

# **A HISTORY MUSEUM FOR KARS:**

## **A STUDY ON THE CONCEPTUAL FORMATION OF A MUSEUM IN KARS**

by

**Mehpare Özlem Başdoğan**

**20040922**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Graduate School of Social Sciences  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of

Master of Arts  
in  
Anatolian Civilizations and Cultural Heritage Management

Koç University  
May 2007

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a master's thesis by

Mehpare Özlem Başdoğan

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by the final  
examining committee have been made.

Committee Members:

---

Assist.Prof. Gül Pulhan (Advisor)

---

Prof. Norman Stone

---

Prof. Edhem Eldem

---

Date:

---

## **ABSTRACT**

The subject of this thesis is a history museum proposal for the city of Kars. The vision of the Museum proposed is to ask questions and explore new meanings about what is known about Kars and its history and, through this, to reveal the less known, neglected and the missed out. In other words, the proposed museum aims to create an awareness for the diverse cultures and histories of the people of Kars by employing their own stories. The suggested museum has been conceptually constructed on four major themes: Movement, stability, diversity, and interactivity. By implementing the contemporary museum theories and practices, particularly in the field of history museums, this study proposes a new interpretation for the history of Kars in the last hundred and fifty years. This work benefited significantly from the opinions, expectations and perceptions of the people of Kars both on the issues of museum practices and on their recent past. In order to understand these issues in the local context, a systematic survey was conducted during the research stage. A democratic and pluralistic approach to history, a keen investigation for the local and authentic evidence and its interpretation in a wider social and political context, emphasis on visual presentation, creation of an inspirational research environment for the local past and finally to connect and unite the past, present and future people of Kars through the stories and the exhibitions of the museum are the main objectives tried to be achieved in the undertaking of this study.

**Keywords:** Kars, Perception of Historical Heritage, Museology, History Museum, Recent History of Kars.

## ÖZET

Kars ve tarihi hakkında bilinenler ve bunların ışığında az bilinenler, yeterince önemsenmeyenler ve gözden kaçanlar hakkında sorular sormak ve yeni anlamları araştırmak için, diğer bir deyişle, özellikle yakın geçmişte yaşananları farklı açılardan farklı yorumlarla “şimdi” anlamaya çalışmak ve geçmişin hikayelerini “şimdi”nin ve “gelecek”in “farkındalıklar”ı yapabilmeyi amaçlayan bu tezin konusu Kars için bir tarih müzesi önerisidir. Bu çalışma, günümüz müzeciliği, bu anlamda özellikle tarih müzeciliği çerçevesinde, Kars bölgesinin son yüz elli yıllık yakın tarihine odaklanarak, Karşılıklar’ın beklenti ve önerilerinin de göz önüne alınması ve son olarak yazarın derleme ve yorumuyla oluşturulmuş bir tarih müzesinin fikrîsel altyapı ve içeriğini kapsamaktadır. Geçmiş zamanın, şimdiki zamanın ve gelecek zamanın insanlarını sergileri aracılığıyla bünyesinde buluşturmaya amaçlayan bu müze fikri özellikle demokratik ve çoğulcu söylemi, görselliği etkin kullanma çabası, özellikle yerel ve otantik olanı araştırıp bunları daha geniş bir kontekste ifade etme amacı, bölgenin yakın tarihinin sosyal içerik ve insanların yaşamları ekseninde araştırılmasında bir mekan yaratma isteği gibi hedeflerle ana çerçevesini çizmektedir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Kars, Tarihi Miras Algısı, Müzecilik, Tarih Müzesi, Kars’ın Yakın Tarihi.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORY MUSEUMS - THEORY AND IMPLEMENTATION.....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1. MUSEUM .....	14
2.2. MUSEUMS IN TIME.....	16
2.3. MUSEUMS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY .....	20
2.4. NEW APPROACHES TO HISTORY WRITING .....	25
2.5. HISTORY MUSEUM.....	31
2.5.1. <i>Memory in the Museum</i> .....	31
2.5.2. <i>History Curatorship, Exhibition and Exhibition Patterns</i> .....	34
2.5.3. <i>Objects - Collection Management - Acquisition Policy</i> .....	36
2.5.4. <i>Working with Oral Testimony</i> .....	40
2.5.5. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	41
<b>3. THE HISTORY AND PEOPLE OF KARS.....</b>	<b>42</b>
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	42
3.2. KARS AND THE RUSSIAN OCCUPATION .....	47
3.2.1. <i>A Brief Outlook on the Ottoman Empire in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries</i> .....	47
3.2.2. <i>A Brief Outlook on the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire</i> ...	49
3.2.3. <i>Occupation Years</i> .....	53
3.3. KARS DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR.....	56
3.4. THE AFTERMATH: LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND “CENUB-I GARBI KAFKAS HÜKÜMETİ” .....	61
3.4.1. <i>The Ottoman Empire and the end of the First World War</i> .....	61
3.4.2. <i>Local Authorities and the “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti”</i> .....	64
3.5. KARS AND THE TURKISH WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.....	67
3.6. KARS WITHIN NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL DYNAMICS FROM THE FIRST QUARTER OF THE 20 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY ONWARDS.....	73
3.7. CONCLUSION.....	79
<b>4. PERSPECTIVES AND OBSERVATIONS FOR A NEW MUSEUM IN KARS.....</b>	<b>84</b>
4.1. METHODOLOGY .....	84
4.2. SECTION ON PERSONAL INFORMATION .....	86
4.3. SECTION ON PERCEPTION OF HISTORICAL HERITAGE .....	87
4.4. SECTION ON A “MUSEUM” AS A TOOL OF PRESERVATION .....	96
4.5. CONCLUSION.....	102
<b>5. THE PROPOSED HISTORY MUSEUM FOR KARS.....</b>	<b>107</b>
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	107
5.2. SCOPE.....	108
5.3. MISSION OF THE MUSEUM .....	110
5.4. EXHIBITIONS .....	111
5.5. COLLECTIONS.....	143
5.6. RESEARCH.....	145
5.7. EDUCATION.....	145
5.8. OUTREACH.....	146
<b>6. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1.....</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2.....</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>161</b>

## **1. Introduction**

The purpose of this study is to attempt to create a history museum on paper for the city of Kars. The idea behind this thesis originated during my summer internship in 2005 while I was working in Kars Kaleiçi Revitalization Project<sup>1</sup>. The goal of the project was to preserve the cultural heritage in the historic core of the city. This opportunity gave me the chance to spend significant amount of time in Kars and develop this idea that represents my interest in museum studies.

During my stay in Kars I was able to observe and deal with the cultural and historical richness of the city and its surroundings. This already existing potential and the current rise of interest, both academic and touristic investments, have encouraged me to pursue the idea of proposing a history museum for the city of Kars. Therefore, I have tried to bring together theoretical aspects of contemporary museum practices and the tangible and intangible values of Kars's history. The reason why a history museum but not a city museum is proposed can be explained with the fact that the author did not want to limit the narratives with the city but instead focus on the people in the context of the city and the related dynamics in the region.

I have grouped the main parts of this thesis in five chapters. In Chapter 2, I will try to discuss the theoretical background and the practical implementations of history museums. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the history of Kars, in which I have provided a brief survey of the main events that have affected the city and its people. The following part aims to figure out the opinions of the locals on their historical heritage and on my intentions of creating this museum concept. In Chapter 5, I will try to define the content of the museum with seven sub-headings which enables me to

---

<sup>1</sup> Although I began to consider working on this topic during my internship, it has no connection with the Kars Kaleiçi Revitalization Project and was developed independently.

explain my point of view and makes it easier for the readers to picture it in their minds. In the conclusion following this chapter, I will suggest certain hints on the feasibility and realization of this museum idea, although the feasibility and sustainability are not among the concerns of this thesis.

\* \* \*

The following pages of my introduction will consist of a brief chronology of Kars and its surroundings beginning from the prehistoric periods until the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Then I will try to explain briefly the conditions in which I imagine the museum.

Kars is located in the northeastern part of Turkey and is surrounded by Armenia in the east, and provinces of Iğdır in the southeast, Ağrı in the south, Erzurum in the west and Ardahan in the north. Kars has always had close ties with the different lands on this geography such as Russia, Caucasia, Central Asia, Anatolia, Middle East, and consequently Mediterranean and Persian Gulf. This location has played a major role throughout its history.

The earliest records in the Kars region indicating human existence goes back to the Palaeolithic Age. This period (c.600.000-10.000 BC) is represented by certain findspots such as Ağzıaçık Suyu, Borluk Deresi and Cılavuz/Susuz which have yielded hand axes, pebble tools and chipped stone tools. The inhabitation of the region has continued in the Chalcolithic Period (c.5000-3000 BC) in settlements including Danamayalı and Mağaracık E Cave. The Early Bronze Age (c.3000-2000 BC) has been determined in a larger number of sites such as Baykara Kalıntısı,

Kayalık Kalesi, K rođlu Kalesi, Polat Kalesi, Yarbaşı, Yođunhasan/Karapınar Kalesi, and Yumrutepe Kalesi <sup>2</sup>.

The earliest written documents mentioning the Kars region date from the 9<sup>th</sup> century BC. The archives of the Urartian King Menua (810-875 BC), tells that Menua made fourteen campaigns to the region covering Kars, Arpaçayı, G kçeđol and ıldır and seized these places (Kırziođlu, 1972: 7).

After Urartians the area was occupied by Saka Turks. They settled in this region after various military conflicts with Urartians and Assyrians in 7<sup>th</sup> century BC. When the Persians appeared in the region in 550 BC, they included the area into their territories as the 18<sup>th</sup> satrapy. It is possible to trace this information via tax records of the region kept by the Persian rulers. After Persian rule, Parths who originated from Caspian Sea controlled the area. Subsequently, the Karsak Principality ruled the region from the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC to the middle of the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD. In 430 AD, the region was captured by the Sasanids (Kars İli Yıllıđı, 1967: 110; Kırziođlu, 1972: 7, 8; 1964: 809).

The 7<sup>th</sup> century AD in the region was marked with the military campaigns of Muslim Arabs. Although the Byzantine Empire was the main authority in Anatolia at the time, the local Gregorian rulers preferred Arab authority as they did not want to be controlled by the Orthodox Byzantine Empire (elik, 1943: 19, 20, Kırziođlu, 1972: 9, 10). During this period, local Bagrat Principality was established with the political support of Arabs. In addition to Bagara and Erasgavork, they accepted Kars as their third center of the principality and Ani became the capital (Kırziođlu, 1972: 9, 10). Byzantine Empire defeated Bagrat Principality and captured Kars in 1045 AD and ruled the territory until the Seljuk arrival in 1064. Alpaslan captured Kars.

---

<sup>2</sup> This information on the archaeological sites of the region has been taken from [www.tayproject.org](http://www.tayproject.org).

However the conflicts at the administrative level of Seljuk government affected the region drastically and Seljuks lost control on the region (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 10). In the 13<sup>th</sup> century, Saltuks and Mongols ruled the region. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century Karakoyunlu State, in the 15<sup>th</sup> century Akkoyunlu and Safavids dominated Kars and the surrounding region (Çelik, 1943: 19, 20, Kırzioğlu, 1972: 9, 10).

With the capture of the area by Süleyman the Magnificent in 1534 the Ottoman rule began. He initiated the reconstruction of Kars Castle which was possibly first built in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and had been destroyed by previous wars with the Safavids. During the Ottoman period, Kars kept its importance due to its strategic location and consequently various construction activities were implemented. In 1579, Lala Mustafa Paşa, the vizier of Murad III, managed many construction projects including the two stone bridges, the Mazlumağa Public Bath and the Beylerbeyi Palace (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 10). The Kars Castle was again renovated in the 16<sup>th</sup> century during the reigns of Ahmed I and Murad IV as a result of the ongoing military conflicts with the Safavid State in Persia. These conflicts lasted for one hundred years more until the peace treaty named Kasr-ı Şirin signed between the Ottomans and the Safavids in 1639 (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 10, 1964: 812).

At the beginning of the 1800's, because of the Russian policy aiming to reach to the Mediterranean Sea, struggles between the Ottomans and the Russians occurred in the region that led to the Russian occupation of Kars. Because of the wars between these two empires in 1807, 1828, 1855, 1877 and 1914-1915, the people in the region suffered economically and socially. Between 1877 and 1918, the Russians settled in Kars and its surroundings. The Russians did not settle in the existing city but instead constructed a new one located to the north of the Kars Stream. This newly constructed part included mainly military, religious and official structures

representing high quality of masonry. During this period, different communities settled in Kars such as Russians, Greeks, Estonians, Molokans and so on (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 10, 11, 1964: 812, 813).

The World War I and the Turkish War of Independence have caused numerous military conflicts between the Ottomans, the Russians and the emerging Turkish separatists in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The city was captured by the Turkish separatist troops in 1918 under the command of Kazım Karabekir. At the time, certain local intellectuals gathered under the leadership of Piroğlu Fahreddin Bey with the aim of establishing the Kars Islamic Council in November 1918. A new formation called “*Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti*” was founded in 1919. Cihangirzade İbrahim Bey was the first president of this short-lived local authority. In 1921, Kars became a land of the new Turkish authority (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 12, 1964: 813).

After the World War II, especially during the Cold War years, Kars again took place in the political agenda. Turkey stood beside the USA during the opposition between the USA and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union gave up their demand on Kars and the relations were stable between the Turkish State and the Soviet Union. The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the new picture of the Caucasia, which included the independent Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, have created new dynamics in the region and Kars itself. At the same time, especially during the period beginning with 1990, Kars began to lose its population while Turkey and the rest of the world were regarding the region as a new potential for economic alliances.

However, as has been shortly mentioned above, recently Kars has become a center of attraction because of certain reasons. The novel “Snow”, “Kar”, written in

2002 by the well-known Turkish author Orhan Pamuk, recent trans-border trade activities with the Caucasian countries, recognition of the significance of the border gates and railway networks as a means of including Kars in this web as a focal point, have been the factors that have fostered positive initiatives in Kars; in other words they have turned Kars into a center of curiosity. The exchange of communication brought by this development has also led to a cultural dialogue. For example, the Caucasian Cultures Festival has started to be held in Kars since 2004 with national and international participants mainly from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Russian Federation. Anadolu Kültür, a Turkish non-profit organization which aims to spread art and cultural activities in Anatolia, introduced a new art center called Kars Art Center. In March 2006 a meeting called “Strategies for City Cultural Development II” was held with the participation of local authorities and inhabitants as well as academicians and cultural heritage experts.

The sustainability of such economic and social development projects aiming at the development of the cultural tourism in the region as well as bringing new meanings to the daily lives of the locals with activities such as theaters, cinemas, concerts, art performances can be best achieved by disseminating and sharing this experience with the society. Being aware of this fact, in addition to economic benefit oriented approaches for Kars, educational efforts should also be carried out by establishing new institutions. In this manner, as an educational tool, a museum would be one of these options. Because this historic wealth which has accumulated traces of various cultures in time, this story can best be told via a museum. In this way, people can discover the recent history of Kars while they are visiting the other historical remains or tasting traditional foods and accommodating at Ottoman style or Russian style renovated boutique hotels. In order to introduce Kars’s cultural and historical

richness to people's minds, I propose a "history museum" for this purpose. This thesis will be a conceptual creation of this new museum. I do not intend to represent the history of Kars with all of its components. The museum will mainly be focusing on the period between the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Through historical evidence, documents, building remains, and living people, these eras can be researched effectively.

\* \* \*

Museums are places where visitors can gather information on associated subjects through exhibited materials. Museums collect, preserve and communicate with their audience through the collections they have. Within the last twenty years, the function of museums has shifted from just being places for storing objects to interactive institutions where the communication between objects and people has been targeted. Bringing up the visual material and the discipline of history together has emerged as a new approach. It was believed that history could just be studied via written documents but not objects. Objects used to be evaluated solely according to their artistic values. Especially after the World War II, new approaches were introduced to historical studies. Instead of pure political history, social, economic, and mentality history studies became dominant. Parallel to these new research interests, museums have become suitable places to conduct research for historians after 1960's. Creating historical consciousness, production and dissemination of information were certain motivators behind this movement. Museums started to exhibit not only the objects at high artistic level but also the ones having historical and informative value.

In this context, the museums focusing on historical information through objects, documents, photographs, and other material evidence can be named as history museums. History of cities, countries, different societies (ethnic, religious, linguistic), science, technology, agriculture, industry, war, entertainment and such various topics can be subjects of history museums.

Via history museum practices, it is possible to stimulate imagination, provoke discussion and increase the ability to ask questions for the visitors. That is to say that people can discover the past by asking questions, moving around to get a better or at least alternative perspective and looking for new evidence in the effort to understand the past. It is emphasized in this approach that there is never one simple story and one solid narrative. In order to understand different histories and gather enlightenment in historical perspective, plural voices and contradictory accounts should be taken into account.

In the concept of history museum, in addition to objects, other components are also keys to the transmission of narratives to the visitor such as the encodement of space, movement, physical action and emotional reaction.

I believe, considering both the historical background of the region and the available conditions in the city, history museum practices can be applied to Kars successfully. In this case, conceptualization efforts of the museum could focus on people-oriented narratives, which would enable the locals to understand and evaluate the recent past more effectively.

## **2. The Origin and Development of History Museums - Theory and Implementation**

The subject of this chapter is the theory and implementation of history museum work. In order to understand the notion of history museum practice, it would be useful to give the definition of a “museum” and its meaning to people and briefly survey the history of museums through time.

### **2.1. Museum**

ICOM (International Council of Museums) has defined “museum” in 2001 as *“a non-profit-making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates, and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment.”* This definition has been modified since 1946 when the first definition was made. Since societies with their all components have changed socially and economically in time, museums among other civic institutions have experienced alterations contextually (<http://icom.museum/definition.html>).

According to the definition of the Museums Association (United Kingdom) a museum *“is an institution which collects, documents, preserves, exhibits and interprets material evidence and associated information for the public benefit. ‘Institution’ implies a formalised establishment that has a long-term purpose. ‘Collects’ embraces all means of acquisition. ‘Documents’ emphasises the need to*

*maintain records. 'Preserves' includes all aspects of conservation and security. 'Exhibits' confirms the expectation of visitors that they will be able to see at least a representative selection of the objects in the collections. 'Interprets' is taken to cover such diverse fields as display, education, research and publication. 'Material' indicates something that is tangible, while 'Evidence' guarantees its authenticity as the 'real thing'. 'Associated information' represents the knowledge which prevents a museum object being merely a curio, and also includes all records relating to its past history, acquisition and subsequent usage. 'For the public benefit' is deliberately open ended and is intended to reflect the current thinking, both within our profession and outside it, that museums are the servants of the society."* (Ambrose, Paine, 2006: 8).

E. Hooper-Greenhill defines contemporary "museum" as "*an environment where the act of "knowing" is shaped through a mix of experience, activity and pleasure,*". According to her, in the museum environment, "*both the "learning" subject and the "teaching" subject"*t are harmonized within multiple perspectives and advanced technological opportunities (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 214).

The American Association of Museums has defined a museum as "*an organized and permanent non-profit institution, essentially educational or aesthetic in purpose, with professional staff, which owns and utilizes tangible objects, cares for them, and exhibits them to the public on some regular schedule.*" (<http://www.aam-us.org/aboutmuseums/whatis.cfm>).

Efforts for trying to define "museum", its function and its meaning to people, have kept their popularity among both museum people and academia. These studies have emerged especially in the 20<sup>th</sup> century when certain social, political and

economic dynamics have changed considerably, and museums have been affected by those changes, which will be discussed in greater detail in the following pages.

## **2.2. Museums in Time**

Neo-Babylonian kings Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus were the first collectors of archaeological objects. They collected and put these objects in their palaces in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries BC (Guerrieri, 2002: 53).

The Latin word “museum” has its origin in Greek word “mouseion”, house of the Muses. They were nine young goddesses who watched over the welfare of the epic, music, love, poetry, oratory, history, tragedy, comedy, dance, and astronomy. (Artun, 2006: 11, Guerrieri, 2002: 54). The most famous mouseion was founded in Alexandria about 290 BC by Ptolemy I. The Mouseion of Alexandria had collections including statues of thinkers, astronomical and surgical instruments, elephant trunks and animal hides, and it included a library, a botanical and zoological park, and an astronomical observatory (Alexander, 1996: 6).

