tell me, what has happened to your all-conquering Golden Horde?’) prefaces an essay on the history of the Crimean Tatars by Edige Kırımal, for instance, the reader is invited to trace a circuit between the text and its epigraph in which the conclusiveness of the past becomes a question to be answered. In other words, in these journals, poetry is the incense and, at times, the drum. It can sanctify the project with sonic allusions to the mystical or incite action with rousing rhetoric set to the cadence of a march.

These poems in *Toprak*, *Emel*, and *Türk Birliđi* tend not to dwell explicitly and exclusively on the suffering endured by the Crimean Tatars over the course of their deportation and exile. Rather, they showcase the role of lyric poetry in the sanctification and mobilization of Pan-Turkist ideas and aspirations and, moreover, offer insight into the position of the Crimean Tatars as figures whose ‘captivity’ helps provide a rationale for Cold War-era Pan-Turkist irredentism. It is in Turkish prose fiction that the suffering of the Crimean Tatars finds its most sustained and graphic representation, and it is in the Turkish military that such fiction enjoys promotion and distribution.

In June 1969 *Milliyet* published an article entitled ‘Kırım Türkleri ile niye ilgilenmiyoruz?’ (Why are we indifferent to the Crimean Turks?), complaining that

[o]ur intellectuals, who follow closely the troubles of the Vietnamese and of blacks in America (*Amerikan siyahları*), are to a surprising degree indifferent to the plight of the Crimean Turks. Only one or two touch upon the ‘Tatar’ situation (*Tatarların durumu*) with any interest in newspapers. By contrast, foreign outlets have published very compelling items about Soviet Russia’s act of genocide against our Crimean countrymen (*Kırımlı soydaşlarımızı*) during the Second World War.⁴⁴

Turkish ‘intellectuals’ may have been largely indifferent to the plight of the Crimean Tatars, but officers in Turkish Armed Forces were not.⁴⁵ In fact, in March 1969, months before the publication of the *Milliyet* article, the General Staff (*Genelkurmay Başkanlığı*) actively promoted a novel by Mehmet Pişkin and Mehmet Coşar titled

Kırım Kurbanları (Crimean Sacrifices, 1969), the purported ‘memoir’ of a Crimean Tatar spy wreaking havoc in a war-torn Soviet Union.

Major-General Hayri Yalçiner, who would later become a member of the so-called March 9th junta associated with the 1971 military coup, declared *Kırım Kurbanları* ‘useful’ (*yayarlı*) and recommended it to the Gendarmerie General Command in his capacity as head of the military’s Education Department (*Eğitim Daire*).⁴⁶ In October 1969, the novel made its way to the gendarmerie, where Major General Zeki Erbay announced that ‘*Kırım Kurbanları* isimli kitap, birliklerimiz için faydalı olduğu . . . kurul raporundan anlaşılmıştır’ (it is clear from committee reports . . . that the book *Crimean Sacrifices* is useful for our units).⁴⁷ Erbay assigned a preferential price of six lira to the work, which sold well enough to appear in three editions (1969, 1972, and 1976). The back cover of the third edition bears the quatrain:

Minareler ezansız
Camiler bomboş
Yurtlarından sürülenler
Kim bilir şimdi nerde?

(Silent minarets / Deserted mosques / A people driven from their homes / Who knows where they are now?)

The mournful question conducts the reader on a journey to find an answer.

Why did the Turkish military consider *Kırım Kurbanları* ‘useful’? In the late 1960s, after a period of rapprochement with the Soviet Union, the Republic of Turkey became troubled by an increased Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean and, in particular, by a domestic socialist movement taking to the streets in growing numbers.⁴⁸ The military appeared especially concerned about this leftist ascendancy and, upon taking power in 1971, immediately outlawed the socialist Turkish Workers’ Party (TIP), which was sympathetic to the Soviet ideological position. The strong anti-Communist tenor of *Kırım Kurbanları* provided something of a propitious, albeit modest response to the members of the TIP and others among the Turkish Left. Like Teymur Ateşli in ‘Kahrolsun Komünizm’, the authors Pişkin and Coşar proclaim in their preface that ‘as long as the Communist world is not confined to its own borders, the rest of the free world will never know peace’. Implicit in the first part of this remark is a likely reference to the armed 1968 crackdown on the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia as well as a more general attempt to delegitimize Soviet territorial integrity and sovereignty in Central Asia, a *sine qua non* of irredentist politics. The authors also make explicit the intended instrumental nature of their work, exhorting the reader ‘to make this realization [about the evils of Soviet Communism] and work accordingly (*buna göre çalışmalıdır*)’.⁴⁹

Pişkin and Coşar contextualize the anti-Soviet message of *Kırım Kurbanları* as the outcome of a perpetual struggle of Turkish good versus Russian evil, citing the ‘Muscovite infidel’s hostility to Turks’ from time immemorial. In twentieth-century Crimea, this hostility has manifested itself as, first, a ‘breach of promise’ and a betrayal of ‘Crimean Turk’ political aspirations after 1917 and, second, a ‘cowardly rape’ of the people (*alçakça tecavüz etmeye başladı*) through the Stalinist purges, deportation, and exile.⁵⁰ As one character declares, ‘the Crimean Turks endured the

most pain during Stalin's reign'.⁵¹ Despite the singularity of their experience, the 'Crimean Turks' are meant to stand for all *esir Türkler*, who collectively have fewer rights than 'cannibals in Africa' (*Afrika'da yamyamlar*), as the authors argue with racist overtones in the preface.⁵² As in the *Milliyet* article, this attention to an in-group victim who suffers subhuman treatment at the hands of the foreign enemy is meant as a riposte to pro-Communist and anti-American Turkish leftist groups protesting the war in Vietnam: 'We hope that some of the breath being expended on Vietnam . . . will be directed toward the captive Turks after this book is read.'⁵³ *Kırım Kurbanları* therefore styles itself as a means of combating a leftist 'menace' and inculcating in the reader a right-wing, Pan-Turkist ideology.

