

Format de citation

Morack, Ellinor: Rezension über: Hüseyin Ağuiçenoğlu, Zwischen Bindung und Abnabelung. Das "Mutterland" in der Presse der Dobrudscha und der türkischen Zyprioten in postosmanischer Zeit, Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2012, in: Südost-Forschungen, 72 (2013), S. 475-478, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/ec148cedbf1340c9af8b24ae811908d4>



copyright

Cet article peut être téléchargé et/ou imprimé à des fins privées. Toute autre reproduction ou représentation, intégrale ou substantielle de son contenu, doit faire l'objet d'une autorisation (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Hüseyin AĞUIÇENOĞLU, Zwischen Bindung und Abnabelung. Das „Mutterland“ in der Presse der Dobrudscha und der türkischen Zyprioten in postosmanischer Zeit. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag 2012 (Istanbuler Texte und Studien, 29). XII, 323 S., 4 Farb-Abb., ISBN 978-3-89913-956-3, €75,-

The Treaty of Berlin of 1878 brought the Muslim populations of both Cyprus and the Dobrudja region under post-Ottoman administrations. Cyprus was leased to the British Empire, the southern part of the Dobrudja became a part of the Principality of Bulgaria, whilst the northern portion was ceded to Romania. Northern Dobrudja was also a part of Romania between 1918 and 1940. Whilst Ottoman sovereignty was *de jure* maintained both in Bulgaria (until 1908) and Cyprus (until 1914), 1878 marked the end of direct Ottoman control over all three areas.

For several years, Hüseyin Ağuıçenoğlu has been conducting work on the history of Muslim minorities and their periodicals in Romania and Cyprus. With this study, a revised version of his habilitation thesis (University of Bern, 2010), he offers a comparative perspective on the Muslim press of both regions. Based upon periodicals written in Ottoman Turkish, Turkish, Romanian and English between ca. 1878 and 1940, he studies the Dobrudja and Cyprus as cultural peripheries of the Ottoman, and later Turkish, state. Utilising this conceptualisation as center/periphery, he seeks to shed light on the relationship and interactions between the Ottoman/Turkish state and the Muslim intelligentsia in both places (6). Arguing that a relationship of cultural dependence persisted throughout the studied period and despite major political changes, he seeks to explain why this was the case. In line with Benedict Anderson's work on the role of newspapers in creating modern nations, he also analyses how the producers of "peripheral" periodicals constructed their center and, in interaction with that, their own identity (7).

As the author points out in the introductory chapter, the situation of Turkish-speaking Muslims in post-1878 Cyprus and the Romanian Dobrudja shared some important characteristics, which make it possible to compare them: In both places, the transition from Ottoman to post-Ottoman rule was accomplished through diplomatic negotiations rather than war. Consequently, relations between the Ottoman and the Romanian and British administrations were relatively cordial, allowing Istanbul, and later Ankara, to maintain a strong cultural influence on the affairs of local Muslims. Both the British and the Romanian administrations granted Muslims far-reaching autonomy in educational and religious affairs. Cypriot and Dobrudjan Muslim periodicals emerged almost simultaneously and could be produced under conditions of relative freedom (compared to the ongoing press censorship under Abdülhamid II). However, in spite of these parallels, both localities' press has thus far not been the focus of detailed study. Although some overviews of the respective press histories do exist, Ağuıçenoğlu's study is the first to provide a detailed, source-based picture of their development.

The book is divided into five main sections. Following the introduction, section II is devoted to a chronological discussion of the periodicals under scrutiny, discussing their principal topics, debates and problems. As in the rest of the book, Dobrudjan and Cypriot newspapers are discussed separately and along the lines of major political changes. Section

III and IV are devoted to four exemplary intellectual biographies and debates, respectively. The conclusion (section V) is followed by an appendix offering alphabetical and chronological lists of the studied periodicals, two exemplary transcriptions of articles, maps, a bibliography, and an index.

Ağuiçenoğlu distinguishes between three main periods: A first one, which started in 1879 (Cyprus) and 1888/1897 (the first surviving Dobrudjan papers date from 1897), was characterised by relatively short-lived periodicals and a re-organisation of informational networks. The long arm of the Hamidian regime continued to be felt during this period: Whilst some newspapers received financial aid from Istanbul, others were held in check by threats or, in the case of Young Turk periodicals in the Dobrudja, shut down through diplomatic interventions (122). Many papers dealt with this pressure by confining themselves to non-political topics ("Flucht ins Unpolitische", 122). Another strategy was to extensively report on political struggles about freedom and constitutionalism that were taking place elsewhere: "man transferierte Begriffe und Inhalte aus anderen politischen und kulturellen Kontexten und machte sie so für ein osmanisch-türkisches Publikum sichtbar" (ibid.).