During the Middle Ages, in Western Europe, churches, cathedrals, and monasteries were endowed with the relics that were gained during the Crusades (Alexander, 1996: 7, Artun, 2006: 21). Natural curiosities and religious relics in these buildings were especially significant for the glorification of Christianity (Artun, 2006: 21-2, Burcaw, 1997: 26).

With the discovery of the new lands and the Renaissance a large amount of new material was transported to Europe (Artun, 2006: 25). In the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, collections included curiosities of art and nature such as animals, botanical rarities, and small works of art like medallions and statuettes, which were generally

founded by aristocrats. At that time, the concept of the museum was expressed through two words. The collections were placed either in a “gallery” or a “cabinet” located in the private residences of European royalty. Privileged travelers and foreign scholars were permitted to see the collections (Alexander, 1996: 8, Burcaw, 1997: 26).

In the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries noble and wealthy people collected real works of art (Burcaw, 1997: 26). These collections included paintings and sculptures had been very much affected by the concept of *Museum Jovianum*. Paolo Giovio, bishop, humanist, and scholar, had favored the idea of “likenesses” through the act of collecting. Catherine de Medici and Paul Ardiere were the certain figures of those wealthy collectors (Alexander, 1996: 79).

The museum began to expand its function and audience in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century (Alexander, 1996: 8). The Abbey of Saint Vincent in Besançon, France was one of the earliest examples of public admission to a museum. Following the death of Abbot Boisot in 1694, his personal collections were opened to the public (Burcaw, 1997: 26). The picture gallery of the Palais de Luxembourg was open to the public in 1750 concluded with the decision of the royal French government (Burcaw, 1997: 27).

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, discovering the basic natural laws that formed a framework for the universe and humanity and preservation of natural specimens as well as human artistic and scientific creations were the main interests among the intellectuals of the time (Alexander, 1996: 8). Therefore museums were in a way regarded as systemized sources of information on objects (Artun, 2006: 96). The British Museum was founded in 1753 based on the collection of Sir Hans Sloane which was mainly dedicated to natural science (Alexander, 1996: 8). It was open to

the public, however only thirty visitors were allowed to see the collections in a day within a two-hour period concluded with an admission procedure held by the Museum administration (Burcaw, 1997: 26, Prior, 2002: 35).

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, American museum initiators were on the same route as their colleagues in Europe. The Charleston Museum devoted to natural history was opened in 1773. Charles Willson Peale was an important figure in the field of museum in the United States (Alexander, 1996: 11).

Following the French Revolution, France opened the Palace of the Louvre as the Museum of the Republic in 1793 (Alexander, 1996: 8, Burcaw, 1997: 27). The Louvre was the first large-scale public national museum in Europe. However, visitors in Louvre were provided little guides to orient themselves in the museum and to gain knowledge from the exhibits (Prior, 2002: 30). The Louvre was the glory of the Republican Government or the French nation-state over the old regime or kings. The royal collections were turned into the state-administered collections. From the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, The Louvre's influence led other nations in Europe to open various new museums in the service of nation-state building efforts (Prior, 2002: 34, 35).

The monumental architecture, interior regulations, and exterior appearances of the buildings caused a distance between the public and the institution. Across Europe, restricted hours of opening set by the museum administrations discouraged people from visiting museums. Museums were places through which elites or bourgeois culture placed themselves as cultural superiors within the social system especially in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Maleuvre, 1999: 11, Prior, 2002: 29, 31, 33).

In the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, German and Swiss museum directors introduced a new exhibition form wherein objects were placed in period rooms or halls through which visitors could acknowledge a culture within an arranged

historical environment (Alexander, 1996: 10). Germanisches Museum was founded at Nuremberg in 1856. This building was a Carthusian monastery. There were six rooms in the building and they were arranged chronologically ranging from the 15<sup>th</sup> century to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Historical period rooms provided people a unity of vision in which objects were placed in their functional contexts (Alexander, 1996: 86, 87).

Artur Hazelius established Nordiska Museet, the Museum of Scandinavian Folklore, at Stockholm in 1873 (Alexander, 1996: 10). He had stated that the Industrial Revolution had threatened the characteristic ways of living in Sweden and in all Scandinavia. This institution was dedicated to the everyday life of the Scandinavian folk. He placed the historical objects in their functional contexts. Visitors could walk along the carefully restored environments of older periods which helped them to experience the visit emotionally. In 1891, Skansen was opened in Stockholm as the first true outdoor museum by Hazelius (Alexander, 1996: 10).

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, significant museums were opened in the United States that had kept their importance in terms of being inspirational within the field of museums in the country. The Smithsonian Institution was opened in 1846 as a research institution of science dedicated to increasing and diffusing knowledge. This institution was turned into a museum devoted to science, the humanities, and the arts called the American Museum of Natural History. The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston were the other two institutions that marked the existence of US museums worldwide. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, historic house museums were introduced in the United States within the museum mainstream. This was succeeded by the opening of national parks and outdoor museums in the country (Alexander, 1996: 11). In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, historical societies emerged in the United States. They were mainly driven by the love of

country. In 1876, seventy-eight historical societies were counted in the country; about half of them were associated with museums and were equipped with scholarly activities like libraries, research and publications (Alexander, 1996: 87). At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, American museums were functioning as centers of public education in the service of the state imposing national pride and democratic ideals (Alexander, 1996: 12).

### **2.3. Museums in the Twentieth Century**

Following the Revolution in Russia in 1917 and World War I, Marxist philosophy and intellectuals such as Friedrich Nietzsche and Paul Valery criticized the museum concept. They claimed that the museum had been functioning based on a 19<sup>th</sup> century mentality. As the museum was bound by this 19<sup>th</sup> century tradition, it could not escape from its conservative political meaning. The museum represented the values and interests of the dominant elite. The museum was criticized as a repository of objects within this perspective (Witcomb, 2003: 8).

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, especially following the World War II, many social, economic and political changes occurred. Museums as social institutions have been affected by those changes extensively. Especially the ones that were focused on art, history, ethnography and anthropology, and natural history became the focal point of attention. The number of museums enormously increased around the world. Various issues and debates have emerged in the mass media and in the academic sphere over the last decades regarding the status of museums around the world (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 1, Witcomb, 2003: 13).

*“‘New Museology’, a field of study, critiques museum practices in relation to their social, economic and political contexts. New museologists criticize the traditional museological notion that objects possess inherent moral and aesthetic characteristics or reflect an objective and empirical representation of the social world,”* (Witcomb, 2003: 103). *“The new museology, as defined at a meeting in Quebec in October 1984, ‘is primarily concerned with community development, reflecting the driving forces in social progress and associating them in its plans for the future’. The new museology then, encompasses ecomuseology, community museology, in fact all those museologies which espouse the idea of the ‘active’ museum – museums which are concerned with involving people in the processes of both representation and interpretation,”* (Walsh, 1992: 161).

New museologists have emphasized *“the centrality of ‘community’”* saying that museums function as *“to associate the concept of “community” with radical democracy and resistance to the dominant culture,”*. In this frame, *“giving voice to the powerless”, “a process of self-discovery and empowerment”* and *“a place for all of us”* have been the main discourses of new museologists (Witcomb, 2003: 79). Museums have moved their practices towards more dialogic and democratic ways. While the discourse was *“to instill a sense of morality and good behavior in the hearts and minds of citizens,”* in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, new museologists have declared that the existence of *“diversity”* within a culture or among other cultures should be accepted. Accordingly, the emphasis has been placed not upon the construction of a single ideal, but on the representation of a *“culturally diverse society”* (Witcomb, 2003: 80). The idea that museums may function as platforms where different voices of the community can be addressed has become important. In that sense the representation of the community’s experiences through a narrative in which certain

objects and images are contextualized has been emphasized. Transmission of experiences between different communities through time has been realized within curatorial practices. Addressing this, curatorial practices have been based upon “*ideas*” rather than “*objects*”. The idea that “*objects are understood to be mute unless they are interpreted*” has become prominent (Witcomb, 2003: 85). As Kevin Walsh puts that “*the key to a successful future for museums has to be based on an idea of local democracy and public service, that is, the development of the museum as a facilitator for communities who wish to learn more about the development of their place, a provision which should be available as an educational service,*” (Walsh, 1992: 160).

The Museum as an institution has become more concerned with information. Museums have started to evaluate objects as archives of information which could be stored, reproduced and made available for a variety of purposes; this focus on information has meant that objects have been frequently placed alongside other sources of information such as photographs, film and oral testimony (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 204, 206). The demonstration of a personal, rather than an institutional viewpoint within historical records has gained importance. It has been accepted that the oral histories provide the narrative themes of an exhibition - a way in which the private nature of people’s experiences and memories could be told and respected in a public space with a mission to educate through the use of images, media and interpretative text (Witcomb, 2003: 87). Museums through their exhibitions have touched upon issues of temporality, diversity, and intergenerational transmission of heritage.

In 1988, the Smithsonian Institution in Washington organized a conference on museums and cultural diversity. For museums, three challenges in exhibitions

involving culturally diverse subjects were stated (Murphy, 2005: 72). Diverse populations need to be more involved in the way they are presented in museums. In the presentation of non-Western cultures and minority cultures, more expert people should be established in museums. Exhibition design needs to be allowed museums to offer multiple perspectives (Murphy, 2005: 73).

Towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, economic imperatives have changed as well. Due to the huge destructive impact of global economic initiatives on rural and regional economies, many of these traditional systems have begun to collapse, while the importance of tourism, especially local tourism, has increased (Witcomb, 2003: 96). Local museums and heritage centers have started to be evaluated as alternative sources of economic development through which new job opportunities would be created (Witcomb, 2003: 96). Museums have started to employ marketing techniques to attract new audiences. New subject positions have emerged in museums; marketing managers, development officers, and fund-raisers have started to be employed in museums besides education officers, designers, and curators (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 211).

As technology has substantially improved, there has been a shift from “industrial society” to “information society”. Media has intervened in people’s lives more than in the past. Museums have also been introduced electronic media technologies. They have employed multimedia technologies extensively to be more “interactive” with their audiences (Witcomb, 2003: 113, 114, Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 200). Introduction of new media technologies into the museum field in the last few years has led a new facility in the museum operation which has been advancement in the dissemination of information kept in the museum. The idea of “*open storage*” has emerged. The data held on the collections has been made

accessible through the use of computer documentation and print-outs collated in books positioned near the relevant objects. The private spaces and processes are sometimes opened quite literally through inviting visitors on “*open days*” to see “*behind the scenes*”. Storage areas, conservation and photographic laboratories, and archives have started to be demonstrated and explained (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 200, 201).

Museum spaces have been rearticulated in different ways. Shops, restaurants, rest and orientation areas occupy space that in the past would have contained objects and displays. The percentage of space within the building allowed for the display of objects has been reduced in favour of spaces to display people. Museum visitors as lookers and learners are repositioned as customers. Many museums and galleries have allocated space for their visitors to eat and drink varying from expensive restaurants to sandwich bars. Some museums contain both, so that business people and families can both be situated. Museums have had to change their architecture in order to accommodate the new technology. In the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, the walls and the floors of the museum have to be built to contain cables (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 201, 202, Witcomb, 2003: 115).

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, understanding of “history” has been changed and “new history” studies have emerged. Attention to other people’s lives has increased. “New museology” studies have been inspired especially by the new approaches in the field of history-writing.

## 2.4. New Approaches to History Writing

The historian Ernst Breisach explains that “*history deals with human life as it ‘flows’ through time,*”. He continues that “*there we observe how the expectations for the future turn first into the realities of the present and then become the memories of the past,*”. He has finally points out that “*once we accept that human life is marked both by change as that which makes past, present, and future different from each other and continuity as that which links them together,*” (Breisach, 1994: 3). He emphasizes the fact that there is a “change” through which people acknowledge “past” and “present” and “future” in their lives. There is a “continuity” marking this phenomenon that makes people place in time not a “static” but in a “dynamic” way.

The historian John Tosh identifies history as “*history is collective memory, the storehouse of experience through which people develop a sense of their social identity and their future prospects,*” (Tosh, 1991: 1). He underlines the past experiences belonging to the people and marks their importance to understand a society. Personal identity establishes itself in the past, particularly in genealogy and in family history. According to him, people constantly interpret their experiences, from individual level relationships to collective events, in time perspective. Awareness of what has happened or not happened in the past defines what is practicable in the future in people’s minds therefore they learn by experience. Within this frame, he points out that people would step outside from their own assumptions and start to evaluate matters being into the shoes of others that are requirements to explore the past efficiently at both individual level and national level (Tosh, 1991: 10, 21).

This approach to historical studies is very much related to the “*new history*” studies. The term “*new history*” first appeared in 1912 in a book with this title published by the American scholar James Harvey Robinson (Breisach, 1994: 370, Burke, 1992: 7). In France, in 1929, a journal called “*Annales*” was published. The historians, Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch rejected “*event-oriented history*”. They claimed that narratives with political contents would not fully cover the human reality and this threatened the position of history among the disciplines studying human life (Breisach, 1994: 370, 371). In the late 1940’s, in Britain, the historians E.P. Thompson and Christopher Hill pointed out the importance of “*the experiences and every-day life of the common people*” to understand the past (Fairburn, 1999: 17). In Britain, in the late 1960’s, “*the History Workshop movement*” evaluated the historical reconstruction of working people’s experience as “*a source of inspiration and understanding,*” (Tosh, 1991: 8). Their aim was to rescue working-class memories of work, locality, family and politics (Tosh, 1991: 8). In the 1970’s, feminist historians in Britain, and feminist and black historians in US criticized the dominance of the “*white male elite*” in historical studies (Fairburn, 1999: 17). Developments in 1970’s and 1980’s were the reaction against the traditional paradigm. They have become world-wide in Japan, India, and Latin America (Burke, 1992: 7).

National history was the dominant form of history in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. According to this traditional paradigm, history is essentially concerned with politics and state. In other words, it deals with national and international rather than local. It tends to address events, politics, elites, kings, battles, and treaties (Burke, 1992: 3, Fairburn, 1999: 16). Traditional history introduces a view from above, in the sense that it always focuses on the achievements of statesmen, generals, or occasionally

churchmen. According to the traditional paradigm, history is based on documents: chronicles, official records, archives, etc.. It neglects other kinds of evidence. The period before the invention of writing is called “prehistory” because of this reason (Burke, 1992: 4). According to the traditional paradigm, history should be objective in the sense that the historian is to give readers the facts and to tell the way events happened (Burke, 1992: 5, Fairburn, 1999: 16).

However, the new history concept is concerned with virtually every human activity. Peter Burke quotes from J.B.S Haldane that “*everything has a past which can in principle be reconstructed and related to the rest of the past,*” (Burke, 1992: 3). In the last thirty years, a number of remarkable histories of topics have emerged that they have not been thought to possess a history before. Histories of childhood, death, madness, the climate, smells, dirt, femininity, gestures, and the body are counted among those (Burke, 1992: 3).

The theory of “*cultural relativism*” deserves to be emphasized here. The philosophical foundation of “*new history*” is the idea that reality is socially or culturally constituted (Burke, 1992: 3). Cultural relativism undermines the traditional distinction between what is central and what is peripheral in history (Burke, 1992: 4). “*History from below*” is interested in the views of ordinary people. It chronicles their experiences as means of social change (Sharpe, 1992: 25, 27). Written documents like official records are limited in the sense that they generally express the official point of view. Reconstruction of the attitudes of untold people in history is achieved through supplementing written documents with other kinds of sources such as visual, oral, and statistical testimonies (Burke, 1992: 5). Understanding of changes and conflicts that have formed cultures is achieved and enhanced through the presentation of opposite viewpoints. “*Objectivity*” is impossible in reconstructing the

past. Observation of the world as it was from a particular point of view limits comprehension of it fully because observations are biased by preconceptions (Burke, 1992: 6, Fairburn, 1999: 5, 6). The whole range of human activity needs to be searched through inter-disciplinary collaborations with social anthropologists, economists, literary critics, psychologists, sociologists, and so on (Burke, 1992: 6).

Within this mainstream, various new study fields have emerged like social history, labour history, urban history, and rural history. Among them social history has become the fastest growing and the most fashionable area of professional historical writing and research in the last three decades. Social historians have favored and employed different concepts and theories of social sciences (Fairburn, 1999: 1).

Social history is generally concerned with the behavior, actions, customs, desires and values of large aggregates (or collectivities) of subordinate people. The term “*collectivity*” refers to a whole society, a cluster of a society, an empire, and a civilization, a large segment of people within a society, a local community, or an institution. Social history also deals with individuals as well as families and other small groups. Social history gives representation to the people who are “*lost from history*,” (Fairburn, 1999: 7, 8).

Keith Jenkins quotes from Jean-François Lyotard, a French philosopher, and argues that “*secularizing, democratizing, computerizing, and consumerising*” which are especially unique to our age have had a huge impact on the understanding of the past (Jenkins, 2003: 71). She states that values change constantly and their impacts on history writing have been observed in time. In the time of aristocracies, divinity, race, blood and lineage were the values through which people were positioned in a society. In other words natural orders shaped a society. In the late 18<sup>th</sup> and the early

19<sup>th</sup> centuries, the bourgeoisie undermined this phenomenon. They introduced the idea that value was to be earned, not given. Hard-working bourgeoisie established themselves and their own value through gain and private property. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, following the Russian Revolution, working classes abolished the private property value and did their own value. They claimed that being alive was enough to be a man. Jenkins continues that two European-based world wars, economic crises, Fascism, Nazism, de-colonisation movements, Marxists critiques, and feminist acts have broken down the notions of liberal progress (Jenkins, 2003: 72, 73). In this situation, capitalism has had to find itself another basis for value which is the concept of “*relativism*” that one can be anything he likes through the goods he has and can exchange them with whoever he likes according to a relative taste and style (Jenkins, 2003: 74). Status of knowledge and practices is affected by this relativism; therefore positions, perspectives, models, angels and paradigms are affected (Jenkins, 2003: 75).

Memories of ordinary people have been accepted as important sources for tracing past experiences. Social practices and routines would be acknowledged through connection with memories of daily life derived from personal histories (Moran, 2004: 59). The French historian Pierre Nora states that memory embodies itself in living societies and this is an everlasting phenomenon. There are as many memories as there are groups, therefore “*memory is multiple yet specific; collective and plural yet individual,*” (Nora, 1996: 3).

Psychologists define memory as a process to retrieve and to store information. They define different types of memory. Each is connected to each other and to the different functions of the brain. Memory has a duration, short and long term. Within long term memory, different forms of remembering are defined:

semantic/declarative, procedural and episodic (Kavanagh, 2000: 11, 12). Episodic memory is the ability to remember events, places, connections, information and people within the terms of lives of people. They are particularly context dependent therefore they are vivid and affecting (Kavanagh, 2000: 13). As Pierre Nora states “*memory is always a phenomenon of the present.*” An old song (audio), a photograph (visual), smell of something or a feeling (fear or contentment) and sometimes a tactile sensation can prompt them and bring memories to mind. Pierre Nora notes, “*memory as a phenomenon of emotion and magic,*” without thinking about them, memories come back through stimulation of the senses (Nora, 1996: 3).

Memories are also culturally and generationally dependent. They can be transferred to the next generations. They are mood dependent as well. People remember sad things when they are depressed. Equally, people remember happy times when they are happy. Memories are also audience-dependent (Kavanagh, 2000: 15). The existence of a listener or listening group can turn a private memory into one that is expressed publicly (Kavanagh, 2000: 15).

As Fernanda and Mansard state, memory must be recovered before it is lost and incorporated in wider contexts (Fernanda, Mansard, 2001: 33). Access to memories and trace past experiences are achieved through consulting oral testimonies. Oral testimony complements other sources and sometimes can even undermine them. Because every person can be interviewed, oral history can involve all strata.

Before the World War II, some museums and regional ethnologists had been involved in studies concerning oral testimony. However, the emergence of oral testimony as a distinctive approach within the academic study of the past was primarily a postwar phenomenon. In the US, Allan Nevins at Columbia University

initiated the country's first oral history project in 1948 (Kavanagh, 2000: 54). In Britain, the work of Professor Paul Thompson at the University of Essex was another example (Kavanagh, 2000: 54). In 1978, David Lance, head of sound archives at the Imperial War Museum, published a guide to oral history (Kavanagh, 2000: 54).