It is also designed to be entertaining in a way that the often sermonizing poems of *Toprak*, *Emel*, and *Türk Birliği* are not. *Kırım Kurbanları* is a novel for young male soldiers, a tale of espionage, sabotage, double agents, and beautiful Russian defectors to the Turkish cause.⁵⁴ Its hero and narrator is Ahmet Hamdi, a 'Crimean Turk' from Sudak who becomes a Communist in the 1920s, during the Crimean 'Golden Age' presided over by the popular Soviet government of Veli Ibrahimov. After Ibrahimov's execution, Ahmet joins the 'Crimean Turk' anti-Soviet underground, determined not to become 'a servant to the Russians' (*Rus uşağı*). He infiltrates the NKVD and 'begins an adventure' (*maceralarım başlıyordu*) which leads to an assignment at a bomb factory in an unnamed city. Ironically his NKVD superiors want him to 'follow and study' anyone he may find 'with a bad intention – like committing sabotage'.⁵⁵ Ahmet becomes the proverbial fox guarding the henhouse. After numerous fits and starts that build narrative suspense, he and a team of conspirators, including a German named Aynirik, succeed in blowing up the bomb factory. Along the way, Ahmet kills a number of 'cowards' and 'dogs' and dispatches 'their foul souls to hell' (*pis ruhlarını cehenneme*).

While Ahmet is no James Bond, *Kırım Kurbanları* does advance a narcissistic brand of masculinity that glorifies the Turkish man and, by extension, the Turkish nation. The blonde, 'shapely' (*uygun endamli*), and 'bubbly' (*neşeli*) Marusya, a young Russian woman from a family of kulaks who joins Ahmet's sabotage operation, repeatedly and effusively promotes this image over the course of the novel:

Hele Türk erkekleri . . . Çok yakışıklı, kibar, centilmen oluyorlar. Belki dünyanın en yakışıklı erkeği Türklerdir. Cesaretleri, mertlikleri de üstün Türklerin . . . Türklerin içinde acaba bir tek fert bulunur mu ki cesur, kahraman ve dürüst olmasın . . . [B]en, Türkleri pek çok severim.⁵⁶

(Especially Turkish men . . . They are so handsome, noble, and gentlemanly. Perhaps the most handsome men in the world are Turks. Their bravery and manliness are superior as well. I wonder if there is a single individual among the Turks who is not a bold, heroic, or honest person. . .)

That a Russian would pay such compliments to Turks seems to presage a degree of Russian–Turkish friendship in the novel, but alas, Marusya ultimately turns out to be of Turkish extraction. She and Ahmet fall in love. When Marusya is captured and taken to Moscow, Ahmet travels through Ukraine and Russia in an attempt to find her.⁵⁷ He is ultimately arrested *en route* and sent to the Solovki camp for five years.

Given Marusya's glorification of the Turk in *Kırım Kurbanları*, it is no wonder that Ahmet frequently and enthusiastically attests to his identity as one: 'Evet, Türküm!' 'Türküm Mösyö!' (Yes, I am a Turk! I am a Turk, sir!)⁵⁸ For authors Pişkin and Coşar, Ahmet is ultimately not a Crimean Tatar; he is simply a Turk in Crimea. He represents one of the scattered children, the *esir Türkler*, separated from the bosom of the mother: 'Türkiye, bütün dünya Türklerinin Anayurdu değil mi?' (Turkey is the motherland of all the world's Turks, isn't it?).⁵⁹ The novel's narrative works to resolve this separation and division, albeit not by envisioning a defeat of the Soviet Union that would lead to an establishment of a Pan-Turkist state from Anatolia to Central Asia. These overtly irredentist designs are put aside in *Kırım Kurbanları*. Instead, Ahmet ends up only escaping to Anatolia, a 'captive Turk' in captivity no more.

In addition to being a fanatically anti-Communist, exuberantly pro-Turkish dime novel, *Kırım Kurbanları* also offers a revisionist historical account of the Second World War and its aftermath for the reader. In one of the novel's more striking moments, Pişkin and Coşar give us a member of the Soviet elite – a boss at the bomb factory, no less – who knows before the war of a definitive plan to deport the entire Crimean Tatar population. He confesses to Ahmet, still under his NKVD cover: '[H]er fırsatta çeşitli nedenler ve bahanelerle hepsi [sizleri] Kırım'dan Orta Asya'ya sürüleceklerdir' (They will deport all of you from Crimea to Central Asia at the first opportunity, using any reason or pretext to do so).⁶⁰ The scene invites the reader to conclude that collaboration with German occupiers, who are treated in *Kırım Kurbanları* with kid gloves, amounted to a practical necessity. Later in the novel Ahmet receives cryptic communiques from an 'old friend' (*eski dost*) warning him of the impending deportation. This 'friend' explains that if Russian forces retake Crimea,

Kırım Türkününün hayatı tehlikeye girecek; 'Almanlarla işbirliği yaptınız' bahanesiyle Kırım Türklerinin tümünü ya kurşuna dizip öldürecekler, veya toplayıp Kırım dışına sürecektir. Zira komünist yöneticiler, uzun zamandır böyle bir fırsatı bekliyorlar, yaratmaya çalışıyorlardı.⁶¹

(The lives of the Crimean Turks will be in danger; using the pretext that 'they collaborated with the Germans', [the Soviets] will shoot and kill all of you or collect and deport you from Crimea. Communist leaders have been waiting for this opportunity and have been working to execute this plan for a long time.)