The second period, lasting from ca. 1900 to the British annexation at the beginning of the First World War (Cyprus) and from 1908 to the end of the Great War (Dobrudja), witnessed the publication of a new generation of newspapers, and, in the case of the Dobrudja, a new intellectual dynamic kindled by the Young Turk revolution. This period was cut short in Cyprus with the British annexation and the beginning of the First World War, during which no Ottoman newspapers were published on the island.

The post-war period saw a professionalization of journalism and a major contestation by the *Enosis* idea of unification with Greece (on Cyprus) and near hegemony of Republican Turkish nationalism in the Dobrudja press. The latter was contested by the formation of Tatar nationalism which gained momentum in the 1930s.

Section III is comprised of four biographical chapters on prominent journalists (or rather: journalistically active men): Based on their autobiographies and their writings in the peripheral Muslim-Turkish press, it discusses the ideas of İbrahim Temo (one of the founders of the *İttihad-i Osmaniye* who had been forced to emigrate to the Dobrudja in 1895 and, having fallen out of grace in Istanbul, again in 1911) and Müstecib Fazıl (a Crimean Tatar from the Dobrudja who later emigrated to Turkey), Dr. Hafız Cemal Lokmanhekim (a Cyprus-born popular doctor and educational reformer who emigrated to Turkey in 1909) and Con Mehmet Rifat (a radically anti-religious fan of the Young Turks on Cyprus). Three of the four men migrated to or from Turkey in the course of their lives, and can thus be considered as cross-border intellectuals („intellektuelle Grenzgänger“) between center and periphery.

In section IV, Ağuiçenoğlu analyses "Formen und Variablen der Interaktion" between center and periphery by focusing on five exemplary debates: the question of emigration to the Ottoman Empire (and later the Turkish Republic), that of educational reform (studied separately for both places), the *Enosis* idea on Cyprus, and Tatar nationalism in the Dobrudja.

Ottoman and Turkish influence was especially strong in the field of education. Money, textbooks and teachers continued to be sent to both regions, and students travelled to the center to study, often returning as teachers. The second major field of influence was the

emigration issue. Virtually inexistent on Cyprus before the British annexation in 1914, emigration to the “motherland” (*anavatan*) was discussed early on in the Dobrudja Muslim press. Ağuıçenoğlu argues that emigration from both areas, where Muslims enjoyed good relations with their respective governments, was largely triggered by propaganda from the center. While voices against emigration (including reports on impoverished returnees) could be heard until the late 1920s, they were increasingly marginalized after that time. It is, however, not true that pro-emigration propaganda commenced only in Republican times. Rather, Young Turk policies aimed at encouraging Muslim immigration from post-Ottoman territories to Ottoman Macedonia (and later Anatolia) began as early as 1908, continuing throughout the First World War.¹

Ağuıçenoğlu shows that as of the late 1890s, Dobrudjan papers actively promoted Muslim integration (but not assimilation) into Romanian society, encouraging their readers to perform military service and to proficiently learn Romanian (194). As a matter of fact, many Muslim journalists from the 1920s and onwards spoke Romanian with greater fluency than Turkish and published in both languages. The predicament was structured differently in Cyprus, where the idea of an eventual re-union with the Empire could be upheld until 1914, when the island was annexed by the British. After that date, Cypriot Muslim papers rejected the *Enosis* idea, instead promoting Greek-Turkish brotherhood (*kardeşlik*) against the growing threat of Greek irredentism. The author concludes that a strong sense of localism (*Lokalpatriotismus*) can be traced in both places’ periodicals, and especially in all four journalists’ writings.