Universities were influential in the development of oral history studies. They particularly studied memory as evidence. They searched for ways through which understanding and examination of memory could be achieved more effectively. They also published critical explorations of societies through the application of oral testimony (Kavanagh, 2000: 55). In the early 1980's, the History Workshop Group defined "*the democratizing of the act of historical production, enlarging the constituency of history writers, and bringing the experience of the present to bear upon the interpretation of the past,*" (Kavanagh, 2000: 55). The emphasis has been upon "*history from below*". Oral history studies have been encouraging and promising to empower marginalized or ignored histories. Oral testimonies have promoted community awareness and a sense of personal or cultural identity. In 1980's and 1990's, academic enquiry was concerned with the content of an interview and new forms of analysis emerged (Kavanagh, 2000: 56).

## **2.5. History Museum**

### **2.5.1. Memory in the Museum**

Gaynor Kavanagh quotes from Sheldon Annis and states that visitors experience three symbolically different spaces which are overlapped in the museum visit (Kavanagh, 1996: 3, 2000: 2). These are called cognitive, pragmatic (social) and

dream spaces (Kavanagh, 1996: 3, 2000: 2, 3). The cognitive space is associated with the educational purpose of museum. The museum is an important site for open and life long learning. The second space is the pragmatic or social one. The motivation for the visit is usually social. Visitors already having different roles like partner, parent, or friend, experience the visit in their personal times through choice. They enhance their roles by sharing this experience with other visitors that create a social union in the museum. Annis's third category is the dream space. In the dream space there is an interaction between objects and the visitor's subrational consciousness (Kavanagh, 1996: 3, 2000: 2, 3). This is very much connected with imaginations, feelings, and memories. Different shapes, colors, operation of space, people moving through can be triggers for various personal associations. Imagination, emotions, senses and memories are vital components of this type of visit experience (Kavanagh, 1996: 4, 2000: 3).

Gaynor Kavanagh puts that history museums work with dream spaces (Kavanagh, 1996: 4, 2000: 3). She sees memories as products that history museum record and collect. Memories as sources of information are stored, interpreted, and returned. History museums gather and employ memories extensively (Kavanagh, 2000: 3, 4).

Susan A. Crane puts that memory as a mental process in the brain is invisible to the naked eye, however it becomes sensible and visible when it is recollected and represented (Crane, 2000: 1). Each person has individual memories that belong to no one else. On the other hand, memories are collective and they are shared through common experiences, learning, heritage, and tradition. According to Crane, history museums are places where memories are stored like an archive through their collections (Crane, 2000: 2, 3). Cultural and scientific materials as records are

manifestations of memories. Memories are removed from the mental world through this visualization process and they become visible (Crane, 2000: 3, 2005: 319). She puts that memory is not static in the museum in its fixed place, but functions in the museum through the contexts within which memory is recalled and revived (Crane, 2005: 322). History museums are institutions through which historically conscious individuals are attracted and gathered around the efforts of production of history. Personal memories are resources serving to this aim (Crane, 2005: 332).

Gaynor Kavanagh defines history museums as institutions serving the social production of history (Kavanagh, 2005: 349). They produce histories through their exhibitions. They handle, analyze, and interpret the evidence in the exhibition form. History museums are in different shapes and sizes. They are given different titles like social history, industrial history, local history, rural life, and folk museums. She points out that history museums have progressed especially in the post World War II era (Kavanagh, 2005: 349).

The history museum is a sector of museum provision which deals specifically with material relating to the more recent centuries of human experience. History museums in the United States and Canada deal generally with local history or the history of the region where the museum is located. Every kind of object is of interest to them. History museums do focus on a certain time period, a certain limited geographical area, or a particular field within an already defined scope. The purpose of the museum is clarified through this established scope. The scope of the museum guides the museum staff in the collecting, exhibiting, and programming policies. Objects are collected according to the purpose of the museum, in the service of public education (Burcaw, 1997: 39). History museums deal with the lives of all people regardless of the fact that they are originated from different segments of

society (Burcaw, 1997: 66). History museums, preserved historic houses, preserved villages, and folk-life museums around the world place and voice histories of “*ordinary people*”. Preservation of the everyday and representation of it through commonplace artifacts and reconstructed scenes from the past are features of these institutions (Sand, 2001: 352). Carl E. Guthe defines history museum as an institution that it preserves and interprets the collections of significant historic objects. He puts that most history museums deal with a restricted geographical area (Guthe, 1977: 10). He especially claims that through a local history museum, native citizens can see and understand the materials directly related to their own past (Guthe, 1977: 76).

### **2.5.2. History Curatorship, Exhibition and Exhibition Patterns**

History museum curatorship is based on certain fundamentals. Objects and memories are found, kept, and used within some system of explanation (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 206, Kavanagh, 2000: 7). Source material is evaluated mainly in two ways; in terms of research and acquisition. Either it is approached in a source-oriented way or in a problem-oriented way. The former emphasizes the source itself. The latter asks questions and searches for answers. History museum curators and historians working in history museums gather a wide range of material together. Gaynor Kavanagh sees social and communication skills as vitals for history curatorship in order to introduce the various uses of source material (Kavanagh, 2005: 351).

A history museum produces histories through its exhibitions. Exhibitions are produced based on their social relevancy which is determined through research. They

are interpreted through curatorial practices which require creativity, literary and visual flair. Signs, symbols, and subtexts are harmonized in curatorial language (Kavanagh, 2005: 351).

Gary Edson's term "socioexhibitry" meets well with history museum exhibition practice (Edson, 2001: 42). Socioexhibitry is a people-oriented exhibition technique that acknowledges human social relations or group life and is achieved through objects which are already gathered, researched and interpreted within a meaningful frame (Edson, 2001: 42). Objects are displayed in a setting in which related cultural, aesthetic, and historical information is provided thanks to the curatorial practice (Bessire, 1997: 53).

There are certain patterns that are essential to history museum exhibition practice. In the first pattern, objects are shown by gathering those of similar examples in a single case. Another pattern gathers objects within a class reflecting the developmental changes occurring within the class of objects in time. The third pattern differs from the two stated above. Objects are purposefully arranged for the interpretation of an historical theme. Therefore the objects are not the center of interest. Different units deal with incidents in history in chronological order, or customs, historical events, crisis, and similar aspects.. This method allows museum staff to establish a unity in the exhibit program. Through this well-established exhibit, visitors would orient themselves quickly in the museum and acknowledge what is being conveyed within the displays (Guthe, 1977: 61).

M.R.Gorgas states that an object is represented as much as its original context so that its time and its original setting can be acknowledged (Gorgas, 2005: 357). James Deetz claims that collection and organizing of objects into systematic and functional groupings allow visitors to acknowledge the behavior of groups of people

like familial roles, division of labor, and their relationships with artifacts. Within this perspective, period rooms and group installations are methods being employed by history museums (Deetz, 2005: 377). Historic houses and full-scale community recreations are other display methods still in use. Live interpretations by professionals costumed and equipped with historical material, role playing, and interpretative activities appeal to visitors' attention (Deetz, 2005: 380). Carl E. Guthe maintains that accompanying materials such as charts, diagrams, photographs, textual explanations, maps, audio-visual devices are helpful tools through which interpretation of subject is enhanced for a satisfactory exhibit (Guthe, 1977: 63).

### **2.5.3. Objects - Collection Management - Acquisition Policy**

Collections serve as a resource from which other museum functions derive. These are exhibitions, research, educational work, and outreach.

The scope of the museum defines the scope of the collections. The major interests of the history museum, like the story of a city, town, county, or restricted geographical area, a particular industry, activity, or historic incident or period are reflected within the museum's collections. Objects directly related to the objectives of the history museum appeal to visitors who may be native citizens, recent arrivals, and tourists (Guthe, 1977: 22, 23). Visitors' response to museum collections and exhibitions is very much connected with their expectations, needs, and assumptions which are the accumulations of their previous experiences. As Carl E. Guthe asserts, every observer tends to see things which are related to his own experiences. The native citizen focuses on the materials directly connected with his community, environment, or which have local historical significance. The recent arrivals and

tourists are interested in the key materials as a key to understanding the local community (Edson, 2001: 41, Gorgas, 2005: 360, Guthe, 1977: 23).

Carl E. Guthe categorizes history museums' collections into four groups (Guthe, 1977: 30). Objects in the first group are the most historically significant ones. They have authentic documentary records including their physical characteristics and conditions, their associations with relevant historic periods, events, or individuals. Objects in the second group have incomplete individual records or no records at all. They are identified through comparisons with authentically documented objects, photographs, and descriptions. Objects in the third group have no inherent historical value however they are useful in interpreting history. These are modern replicas and they are mostly used in filling gaps in the collections, completing associated objects in period rooms, illustrating larger historical materials which cannot be shown. Objects in the fourth category are miscellaneous ones that are old, strange, but have doubtful associations with the content of the museum (Guthe, 1977: 30, 31).

Previously, research on the collections was carried out after the object had entered the collection. Acquisition and research used to be seen as two separate processes. In the early 1980's, due to Swedish curators' efforts, new approaches to acquisition, especially in the history museum practice, have emerged (Kavanagh, 2000: 99). Since ideas have become more important than objects, acquisition and research have begun to be evaluated as part of the same process. Objects are means of telling a specific story. They are gathered as they relate to a story. An object's importance derives from its relationships with humankind and relevant values, in other words its consistency with narratives and discourses (Gorgas, 2005: 360, Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 206, Kavanagh, 2000: 7).

Materials in the collections are interpreted through study and investigation in advance. There are certain suggested activities and procedures as ways of study and investigation. Research on the collections can be achieved by employing scholars, or inviting scholars in the field of history or in other social sciences, inviting students, collaborating with research institutions, or involving citizens of the community into these efforts (Guthe, 1977: 53, 55).

Within the terms of social and physical context, history museum curators decide what to collect and what to ignore. In other words, they define what to remember and what to forget. This is a matter of judgement. This judgement primarily concerns the object's relevance to the social history of the area. An object's condition, cost of maintaining an object in good order, place of it within established collections, and its likely uses are other points that need to be considered for the judgement of an acquisition (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 204, Kavanagh, 1996: 6, 2000: 98).

A clear written policy regarding what objects are to be collected is formed based on the scope of the history museum. Guidelines have been introduced which are to be followed while acquiring objects for collections. These guidelines include these subject headings: scope, legal title, documentation, safety and security, ability to care for, potential use, duplication, condition, public relations, relevance, and special considerations (Burcaw, 1997: 64). Accession of an object into the collections is primarily connected with the scope of the museum, whether an object fits with the geographic, temporal, and subject matter limitations. An object needs to be titled legally, and the donor and the museum must agree on the fact that the museum is free in the use of the object. An object needs to be documented to ensure that its function, origin, previously usage, place within the scope, educational usage,

and other details are clear. Safety and security conditions of an object need to take into account the safety of staff, visitors, the building, and other objects in the collections. An object needs to be stored, exhibited, and preserved properly in terms of the space, staff, and facilities the museum has. An object is investigated to determine whether it is educationally useful or not in terms of museum operation including research, comparison, loan, exchange, exhibition, traveling exhibits, and hands on activities. If an object is duplicated in the collections, it is investigated in terms of its space and staff needs. The completeness and condition of an object are considered before accessioning, looking particularly at whether an object represents its class of objects properly. Another criterion touches upon the issue that whether an object would attract people's attention to the museum. An object is valued in terms of whether it is related to the teaching purpose of the museum defined by the scope. Accessioning is needed to be appropriated considering features of the community such as economic conditions, ethnicity, the museum's economic resources, and public expectations and demands (Burcaw, 1997: 64, 65). The collecting policy is a permanent concept/entity that can not be affected by fads, hobbies, and myths (Burcaw, 1997: 69).

Carl E. Guthe introduces the term "*historically significant object*" that is a historical valued object which contributes to the knowledge of history (Guthe, 1977: 26). He lists three criteria that define a historically significant object. A historically significant object has a documented individual history. Its physical character and condition provide a clear understanding or interpretation of former custom, activity, episode, or personality. The third criterion is the nature of the historic period or episode that a historically significant object is associated. Its associations with a

number of important events, periods, or individuals in the history of community judge its historical worth (Burcaw, 1997: 66, Guthe, 1977: 27, 30).

#### **2.5.4. Working with Oral Testimony**

Oral testimonies are one of the main sources of information for the history museums as they bring a variety of possibilities such as inspiration for exhibitions and research, a new argument for the museum itself as an institution as well as a dynamic nature. Since the oral testimonies are kept in the museum, it also serves as an archive for these memories before they are lost and therefore some of them see the recording of oral testimonies as part of their archiving function.

Large museums like the Museum of London dedicate facilities to this purpose. Some history museums primarily focus on documentation, index and transcription of tapes. They keep them in appropriate conditions and allow public access for research purposes. Others use tapes almost as impermanent material. Whenever the purpose is fulfilled (for example, supplying a quote for a temporary exhibition) they are discarded (Kavanagh, 2000: 57).

Five forms of oral testimony are defined with which history museums work regarding different interests and concerns (Kavanagh, 2000: 68). The first one is concerned with skills, procedures, and the use of objects. The second one is concerned with the use of language. The third one deals with episodic memories. The fourth one deals with life experiences. The last one focuses on being and believing. Rural museums and museums with rural history interests prioritize recording of memories which are about skills, procedures and the use of objects. Industrial and technical museums take a similar kind of interest. Much of the recording work

devoted to language takes place where a native language is threatened or is in decline. In more recent forms of interview, museums aim to record people's experiences of life. This is more than asking them to describe a process, outline a skill, or provide a narrative. The recording goes beyond this in an effort to get some sort of understanding about what something was like for someone. The closer oral testimony gets to experiences, the more questions arise about how people coped and how they were able to get through the best and worst of times (Kavanagh, 2000: 71, 75, 77).

#### **2.5.5. Conclusion**

The museums, from their earliest examples to the contemporary ones, have always functioned as civic institutions interacting with their community. Therefore, in time they have become places that reflect the society in which they exist and the changes that occur. As has been demonstrated, the "museum" has reached its current identity as a result of the changes that have occurred throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. History museums in particular have been among the institutions that were influenced by these changes and the understanding of new museology.

### 3. The History and People of Kars

#### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter is going to provide a brief outlook on the history of Kars covering the period between the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The aim here is to give a historical background in order to have a perspective on the history of Kars and to combine this with the contemporary national and international contexts. I have put together bits of information from various works, both in English and in Turkish; however, giving a detailed historical survey of Kars and of the region is not the aim of this study at this point. This chapter is based on the summary and analysis of secondary and occasionally primary sources. This brief information has been given in order to demonstrate its relationship with the New Museum proposed.

The historical outlook enables readers to have a background based on the sources which are mainly the ones focusing on political history. Historical studies concerning Kars and its surroundings are mainly the ones which have a military and political approach. Since the components are mainly states, wars, peace treaties, related government and military characters, and political interests, histories of ordinary people, people's lives and the conditions that defined the life patterns at the time could hardly be traced. There are sources dealing with the region with its social features within the period stated above; however they are mostly the ones written in Russian. Mehmet Perinçek<sup>3</sup> mentions that the archives belonging to the institutions such as the “*Şarkiyat Enstitüsü*” and the “*Marksiizm Leninizm Enstitüsü*” in Moscow

---

<sup>3</sup> Personal interview with Mehmet Perinçek. He is a research and teaching assistant in the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at İstanbul University. He has worked in the official archives of the Russian State between 1998 and 2006. His fields of interest include the Russo-Turkish relations, the Armenian question, and the Turkish foreign policy.

provide information on the region within the perspective stated above. He has come across the records concerning Kars in the archive of the Tsarist Russia, “*Çarlık Dönemi Arşivi*”, in Moscow. Kars was put as “the place having been occupied according to the codes of warfare” and examined its police force, its logistic accessibility, and its administrative structure. He especially makes mention of three sources which examine the region socially<sup>4</sup>. The first one called “*Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskaya Politecheskaya Istoriya Karsskoy Oblasti (1878-1921)*” by A.M. Pogosyan is a doctorate thesis and it examines the Kars oblast with its socio-economic features within the period between 1878 and 1921. It was published by the “Akademiya Nauk Arm. SSR Institut Istории” in Erevan in 1965. The second one called “*K Noveyşey Istории Severo-Vostoçnih Vilayetov Turtsii*” was written by D.S.Zavriyev in Tibilisi in 1947. It makes mention of the cities in the north eastern part of Anatolia covering Kars in the recent past. The third one is a five-volume reference work called “*Kavkazskaya Voyna*” which provides information on the wars occurred in the Caucasus. It was published in Moscow in 2006. The volume IV contains articles on the Turkish-Russo war of 1828 by Vasili Potto.

The importance of the period stated above derives from the fact that the city of Kars and its people have been deeply affected by the political clashes in the region especially within this period. As can be concluded from the historical survey, due to political conflicts, wars, and treaties at the end of these wars caused instabilities in the region. Movement of people, high rate of mortality because of wars, food scarcity, and illnesses, and economic restrictions were clustered especially between the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In other

---

<sup>4</sup> Pogosyan, A.M. *Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskaya Politicheskaya Istoriya Karsskoy Oblasti (1878-1921)*. Erevan: Akademiya Nauk Arm. SSR Institut Istории, 1965., Potto, Vasili. *Kavkazskaya Voyna.C.4*. Tsentropoligraf, Moskova, 2006., Zavriyev, D.S. *K Noveyşey İstории Severo-Vostoçnih Vilayetov Turtsii*. Tibilisi, 1947.

words these facts were the major factors defining the social and economic life patterns in the region at the time. Unfortunately, studies concerning the issues stated above have not been favored enough among the scholars both at home and abroad.

Few studies in Turkish provide information on daily life patterns and the experiences of the people in the region. Memories of Kazım Karabekir (1882-1948) as a primary source mostly contain military narratives; they give certain details about lives in the region at the time like general view of the villages, appearances of diverse people, and circumstances under which people lived during the months of April and May in 1918. Another primary source is the memories of Ahmet Refik Altınay (1881-1937) which inform the readers about the war conditions in Kars and its surroundings in May 1918. The one belonging to Fahrettin Erdoğan (1874-1958) mentions the locals who were deported from Kars to Siberia following the break out of World War I in 1914. His memories contain information on the road conditions and the local resistance initiatives following the Armistice of Mondros in the region. Another work written by Ramazan Karagöz (1930- ) contains his memories within the time between 1930's and 1970's placing the region at the center of interest. His work's importance is due to the fact that he does not provide information on the political history in the region but the socio-economic life patterns, mainly in the villages of Kars.

In terms of secondary sources, the works of Fahrettin Kırzioğlu (1917-2005), a local researcher and academician, mainly provide information on the region focusing on Kars however they mainly have a political approach<sup>5</sup>. The Turkish author İsmail Habib Sevük (1892-1954) traveled to the region and gathered his observations in his work called "Yurttan Yazılar". His work mentions the city and its

---

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed bibliography of Kırzioğlu, see Zeyrek 2003.

surroundings in 1937. In terms of secondary sources, the one belonging to Mürsel Köse (1928- ) deserves to be mentioned here. He is a local amateur researcher on the history of Kars. His work mostly contains military narratives like the wars between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire, or the clashes between the Turkish-Muslim community and the Armenians. Since the author's father and his father's friends are among the figures of the local resistance against the Russian hegemony in the region and the local independence efforts at the time, his work contains many names of local figures.

Considering the sources discussed above, it is apparent that they are scarce and contain insufficient information in order to grasp the full picture reflecting the social life with its all components in Kars and its surroundings. This situation constitutes a great gap in the historiography of the region. Political clashes and their impacts on human lives can be traced through their reflections in a society. These reflections in the social life can be gathered by voicing diverse interests from diverse sections of a society. It is important that the Museum proposed reflects the disregarded social picture of Kars and its surroundings at the time as a result of the political clashes. In this sense, the New Museum would contribute to social history studies concerning the region by pointing new fields of research. The time period chosen enables us to consult to various types of historical material evidence such as oral testimonies, well-preserved documents, and artefacts in good condition considering their contribution to the knowledge of history. In displays with social history narratives, different perspectives and experiences in the recent history are told based on various sources without losing the human factor. Therefore, the museum practice focused on this understanding encourages the author to reflect history in this way.