At the end of the novel this helpful 'old friend' reveals himself to be Ahmet's fellow saboteur from years earlier, the 'German Aynirik'.

Issues of content and characterization aside, the utility of *Kırım Kurbanları* resides to a significant degree in its exploitation of a seam between the genres of the first-person novel and autobiography to allow the reader to experience the world of Ahmet's 'I' and to persuade him of its referential truth content and verisimilitude. In the foreword Pişkin and Coşar claim that *Kırım Kurbanları* is 'not a novel, but a hair-raising account of a life lived'.⁶² This is a convenient conceit, fiction forswearing its fictionality. Verifiable extradiegetical biographical information about Ahmet Hamdi is not presented to the reader, nor is the relationship of the protagonist to the authors

explained. His name only emerges well into the second chapter. The novel's flat narrative style – devoid, for instance, of the allusory and allegorical flourishes of Hüseyin Nihal Atsız's pseudoautobiographical *Ruh Adam* (The Man of the Soul, 1977) – manifests little of what Michał Głowiński calls 'formal mimetics', the imitation of a particular style or form of discourse.⁶³ Ahmet's 'I' speaks with no phonic, syntactic, or dialectical individuality, turning on a dime from emotional character assessment, for instance, to dry historical exposition. In other words, *Kırım Kurbanları* is a third-person novel poorly dressed in first-person costume.

The reasons for such literary accoutrement are clear. This narrative first-personalization invites the reader to stage himself as an *esir Türk* and to view the world from his perspective. The novel's autobiographical pretence, meanwhile, seeks to persuade the reader of the verifiability of the world invoked in its pages – a world in which factory functionaries have pre-war intelligence of the 1944 deportation and Russian women an innate predisposition to Turkish men. For the young male soldier in training, *Kırım Kurbanları* offers what purports to be a primer in anti-Communist ideology based on empirical, 'lived' reality as well as a passage to an experience of the self as hero – and victim.

For the inculcation and promulgation of ultranationalist politics, no stranger to military curricula, this last point is crucial. Ultranationalism, after all, 'needs its victims'.⁶⁴ When Ahmet returns to Crimea after sabotaging the bomb factory and enduring his five-year term in Solovki, he is reunited with his distraught mother and enquires after the rest of his family. His mother replies:

Sorma yavrum, dedi annem; başımıza gelenleri sorma. Babanı, albanı, enişten, kardeşini beş yıl önce öldürdüler. Küçük kardeşin Osman'ı da alıp gotürdüler. Hala dönmedi yavrum. Sağ mı, ölü mü bilmiyorum. [. . .] Evimizi soyup sovana çevirdiler, tamtakır bıraktılar. Bağımızı, bahçemizi, tarlalarımızı da elimizden aldılar.

('Don't ask, my dear', my mother said. 'Don't ask what befell us. They killed your father, sister, brother-in-law, and brother five years ago. They took your little brother Osman as well. He still hasn't returned, my dear. I don't know if he's alive or dead. [. . .] They ransacked our house and left it completely empty. They took our vineyards, gardens, and fields right from our hands.')

Ultrnationalism has the propensity 'to create and preserve reservoirs of pain', and Pişkin and Coşar allow the reader to tap these reservoirs from a distance. The Crimean Tatars 'captive' in the Soviet Union become avatar-victims for Turkish soldiers (among other readers) safely ensconced within the borders of an independent, sovereign state. In other words, they offer proprietary access to national victimhood where it might be considered otherwise unavailable. Pişkin and Coşar also take great pains, as it were, to underscore Ahmet's assumption of responsibility for his family's suffering: 'Aileme felaket getiren ben idim. *Evet; suçlu ben idim ve bana kızan hunhar, zalım, merhametten yoksun düşman, benim intikamımı ailemden almıştı*' (I brought this disaster upon my family. *Yes; I was guilty. The bloodthirsty, cruel, pitiless enemy – out for me – took revenge upon my family instead.*)⁶⁵ *Kırım Kurbanları* frames Ahmet's actions, as well as the accepted consequences of those actions, as a *kurban*

or sacrifice, the ritualized forms of which have been widely acknowledged to be generative of communal solidarity. ‘Common sacrifice is a sign of common interests, and an act which asserts and promotes them’, writes the anthropologist Godfrey Lienhardt. ‘It represents a common life, and not only on an ideal or metaphorical plane, but in the day-to-day practical affairs of human cooperation.’⁶⁶

This sacrifice is given an excessive and occasionally puerile representation in *Kırım: Türk’ün dramı* (Crimea: The Drama of a Turk), which appeared in serialized form in 1980 in Yozgat’s *Sabah* newspaper. Written by a young author from Nevşehir named Ali Gündüz, *Kırım* begins with incantatory verse calling upon the reader to bear witness to the suffering of the deported and displaced Crimean Tatars:

Bak, ağzı kanlı, gözleri yaşlı
 Babası şehit, anası yaşlı
 Sürgünde ağlıyor bir soydaşım
 Göz yaşını, silmen mi gardaşım?
 Aziz Kırım önünde yıkık minare [. . .]
 Erenler geliyor Türk’e imdade. . .