With respect to the later period (i. e. from the 1930s onwards), Ağuıçenoğlu comes to the conclusion that both *Enosis* and Tatar nationalism served to secure a stronger bond between writers opposed to those ideas and the Republic of Turkey. He observes that most papers of the period regarded their respective regions as “unbedeutende Orte, in die man zufällig hineingeraten war” (274) while Turkey was depicted as the actual homeland, or, in the words of the Dobrudjan paper *Hak Söz*, the only direction of prayer (*kiblegah*) (264). According to Ağuıçenoğlu, the *Lokalpatriotismus* of previous decades had by then become marginalized by the growing influence of the Turkish Republic. It is, however, questionable whether the term *Lokalpatriotismus* sufficiently conveys the phenomena at play. As illustrated by the author in previous chapters, journalists in the Dobrudja often praised the Romanian governments’ stance towards them, encouraging their readers to be active citizens (and soldiers) of the whole country. On Cyprus, too, Jon Mehmet Rifat rallied for a common sense of “brotherhood by country” among both Turks and Greeks (183). Such notions can hardly be termed *Lokalpatriotismus*.

Likewise, the contention that Tatar nationalism served to secure a stronger bond with Turkey is unconvincing. The material presented in this study suggests rather that Tatar nationalism, just like Dobrudjan Kemalism, emerged among Dobrudjan Muslims as a result of their exposure to Kemalist propaganda. Therefore, both forms of nationalism might have been better described as diverging (and competing) reactions to Kemalism.

The present study offers fascinating and detailed insights into the debates among Cypriot and Dobrudjan Muslim intellectuals in the studied period. Whilst the topics of politics (educational and legal reform, women’s rights, the control of pious foundations and their

revenues), were mostly identical to those in the late Ottoman Empire and Turkey, the relevant institutions were relatively free from state control. This allows us to hear critical voices and opinions that were censored or suppressed in the Ottoman and Turkish press throughout most of the studied period. For instance, a Dobrudjan rural paper could call urban reformers “half-intellectuals” (*yarı münevver*) and “despots under the guise of civilisation” (*medeni kiyafetli zorbalar*) in 1938 (116). It is precisely such examples which render the “peripheral” press more interesting than the supposedly “central” one.

Jerusalem

Ellinor Morack

¹ See Fuat DÜNDAR, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi. İttihat ve Terakkinin Etnisite Mühendisliği* (1913-1918). İstanbul 2001, 176f.

Teşu SOLOMOVICI, Mareşalul Ion Antonescu. O biografie [Marschall Ion Antonescu. Eine Biographie]. Bucureşti: Editura Teşu 2011. 811 S., ISBN 978-9731-765-31-0, RON 90,—

Publié par la maison d'édition Teşu et avec le soutien financier de Radu Cătălin Dancu, la préface de ce volume est écrit par Răzvan Theodorescu. Nous citons de cette préface: « Presque surprenant, un publiciste juif très connu, l'éditeur et l'écrivain Teşu Solomici, a eu le courage d'écrire sur la vie d'un anti-juif notoire qui, par ses décisions, a fait qu'une partie de l'histoire roumaine soit placée sous le signe de la tragédie » (8). Le livre volumineux de 811 pages, publié en bonnes conditions graphiques, contient beaucoup d'illustrations. Il constitue une « fausse » biographie, dans le bon sens du terme, à la manière de l'écrivain Alexandru Odobescu avec son « Faux traité de chasse », œuvre purement littéraire ayant comme prétexte l'idée de chasse. Sous le « manteau » de la biographie, Solomovici exprime – presque dans chaque chapitre de son livre – ses propres opinions, directement ou indirectement sur celui qui, exceptionnel militaire, a conclu sa carrière comme « Conducătorul », finalement jugé et exécuté après la guerre. Il faut mentionner que l'auteur du livre a lui-même supporté dans sa jeunesse les rigueurs du régime antonescien.

À la fin de son écrit, l'auteur exprime une opinion générale sur le personnage du livre: « Nous sommes les témoins d'un perpétuel recours, sans avoir une chance d'être gagné. Aucune chance de resituer au Maréchal l'honneur perdu et sa vie qu'il a perdue. Il reste une question [...] on ne peut pas oublier et lui pardonner sa politique catastrophique » (802).

En tant que genre littéraire (dans la préface de Răzvan Theodorescu, le caractère romanesque des dialogues imaginés est mis en évidence, par exemple celui entre Ion Antonescu et Mihai Antonescu, dialogues qui sont pourtant basés sur des documents et des sources qui font que ces échanges pourtant si faux soit au moins vraisemblables) le livre appartient bien sûr toute proportion gardée à la littérature des biographies écrites par Stefan Zweig et Emil Ludvig, mais aussi à la manière romanesque de Marin Preda qui fut le premier qui, après la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, a traité du sujet en relation avec Ion Antonescu.