The period chosen introduces another advantage which is the development of the social history studies concerning Kars both in the local context and in the wider contexts by attracting researchers and various contributors. In order to introduce a welcoming and supportive environment for them, integration of locals into the recent past of the city is essential so that consequently they would evaluate themselves as a part of that history and they would start to enjoy gathering the knowledge of local recent past.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, today's people have witnessed never ending political clashes between the states and their negative impacts on human lives in the World like the ones in Iraq, Lebanon, and like that. This is such a game that resembles the chorus of a Turkish child game "*aldım, verdim, ben seni yendim*", meaning "I took it, I gave it back, and I defeated you". However the people living in other parts of the world ignore these events and keep on their lives unless they experience similar ones. In order to come over this intolerance and ignorance affecting people in a negative sense, introduction of scenes from the recent past while placing people and their experiences at the center of interest would contribute to the mentality that main figures of events are the ordinary people. Under what circumstances they kept on living and how they survived would be understood through an empathetic way of understanding.

## **3.2. Kars and the Russian Occupation**

### **3.2.1. A Brief Outlook on the Ottoman Empire in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries**

Kars became the territory of the Ottoman Empire during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent in 1534. Kars was in the province of Erzurum (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 24). During the late 16<sup>th</sup> and the early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the Ottoman Empire was engaged in wars against Iran. At the time, eastern Anatolia, particularly the Erzurum-Pasin corridor, became the passageway of the Ottoman armies (İnalçık, 1994: 40). Because of these wars between 1578 and 1639, the Ottoman Empire experienced economic and authoritative instabilities. Finally in 1639, the Treaty of Kasr-ı Şirin determined the current Ottoman-Iranian border (İnalçık, 1994: 22, 23, 422). The Iranians destroyed Kars in 1548 when it was under the Ottoman hegemony. Following the destruction by the Iranians, the city was endowed with new buildings. Five mosques, one medrese, two baths, and one bridge were constructed at the time (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 24). Murad IV visited the city on the way to his Erevan campaign in 1635, and ordered new fortifications and new buildings built in Kars (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 24). Under the Ottoman rule, there was not an efficient communication system in Kars. The city could employ only the telegraph system. According to Ortaylı, Kars could not integrate itself with the developed territories of the Ottoman Empire because of its insufficient communication system (Ortaylı, 2004: 401).

Selim III became the sultan in 1789. During this period there was a strong flow of Western ideas into the Ottoman Empire (Zürcher, 2001: 23, 25). At the time, Russia was the greatest external threat to the Ottoman Empire, a problem which Selim III sought to overcome (Zürcher, 2001: 23, 25). He wanted to increase the strength of the central state organization against Russia.

In the time of Mahmud II, there was an increase in the major European powers' interest in the Ottoman Empire. There was a Russian threat to the British position in the Mediterranean and in Asia. Great Britain and France were the two imperial rivals (Zürcher, 2001: 40). According to Ortaylı, both the Ottoman and the Russian Empires were kept out of the European league claiming that they were not Europeans (Ortaylı, 2004: 378). According to Zürcher, this was the idea behind the "Eastern Question". European states did not want a powerful Russian hegemony but preferred European control over a weak, "non-interventionist" Ottoman Empire (Ahmad, 1993: 29, Zürcher, 2001: 40). In the time of Mahmud II, the Ottoman Empire was dealing with insurrections in the Rumanian province, mainly in Serbia and Greece. Thanks to Russian support, both of these communities declared their independence (Zürcher, 2001: 33). In 1815, the Serbian principality declared its sovereignty (Zürcher, 2001: 33). In 1829, the Ottomans recognized the independence of Greece (Zürcher, 2001: 37).

Mahmud II died in June 1839. During his reign, certain institutional reforms were introduced. The most important outcome of these reforms was the creation of a new bureaucratic class. These new officials launched a programme of reform called "Tanzimat" (Ahmad, 1993: 25). The period from 1839 to 1876 was called by the name of this programme. The men of "Tanzimat" were followed by the Young Turks/ Ottomans (Ahmad, 1993: 26). These groups criticized the westernization movement and free-trade policies. An economic decline had emerged because of the high cost of renovations of the army, of central and provincial administrative bodies, communication system, education system for military and civil servants. The Ottoman Empire had faced acute financial difficulties because of the expenditure for the Crimean War at the time. Borrowing abroad had begun in 1854 (Zürcher, 2001:

67). Between 1854 and 1874, the Ottoman Public Debt was more than half of the Porte's total income (Milgrim, 1978: 521). The Ottoman Empire was near bankruptcy and became dependant on European financial aid (Ahmad, 1993: 28).

Among the Young Turks/ Ottomans, there were numerous factions struggling for power. The most important groups were the Liberals and the Unionists. The Liberals came from the upper classes of Ottoman society. They favored a constitutional monarchy controlled by the high bureaucrats. The Unionists were mostly members of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), a secret political organization founded in 1889 (Ahmad, 1993: 30, 33, 34). The Unionists favored overthrowing the autocracy to achieve social and economic transformation (Ahmad, 1993: 34). In 1908 the CUP staged a coup against Abdülhamid II (1876-1909), ending his reign (Ahmad, 1993: 16). The CUP subsequently won elections held throughout November and December of 1908 (Ahmad, 1993: 35). The ideology of the CUP was mainly based on "Ottomanism", "Islam", and "nationalism" (Ahmad, 1993: 39).

### **3.2.2. A Brief Outlook on the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire**

The first relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire were in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries. These were trade oriented relations (Ortaylı, 2004: 377). During the time of Mehmed II, merchants from Moscow traded in the Ottoman territories (İnalçık, 1994: 278). In the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the Ottomans

received northern goods through the Caffa-Kiev-Muscovy route<sup>6</sup>. The Ottomans exported silk cloth to Muscovy (İnalçık, 1994: 276). One of the main imports in this period was precious furs (İnalçık, 1994: 283). The political and economic interests between the Ottoman Empire and the grand duchy of Muscovy led to an agreement between Ivan III and Bayezid II in 1492, stating the right of free trade in the Ottoman territories for Russian merchants (İnalçık, 1994: 278). According to the Erzurum annual dating from 1871, when Kars was under Ottoman rule, there was an embassy officer in the city connected with the Russian embassy in Erzurum (Ortaylı, 2004: 401).

Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire were tense in the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Ortaylı, 2004:377). Especially during the reign of Catherine II (1762-1796), the imperialist policy of the Russian Empire was very powerful due to its advancement in weapon technology (Ortaylı, 2004: 384, Zürcher, 2001: 21). In the time of Catherine II, Mustafa Reşit Paşa travelled to Petersburg. He examined the Russian army and administrative institutions (Ortaylı, 2004: 380). Under Catherine II, Russia constantly attempted to gain control of the northern Black Sea shore. However, Crimean Tatar khans in the Black sea region held strategic importance as vassals of the Ottoman Empire. This conflict led to war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire from 1768 and 1774. The war was concluded with the Peace of Küçük Kaynarca, which favored Russia, granting independence to Crimea and offering the right of protection over the Greek religion and the Greek Orthodox churches throughout the Ottoman lands (Davison, 1976: 464, Zürcher, 2001: 21). Additionally, article 11 of the Agreement gave Russian merchants the right of free trade by land and sea in the Ottoman Empire (Davison, 1976: 472). During the first

---

<sup>6</sup> In the 15th century, through this trade route oriental goods like silk and spices were transported among subjected places (İnalçık, 1994: 276).

three years of his reign, Selim III concentrated on conducting war against Russia. Because of the hopeless military situation, the Peace of Jassy was ratified between two sides, thanks to British and Prussian mediation. The Peace of Jassy was the confirmation of the Peace of Küçük Kaynarca. It provided additional territorial gains for Russia on the Black Sea Shore (Zürcher, 2001: 23).

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Ahmed Cevdet Paşa examined the Russian strategy about the abolition of the Streltsy system<sup>7</sup> in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and stated common points in the abolition of the Janissaries by the Ottoman Empire in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. During the Ottoman-Russian war between 1828 and 1829, Russian forces crossed the Danube and occupied Shumla, Varna, and Silistria in Bulgaria. On the Caucasian front, Erevan, Kars, and Erzurum were occupied. The Russian army wanted to conquest Kars to cut off the Ottomans from Erzurum which had been a strategically important place, and from supplies and reinforcements from Asia Minor and Trabzon (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 25). The war ended with the Edirne Treaty of 1829, which returned Kars to the Ottoman Empire (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 42, Gökdemir, 1998: 2). During the reign of Mahmud II, the Russian Empire offered the Porte diplomatic and military support against Mehmet Ali Paşa in Egypt<sup>8</sup>. The Russian Empire saw Mehmet Ali as a puppet of the French government. This support was awarded by the Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi in 1833, granting an eight-year defensive alliance between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire (Zürcher, 2001: 39). The Crimean war broke out when a dispute arose over control of the holy places in Palestine by the

---

<sup>7</sup> The first standing units in the Russian army formed between 1545 and 1550. They could farm and trade during peacetime for their income. The system was abolished during the reign of Peter I (1682–1725) (Paul, 2004: 20, 21).

<sup>8</sup> Mehmet Ali, the governor of Egypt, had wanted to occupy the North African Ottoman provinces, Tripolitania, Tunisia, and Algeria. He had asked French and British support but he had been refused by those two. The Ottoman governor of Acre, in Syria, had been defeated in 1832 by the Mehmet Ali's army. In the same year, the Egyptian army had defeated the Ottoman army in order to complete the occupation of Syria. Mehmet Ali had been declared as a rebel. The Ottomans was searching foreign support against him (Zürcher, 2001: 39).

Catholic Church with French support, or the Orthodox Church with Russian support. The Russian Empire wanted to gain support from the Orthodox Church and the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire. In order to appeal them, he favored the religious fervour based on the privileges already granted in 1774. With the support of French and British states, the Ottoman Empire stood against the Russian demands and wanted to stop the Russian expansion in the Balkans, equally the desire for an absolute Russian control on the Black Sea. The Ottoman Empire declared war on Russia in October. In February-March 1856, a peace conference was held in Paris. Both the Russian and the Ottoman Empires agreed not to keep naval bases and naval forces on the Black Sea (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 44, 82, 105, Zürcher, 2001: 55, 56).

British General William Fenwick Williams (1800-1883) arrived in Kars in September 1854. He had been appointed British Military Commissioner with the Ottoman Army to advise Müşir Vasif Paşa was the commander of the Ottoman army in Kars. Kars was captured by the Russian forces in June 1855 (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 81, Gökdemir, 1998: 2). Ottoman forces broke the siege on Kars thanks to the local support. Following this victory over the Russian army, Müşir Vasif Paşa and General Williams were honored with the Mecidiye medals of the Ottoman court. Kars and the locals were given the title “Gazi” and a special medal devoted to this title was minted by the Ottoman court (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 25).

In 1876 and thereafter, the Ottoman Empire was experiencing authoritative weakness in the Balkans. The Russian Empire was supporting the separatist pan-slavist movements in the region to force the Ottoman Empire to introduce more reforms. An international conference subjecting the Balkans, called Constantinople Conference, “Tersane Konferansı”, was held in İstanbul in December 1876. The conference failed and Russia declared war against the Ottoman Empire in April 1877

(Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 115, Zürcher, 2001: 78). In October 1877, during the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian war, Kars was captured by the Russian forces. The Ottoman forces commanded by Gazi Ahmet Muhtar Paşa broke the Russian siege on Kars. However the Russian forces occupied Kars in November 1877 (Gökdemir, 1998: 6, Kırzioğlu, 1972: 26). The fall of Kars in November, 1877 finalized the campaign (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 211). The Treaty of Ayastefanos/ Yeşilköy concluded in 1878, according to the article 19, Kars, Ardahan, Batum, Doğubeyazıt, and Dobruca were given to the Russian Empire (Gökdemir, 1998: 7, Saydam, 1993: 49, Zürcher, 2001: 79). More than 120.000 inhabitants of the city emigrated to Erzurum (Kırzioğlu, 1972: 26). The Russians brought Non-Muslim groups such as Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians, Yezidis, and Molokans, Dukhobors, Ukrainians, and some Germans and Estonians to settle in Kars and in its villages (Gökdemir, 1998: 10). The Treaty of Ayastefanos/ Yeşilköy was confirmed by the Treaty of Berlin in 1878. According to the article 58, Kars, Ardahan, and Batum were ceded to Russia (Gökdemir, 1998: 9, Zürcher, 2001: 79). Through this treaty, the Ottomans lost Bosnia-Herzegovina and Cyprus as well. Bosnia-Herzegovina was given to Austria and Cyprus was given to Great Britain (Ortaylı, 2004: 399).

### **3.2.3. Occupation Years**

Kars experienced economic and social difficulties during the years of Russian occupation. As Kars is located on the Caucasian front, the city had been a strategically/militarily important settlement both for the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire (Ortaylı, 2004: 399, 400). Following the Russian arrival in the city, a new type of administrative system was established by the Russian authority. Kars

was an “oblast”, a subnational administrative unit connected with the centralized unitary state, and it was a part of the province called Zakafkazya. Tiflis was the capital city of this province. Tersk, Dağistan, and Kuban were the other oblasts in the Zakafkazya province. The Kars oblast consisted of the towns of Oltu, Ardahan, and Kağızman. At the time, oblasts were the towns having secondary importance in terms of their economic and military conditions. Tiflis, Kutay, Yelizavetpol, Baku, Erevan, Çernomorks, Batum, and Artvin were the towns having primary importance in the Zakafkazya province (Ortaylı, 2004: 400).

Russians established a new city on the northern side of the river Kars. This was due to the Russian colonization policy. The city was established in a grid plan with streets intersecting each other. New buildings were constructed in the style of inner Russia and Europe. Those new buildings were demonstrations of the advanced local masonry. Rural areas were endowed with the new buildings in Russian style as well (Ortaylı, 2004: 407).

During the occupation period, Russian, Iranian, and Ottoman money circulation/ currency systems were employed together (Ortaylı, 2004: 401). Kars was added to the Caucasian railway network by the Russian, which connected Kars with the center of the Caucasus. According to Ortaylı, this railway provided military transportation and was controlled by the Russian authority. Because of this strategy oriented approach, the economic, social, and cultural integration of Kars with the other parts of the Russian territories could not be achieved (Ortaylı, 2004: 401, 402).

Agriculture and stockbreeding were the main economic sources of the region during the occupation period (Ortaylı, 2004: 409). At the time, agricultural technologies were becoming advanced. There were small-scale industrial corporations mainly based on agricultural products (Ortaylı, 2004: 406). A new breed

of horse known as the “Molokan horse” and a cow called the “Molokan cow” were introduced (Ortaylı, 2004: 410). Due to the impact of agriculture and trade oriented relations, new words were introduced to Turkish. “İstol” for a table, “işkap” for a cupboard, “*istikan*” for a glass, “*spuşka*” for matches, “*simişka*” for sunflower, “*gaşka*” for a carriage, and “*çaşka*” for a mug in enamel would be considered among those (Ortaylı, 2004: 410, Kars, 2005: 241).

During the Russian occupation period, the social structure of Kars also changed. The society in Kars was composed of different classes including aristocrats, clergy, urbaners, and villagers. Hagopyan reported in 1900s that there were 2089 aristocrats (759 of whom were Russian), 1332 clergy (1163 clergy were Christians), 241 merchants, 15.871 urbaners, 243.839 villagers, and 4346 craftsmen (Ortaylı, 2004: 402). The Ottoman census of 1876 stated that 20.420 Muslims and 4810 non-Muslims -- a total of 25.230 men -- were counted in Kars. The Russian census dating from 1897 counted 162.723 men and 129.755 women -- a total of 292.478 people living in the Kars oblast. 141.336 locals were counted including Kurdish people, Armenians, Aisors, Iranians, Turks, Turkic people, Karapapaks, and Nagays. 77.406 locals were Turkish native people including Turks, Turkic people, Karapapaks, and Nagays. 36.842 colonists were counted including Russians, Polish, Greeks, Estonians, and Osetins. 100.898 non-Muslim people (10.695 Russians, 12 Polish, 23.525 Greeks, 280 Estonians, and 2.330 Osetins) were counted. 123.418 Muslim people were counted. Christian Orthodox, Sektan (Molokans), Armenian-Gregorians, Armenian-Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Shia Muslims, Sunni Muslims, and Yezidis were composed of the religious groups of the Kars oblast. Armenians were the most crowded Christian group. Greeks and Russians were the two most numerous groups

of colonists, while Turks and Armenians were the two largest communities at the time in the Kars oblast (Ortaylı, 2004: 403, 405, Saydam, 1993: 53).

Compared to the Ottoman census in 1876, the Russian census of 1897 reflected a drastic change and increase in the population of the region due to new arrivals in Kars and deportees to other places (Ortaylı, 2004: 404). According to the Russian census dated to 1916, Muslim, Armenian, Russian, Greek, Georgian, Kurdish-Yezidi, Jewish, and German-Estonian-Polish groups were living in the region (Gökdemir, 1998: 104).

During the Russian occupation period, certain educational opportunities were introduced (Ortaylı, 2004: 410). New elementary schools were established. These served few Turkish students (Ortaylı, 2004: 411). According to the record kept by the Russian education authority in the region in 1898, Kars received the least amount of money for educational facilities. In 1910, there were twelve state schools instructing in Russian and 143 schools giving religious instruction (Muslim) administrated by Kars Caucasia Education Authority. Turkish natives generally attended these non-secular schools (Ortaylı, 2004: 412).

### **3.3. Kars During the First World War**

Since there was an insufficiency within the educational facilities and an increase in the amount of illiterate people, intellectuals within the Turkish community acted. Due to the endeavors of the Ottoman consul in Kars, the Ottoman Red Crescent, Hilal-i Ahmer, was initiated in Kars. This institution played an important role within the enlightenment movement among the Turkish community. Yusuf Zülali and Molla Muhiddin were the other important personalities placed

within these efforts (Ortaylı, 2004: 413). Among those intellectuals, Fahrettin Erdoğan who would be one of the prominent actors in the near future of Kars came to Kars (1891-1897) via Batum-Artvin way. He was the head of the Secret Muslim Association (Gizli İslam Cemiyeti) (Erdoğan, 1954: 26, Gökdemir, 1998: 13). The branch of Difai Partisi centered in Azerbaijan fighting against Armenian forces, was opened in Kars in 1906. Local intellectuals like Cihangirzade İbrahim, İmam Hafız Kurban, Hasan Han, Settar Bey, Hacı Ağa, and Fahreddin Bey were members of this branch in Kars (Erdoğan, 1954: 26, Gökdemir, 1998: 13). In 1909, the branch of İslam Neşr-i Maarif was opened in Kars. These initiatives were fighting against the Russian hegemony in Kars and its surroundings following the idea of “union”, equally they were aiming to increase educational opportunities for the people of Kars both in the city center and in the villages as well. The Russian military governor was disturbed by these activities. Following the broke out of World War I in Europe in August 1914, some of those intellectuals were deported from Kars to Siberia, Russia (Erdoğan, 1954: 29, 52, Gökdemir, 1998: 13, 14). Fahrettin Erdoğan have stated in his memories that the Russian attacks started on the border on October 18<sup>th</sup>. 1914. He has continued that at that night, a group of fifty men including him were arrested and deported to Siberia through the route following the places of Gümürü, Tiflis, Baku, Rostof, and Orenburg. The journey lasted for three months. He stated that he came across with other Turkish prisoners in Orenburg (Erdoğan, 1954: 57, 64, 71).