(Look at their bloody mouths and aged eyes / Their martyr fathers and mourning mothers / My kin weeps in exile / Will you not wipe away their tears, my friend? / Ruins of minarets litter sacred Crimea [. . .] / But the soldier-saints are coming to the aid of these Türks. . .)

In this elegy to Crimea, Gündüz employs a string of words – the antiquated *gardaş* (friend), which evokes the lexicon of Old Turkish, and the religious-connotative *aziz* (holy, sacred) and *erenler* (soldier-saints), the latter of which alludes to the Bektaşî Sufi mystical tradition – suggesting ‘Turkish–Islam Synthesis’ (*Türk–İslam Sentezi*), a conservative political tenet that places Turkish culture on ‘two pillars: a 2,500-year-old Turkish element and a 1,000-year-old Islamic element’.⁶⁷ This ‘Sentez’, first articulated in the 1970s by a political group opposed to the growth of the Left called *Aydınlar Ocakları* (Hearths of the Enlightenment), was ‘a popular ideological point of reference for power elites in Turkey, including the military’, and exerts narrative influence in the pages of *Kırım*.⁶⁸

In the hands of Gündüz, this Islamism *cum* Turkish nationalism becomes little more than a hyperbolic, xenophobic chauvinism. He frames the novel from the opening page as a struggle of *İslamlık* and *Türklük* against *Komünizm* and *Faşizm*, citing along the way the national anthem of the Republic of Turkey written by Mehmet Akif Ersoy, the famed poet of the early twentieth century who became a particularly well-regarded figure in Islamic fundamental circles in the 1970s.⁶⁹ In *İstiklal Marşı* (Independence March), Ersoy characterizes the ‘civilization’ (*medeniyet*) of the European powers that sought to partition the Ottoman Empire as a ‘single-toothed monster’ (*tek dişi kalmış canavar*).⁷⁰ In *Kırım*, Gündüz amplifies and expands upon Ersoy’s sentiment, referring to nearly all foreign actors, even purported allies of Turkey, as monsters or ‘canavarlar’ on what seems like every page. The ‘bloodthirsty American imperialists’ who bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for instance, are portrayed as ‘drinking the blood’ (*kanını içmişti*) of many thousands of victims.⁷¹ As long-standing enemies of Turkey, Russians are immoral, even vampiric creatures

slavishly worshipping the idol (*put*) of Stalin – in an echo of Yurdakul’s ‘Petersburg’a’ and Ateşli’s ‘Kahrolsun Komünizm’. An NKVD officer named Nikola, who is seemingly killed toward the beginning of the novel, returns from the dead later on, hell-bent on rape and murder. He is finally defeated by a central hero of the story, who disposes of the body with her family: ‘Yüzbaşı Nikola’nın leşini attıktan sonra içeri akan mundar kanlarını da sildiler’ (After throwing away Captain Nikola’s rotten corpse, they wiped the floor of the unclean blood).⁷² Instead of using *kirli* or *pis* (dirty), Gündüz describes Nikola’s blood as *mundar* (unclean), a term equivalent to the Arabic *haram* with strong ritual connotations.⁷³ Throughout *Kırım*, such unclean and monstrous elements are counterposed against the piety of the Crimean Tatar characters and the potentially purifying power of a ‘Turkish-Islamic sun’ (*Türk-İslam güneşi*).

Not unlike *Kırım Kurbanları*, Gündüz’s novel uses Crimea as a means to an end, a rudimentary prop for a programmatic Pan-Turkist narrative. Set on the Black Sea peninsula during the Second World War, *Kırım* exhibits no specific knowledge of the Crimean battlefield or of Soviet Crimean Tatar society *per se*. It plays fast and loose with history, gives us Crimean Tatar characters with non-Tatar names (e.g. Oğuzhan), and swells with moments that transgress the bounds of believability with unintended humour. Russians named Gorki, Troçki, and İlyiç speak unconvincingly in Turkish proverbs (‘Bir pire için bir yorgan yakıyoruz’ – We are burning a blanket for a flea), for instance, while Nazis exchange Muslim messages of good will (‘Allah şifalar versin’ – May Allah protect you).⁷⁴ Meanwhile, the novel’s ‘Crimean Turk’ hero Alparslan – a namesake (‘valiant lion’) both of the eleventh-century Seljuk sultan who defeated the Byzantine forces at Manzikurt and of Alparslan Türkeş, leader of the Nationalist Movement Party from 1969 to 1980 – jumps from high windows, causes Russian women to swoon, and fools his enemies with effortless disguises.

Deception, intrigue, espionage – these are the entertaining, youth-friendly themes at the centre of *Kırım Kurbanları* as well. Gündüz’s *Kırım*, however, renders them not by way of *faux* autobiography but by way of omniscient third-person narration that presents the action in overwrought cinematic ‘takes’. Indeed, *Kırım* swells with scenes of gratuitous violence and sensationalized tragedy, which often prompt the narrator to address the reader with passionate hortatory passages, especially at the novel’s conclusion:

Sovyet Rusya’nın bu insanlık dışı tutumunu birlikte protesto edelim. Kırım Türkleri bu acı işkencenin içindeyse... Yarın komünizm yumruğu seni de böyle ezecektir. Onun için uyanalım... Komünizme karşı omuz omuza duralım... Mücadele verelim...