The revolution by the CUP in 1908 led to a new regime in the country, which allowed political exiles to return. The representation of the main religious and ethnic communities of the empire could be attained with the support of their leaders (Ahmad, 1993: 31). The Great Powers were alarmed by the revolution in İstanbul (Ahmad, 1993: 33). In the Balkans and in Europe, new national states appeared in the

first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They wanted to remove the Ottomans from Europe. In 1912, Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro gathered and concluded an alliance issuing extended reforms which were against the policies of the Ottoman Empire. Montenegro was the first state which declared war, and other states soon followed (Zürcher, 2001: 111). The Balkan war ended with an armistice and following two conferences. New political boundaries were created in Europe as well as in Macedonia and Thrace, and the new independent state of Albania was created (Zürcher, 2001: 112). Those lost areas in Macedonia, in Albania, and in Thrace had been the richest and the most developed parts of the Ottoman Empire which had ruled there for 500 years (Ahmad, 1993: 17, 18, Zürcher, 2001: 114). After the Balkan war (1912-1913), two different policies were on the agenda of the Great Powers regarding the Ottoman Empire. The Great Powers – which included England, France, Germany, Russia, Italy and Austria -- were discussing whether they should have partitioned the Ottoman Empire or have maintained it to profit. In the meantime, among Balkan states there was raising tension related to the varying degrees of territorial gains after the Balkan war (Zürcher, 2001: 113). After the Balkan war, the CUP decided that the Ottoman Empire could survive as an ally. The Ottoman Empire preferred to ally themselves with the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires (Ahmad, 1993: 40, Zürcher, 2001: 116). The decision to fight was made on October 25<sup>th</sup> and the Ottoman Empire entered into World War I in November 1914 (Kerner, 1929: 401, Zürcher, 2001: 118). Enver Paşa was the war minister in the Cabinet of Union and Progress in 1914 (Ahmad, 1993: 35).

Enver Paşa wanted to stop Russia (Lewis, 1968: 225). He had given great importance to the security of the borders with the Russian Empire. He had favored the idea that semi-independent Turkish-Muslim states in the Caucasus could act as

buffer zones between Russia and the Ottoman Empire (Gökdemir, 1998: 27). All of eastern Anatolia, including Kars, Ardahan, and Batum, as well as southern and central Anatolia, were under the control of the Ottoman Empire (Bıyıklıoğlu, 1957: 568). On the Caucasus front, the Russians attacked in November and the Ottomans stopped them. Under the command of Enver Paşa, in the early January of 1915, three corps of the Ottoman army headed to Sarıkamış. The majority of the army froze to death while trying to cross over the Allahüekber mountains (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 265, Kırzioğlu, 1972: 26). Eastern Anatolia became open to the Russian advance due to this crushing defeat. The Ottoman Armenians in the region were suppressed by the Ottoman authority. But in the meantime with the support of the Russians, Armenians were hoping to establish an independent Armenian state in the region. In the spring of 1915, Dashnak<sup>9</sup> envoys visited Britain and France to lobby for an autonomous Armenia, including the territory of Cilicia on the Mediterranean, within the Ottoman Empire. The six eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire were declared an interest of Russia in secret discussions with Britain and France. The Armenian volunteer battalions and the Dashnak guerilla raids operated together in Turkish Armenia (Goldenberg, 1994: 27, 31). In this critical situation, Talat Paşa decided to relocate the Armenian population to Zor, Syria. Between 1915 and 1916 thousands of Armenians, mainly from Van, Muş, and Bitlis, were forced to emigrate to Zor on foot. This caused an enormous number of deaths within the Armenian community (Goldenberg, 1994: 31, Zürcher, 2001: 119, 120). In his memories, Fahrettin Erdoğan stated that he heard of the relocation of the Armenian population to Syria when he was in Orenburg, however he did not give any specific information on the

---

<sup>9</sup> The Dashnaksutiun was a socialist party that put a strong emphasis upon Armenian national unity. This group was against the revolutionary forces in Russia (Gökay, 1997: 22). “Dashnaksutiun”, Armenian Revolutionary Federation, was founded in Tiflis in 1890 aiming the Armenian independence (Zürcher, 2001: 87).

situation concerning the Armenians living in Kars (Erdoğan, 1954: 87). In the Diaspora, this has been a continuing struggle for the Turkish State to admit that this was genocide<sup>10</sup>.

During World War I, about 50.000 Ottoman officers and soldiers were captured by the Russian Empire (Yanıkdağ, 1999: 69). During the winter of 1915, 800 Ottoman prisoners were transported to the prison camps in Priamur, Siberia. Only 200 of those survived and reached to their destination, with the rest dying from the cold and from suffocation (Yanıkdağ, 1999: 71). The Russian assembly camps for the Ottoman prisoners were mainly located on the island of Nargin in the Caspian Sea and in Siberia (Yanıkdağ, 1999: 72).

In the spring of 1917, the imperial regime in Russia collapsed. The Bolsheviks seized the power in the autumn of the same year with the broad support of all social classes (Allen, 1927: 430, Zürcher, 2001: 124). The Bolsheviks aimed to challenge the international system of states and markets and to produce a new form of socio-economic rule (Bisley, 2004: 3). The Bolsheviks were against the “Imperialists’ war” and they declared that they did not want the Dardanelles (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 457). After the revolution, the new Soviet government wanted to negotiate with the Ottoman Empire. At the end of the peace negotiations, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was ratified in March 1918. The new Soviet government ceded Kars, Ardahan, and Batum to the Ottoman Empire (Dekmejian, 1968: 510, Hovannisian, 1968: 145, Saydam, 1993: 82). According to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, a “plebiscite” would be held in Kars, Ardahan, and Batum to determine the new authority. In this system men who were already 19 could vote. The plebiscite started on July 14<sup>th</sup> 1918 (Gökdemir, 1998: 20). At the time, there were 138.582

---

<sup>10</sup> On the Armenian question and the Turkish-Armenian relations, see the extensive bibliography published by the Turkish Historical Society in 2004 (İlter, 2004).

Muslim men and 23.326 non-Muslim men in the region. 87.048 men voted. 85.129 people stated the Ottoman authority (Gökdemir, 1998: 21, 22). The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was an accomplishment for the Ottoman Empire, ensuring the safety of the Eastern front-line. Anti-Bolshevik groups in Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan formed the Republic of Transcaucasus. They refused to withdraw from the areas that had been conquered in 1878. This federation was not represented at the peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 457, 458, Zürcher, 2001: 124).

In his memories, Kazım Karabekir stated that following the Russian withdrawal, the Armenians and the Ottoman troops were fighting in Kars and its surroundings. The Ottoman forces headed by Kazım Karabekir advanced towards Kars (Karabekir, 1994: 140). Following the fighting at Novo-Selim, the troops of both sides were moving nearer to Kars. On April 24<sup>th</sup> 1918 Colonel Morel, the head of the Armenian forces, and Colonel Kazım Karabekir were negotiating. The next day, on April 25<sup>th</sup> 1918 the Ottoman forces under the command of Kazım Karabekir entered Kars. By the end of the 28<sup>th</sup>, the Armenians left the city (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 467, Karabekir, 1994: 164, 167, 183).

### **3.4. The aftermath: Local Authorities and “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti”**

#### **3.4.1. The Ottoman Empire and the end of the First World War**

Mehmed VI was the sultan and Talat Paşa was the head of the CUP cabinet in 1918. İstanbul was under the threat of Entente states occupation. Talat Paşa resigned in 1918 and a new cabinet was founded by İzzet Paşa (Gökdemir, 1998: 29, 30). İzzet Paşa was searching ways to negotiate with Entente states, France, Great Britain,

and Russia. The central government was powerless. The armies were in dissolution and the territories in Arabia, the Levant, and Mesopotamia were under Entente states occupation. The efforts finalized at the armistice of Mondros, signed on October 30<sup>th</sup>-31<sup>st</sup> 1918 (Kedourie, 1968: 19, Zürcher, 2001: 124, 125). According to the armistice, Entente states had the rights of military occupation of the Straits, of control of all railways and telegraphs lines, of demobilization and disarmament of the Ottoman troops. All German and the Austrian military personnel had to leave the country within two months. According to article 7 of the armistice, the Entente had the right to occupy any place in the Ottoman Empire should it become unsecured. Article 24 gave Entente the right to intervene militarily in the Armenian provinces in the case of threat to its security in those places. Article 11, which mentioned Caucasia, covering the towns Kars, Ardahan, and Batum, stipulated the withdrawal of the Ottoman Empire from the region (Bıyıklıoğlu, 1957: 572). Entente states rejected the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the plebiscite. The decision was informed to commander Yakup Şevki Paşa in the region İzzet Paşa in October 1918 (Bıyıklıoğlu, 1957: 573, Gökdemir, 1998: 33).

The Entente states occupied İstanbul on December 8<sup>th</sup> 1918. The Arab provinces were already in Allied possession. French troops advanced from Syria into Cilicia and the Adana district. British forces occupied the Dardanelles, Samsun, and Antep. Italian troops landed at Antalya on April 29<sup>th</sup> 1919 (Lewis, 1968: 240). The Ottoman army withdrew from Ahıska and Ahılkelek in Georgia and Nahçıvan, Iğdır, Gümrü, and Karakilis by December 1918. Kars, Ardahan, and Batum were emptied by January 1919. The British Empire gave Kars to Armenians on 26 August 1919 (Bıyıklıoğlu, 1957: 579).

After the armistice of Mondros, resistance groups called “defense of rights associations” were formed in eastern Thrace and in Anatolia. They refused to accept the annexation of western Anatolia by Greece or the creation of Armenian and Kurdish states in the east (Ahmad, 1993:49, Zürcher, 2001: 141, 154). The one founded in Kars in November 1918 was one of the first examples of these organizations (Zürcher, 2001: 154). These organizations were inspired by each others. The Unionists were the hidden actors behind these organizations. Local notables and religious dignitaries-- titular characters of the society-- gathered in an organized way to garner broad support. They all emphasized being “national” and through congresses they announced their “national” representative features (Zürcher, 2001: 154). Turkish-Muslim communities in Kars, Ardahan, and Batum gathered to challenge the Entente occupation. A group of representatives from Ahıska, Ahılkelek, Gümrü, Iğdır, and Nahçıvan informed Yakup Şevki Paşa that the Ottoman Empire armies would not be withdrawn from the region (Gökdemir, 1998: 34, 35). İstanbul’s answer was negative. The Ottoman Empire had been defeated in the war and had to obey what the armistice of Mondros said. Armenian and Georgian armed forces were active in the region. Hopelessness and fear caused migration among the Turkish-Muslim communities (Gökdemir, 1998: 37, 38).

In the aftermath of World War I, The Fourteen Principals were introduced by United States’ President Woodrow Wilson at the Peace Conference in Paris. One of them gave nations the right of self-determination which would become the main doctrine of the resistance initiatives in Kars and in the surrounding area (Palmer and Colton, 1978: 681).

### **3.4.2. Local Authorities and the “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti”**

Local authorities favored the ideas of solidarity, liberty, and resistance. They emphasized “Turkish” and “Muslim” identities as unifying criteria. They stood against the Entente occupation in the region. Local authorities had their own parliaments. They administered in their area through their own governmental bodies including ministries of internal affairs, foreign affairs, economy, military, and so on. They opened branches in towns to make propaganda and to appeal support. Ahıska and Acara were the pioneers and announced their own authority via the document called “Ahıska Hükümet-i Muvakkatası” on October 29<sup>th</sup> 1918 (Gökdemir, 1998: 38, Saydam, 1993: 97). In the meantime another local authority named “Aras Türk Hükümeti” was initiated on November 3<sup>rd</sup> 1918. The minister of military affairs was Cihangirzade İbrahim (Gökdemir: 1998: 46, Saydam, 1993: 97). “Kars İslam Şurası” was established in Kars on November 5<sup>th</sup> 1918. Members gathered in Kars on November 14<sup>th</sup> 1918. “Kars İslam Şurası” held a congress in Kars on November 30<sup>th</sup> 1918. Delegates from Batum, Nahçıvan, and other places participated in the congress. The name of “Kars İslam Şurası” was changed as “Milli Şura Hükümeti” and “Ahıska Hükümeti” united with “Milli Şura Hükümeti” at the congress (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 32, Erdoğan, 1954: 166, 168, 169, Gökdemir, 1998: 43, 63, 65, Saydam, 1993: 97). Cihangirzade İbrahim was elected president of “Milli Şura Hükümeti”. It was then decided that an army to fight against the Armenians, the Georgians, and the British forces would be formed (Gökdemir, 1998: 70). On January 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> 1919, the second Congress of Ardahan was held. At the congress, all local authorities’ delegates decided to gather and to make another congress in Kars which would form and announce “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümet-i Muvakkata-i

Milliye” (Gökdemir, 1998: 80, Saydam, 1993: 97). In the mean time British general F. Walker came to Kars as a sign of British hegemony on Kars and met with Yakup Şevki Paşa (Gökdemir, 1998: 83). On January 17<sup>th</sup> 1919, “Büyük Kars Kongresi” was held by the “Milli Şura Hükümeti”. The establishment of “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” was announced at the congress. Kars was defined as the capital city of the governor. The constitution, which included 18 articles, was accepted. Cihangirzade İbrahim was elected as the president of “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 498, Gökdemir, 1998: 90, Saydam, 1993: 97). The cabinet was composed of eight ministries including internal affairs, justice, foreign affairs, military affairs, economy, education, support/feeding, “nafia”, and agriculture-forestry-trade ministries. There were mail-telegraph, railway, police, and gendarme units as well (Gökdemir, 1998: 90). The new parliament was activated on March 1<sup>st</sup> 1919. The election for the members of the new parliament was announced via phone calls and telegraphs. One deputy could represent 10.000 men (Erdoğan, 1954: 182, 183, Gökdemir, 1998: 93). “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” controlled the area covering from Batum to Orduabad, 40.000 square kilometers (Erdoğan, 1954: 194, Gökdemir, 1998: 96).

This formation was mainly inspired by the Wilson principals. “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” aimed at achieving recognition from the Entente, the US, the rest of the country, and by Caucasus as well. “Sada-yı Millet” was the official newspaper, serving to propagandist efforts (Erdoğan, 1954: 188, Gökdemir, 1998: 97). In order to bolster the government, “Karlılar Association” was established in İstanbul in January 1919 thanks to the support of people from the CUP (Gökdemir, 1998: 108). In February 1919, there were conflicts between Turkish forces and Georgians in Ahıska and in Ahılkelek. Conflicts continued and the Georgians occupied Ahıska in

March 1919. They were defeated by the army of “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” (Erdoğan, 1954: 187, Gökdemir, 1998: 126, 127, 128).

Initially, the British Empire was sympathetic to “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti”. The British Empire had not trusted the Armenians claiming their religious attachment with the Russians. Since “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” was against Russia, the British Empire supported it (Erdoğan, 1954: 181, Gökdemir, 1998: 131). However the attitude of the British Empire changed. He wanted “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” not to expand out of Kars (Erdoğan, 1954: 189, Gökdemir, 1998: 133). The British Empire started to support the Armenians in Kars (Gökdemir, 1998: 136). He aimed to make Kars a buffer zone between Bolshevik Russia and itself through Armenian control of Kars (Gökdemir, 1998: 168). New British troops<sup>11</sup> reached Kars (Erdoğan, 1954: 206, Gökdemir, 1998: 155). Cihangirzade İbrahim and certain members of the “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” were arrested on April 12<sup>th</sup> 1919. They were deported to İstanbul, finally to Malta (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 498, Erdoğan, 1954: 207, Gökdemir, 1998: 156). Kars was put on the Armenian control in May, 1919. General Osebyan was assigned as the commander in Kars on behalf of the Armenian government in Erevan. Among the Turkish community covering members of families of the provisional government many persecutions were committed by the Armenian troops in the region (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 498, Gökdemir, 1998: 168).

The remaining members endeavored to find support to survive (Erdoğan, 1954: 208, Gökdemir, 1998: 162). They also tried to stop migration among the

---

<sup>11</sup> In November 1918, British forces had already arrived in Baku and Batum. Britain had aimed to control Baku’s oil for the Entente, and to squeeze Bolshevik energy supply. Britain wanted to transform the Caucasus states into an effective barrier to Soviet expansion which was a threat for its operations in the region. In Armenia, the Dashnak-dominated government welcomed British existence in the region. Britain removed its forces from Azerbaijan in August 1919 (Goldenberg, 1994: 34, 36, Gökay, 1997: 51, 52).

Turkish-Muslim community. Concurrently, new Armenian groups from Gümri arrived in Kars causing conflicts between two sides and remaining local authorities endeavored to survive, including the authorities in “Nahçıvan”, “Kulp”, and “Oltu” (Gökdemir, 1998: 172, 175).

### **3.5. Kars and the Turkish War of Independence**

Following World War I, there was a disagreement on the partition of the Ottoman Empire among Allies. The Sultan and the old ruling class desired power because the vast majority of the members of the CUP government had been deported to Europe. The sultan endeavored to remain caliph, while there were the Nationalists who were opposed to the sultan’s religious policy (Ahmad, 1993: 48, Zürcher, 2001: 139). Additionally, the Bolsheviks were in control of Russia. The German and Austria-Hungry Empires were defunct. The Ottoman Empire was searching ways to negotiate. The victorious states, France, England, Italy, and the United States gathered in Paris in 1919. At the Paris Peace Conference five treaties were signed. The treaty of St. Germain was signed with Austria. The treaty of Trianon was ratified with Hungary. The treaty of Neuilly was signed with Bulgaria. The treaty of Versailles was signed with Germany (Palmer, Colton, 1978: 681). The treaty of Sevres was signed with the Ottoman Empire in August 1920 (Ahmad, 1993: 48, Lewis, 1968: 246, Zürcher, 2001: 139). It was decided that an independent Armenian state would be established in eastern Anatolia (Zürcher, 2001: 153).

Kazım Karabekir had been assigned as head of the Ottoman army corps at the Caucasian front during World War I. At the time there had been two Ottoman army corps covering the area between Lake Van and the Black Sea (Gökdemir, 1998: 179).

Kazım Karabekir, Rauf Orbay, İsmet İnönü, and Mustafa Kemal gathered in İstanbul to discuss the attacks of the Armenians and of the Georgians in Erzurum, Erzincan, and Kars (Gökdemir, 1998: 179). Since sizeable and reliable Ottoman forces had been in eastern Anatolia, they signified the independence of eastern Anatolia in the first place. Kazım Karabekir was the commander of the army called XVth Army Corps (Lewis, 1968: 247, Zürcher, 2001: 155). In the early months of 1919, Kazım Karabekir went to Erzurum. In this period British intelligence officers were active setting up an intelligence network in the region between Trabzon, Kars, and Erzurum (Gökay, 1997: 71). Kazım Karabekir favored the local resistance movement which was still active following the abolition of “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” (Erdoğan, 1954: 215, Gökdemir, 1998: 181). In the meantime, Mustafa Kemal was advancing through Anatolia (Gökdemir, 1998: 182).