(Let us join together in protest against Soviet Russia’s inhumane attitude. If the Crimean Turks are enduring bitter torture, tomorrow the fist of Communism will crush you too in the same way... So let us wake up... Let us stand shoulder to shoulder against Communism... Let us fight...)

A collective *we* ‘invites’ the reader to stand in solidarity with ‘the 100 million captive Turks’ (*100 milyon esir müslüman Türk’un safına katılmaya davet ediyoruz*) in the Soviet Union.⁷⁵ Once again, the Crimean Tatars are presented as emblematic of all

‘captured Turks’, a searing and stirring symbol of Turkish victimhood. In the hands of Gündüz, this symbolization tends to efface their individuality and their historical, cultural, linguistic difference. Indeed, in *Kırım*, the tragedy of their deportation in 1944 is not a ‘Tatar drama’ (*Tatar Draması*), much less a ‘Turkish/Turkic drama’ (*Türk Draması*). It is, as the novel’s subtitle insists, a ‘drama of the Turk’ (*Türk’ün Dramı*).

In October 2012, weeks after Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s meeting with Mustafa Dzhemiliev in Crimea, Turkish state television broadcast a nine-part documentary film based on Dzhemiliev’s life and on the collective struggle of the Crimean Tatar people after the 1944 deportation. Among the prominent figures interviewed for the series were former Turkish President Süleyman Demirel, Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu, and Prime Minister Erdoğan himself.⁷⁶ The film is testament to a new political reality in which the Crimean Tatars are no longer objects of ‘passivity’ or ‘indifference’ in Ankara’s corridors of power. Today their ongoing efforts to reintegrate into the life of their ancestral homeland are a topic of domestic political discussion and a lead agenda item in Turkey’s evolving strategic relations with Ukraine.

This article has shown that this shift in policy did not occur in a vacuum. For decades, Pan-Turkist publications foregrounded the plight of the ‘Crimean Turks’ and the *esir Türkler* to invigorate their movement and legitimize its irredentist ideology bent on (at least cultural, at most political) control of Central Asia. They frequently leveraged aesthetic literature for this purpose, using the sonic and semantic vagaries of lyric poetry and the familiar narrative frames of pulp fiction to stimulate the reader’s constitutive, ideating activity and evoke an ‘irredentist solidarity’ among audiences young and old. These texts were subsequently consumed and distributed in the Turkish military, revealing that Turkey did not completely ‘ignore the plight’ of the Crimean Tatars at the state level.

Yet for all the changes in the political reception of the Crimean Tatars in Ankara – some modest, others profound – Pan-Turkist literature centring on the Crimean Tatars in the post-Soviet period remains imprisoned in a world of its own making. This stasis is telling. In a pulp fiction novel entitled *Kırım Kan Ağlıyor* (Crimea in Agony, 1994), for instance, Crimean ‘Turk’ patients at an Akmescit (Simferopol’) hospital languish at the hands of NKVD ‘vampires’, one of whom bears the moniker ‘The Executioner’ (*Cellat*) due to his thirst for Turkish blood.⁷⁷ Plotlines are recycled, stereotypes perpetuated. The Cold War lives on. Indeed, for Pan-Turkists like Turkish poet Yücel İpek, the dissolution of the Soviet Union has brought no change to Crimea and the Crimean Tatars at all. ‘Russians have gone, Ukrainians have come’, he writes in ‘*Vatanda Gurbet*’ (An Exile in One’s Homeland, 1998), ‘but what is new?’ (*Rus gitti, Ukraynalı geldi, değişen nedir?*).⁷⁸

Notes

I would like to thank Etem Erol and Nader Sohrabi for their invaluable guidance and input on an earlier draft of this essay.

1. B.G. Williams, *The Crimean Tatars: The Diaspora Experience and the Forging of a Nation* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), p.230.