The Nationalist movement derived from the foundations of the CUP (Ahmad, 1993: 48, Zürcher, 2001: 140). Mustafa Kemal had been a unionist and formerly member of the CUP. His reputation was based on his early military accomplishments, such as the Dardanelles campaign. The Porte appointed Mustafa Kemal inspector-general of the third armies in eastern Anatolia to organize resistance against imperialist intervention (Ahmad, 1993: 49, Zürcher, 2001: 148). The third army was responsible for the area covering Trabzon, Erzurum, Sivas, Van, Erzincan, Canik, Diyarbakır, Bitlis, Elazığ, Ankara, Kastamonu, Maraş, and Kayseri. Mustafa Kemal arrived in Samsun on May 19<sup>th</sup> 1919. At the time Samsun was under British control (Gökdemir, 1998: 183, Zürcher, 2001: 155). He immediately began attempts to gather the regional resistance groups into one national initiative (Zürcher, 2001: 156). He was aware of the conflicts between the Turkish-Muslim community and the Armenians, and the Georgians that occurred in Kars, Ardahan, and Batum after the

abolishment of “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” (Erdoğan, 1954: 228, Gökdemir, 1998: 185). At the time the six eastern Anatolian provinces were decided to be put on an independent Armenian state control, a decision reached at the conference of San Remo (Gökdemir, 1998: 188, Zürcher, 2001: 151, 156). Mustafa Kemal described the situation that the Turks faced in May 1919 (Ahmad, 1993: 47). He announced “Amasya Tamimi” calling people for national independence movement, “Milli Mücadele”, on June 21<sup>st</sup>–22<sup>nd</sup> 1919. Mustafa Kemal resigned (over) his mission in the Ottoman army on July 8<sup>th</sup> 1919 (Gökdemir, 1998: 190). The Erzurum Congress was held between July 23<sup>rd</sup> and August 7<sup>th</sup> 1919 in Erzurum (Gökdemir, 1998: 192, 193). A group of delegates from Kars, Ardahan, and Batum wanted to participate in the congress. However, they could not attend because of the danger of the British hindering the congress’ progress (Erdoğan, 1954: 229, Gökdemir, 1998: 191). At the congress, the National Pact, Misak-i Milli, was announced. The representatives of the regional resistance groups gathered at the congress and they determined to maintain the integrity of the country within the borders defined by the National Pact. Sivas Congress was held between September 4<sup>th</sup> and September 11<sup>th</sup> 1919. Through these congresses the regional resistance groups were united under the name of “Association for the Defense of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia”. Mustafa Kemal was chairman of these congresses (Ahmad, 1993: 49, Zürcher, 2001: 158). Article 2 in the National Pact mentioned that a new plebiscite would be held in Kars, Ardahan, and Batum to define the new authority (Gökdemir, 1998: 195). Following the increase in resistance in Anatolia, Entente states got alarmed and occupied İstanbul. They abandoned the Ottoman Parliament, “Meclis-i Mebusan” on March 16<sup>th</sup> 1920. 150 nationalists were arrested and were deported to Malta (Ahmad, 1993: 49, Zürcher: 2001: 140, 158). İstanbul became an unsafe place to activate a new

parliament. Therefore the Grand National Assembly met in Ankara on April 23<sup>rd</sup> 1920. Mustafa Kemal was assigned as the head of the parliamentary (Ahmad, 1993: 50, Zürcher, 2001: 158). In his memories, Fahrettin Erdoğan has reported that seven representatives from Kars, Ardahan, and Batum were chosen and sent to Ankara to participate in the new parliamentary (Erdoğan, 1954: 238). The first cabinet of the new Turkish government including eleven ministries was activated on May 2<sup>nd</sup> 1920. The Bolsheviks provided military and financial aid to the Nationalists in 1920. However they demanded the Turkish forces to cede Van and Bitlis to the Armenians (Ahmad, 1993: 50, Zürcher, 2001: 159, 160). In September 1920, a war broke out between the Armenians and the Turks in the region. Since the summer of 1919 there had been a dispute between two sides over the eastern provinces of Anatolia. Turkish forces under the command of Kazım Karabekir took over Kars on October 30<sup>th</sup> 1920 (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 499, Bıyıklıoğlu, 1957: 580, Erdoğan, 1954: 255, Gökay, 1997: 85).

Richard G. Hovannisian states that Mustafa Kemal and Kazım Karabekir were agreed that a decisive action was required to destroy the Armenian army at Kars or in front of the fortress (Hovannisian, 1996: 246). On October 23, the National Grand Assembly declared that the Erevan government had done everything to decimate the large Turkish-Muslim element under its domination and the Dashnaks were responsible for every form of cruelty to expand the Armenian patrimony; however the West ignored the voice of the Muslim population who had been forced from their homes and resettled as immigrants in their places. The Turkish people had no aggressive designs against the Armenians but simply exercising the primordial right of the nation (Hovannisian, 1996: 247).

On October 28, Turkish and tribal cavalry regiments had a short distance east of Kars. More than 2,000 Turkish troops had passed to the east of the fortress and controlled the Yaghni-Vezinkoy heights and the villages of Khalifoghlu and Dashkovo (Hovannisian, 1996: 251).

Although some civilians departed during the Turkish offensive, the vast majority of the 40,000 civilian inhabitants of Kars remained in place, apprehensive and fearful on the night of October 29 (Hovannisian, 1996: 252). Hovannisian states that the Armenian government cast about for external intervention when the situation at Kars turned critical (Hovannisian, 1996: 253). On October 30, she issued a public appeal calling “everyone toward the front, everything for the front,” (Hovannisian, 1996: 256).

On October 30, the Turkish 9<sup>th</sup> Division as being the lead with several battalions of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> regiments broke into the forts from the east. At about 10:30 in the morning, the 12<sup>th</sup> Division’s 34<sup>th</sup> Regiment entered the city. The civilian population was in confusion and chaos. Thousands of townspeople and troops mixed together attempted to pass through the river gorge in the direction of Gümürü to get to safety; however they were suddenly trained on by the machine guns of Turkish soldiers placed on the heights of Fort Radiev. The population surged forward and backward to escape the trap. Many townspeople fled back to their homes and went into hiding (Hovannisian, 1996: 257). Most of the 2,000 Armenian junior officers and enlisted men who fell prisoner were taken to the railway station and then transported for confinement and labor in Erzurum. Subsisting under extremely harsh conditions during the winter of 1920-1921, many of them died in captivity. Richard G. Hovannisian puts that the Armenians had given up so quickly that had left intact enormous quantities of military material, locomotives and freight cars,

communications and technical equipment, and light and heavy artillery with thousands of shells (Hovannisian, 1996: 259). Kazım Karabekir addressed a circular to the Armenian inhabitants of Kars on November 2, putting the Dashnaks as the reason for the Armenians' tragedy and the cause of animosity between the two groups (Hovannisian, 1996: 260).

The fight with the Armenians concluded with the Gümri Treaty on December 2<sup>nd</sup> 1920 (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 500, Bıyıklıoğlu, 1957: 580). The Moscow Treaty/The Turco-Soviet "Treaty of Friendship and Brotherhood" was signed with the Bolsheviks on March 16<sup>th</sup> 1921 in Moscow. It consisted of 16 articles. This was a diplomatic case which the Nationalists achieved. The Soviet State recognised the borders defined in the National Pact. The treaty gave both Kars and Ardahan to Turkey. Batum was ceded to Georgia (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 500, Gökay, 1997: 102, 109, 114, Gökdemir, 1998: 219, 222, Zürcher, 2001: 160). Exchange of populations in the ceded parts was provisioned in the treaty. Article XIII mentioned the return of the prisoners of war back home (Gökay, 1997: 114).

In May 1921, a dispute between the Ankara government and the Soviet government began concerning the maltreatment by the Turkish government of Molokans, who had been resettled in Kars by the Tsarist rule in 1896. The Turkish government wanted them to mobilize against the Greek army in the Western front. This policy of the Turkish government was protested by the Soviet government (Gökay, 1997: 115). To resolve the issue, a conference was held in Kars beginning on September 26<sup>th</sup> 1921 and lasting for two weeks. It concluded with the Treaty of Kars on October 13<sup>th</sup> between the Ankara government and the three Caucasian republics of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia (Allen, Muratoff, 1999: 500, Allen, 1927: 435, Gökay, 1997: 117). This agreement was a confirmation of the Moscow

Treaty/ The Turco-Soviet “Treaty of Friendship and Brotherhood,” which defined the current north-eastern border of the Turkish state with the Russian state (Goldenberg, 1994: 38, Gökdemir, 1998: 222).

Because of the accomplishments of the Turkish forces in the east, Allies gathered in London in February-March 1921. The Italian and the French governments agreed to negotiate with the Nationalists. However the British government kept supporting the Greek army. The war between the Turkish army and the Greeks ended in favor of the Turks. The national struggle was culminated at Lausanne through a peace treaty recognizing the creation of the Turkish state within the borders of the National Pact on July 24<sup>th</sup> 1923 (Ahmad, 1993: 50, Zürcher, 2001: 168, 169). The Republic was declared on October 23<sup>rd</sup> 1923. The sultanate was abolished on November 1<sup>st</sup> 1923. The Grand National Assembly on March 3<sup>rd</sup> 1924 provided the abolition of the Caliphate (Lewis, 1968: 264).

### **3.6. Kars within National and International Dynamics from the First Quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century onwards**

Following the Independence War, Turkey felt the effects of large-scale migration and mortality. The Eastern Anatolia had been a war scene from early 1915 onwards and mortality had increased extremely because of warfare and atrocities. In addition to warfare, famine and epidemics also caused high mortality. The Muslim population, as well as the Armenian population was greatly reduced, especially in eastern part of the country. The Muslim community, mainly Turkish ones living in this area became refugees and emigrated to the other parts of the country. Following

World War I, Armenians emigrated from Anatolia mainly to Soviet Union, France, and USA (Zürcher, 2001: 171).

Following Lausanne, there was a clash with Britain over the Mosul question. During this period, the relations between the Soviet State and Turkey were congenial. At the time, the Soviets were able to offer a method of economic expansion capital to initiate it, and experts to assist in its application. The Treaty of Moscow was confirmed with an agreement called the Russo-Turkish Treaty of Friendship signed between two states on December 17<sup>th</sup> 1925 (Lewis, 1968: 284). In November 1929, through a commercial agreement with the USSR, relations became closer. In September 1930 visits at minister level between Moscow and Ankara were tense. In 1932, the Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister went to Moscow and signed an agreement with the Soviet government stating a loan of \$8 million. Most of it was used for the development of the textile industry, through the Soviet-guided kombinat, a textile factory, in Kayseri (Lewis, 1968: 285). In 1933, the first Turkish five-year plan was prepared for the expansion of Turkish industry and it was approved on January 9<sup>th</sup> 1934. It was completed in 1939. It was inspired by the Russian precedent, and aided by the Russian loan and guidance (Lewis, 1968: 286).

Mustafa Kemal died in November 1938. Following his passing, a smooth transition was needed for the continuation of the regime. Without break or interruption, İsmet İnönü was assigned as the second President of the Turkish Republic on November 11<sup>th</sup> 1938 (Lewis, 1968: 294).

Conflicts of interests of the states caused another war in Europe. It broke out in 1939. It lasted for six years and ended in 1945. In the aftermath of World War II, France, England, and Germany were experiencing economic and social difficulties.

There was huge destructive impact of the war on people in Europe, while the USA emerged as the first nuclear power.

The Turkish state did not participate in the war. During the war years Turkey experienced severe economic strain. The Turkish government's intervention in the nation's economic life increased. In order to launch a system of wartime controls, the National Defence Law was approved on January 18<sup>th</sup> 1940. Foreign trade flourished and Turkish products were in high demand. The government needed an effective system of tax assessment and collection for the fortunes which were exempt from taxation or control. The capital tax, Varlık Vergisi, was approved by the Assembly on November 11<sup>th</sup> 1942. It was apparent that religion and nationality were two criteria determining taxpayers' assessments. The taxpayers were classified in two separate lists, the list for Muslims, and the list for non-Muslims, Greeks, Jews, and Armenians (Lewis, 1968: 298).

The Russo-Turkish Treaty of Friendship was valid until the end of World War II, ending on March 19<sup>th</sup> 1945. This treaty was based on the principals of neutrality and nonaggression (Kumkale, 1994: 51). On March 19<sup>th</sup> 1945, the Soviet government informed Turkey that it would renew the 1925 Russo-Turkish Treaty of Friendship (the 1925 Treaty of Neutrality and Nonaggression) which would be expired on November 7<sup>th</sup> 1945, claiming that: first, the Turkish state would return Kars and Ardahan, originally taken by Russia from the Ottoman Empire in 1877 but given up by the Bolsheviks in the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, a loss they accepted in the Soviet-Turkish Treaty of 1921. Second, the Soviet state would be given military bases in the Straits and on the Aegean Sea (Rubinstein, 1992: 64).

Following World War II, the Middle East and the eastern Mediterranean became strategically important for the USA government. They decided to improve

the military capabilities of Turkey against the Soviet state (Kumkale, 1994: 57, Leffler, 1985: 808). In the postwar period the Soviet state was searching for national security, and regarded the West as an enemy. This need demonstrated itself in Stalin's foreign policy. Extension of military power into the center of Europe and territorial expansion were viewed as actions to gain power. America's development of the atom bomb intensified Stalin's desire for military modernization. On the other hand, at the time the USSR already dominated the entire area extending from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea. This expansion of Soviet military power was seen by the Western nations as a threat to their security (Bisley, 2004: 4, 12, Rubinstein, 1992: 62). It was known that the Soviet state desired new military bases in the Straits and the acquisition of Kars and Ardahan as frontier readjustments which were both threats to the USA's interests at the time (Leffler, 1985: 808). Although the Soviet Union stopped demanding Kars and Ardahan in 1946, the diplomats kept emphasizing the Soviet security in the Straits and in Black Sea (Kumkale, 1994: 54, Leffler, 1985: 809). There was little sympathy in Turkey for the Soviet state. The Turkish government, with British and American encouragement, stood against the Russian demands. On March 12<sup>th</sup> 1947, the US President announced the decision, the Truman Doctrine, stating extension of economic and military assistance to Turkey (Lewis, 1968: 313, Rubinstein, 1992: 72). USA emphasized the importance of Turkey as a base for Allied operations against the Soviet Union. Due to the support of the USA, Turkey was accepted in NATO in 1949 and stood beside the western states (Dekmejian, 1968: 512, Kumkale, 1994: 57, Lessler, 1985: 813). In August 1949, Turkey became a member of the Council of Europe (Lewis, 1968: 313).

In May 1950, general election was held in Turkey. Twenty-seven years of uninterrupted rule by the Republican People's Party ended (Lewis, 1968: 303). In

1953, following the change of leadership in the Soviet State, a campaign aiming at improvement in relations with Turkey and repair of the damage done during Stalin's rule was initiated. Following the issue on the US arms embargo over Cyprus in July 1976, Turkish Premier Bülent Ecevit visited Moscow in June 1978, to sign a document stating the principals of good neighborly and friendly cooperation for the relations of the two states (Rubinstein, 1992: 204,205).

In the early 1990s, Soviet relations with Turkey were friendly (Rubinstein, 1992: 205). Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union on December 8<sup>th</sup> 1991, Azerbaijan declared its independence on August 30<sup>th</sup> 1990. Georgia declared its independence on April 9<sup>th</sup> 1991. Armenia declared its independence September 23<sup>rd</sup> 1991. They were diplomatically recognized by various countries and embassies were opened in their capitals (Goldenberg, 1994: 44). Within four months of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, they became members of the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the Council for Security and Co-operation in Europe (Goldenberg, 1994: 46). Following the first years of their independence, Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan experienced political struggles, banditry, territorial rivalries, economic disruption, and ethnic violence. As they are three big ethnic groups of Caucasus, those have had a big impact on the rest of the region as well (Goldenberg, 1994: 2, 7). However the Caucasus has been an important arena for Turkey, Iran, and Russia introducing new economic alliances and trade routes, and offering an entry to the markets of Europe and the West (Goldenberg, 1994: 5). In terms of global finance, Azerbaijan's oil fields have attracted British and American interest, and Britain has become one of the main purchasers of Azeri petrochemicals (Goldenberg, 1994: 47). When Azerbaijan became the first independent state, Turkey recognized it in November 1991. At that time, the Teletaş,

the Turkish communication firm, supplied radio equipment for rural areas in Azerbaijan through a \$2.3 million contract (Goldenberg, 1994: 49). In early 1992, the Baku government returned from the Cyrillic script to the Latin alphabet and Turkey sent printing presses, typewriters, and lots of books in Turkish to Azerbaijan. Additionally, Turkey included Azerbaijan in two world bodies. The Black Sea Economic Co-operation Project aiming formation a common market with co-operation in transport, mining and communication and the exchange of economic and commercial information saw Azerbaijan as a new source of oil and gas. Grouping of Turkic Muslim states, a formation offering joint business ventures included all the Muslim republics of the former Soviet Union except for Tajikistan. \$150 million export/import credit for Azerbaijan was earmarked for Azerbaijan (Goldenberg, 1994: 51).

The Armenian parliament declared independence in August 1990. Establishment of diplomatic relations was not easy as there were irredentist claims to territory inside Turkey, by Armenians. Five months after independence (declaration), Armenian parliament declared that the existing frontiers, established in 1921 by the Treaty of Kars, would not be recognized by the Armenian state. Turkey declared that diplomatic relations would not be opened unless the Armenian state respected the existing frontiers. This resulted in Turkey's rapprochement with Azerbaijan against Armenia over the Nagorno-Karabakh question<sup>12</sup>. In early 1993, Armenia stopped claims to Kars and other areas of north-eastern Turkey and recognised existing frontiers. Turkey responded this via a passage/ a trans-shipment permission which was 35.000 tons of wheat in part of EC food aid, to Armenia (Goldenberg, 1994: 55).

---

<sup>12</sup> Both the Armenians and the Azerbaijanis regarded the region as their own historical territory (Rutland, 1994: 841).

Turkey has developed relations with Georgia as well. Turkey adopted a law allowing for the immigration of Meskhetians Turks, who were deported from Georgia to Central Asia during the Second World War and they were not allowed to return to Georgia. The Georgian-Turkish border has been a trade area for a number of small traders selling cheap goods. Georgian ferries from the port of Poti cross the Black Sea to Turkey.

### **3.7. Conclusion**

In this chapter, a historical background of the Kars region that mainly contains political narratives but also includes details of the social components of the events has been provided. Kars has been put as a center of interest regarding both the national and the international contexts in the period between the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This brief historical survey has been undertaken considering its relationship with the New Museum proposed which has been previously discussed.

Kars appeared as an important place due to its strategic location that made it on the agenda of the great states of the time, especially in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The Ottoman Empire, the Russian Empire, Great Britain and France had a desire to control over the lands like the Black Sea, the Straits, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and the Caucasus. Kars and its surroundings had been a place where the wars between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire occurred especially during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Ottoman Empire was dealing with authoritative instabilities at home and abroad, economic difficulties due to the efforts to build a new administrative structure and the expenses of the institutional reforms equally with the expenses of the wars with the Russian Empire who was the greatest external threat of the time.

Following the occupation of the city by the Russians for three times, they managed to control Kars and its surroundings finally in 1878. The Russian hegemony lasted for forty years. Kars gained a new entity that reflected itself in the people and their new lives. Kars and its surroundings were administered through a new institutional structure that was called as an “oblast”. New arrivals brought their own ways of living simultaneously with the fact that the city lost its certain features.

Kars was the subject to new struggles on the Eastern front during World War I (1914-1918). During war years, Sarıkamış and the soldiers that froze to death in early 1915, relocation of the Armenian population to Syria in 1915, revolution in Russia in 1917, and the Armistice of Mondros in 1918 were significant incidents among many others, the main stem including the dynamics of politics, ordinary people, the situation of ineffectiveness, and many lives had to be changed. However the Wilson principals and the right of self determination presented the solution in the local context that there were people who were to define their own future. The efforts were culminated in the formation of the “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” in 1919. However during the years between 1919 and 1921 Kars and its surroundings witnessed the struggles between the Nationalists, the British troops and the Armenian forces. Ending of the struggles and achievement of the safety of the Eastern front were formally announced through the Treaty of Kars on October 13<sup>th</sup> 1921, however the question whether the end of the disputes between the states meant the end of the difficulties that ordinary people were experiencing should be asked. Kars and its surroundings were again on the agenda of the politics in the years 1945 and 1946 that there would be no point in demand Kars and its surroundings but creating a new tension on the politics at the time.

In the post war era, İsmet İnönü was aware of the fact that a new world order of capitalism and democracy emerged and the Turkish political system required reforms. An opposition party was proposed as a solution that led to the founding of the Democrat Party in January 1946 (Ahmad, 2003: 99, 100). The Democrats had the support of much of the bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, the educated segment of the urban population as well as journalists, academicians, and the landlords. As Feroz Ahmad explains that the Republicans had no chance but trust their traditional supporters in eastern and central Anatolia, the most underdeveloped parts of Turkey (Ahmad, 2003: 102). Although the general election in 1946 resulted with the victory of Republican People's Party, the general election in 1950 finalized the twenty-seven years of the Republican rule and initiated the DP period which was last to ten years (Ahmad, 2003: 102, 103). In the Kars context, as has been expressed by Dr. Beşir Doster, an amateur researcher on Kars's history, the general elections in 1950, 1954, and 1957 resulted on behalf of the Republicans while the general picture in Turkey was on behalf of the DP<sup>13</sup>. According to Doster, in the years between 1950 and 1960, private and state investments did not take place in Kars. However, interestingly, as Ahmad puts that the Democrats distributed state lands to some landless peasants and introduced agricultural machinery imported from the US (Ahmad, 2003: 109). The question here is whether this initiative of the DP was echoed in the Kars context where agriculture was one of the main economic sources.