2. 'Zustrich prem'ier-ministra Turechchyny Redzhepa Taiipa Erdohana z Holovoiu Medzhliisu kryms'kotatars'koho narodu Mustafaioi Dzhemilievym', *Medzhlis kryms'kotatars'koho narodu*, 14 Sept. 2012, <http://qtm.org/ua/ua-новини/1953-зустріч-прем-єр-міністра-туреччини-реджепа-тайіпа-єрдогана-з-головою-меджлісу-кримськотатарського-народу-мустафою-джемілевим> (accessed 26 Jan. 2014).
3. V. Prytula, 'Krym vidviduie turets'kyi prem'ier', *Radio Svoboda*, 12 Sept. 2012, <http://www.radiosvoboda.org/content/article/24705550.html> (accessed 2 Oct. 2012).
4. 'Hlava Medzhliisu Mustafa Dzhemiliev vziav uchast' u 4-mu z'izdi Partii spravedlyvosti i rozvytku Respubliky Turechchyna', *Medzhlis kryms'kotatars'koho narodu*, 1 Oct. 2012, <http://qtm.org/ua/ua-новини/2018-глава-меджлісу-мустафа-джемілев-взяв-участь-у-4-му-з-їзді-партії-справедливості-і-розвитку-республіки-туреччина> (accessed 26 Jan. 2014).
5. P. Reddaway, 'The Crimean Tatar Drive for Repatriation', in E. Allworth (ed.), *The Tatars of Crimea: Return to the Homeland*, 2nd ed. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), p.233.
6. M. Perlman, 'Bütün Müslümanlar Mustafa Cemiloğlu'nu savunmalı', *Milliyet*, 15 Feb. 1976, p.1; Anatolii Levitin-Krasnov issued a similar appeal in 'Müslüman Dünyasına Çağrı', trans. F. Yurter, *Emel*, No.93 (1976), p.22.
7. 'Ülkü Ocakları, Cemiloğlu için Ecevi'fe telgraf çekti', *Milliyet*, 11 Feb. 1976, p.10. The TRT television channel broadcast news reports of Dzhemiliev's death on 5 Feb. 1976. See K. Özcan, *Kırım Dramı* (Istanbul: Babıali Kültür Yayınlığı, 2010), p.197.
8. A. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), p.181; the passage is reprinted in *Emel*, No.53 (July–Aug. 1969), pp.22–3; I. Kreindler, 'The Soviet Departed Nationalities: A Summary and an Update', *Soviet Studies*, Vol.38, No.3 (July 1986), p.396.
9. Y. Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1976), p.28.
10. J. Landau, *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), p.149.
11. A.N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p.116 and p.130; quoted in W. Iser, *How To Do Theory* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), p.60.
12. W. Iser, *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), p.239; W. Iser, *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), p.5.
13. Iser, *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*, p.52.
14. M.E. Yurdakul, 'Ey Türk Uyan', *Mehmed Emin Yurdakul'un Eserleri: Şiirler*, Vol.1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1969), p.135. Yurdakul is referred to as the 'first nationalist poet of Turkey' in U. Schamiloglu, 'Tatar or Turk? Competing Identities in the Muslim Turkic World during the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries', in: Ergun Çağatay and Doğan Kuban (eds.), *The Turkic Speaking Peoples: 2,000 Years of Art and Culture from Inner Asia to the Balkans* (Munich: Prestel, 2006), p.240. For the sake of clarity and consistency, I will refer to him by his pen name 'Yurdakul' in this article, although 'Mehmet Emin' or 'Emin Bey' is preferred in Turkish sources. Erik J. Zürcher asserts that Mehmet Emin Yurdakul 'came from the Turkic areas of the Russian Empire'. He was born and raised in Istanbul. See E.J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3rd ed. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), p.132.
15. M. Yanardağ, *MHP değişti mi? Ülkücü hareketin analitik tarihi* (Istanbul: Gendaş, 2002), p.288.
16. Yurdakul, 'Ey Türk Uyan', p.131.
17. *Ibid.*, p.136.
18. These journals on the whole prefer *esir Türkler* to the more neutral *dış Türkler* (outside Turks), a term also in circulation in Pan-Turkist circles. Unlike *esir*, *dış* explicitly introduces concepts of inside/outside that are irrelevant for the more ardent Pan-Turkist. In any case, as Lowell Bezanis notes, the term *dış Türkler* still 'betrays a subtle irredentism suggesting that these groups await deliverance and that Turkey is the natural protector of their interests'. L. Bezanis, 'Soviet Muslim Emigrés in the Republic of Turkey', *Central Asian Survey*, Vol.13, No.1 (1994), p.61.
19. *Toprak*, No.15, (1 Feb. 1956).
20. M. Aydin, 'Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War', *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, No.1 (Jan. 2000), pp.107–8. In 1945, the Soviet Union also declared that it would not renew the Turkish–Soviet non-aggression pact. As Fisher notes, this declaration came soon after the deportation of the Crimean Tatars, which lends credence to the thesis that they represented for Stalin a potential 'fifth column' in a war with Turkey. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars*, p.169.

21. O. Bolulu, 'Bu Toprağa ve İnsanına Dair Destan'dan', *Toprak*, No.1, (1 Dec. 1954), p.43. This description of Turan is reminiscent of another found in the Pan-Turkist 'canon': '[F]rom wherever the sun rises to wherever the sun sets' (*güneşin doğduğu yerden battığı yere kadar*). See H.C. Güzel *et al.* (eds.), *Genel Türk Tarihi*, Vol.9 (İstanbul: Yeni Türkiye, 2002), p.398.
22. The suffering of this race at the hands of the Soviet regime provokes 'a boiling hatred' for Moscow in the heart of Körüklü's lyrical persona: 'Moskofa kalbimden kinimdir taşan'. R. Körüklü, 'Bırakın dağlar', *Toprak*, No.4 (March 1955), p.12. Elsewhere the poet boasts that 'there is the mark of a Muscovite's lip on my foot' (*Moskofun dudak izi var ayaklarımda*). R. Körüklü, 'Sesleniş', *Emel*, No.3 (March 1961), p.26.
23. H.B. Ulusoy, 'Gelsin', *Toprak*, No.1 (1 Dec. 1954), p.14 (emphasis added).
24. G.M. Uytun, 'Gelsin', *Toprak*, No.16 (1 March 1956), p.12 (emphasis added).
25. M. Belge, *Kemalizm*, 3rd ed. (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), p.34.
26. For centuries, religion held a primary position in the hierarchy of identity markers in Crimea. Before Gaspıralı, in fact, it had been common in the nineteenth century to refer to the Turkic language of the peninsula as the 'Muslim language'. See H. Kırımlı, *National Movements and National Identity among the Crimean Tatars, 1905–1916* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), p.36. But with his first work *Russkoe musul'manstvo* (Russian Islam), written in Russian and published in 1881, Gaspıralı employs designations of the ethno-national variety. When he chooses to refer specifically to the Tatars of the Crimean peninsula, rather than to the 'tiurko-tatary' located generally in the Russian Empire, he writes of 'Crimean Tatar schools' (*krymskie tatarskie shkoly*) and 'the emigration of Crimean Tatars' (*emigratsi[ia] krymskikh tatar*), for example. I.B. Gasprinskii, 'Russkoe Musul'manstvo', *Rossia i vostok* (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1993), pp.47 and 28. It is therefore inaccurate to state, as Edward Allworth does in his fine introduction to *The Tatars of Crimea*, that Gaspıralı 'writes of "Tatar-Muslim traits" but, significantly, does not choose the form Crimean Tatars' in *Russkoe musul'manstvo*. See E. Allworth, 'Renewing Self-Awareness', in Allworth (ed.), *The Tatars of Crimea: Return to the Homeland*, pp.7–8. Gaspıralı's role in promoting 'Kırım Türkleri' has been complicated somewhat by the recent discovery of a poem attributed to him entitled (in Crimean Tatar) 'Tatar og'lu tatarım' (I am a Tatar, a son of the Tatars). See R. Fazyl, 'Gasprinskiinin ian'y tapylg'an shiri', *Ian'y Diun'ia*, 12 April 2008, <http://www.yanidunya.org/?p=244> (accessed 14 Oct. 2012).
27. İ. Gaspıralı, 'Yine lisan bahsi', *Tercüman*, 21 Nov. 1905, as cited in Kırımlı, *National Movements*, p.41. As Uli Schamiloglu points out, the term *Tatar* was first recorded in Old Turkic inscriptions near the Orkhon River in Mongolia in the eighth century. Schamiloglu, 'Tatar or Turk?', p.233.
28. One of the most prominent advocates of the term *Kırım Türkleri* was the Crimean Tatar émigré historian and civic activist Edige Kırımlı. 'I deliberately [use] the term "Turks of Crimea (Crimean Turks)" instead of the former name, "Tartars of Crimea." We have a common cause with the Turkish peoples, we put our hopes in solidarity with them and their future assistance.' E. Kırımlı, 'The Tragedy of Crimea', *The Eastern Quarterly*, Vol.4, No.1 (Jan. 1951), p.3. It must be emphasized that the usage of 'Crimean Tatar' and 'Crimean Turk' is largely situational. Despite his advocacy of 'Crimean Turk' above, for instance, Kırımlı used 'Crimean Tatar' when establishing the *Krim-tatarishche Leitstelle* (Crimean Tatar Office) in Berlin in 1944. In eventually choosing *Türk* over *Tatar*, he follows in the footsteps of the Kazan Tatar intellectual Abdullah Battal-Taymas, who in 1925 wrote a history of the Kazan Tatars titled *Kazan Türkleri*. See Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p.84.
29. The Turkish state, which sought to assimilate its national minorities to the greatest extent possible, also promoted the use of *Türk* at the expense of other ethnonyms, even citing on at least one occasion the use of *Tatar* as evidence of *kabilecilik*, 'tribalism'. Bezanis, 'Soviet Muslim Emigrés', p.81. See also Williams, *The Crimean Tatars*, p.252.
30. A. Nekrich, *The Punished Peoples: The Deportation and Fate of Soviet Minorities at the End of the Second World War*, trans. G. Saunders (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978), p.19. Nekrich also believes the term 'Crimean Turks', as employed by Crimean Tatar émigrés like Kırımlı advocating their cause in Germany during the war, 'did much to harm the Crimean Tatars in the fateful year of 1944'. *Ibid.*, p.19.
31. N. Eren, 'Crimean Tatar Communities Abroad', in Allworth (ed.), *The Tatars of Crimea: Return to the Homeland*, p.337.
32. G.M. Uytun, 'Garipsi', *Emel*, No.5 (July–Aug. 1961), p.24.
33. 'Yeniden Çıkarken', *Emel*, No.1 (Nov. 1960), p.1.