The military coup of 27 May 1960 finalized the era of the DP rule (Ahmad, 2003: 119). The period between 1960 and 1980, as Ahmad puts that was the time of "military guards" in Turkey (Ahmad, 2003: 145). Especially in 1971 and thereafter

---

<sup>13</sup> Personal interview by the author.

political life was totally paralyzed in Turkey due to the clashes between the leftists, neo-fascist militants, and the Islamists (Ahmad, 2003: 134).

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia appeared as the biggest three independent states of the Caucasus. Third Caucasian Cultures Festival was initiated in Kars in September 2006 thanks to the Municipality with the support of different actors. Music and dance groups from Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia participated in the festival besides other countries like Sudan, Iraq, Cuba, Norway, and like that. The expectations have been computed for the economic alliances rooted in the Caucasus both in the local and the national contexts since 1990's. This has demonstrated itself in the local context that the initiation of the Municipality in teaching of Russian has been welcomed by the locals.

The Kars airport, which was opened in 1988, made the region easily accessible. It has been open to the international flights since 1993 which is crucial not just for Kars but for Ardahan, Iğdır, and Artvin as well. Reactivation of the border gate called "Akyaka"/ "Doğu Kapı" with Armenia which has been closed since 1993 and the construction of the railway through Kars, Tbilisi, and Bakü are the issues that might be interpreted as ways of healing the past sorrows. In fact, it can be said that voicing of current commercial concerns is easier than voicing the pain of the recent past. These border gates and railways are open to new economic collaborations equally to a cultural dialogue, which would symbolically refer the mentality of a new beginning for all of the interests in the future. However two news placed in the national press pointed another kind of stories that they would introduce new discussions concerning the region and its people. The one published in "Hürriyet" on September 11<sup>th</sup> 2002 mentioned that 2.500 people were asked about

their hometowns for a survey concerning the perception of an earthquake in İstanbul among the inhabitants of the city. It was collaboration of the Municipality, Boğaziçi University Kandilli Observatory and Earthquake Research Institute, and of the “*GENAR Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık Şirketi*”. The survey demonstrated that 2.1% of the answers directed to Kars. Another one placed in “Hürriyet” on December 17<sup>th</sup> 2002 claimed that the “Milli Piyango İdaresi” in Kars did not demand any ticket to be sold in the city for the New Year lottery while the prize was 8 trillion.

## **4. Perspectives and Observations for a New Museum in Kars**

The purpose of “Kars Historical Heritage and its Preservation - Awareness Survey” is to consult to local people’s opinions about their local historical heritage. Before the proposal concerning the Museum’s concept, Kars people’s attitudes toward their historical wealth was investigated. Within the efforts of forming the concept of the new museum, local people’s opinions and expectations about preservation efforts in Kars especially focusing on a museum practice is quite essential. This issue is examined by evaluating the existing Kars Archaeological Museum in terms of what the locals know about a museum as a concept and how they evaluate this practice. Forty interviews were undertaken within the survey.

The related questionnaire has been designated into three parts. The first part investigates personal information of the informants. The second part aims to understand the current level of historical heritage awareness. The third part is formed to assess local people’s opinions about a museum practice as a preservation effort through the examination of the existing Kars Archaeological Museum. Every section examines its own particular theme. However, the results belonging to each section will be evaluated all together in the conclusion.

### **4.1. Methodology**

In this survey, an interpretative research method was employed. The research is based on qualitative analysis of qualitative data. In other words, it is based on the interpretation of the nonnumerical data. Transcriptions of interviews are done

through focusing on certain issues. In other words, qualitatively described relations are forming the essence of this study. It was clear that the themes are related to one another. The aim is not to let the readers know the actual results of each interview but rather know the general meanings of the interviews.

People who are interviewed are called “informants”. Another term is widely used in social science research which is “respondent”. The difference is significant. When people describe their culture, they are named as “informants”. When they talk about their own characteristics, their own beliefs (opinions, preferences, values, ideas), and their own experiences and behaviors, they are known as “respondents” (Bernard, 2000: 192). Everyone is knowledgeable about themselves, and so everyone can be a respondent. However, not everyone can be an equally good informant. Some people are clearly more competent than the others to talk about the culture of a particular group. The term “informant” has been regarded since the aim of the study is to know about the lived experiences of individuals. Luckily whole informants were willing to talk about their own lives, experiences and values.

A non-random sample of informants was interviewed. The criteria include their age, gender, educational level and ethnicity. Those criteria could provide a heterogeneity offering diverse insights into inquiries. The informants’ opinions and observations on a particular topic are important. I’d like to know what they think, and what their observations and ideas are about the themes specified within each section. The study does not aim to control people’s responses. Therefore, a semistructured interviewing method was applied. It is based on a written list of questions and related topics, which are covered in a particular order. Although the interviewer was in control of what would be declared by the informants, they have been left to follow new leads.

Collecting data was undertaken through face-to-face interviews. There are advantages to this interview style. The informants who are illiterate, very old, or even bedridden could be interviewed. For conditions where the informants were not answering fully, they could be probed for more complete data. The interviews could last longer than telephone or self-administered interviews. The interviews were not costly in both time and money so many people could be interviewed. The interviews took place during March 2006.

The interviews started with general questions and moved on to specific ones. Different question types were used. These are open-ended, closed-ended and fixed-choice questions. The open-ended questions were beneficial because they break the monotony for the informant. However the closed-ended items have been employed since they could carry the interviewer to the answers fast. As fixed-choice questions restrict the informants' willingness to talk, they were not used as extensively.

#### **4.2. Section on Personal Information**

This part is formed in order to understand people's personal backgrounds. The information on name, age, gender, current occupation, marital status, education status, current residence, and homeland, ethnicity, and leisure time activities was gathered through both open-ended and close-ended questions. The informants' ages range from 22 to 84, but mostly clustered between 25 and 50. The importance of this part derives from the two matters. These are the matters of birth place and of ethnicity. The matter of birth place is important. People whose homeland is Kars were especially sought for interviews. The informants have originally been from Kars. They have been living in Kars since they were born. In terms of access to local

culture, interviewing with the local people is crucial to assess their habits, beliefs, opinions, and ideas (about their lives) in the present as well as in the past. It is important to remember that this whole group of values has been shaped through the time.

The matter of ethnicity is also important. Ethnicity defines a kind of diversity within a society. However linguistic and religious differences identify diverse groups within a society as well. This needs to be clear in readers' minds. The historical background of ethnic diversification among groups in Kars has been previously discussed in the third chapter in detail. Especially in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Kars had become a place where people moved to and left. This movement of people caused ethnic diversification in Kars and in the region as well. However, linguistic and religious diversification went hand in hand with the ethnic differences. In the survey, randomly chosen people were questioned regarding ethnic differences. The aim is to reflect the current ethnic diversity in Kars and to voice various perspectives as well. They have not been questioned regarding specifically linguistic and religious differences. It has been seen that different ethnicities still exist in Kars including Turks, Azeris, and Kurds.

### **4.3. Section on Perception of Historical Heritage**

This section is aimed at understanding people's awareness level about the historical heritage of Kars. From the 10<sup>th</sup> millennium BC, Kars has been occupied by various groups. Their remains can be traced via their material culture including archaeological objects, historical buildings, old settlements, and other forms of footprints of those earlier societies. In addition to this physical wealth, intangible

morals, values, beliefs, customs, habits of those cultures have been inherited by the people of Kars through the ages. Within this historical and cultural richness, this inquiry appears: Are people living in Kars are really aware of this situation or not? Within this perspective, their perception of this phenomenon and their interaction with the whole seen and unseen environment deserve to be analyzed. This investigation is undertaken into four categories. These categories are sources for history of Kars, sites/ places, knowledge of history, and inherited practices/ habits.

In terms of sources for history in Kars, the informants have been asked about sources previously used, sources possibly to consult, and current source preferences for the history of Kars. In terms of “sources previously used”, the informants have been asked to claim sources that were used for gathering information on the history of Kars so far. The great majority of the informants have declared that they have primarily gathered information on the history of Kars from their families, relatives and neighbors. In other words, they are equipped with information on lived experiences belonging to their own grandfathers, grandmothers, mothers, and so on. This is important for three reasons. First, through those stories recent history in Kars can be acknowledged. Second, those lived experiences are acknowledged from different voices. Third, there is a strong reflection of an oral testimony tradition which would be marked as an opportunity. The content of the stories told vary markedly. Grandparents told stories about events that happened during the war years especially in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These memories are emigration stories, stories of conflict mainly with the Russians and the Armenians, memories reflecting on daily life at that time, and stories based on rural life styles, especially the transportation conditions and social relations of the period. There are stories of local personalities that fought with the Ottoman army or with Kazım Karabekir

mainly against the Russians, the Armenians, and so on. This generation tells stories about their childhood or youth, based on daily life in the city, in the period from the 1960's till the 1980's.

The great majority of the informants have declared that they have secondarily acknowledged the history of Kars based on written documents. Written documents refer generally to history books which are used for instruction in elementary and high schools. Besides, the great majority of the informants declared that their information on the history in Kars was gathered during their school years. Here it would not be wrong to examine those last two (sources previously used) together. First of all, three points have appeared related to the history books. The great majority of the informants have agreed on the fact that the history books which are used at schools don't deal with Kars and its history specifically. Besides, the history books (instructed at schools) mainly cover the national history of Turkey. They contain insufficient information on Kars and its history. The great majority of the informants have declared that regardless of belonging to Kars history, specifically or not, information in the history books should be examined as to whether it concerns diverse perspectives or not. According to them, history books have been written to serve certain aims, institutions, or interests. Therefore, they cannot reflect a broad range of facts, events, and personalities but only certain ones.

Some informants in the young age group have claimed that they have gathered information on history in Kars through media including visual, written and internet.

In terms of "sources possibly to consult", the informants have been asked to declare what kinds of sources provide historical information in a general sense. They have been asked to choose among those: history books, diaries/memories, records

kept by governmental institutions, myths and stories, old photographs, old engravings and pictures, old maps, archaeological remains, personal belongings, and historical buildings. All of the informants have agreed on the fact that all of those sources provide historical information. However two points have been emphasized. Most of the informants have stressed the importance of the visual ones. In other words, they have mostly credited photographs, old gravings and pictures, old maps, archaeological remains, personal belongings, and historical buildings. Most of the informants have accepted “history book” as a source; however they have stressed the fact that history books cannot reflect the facts from different interests.

In terms of “current source preferences”, the informants have been asked to claim their current preferences for sources on the history in Kars. They have been asked what sources they would use in the case of making research on history in Kars. They have been wanted to choose among the following: history books, library/archive, museum, media, film/documentary archive, photograph archive, and conference held in the city. One third of the informants have claimed that they would use all of them when they want to research the history in Kars. Two thirds of the informants’ preferences have diversified like that: Most of this group has primarily preferred to consult institutions such as a “library” and “museum” in the case of research. Secondly, they have preferred to use a “photograph archive”. Thirdly, they have declared that they would use “film/documentary archive” if it were available. Similarly, they have claimed that they would benefit from conferences subjecting the history of Kars. They have pointed out media (visual, written, internet) as their last preferences.

In terms of sites, the informants have been asked about historical places in Kars and its surroundings with two directions of inquiry in mind. On the one hand,

the informants gave information on what historical places they have acknowledged so far. On the other hand, they have been asked to recommend places to visit. These two perspectives have been employed to make the informants remember the places comprehensively during the interviews. The answers of those two mostly pointed to certain places. All of the informants favored Ani which is an ancient city 34 km. away from Kars as the first place to see in Kars. As a second place, the informants have signified the Castle of Kars, The Church of the Holy Apostles, and the Russian period buildings have been put in the third rank. The Stone Bridge and Mazlumağa Bath have been mentioned as the fourth places. The informants have indicated Evliya Mosque, the Ottoman period houses, and Kars Archaeological Museum as the places in the fifth rank. Except Ani and Kars Archaeological Museum, all of those sites are located in the historic part of the city. It is apparent that the informants perceived the historic area as a whole. They were able to point out the historical features site by site, at least the main ones. Here the other interesting point is that all of the informants mentioned Ani in the first rank regardless of being located out of the historic core. Another interesting point is that the informants mentioned Kars Archaeological Museum as a place having historical importance.

In terms of knowledge of history in Kars, the informants have been asked to declare unforgettable historical periods, events, and personalities of the history in Kars based on their personal views. In other words, it was investigated what historical periods, events, and personalities they find significant and memorable. They were also asked to express their opinions about past research initiatives on Kars, the results of them, and whether they were satisfied or not by the results of them. In terms of “period”, most of the informants answered this question. The great majority of the informants pointed out two periods in the history of Kars as being

equally significant: The Russian occupation period, and the beginning of 1950's till the end of the 1970's. In terms of "event", the great majority of the informants agreed on the fact that the independence of Kars, gained during the Turkish Independence War, was the most important event in the history of Kars. Secondly (half of the responses of the former one), the vast majority of the informants mentioned the conflicts between the Armenians and the Turkish forces in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Thirdly most of the informants claimed that Sarıkamış and the martyries should always be remembered. In terms of "person", the great majority of the informants have agreed on the name that Kazım Karabekir was the most important personality in the history of Kars. Secondly, various names/personalities have been mentioned within this inquiry. These are Gazi Ahmet Muhtar Paşa, Mihri Ali Bey, Ağa Dede, Emin Bey, Celal Baba, and Gülizaroğlu Abdullah. Those were local heroes involved in the efforts of the independence of Kars either in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, mainly with the Russian forces, or in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century with the "Kuvayi Milliye" troops. Although "Molokans" have not been specifically mentioned in this "person" inquiry, they have been always referred in the "period" inquiry. All of the informants who have responded "the Russian period" have simultaneously highlighted the contributions of the "Molokans".

When the informants were asked their opinions about the research done so far on those discussed above, all of them claimed that they were not satisfied.

Inherited practices, customs, beliefs, rituals, and habits were also investigated to determine whether they have disappeared or not. Additionally they were asked to recall what traditional practices they know to still be continued. All of the informants agreed on the fact that traditional habits have mostly vanished. In terms of the ones

which are not practiced any more, they are grouped into five categories. These are food/ kitchen, weddings, “*bayrams*”, funerals, and solidarity. The informants claimed that certain local tastes like “*bozbaş*”, “*haşıl*” and “*kete*” have disappeared. All of them have pointed out that wedding ceremonies do not last for three days any more. Certain features unique to the wedding ceremonies like “*şah götürme*”, riding races, and big scale lunch and dinner organizations cannot be observed any more. Weddings are generally held in the salons on the contrary to the open air ones which were more traditional. In terms of “*bayrams*”, all of the informants have complained that people have not signified them at all. They have all claimed that people have not done “*bayram visits*”. According to the informants, “*bayrams*” were the tools gathering people together however they have lost this feature. Especially the older informants have claimed that they missed the breakfasts which were held after the Morning Prayer during the “*bayrams*”. In terms of funerals, all of the informants have claimed that the owner of the funeral used to be financially helped by the relatives, neighbors, and friends. The general opinion agreed on the fact that this habit has practically disappeared. It has been simultaneously pointed out that solidarity has vanished. All of the informants have complained that there is not a group spirit today.

Interestingly, when all the informants mentioned these issues, simultaneously the “Molokans” and their life patterns also were pointed out. It has been claimed that certain aspects of the “Molokan” culture have been inherited by the people of Kars. Their reflections can be traced through examining these traditions.

The other interesting point is that all of the informants have declared that traditional practices are favored by the people of Kars most of the time. By emphasizing those five main themes discussed above, they have all agreed on the

fact that the reason for this situation is the recent economic difficulties experienced by the people living in Kars.

Another interesting point is that both in terms of disappearing customs and the reason for its disappearance, the answers have been homogeneous regardless of the informants' ages. In other words, it can be an indicator of the density of the intergenerational knowledge transfer. The young generation has acknowledged those facts: the traditional practices have mostly vanished, certain ones have entirely disappeared, and the reason of this situation is mainly based on the economic factors. On the one hand this information is partly a result of the young people's own observations. On the other hand, this information has been mostly transferred from older people to younger ones.

Those four categories discussed above form the basis of this section. In other words, the current level of awareness of historical heritage of Kars has been evaluated by analyzing those four subject matters. However, two questions have been placed within this part and they deserve to be examined separately.

One of the questions is aimed towards understanding how the people of Kars define their own culture. When they were directly asked this question in an open-ended form, all of the informants were willing to talk about this issue. They all have expressed their opinions in a positive mood. This is important to understand their opinions about their culture straightforwardly. They looked as if they are really proud of certain characteristics of their culture. All of the informants have defined their culture primarily as being "multicultural". In this sense, they have all claimed that diverse cultures lived in Kars through the time. Due to the fact that those different lifestyles belonging to the different societies have been maintained on a tolerant ground based on respect and brotherhood, Kars's rich cultural heritage has formed.

According to them, this phenomenon is still valid; today various groups are living in Kars without any hostility to each others. All of the informants have proudly raised the wealthy historical heritage of Kars as the second important feature of their culture. They have all claimed that Kars's history goes back to very early times and uninterruptedly the city of Kars has been preferred to live in by different societies from that time forward. In terms of "historical richness", all of the informants' point of views basically relate to two ideas. These are visible remains and invisible remains. In terms of visible remains, all of the informants have implied historical ruins. In terms of invisible remains, they all have meant ideas, beliefs, and customs from the past. According to them, people have had various painful as well as happy experiences through time. As a result of those lived experiences, ideas, beliefs, and customs have been diversified. All of the informants have pointed out hospitality as the third characteristic of their culture. They have been proud of saying that Kars people are always generous in treating their own fellow citizens and outsiders as well. Few informants mentioned the natural and climatic conditions as another characteristic of their culture.

The other question has been placed at the end of this section. I have employed an open-ended form of questioning and avoided fixed-choices. The importance of this question comes from the fact that this question independently investigates the informants' opinions about and reasons for the preservation of the historical heritage of Kars. All of the informants gave the same answers to this question. These answers can be categorized into two groups. The great majority of answers which form the first group dealt with moral themes. Few answers within the second group cover economic themes. Key moral themes included, "protecting the roots", "preserving the identity", "learning the past" and "the enhancement of people through

preservation of the past”. In terms of the economic themes, tourism as an economic source was often mentioned.

#### **4.4. Section on a “Museum” as a Tool of Preservation**

It is true that museums are places where material evidence of old societies are kept, documented, preserved, and displayed. In addition to those basic acts, a museum aims to communicate with people through their collections. Especially in the last twenty years, museums have regarded people as the main basis of their own survival. This policy has two headings. One of them regards people in the past. The other one regards people in the present. The people in the past have begun to be emphasized in terms of displays. In other words, stories and experiences of old people have been told through their material culture (regardless of their aesthetic values). Those efforts have been realized for the people in the present employing huge amount of economic, technological, and human (re)sources.

This part aims to understand the people of Kars’ perception of the museum as a concept. The first half of the investigation was undertaken by examining the existing Kars Archaeological Museum. There are crucial aspects for a museum practice (mentioned above) and I have tried to figure out whether they are understood by the audience in Kars. I have examined those aspects under two covering headings. Under the “communication” heading, visit, visitor profile, possession and outreach subheadings were analyzed. Under the “collections” heading, objects, display, and museum environment subheadings were analyzed.

Under the “communication” heading, in terms of “visit”, first of all the informants have been asked whether they had (ever) visited the Kars Archaeological

Museum or not so far. The great majority of the informants have declared that they had visited it. (Very) few informants claimed that they had not been to the Museum yet. The ones who had visited the Kars Archaeological Museum claimed that they mostly visited it partly because of curiosity about old societies that lived in Kars. Another reason stated was taking guests to the Museum. The other reason for visiting is that the informants had all been taken to the museum at least once during their school years. Few informants who were the ones had not been to the museum yet, declared that they had not visited it because of laziness and indifference. In terms of “visitor profile”, all the informants claimed that Kars audience is composed of two main groups. One of them consists of tourists, while the other contains local students. According to the informants, local people Kars do not visit the Kars Archaeological Museum. In terms of possession, the great majority of the informants have declared that they all recommend that their guests visit there, or they take them to there. Few informants do not see the Museum as a place necessarily to visit therefore they do not recommend it. It is apparent that they criticize themselves for being indifferent to the Kars Archaeological Museum. They claim that mostly student groups and outsiders visit it. However they all recommend visit of it the outsiders. It appeared that Kars people mostly see the Kars Archaeological Museum as a place not for themselves but for other people.