34. *Emel* was reissued in 1960 at the initiative of the *Kırım Türkleri Yardımlaşma Cemiyeti* (Aid Society of the Crimean Tatars). It continues to be published today. The journal's long run is to be contrasted with, for instance, that of *Kırım*, a Crimean Tatar émigré journal which appeared in 1957–58 and 1960 under the leadership of Mehmet Sevdıyar, who was associated with the Crimean Tatar newspaper *Azat Kırım (Liberated Crimea)* during the Nazi occupation of Crimea. Bezanis, 'Soviet Muslim Emigrés', p.108.
35. A. Güleç, 'İçimde Bir Büyük Vatan Ağlıyor', *Emel*, No.5 (July–Aug. 1961), p.19.
36. F.E. Boray, 'Özüm koşu oza edi. . .', *Emel*, No.7 (Nov.–Dec. 1961), p.17.
37. See H.B. Paksoy, 'Chora Batır: A Tatar Admonition to Future Generations', *Studies in Comparative Communism*, Vol.19, No.3–4 (Autumn–Winter 1986), pp. 253–65.
38. İ.B. Gaspıralı, *Kendi kalemiden İsmail Bey Gaspıralı: idealleri, işleri, tavsiyeleri ve haberleri*, Vol.1 (Istanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2006), p.13.
39. See especially T. Erer, 'Kırım Türkleri ve Esir Türkler!', *Türk Birliği*, No.19 (Oct. 1967), p.25.
40. E.B. Koryürek, 'Milli Neşide', *Türk Birliği*, No.2 (May 1966), p.4.
41. *Türk Birliği*, No.33 (Dec. 1968), p.22.
42. 'Rus ve komünizm', *Türk Birliği*, No.3 (June 1966), p.3; Advertisement, *Türk Birliği*, p.19. Atatürk did not support a Pan-Turkist position when in power. This did not stop Alparslan Türkeş's ultranationalist MHP, however, from appropriating Atatürk as a Pan-Turkist utopian. See T. Bora, 'Nationalist Discourses in Turkey', *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol.102, No.2/3 (2003), p. 447.
43. T. Ateşli, 'Kahrolsun Komünizm', *Türk Birliği*, No.6 (Sept. 1966), p.18.
44. A. Kılıç, 'Kırım Türkleri ile niye ilgilenmiyoruz?', *Milliyet* (12 June 1969), p.3.
45. Bora, 'Nationalist Discourses in Turkey', p.437.
46. Yağcımer's wife is believed to have secretly informed the national intelligence service about the junta's activities. N. Kirişcioğlu, *12 Mart (İnönü–Ecevit) ve 1960 Tahkikat Encümeni raporum* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1973), p.227.
47. This letter is given as an appendix to the novel *Kırım Kurbanları*. M. Pişkin and M. Coşar, *Kırım Kurbanları*, 3rd ed. (Istanbul: Yağmur Yayınevi, 1976), no page given.
48. Aydın, 'Turkish Foreign Policy', p.125.
49. M. Pişkin and M. Coşar, 'Sunuş', in *Kırım Kurbanları*, p.7.
50. *Ibid.*, pp.9 and 15.
51. *Ibid.*, p.218.
52. *Ibid.*, p.10.
53. *Ibid.*, p.12.
54. In this regard, Pişkin and Coşar follow in the footsteps of Hüseyin Nihal Atsız, whose ultranationalist novels (e.g. *Bozkurtlar Ölümü* [The Death of the Grey Wolves, 1946] and *Ruh Adam* [Soul Man, 1972]) appealed to a young audience. J.M. Landau, 'Ultra-Nationalist Literature in the Turkish Republic: A Note on the Novels of Hüseyin Nihal Atsız', *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.39, No.2 (2003), p.206.
55. Pişkin and Coşar, *Kırım Kurbanları*, p.19.
56. *Ibid.*, pp.31–3.
57. Ahmet's journey brings him to Kharkiv, where he witnesses the horrors of the Holodomor, Stalin's brutal terror-famine of 1932–33, and encounters a Russian official named 'Puşkin' who dismisses the starving Ukrainian children there as the 'offspring of traitors' (*hainlerin çocukları*). *Ibid.*, p.95.
58. *Ibid.*, pp.115, 142, for example.
59. *Ibid.*, p.47.
60. *Ibid.*, p.38.
61. *Ibid.*, p.328.
62. *Ibid.*, p.9.
63. Atsız has been called the 'subconsciousness of the ultranationalist movement' in Turkey. See C. Saraçoğlu, 'Ülkücü Hareketin Biliçaltı Olarak Atsız', *Toplum ve Bilim*, No.100 (2004), pp.100–124. His last novel *Ruh Adam*, which centres on the exploits and ill-fated loves of Lieutenant Selim Pesat, finds its protagonist on trial before God and the sultans of the Ottoman Empire, for instance. On 'formal mimetics', see M. Głowiński, 'On the First-Person Novel', *New Literary History*, Vol.1 (Autumn 1977), pp.103–14.
64. H. Anastasiou, *The Broken Olive Branch: Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and the Quest for Peace in Cyprus*, Vol.1 (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008), p.148.

65. Ibid., p.145 (emphasis added).
66. R.G. Lienhardt, *Social Anthropology*, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp.144–5.
67. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p.288. In privileging both an ancient concept of Turkishness and a devout Muslim way of life, the ‘Sentez’ bears the influence of Ziya Gökalp. It also departs from him (and his desire to synthesize Islam with western modernity) in its pronounced suspicion of the ideals of European civilization.
68. P.J. White and J. Jongerden, *Turkey’s Alevi Enigma: A Comprehensive Overview* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003), p.79; Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p.288.
69. Gündüz concludes the novel with this couplet from Ersoy’s *İstiklal Marşı*: ‘Canı, cananı bütün varımı alsın da Hüda / Etmesin, tek beni vatanımdan dünyada cüda’ (Let God take my life, my loved ones, and all my possessions / If this be His will, but may He never separate me from my *vatan* in the world).
70. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, pp.268–9. Mehmet Akif never reconciled himself to the secular state of Turkey. He was exiled to Egypt and remained there until his death.
71. A. Gündüz, *Kırım: Türk’ün Dramı* (Istanbul: Gündüz Yayınevi, 1982), p.104.
72. Ibid., p.47.
73. R. Tapper, *Pasture and Politics: Economics, Conflict, and Ritual among Shahsevan Nomads of North-western Iran* (London and New York: Academic Press, 1979), p.298.
74. Gündüz, *Kırım: Türk’ün Dramı*, pp.54 and 61.
75. Ibid.
76. ‘V Turechchyni znialy fil’m pro istoriiu kryms’kykh tatar’, *Krymtatar.in.ua*, 10 Sept. 2012, <http://krymtatar.in.ua/index/article/id/509/ps/11> (accessed 9 Oct. 2012).
77. Y. Bahadıroğlu, *Kırım Kan Ağlıyor* (Istanbul: Yeni Asya Yayınları, 1994), p.17.
78. Y. İpek, ‘Vatanda Gurbet’, *Kalgay*, No.7 (Jan.–March 1998), p.17.