In terms of “outreach”, all the informants have expressed important issues. All of them have agreed on the fact that Kars Archaeological Museum has not been publicized enough. Young groups and children have been especially alienated from the museum, which lacks programs to attract them. Also lacking are supportive activities for adults like conferences, workshops, and concerts.

Under the “collections” heading, in terms of “objects”, all the informants have mentioned important observations. According to them the objects being displayed are beautiful. They give information on the past societies of Kars. They represent diverse life styles from the past. However they are not enough compared to the acknowledged but buried historical richness of the city. The objects in there give information on the past cultures of the city in a general sense. They do not reflect the personal or individual lives of the people in the past. In terms of “display”, all the informants have noted that few objects are on display. Glass cases are small, and objects are put into them randomly. Generally, the placement and installation of the objects do not attract people’s attention. The identification labels contain insufficient information. The exhibitions deal with old societies and their life styles following the general chronology starting from the Paleolithic Period to the end of the Ottoman Period. However historical personalities, characters, individual life stories, and experiences belonging to the history of Kars are not acknowledged. The Museum also lacks personal, audio, visual, or written guidance and interpretation. In terms of “museum environment”, although few informants have claimed that the museum provides suitable housing for the protection of the objects, the great majority of them disagree with this idea. According to them, providing housing for objects is not enough considering the other issues at hand. First of all, the Museum is located at the very far reaches of the city. It is not connected with the historical core of Kars. The building of the Museum is not a historical one. The interior part of the Museum is messy. Especially in the winter times, it is extremely cold. There is not any café or similar kind of resting areas in the Museum.

The great majority of the informants have declared the fact that at least once they have been to the Kars Archaeological Museum so far. Those observations and

ideas have been the result of the informants' own experiences. It would not be wrong to say that they all have pointed out important issues. However it is important to point out that when they have been asked about their previous museum visits, the great majority of them have experienced various visits including state museums as well as certain ones abroad.

The second half of the investigation was carried out by asking what people would like to see and experience in a New Museum. In the first half of the investigation, the Kars audience declared their ideas, opinions, and expectations about a museum through the analysis of the existing one. In the second half of the investigation, through benefiting from them, I have probed them to visualize a New Museum. Before doing this, I have asked them whether they want to have a New Museum in Kars or not. A great majority of the informants expressed their desire for a New Museum in Kars. Answers for this question successfully gave me the chance to do the analysis stated above.

“New museum” has been investigated under five headings. These are exhibitions, outreach, location and accommodation, visitor, and organization. I have examined the “exhibitions” heading under two subheadings. On the one hand, the informants were asked what is supposed to be displayed in the New Museum. Various ideas have been proposed. Some of the informants proposed a museum telling the story of Kars during the Turkish Independence War. They have added that Kazım Karabekir, his life, and his efforts during the war years would be told. The informants who have pointed out those simultaneously have mentioned “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” and Cihangirzade İbrahim Bey. According to them, Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti was an important preparatory factor within the efforts of the independence of Kars and the region as well. In this sense they have also

suggested a “war museum” exhibiting all the wars in the history of Kars. Some of the informants have favored the idea of tolerance. They have proposed a museum covering the ideas of “tolerance” and “being multicultural”. They have suggested that various societies from the past can be exhibited stressing those concepts. Some of the informants have claimed that “Molokans” and their life patterns would be a good topic for a new museum. Some of the informants have proposed an “immigration museum” telling the stories of the people having come to Kars and settled there.

On the other hand, the informants have already declared what important periods, events, and personalities of Kars history should always be remembered in the second part of the survey. Besides, they have declared the traditional practices already vanished. This time, they have been asked whether those can be remembered perpetually via the New Museum or not. All the informants have agreed on the idea that via a museum, those would be remembered, preserved, and perpetuated. They all have indicated that just one new museum would not be enough. Various new ones covering different themes would be established. Regarding the “exhibitions”, they all have stressed these points. Regardless of what is being told, exhibitions should contain personal life stories and lived experiences belonging to the real characters from the history in Kars. Those lives would be demonstrated via personal belongings. Personal objects would be donated by their owners and those donations would be labeled within the relevant exhibitions. Narratives would be performed through costumed actors in the Museum. Audio-visual information kiosks would be placed in the New Museum.

When the informants were asked their opinions about the possible outreach activities to be held by the New Museum, the responses to this inquiry were creative.

They all have pointed out the idea that museums are not just places for housing objects. According to them, if museums only display objects and don't give importance to different facilities under the same roof, then they would not have repeat visitors. In this sense, they have stressed the importance of supportive facilities held by the museum itself. The informants have proposed these programmes. Various workshops including art, traditional cuisine, weaving that references the past, the objects, and the exhibitions in the Museum would be held. Thematic temporary exhibitions covering old and new items would be held. Certain objects would be loaned from other museums and institutions depending on the theme of the temporary exhibition. Concerts and conferences would be held connected with the agenda of the Museum. Restaurants and cafes serving traditional tastes would be placed in the Museum. Especially children and young people would be attracted by programmes designed specifically for them. Women would be organized through certain activities for the benefit of the Museum. People who are experiencing economic difficulties would be aided through programmes concerning economic benefits and development for the people of Kars under the Museum administration. The New Museum would organize daily trips and give guided tours to the historical places in Kars through volunteers administered by the Museum and other civil initiators. By doing so, the Museum and the others would create collaboration to promote advertisements.

Regarding the "location and accommodation", all the informants have agreed on the idea that the New Museum would be located in the historic core of Kars. In terms of building preferences, the responses have pointed to the certain buildings. These are the House of the Governor, the Church of the Holy Apostles, the Mansion

of Gazi Ahmet Muhtar Paşa, the Old Municipality, Fethiye Mosque, and Beylerbeyi Palace.

When the informants were asked their opinions about the “visitor”, all of them have claimed that the New Museum would be a place primarily for the people of Kars.

Regarding the “organization” of the New Museum, all the informants have primarily addressed the Kars community and the civil actors. According to them, regardless of their economic conditions, every one would come together around this idea. Objects, personal belongings, photographs, written documents, and other forms of material evidence would be gathered through this civil drive. Hidden stories, lived experiences, and facts and forgotten traditional practices would be released through this motivation. Especially local wealthy people would fund these initiatives. In addition to those initiators, the national administrative bodies would act with them. These are the Kars Municipality, the Governor, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and the Ministry of National Education.

#### **4.5. Conclusion**

In conclusion, in the survey, answers to the questions have been homogenous regardless of the different perspectives generated by differences in age, gender, education status, and ethnicity.

In terms of heritage awareness level, the following may be said: The informants are equipped with information on the history in Kars through oral testimonies derived from their grandparents, parents, relatives, and neighbors. Owners of those stories are still alive or have just passed away, and therefore

remembering the recent past is common among the informants. They are aware that they have listened to those lived experiences from different interests. They are aware that those memories of the recent past in Kars can be gathered by a cultural institution and used in the understanding of the history. Efforts gathering those memories would be essentially inspired by tolerance and the sense that the locals have to hear and to understand different interests and expressions. The informants' opinions about history books and history teaching at schools in Kars are negative regarding the exploration of the history in Kars. They see them as being insufficient to cover the local features. They have put that history books especially the ones taught at schools in Kars do not deal with Kars specifically. They see this situation as an obstacle that restricts the understanding of the past regarding the locals. They believe that the knowledge of history would be gained through a variety of sources equally gathered. However, among those sources of evidence they credit the visuality that one finds itself in archaeological remains, historical buildings, old photographs, old films, personal belongings, and various old everyday objects. The informants believe to a great extent that offering a variety of sources is an advantage whenever they want to research history in the city. They have especially addressed the institutions, library and museum in which various historical sources are found. They widely give importance to archives including old photographs, old films, and documentaries. Conferences held in the city dealing with the local historical features are very much credited by the informants. The informants are quite knowledgeable about the places having historical importance, at least the ones evidently seen. The historic city, Ani is given primary importance and is referred to and recommended to outsiders although it is far from the city. The buildings dating to the Russian occupation period are generally remembered as if they are a whole group - one

historic feature. The informants signify the historic part of the city by counting its features almost one by one. Although its building has a contemporary appearance, Kars Archaeological Museum is mentioned as a place with historical importance mainly because of its collections. The informants' knowledge of the history in Kars mainly covers two periods. The Russian occupation period is recalled simultaneously with the "Molokans". The period between the 1950's and 1980's are also important times that should not to be forgotten. The independence of Kars, won through the efforts of the Turkish forces headed by Kazım Karabekir is the most remembered event and person. Conflicts between the Armenians and the Turkish forces in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are also considered unforgettable events. Sarıkamış and the death of enormous number of soldiers in the hard wintertime conditions in 1915 are remembered, and the story is transferred from one generation to the next. Remembering local heroes name by name is an indicator of the situation that they are the ones recalled as being local historical features. When the informants were asked whether they have been satisfied with the research efforts concerning the history in Kars, especially related to the ones stated above, it was not a coincidence that their claim has been negative. Although the informants believe that the old habits, traditional practices, and old life styles have mostly disappeared they have a willingness to maintain those. They believe that hard economic conditions restrict them from engaging in traditional practices; however they do not admit defeat. They defend moral values more than the economic benefits. When the informants, the locals, define their own culture they emphasize moral values. According to them, words, tolerance, brotherhood, and respect have defined and keep defining their culture. In addition to these assets, they claimed that they are proud of their wealthy historical heritage. They have stated that their wealthy historical heritage includes

visible and invisible remains. All of the informants have agreed that this historical heritage should be preserved for reasons based on moral values. These are listed as protecting the roots, protecting the identity, learning the past, and the enhancement of the people. Economic benefits which would be gathered through preservation of the remains and investments in the heritage sector are given little credit by the informants.

When the informants were asked about the museum practice as a concept and a preservation effort through the examination of the existing Kars Archaeological Museum, they appeared to enjoy talking. Although there were a few informants who had not been to the Kars Archaeological Museum, the great majority of them had been there either because of curiosity about old societies, or a visit during school times, or when taking guests. However interestingly they believe that the locals do not often visit the Kars Archaeological Museum. According to them, outsiders and student groups are the main audience. They criticize themselves as being indifferent to this institution. However, they state certain points that need to be evaluated. Locals, young people, and children would be attracted more through not only improvements in the interior environment including displays, but also becoming more interactive with the people by holding conferences, and workshops. Although they accept that the Kars Archaeological Museum provides accommodation for the collections, and through them it provides information on the history of Kars, they criticize this as being far from the authenticity and the locality in the exhibitions. The great majority of the informants have a desire for a new museum. The New Museum would favor authenticity and locality in its exhibitions. Exhibitions housed in a historical building would reflect the recent past in Kars through narratives based on lived experiences belonging to the people of Kars. Those individual stories would be

demonstrated through personal belongings, old photographs, old films, and other complementary audio-visual materials. They favor the New Museum as a place where important periods, events, and personalities in the history of Kars would be displayed. They credit this for the preservation of the disappeared traditional practices and life styles. In terms of efforts formation and administration of the New Museum, government legislation is proposed as the only way. Gathering the collections, housing them, gathering various types of evidence material, visioning collaborations with local, national, and international civil organizations, administrative bodies, and with educational institutions for the enhancement in learning about the past and sharing it with the people are actions which would be undertaken through a local drive. Although the New Museum would welcome outsiders, it would be mainly for locals. The informants believe that hearing about untold, lived experiences belonging to the people of Kars will provide a better understanding of the present and an opportunity to prepare them for the future.

## **5. The Proposed History Museum for Kars**

### **5.1. Introduction**

This chapter explains the conceptual frame of Kars History Museum through an examination of the scope of the institution, the aim and function, the exhibitions, the collections, and the research and outreach policies. The aim is not to explain how to establish practically this museum at this point but to discuss the main idea around which the New Museum would be formed. Although the author gives importance to make it believable in readers' minds, the issues of whether it is applicable or not and whether it could be established or not in the near future are not primary concerns at this point.

The following concept has been formulated with reference to the theoretical approaches to history museum implementations, the historical background of the region, a survey conducted by the author in Kars, and her own point of view. The author has attempted to bring together and analyse the aforementioned issues in order to create an institution that would orient the people of Kars towards a new exploration of their recent past and consequently allow them to place themselves in the flow of time. It has been the personal experience of the author that the locals do not feel comfortable when looking into the existing literature; therefore, efforts to establish a new interpretation of the region's history would be essential during the formation process. This new historical context and the existence of an institution dealing with these matters and connecting the past with the present and the future is important considering the fact that currently there has been a rising interest in the city. Kars has become a center of attraction and there has been a significant amount

of effort in the reevaluation and discovery of its potential. In such a process, in which all the endeavours are for the development of this particular region and its people, an institution that discovers, evaluates, keeps, and disseminates this knowledge would be meaningful.

Another crucial outcome of this thesis has been the determination of the type of the institution to be proposed. The fact that not a library, an archive, or a community center but a museum has been envisioned is based on several reasons such as its visual power, its dynamic nature that brings together different materials and creating new interpretations, its character as a research environment, and its potential to be a unique place that brings together people with different ethnicities, gender, educational status, interests, mentalities, incomes, etc.

The starting point of the author that has been briefly described above has led to the formation of the concept that will be examined under the following seven sub-headings.

## **5.2. Scope**

The name the author favors for the new museum would be Kars History Museum. This museum, as has been partially discussed in Chapter 2, has been shaped by the changes in historiography as well as museum studies. These changes have, on the one hand, created a variety of evidence and, on the other, turned its direction towards people-oriented concepts. Consequently, museums have become new places for research for historians who have created new study areas based on the materials and the archives.

When we look at the case of Kars, we see an audience willing to discover their recent past in a different way and, for the time being, an effort to achieve this is being attempted by the existing archaeological museum. As was mentioned in Chapter 4, the locals have openly pointed out the lack of their own stories in the museum and history books. Although they cannot clearly specify what is missing, such as the recent history, ethnic issues or a connection with archaeology, it is evident that they prefer a representation of their recent history so that they can place themselves in this context. Therefore, an institution that introduces social history studies and displays Kars and its people would allow them to see what they would like to see. This has fit perfectly with the author's intentions and the current opinions of the locals on the evaluation and preservation of their historical wealth.

Kars History Museum would aim at voicing different points of view regarding the exhibitions. Here it would be useful to explain how this institution approaches the idea of "diversity". On the one hand, the idea of diversity would find a place in the exhibitions within the realm of ethnic, religious, and linguistic differences. On the other hand, the exhibitions would mention "diversity" in the sense of the different roles and duties reflected in the people in a community, like being a mother, a wife, a father, a soldier, a child, and so on.

The definition of evidence for this institution would be anything that somehow helps the narration of the stories in the exhibitions. The collection would consist of any category of material.

Kars History Museum would also advocate research concerning the recent past in the city providing a wider perspective within national and international contexts.

### **5.3. Mission of the Museum**

Kars History Museum aims to explain, illustrate, and enliven the city's experiences in the recent past based on the following principals: intellectual honesty, promotion of critical thinking, and enhancement of open-mindedness. The institution focuses on the period from the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It would offer an opportunity to explore this period acknowledging historic incidents within the local context. Local narratives are enhanced through equally placement of them within national and international contexts. The institution would investigate and introduce the lived experiences regardless of the fact that they belonged to different accounts. The institution would trace untold and visible or invisible encounters and impacts of those historic incidents on human lives. Kars History Museum aims to raise issues and questions which are important and overdue for consideration from a social or political point of view through employing history in many more creative ways.

The institution would reflect the diversity in Kars and its surroundings at the time through its exhibitions. On the one hand it would offer an examination of diverse cultures existed in Kars, on the other hand the institution would provide a decipherment of different attitudes and relationships among certain societies. Points of interaction, influence, conflict and mediation among various interests and cultures would be examined in a historical context. Material evidence would be evaluated regarding its social value and contextualized by utilizing various categories of information like artefacts, documents, oral evidence, and photographs.

Kars History Museum would introduce its audience, especially the locals, a new museum experience through employing aspects of contemporary museology as an efficient way of exploring the past. Material evidence will be used in themes concerning people and their experiences in the past while bridging these experiences to the present and future. Audio-visual tools will be widely employed as means of providing efficient learning environment. Interactive displays will hopefully move visitors to new inquiries and new meanings.

Kars History Museum will promote new fields of study to investigate. Ideally it would work with researchers and academicians at home and abroad. The institution would serve as a centrum where interested people, locals, and outsiders consult its records. Kars History Museum would search for collaborations with other museums and institutions in the region. The institution would accommodate temporary projects connected with its scope and host certain social events that make communication prosper between the Museum and its audience. Kars History Museum would search for ways to work with other local cultural and administrative institutions in the city.

#### **5.4. Exhibitions**

In Chapter 3, an historical background concerning Kars and its surroundings between the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the 20<sup>th</sup> century has been provided. Being derived from this brief survey, Kars and its surroundings has been a place where conflicts of interests and political clashes occurred in the recent past. The aim of the author is to put forward the social picture of the region at the time which has previously been ignored and not given importance to consider. The contents of the exhibitions will be

mainly based on the social picture of the region at a given time. In order to make it known, the author employs four themes through which the exhibitions will be formed. In other words, while the author has been researching the historical survey of the region within the period defined, these four points have emerged and have consequently become mature that the author would visualize the social picture at the time and illustrate it to other people. These themes are **movement, stability, diversity, and interactivity**. They defined conditions in the past, they are defining conditions currently and they are going to define conditions in the future as well. There is continuity in time which is identified here. Keeping this in mind, there are changes in time, and changes are demonstrated within appearances or formations. Definitions of conditions do not change and keep their inner manners continually. However, there is a change in appearances or formations in time. Therefore, an empathetic way of understanding the past is achieved through a relationship between a visitor and the displays which is based mainly on meanings. The visitor acknowledges changes in appearances or formations in time. He/she realizes that conditions do not change in human lives in time. Regardless of living in the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC, or in the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD, or in the 1930's, or today, people have experienced movement, stability, diversity, and interactivity in their lives. Humanity will experience those in the future. People start to act empathetically through acknowledgement of the past experiences belonging to the people who lived in the past. They evaluate certain historic periods, and historic incidents and facts that occurred at the time with an inquiring approach which ignores parrot-fashion methods sticking to just names and dates.

The displays will be mainly influenced by the themes. Material evidence will be defined and gathered meaningfully through these themes that the visitor would

comprehend as the subject of the display. Visuality and ideas are harmonized within a frame set up through the themes stated above. However it is important to keep in mind that those defined themes would not reflect and explain life in the city with its all components within the period. Rather, they need to be evaluated as just triggers to start and to go on for further research concerning the social history of Kars and its surroundings in the recent past.

Themes may be restrictive regarding two points. First, although a thematic narration provides an easier path for the establishment of the displays, once the themes are defined, the narrative may not be flexible anymore. In this case it might be inevitable to disregard and/or misinterpret some of the incidents. Second, the themes are reflected from the perspective of the narrator and it must be kept in mind that another perspective could bring completely different discussions. Therefore the displays must contain messages which indirectly make the visitor consider the existence of the other angles of the present interpretation.

The stories of the people, who went to Kars, settled in, had been living in Kars, and who left it for some reasons at the time will be reflected through the exhibitions. There were locals living in Kars who developed their own life styles. There were new arrivals bringing their own experiences and daily routines and habits. Those new arrivals arrived in Kars due to certain reasons. Some of them settled in and interacted with the community. Some of them moved to other places. Some locals decided to leave Kars for various reasons and they moved to other places as well.

The people of Kars were composed of different ethnicities at the time. There were groups who spoke different languages and had different religious practices. In addition to this, different social roles, duties, and responsibilities defined social

relations. Because people were the focal points of historical incidents, the stories illustrated through the displays will function like mirrors that reflect the connections between the visitor and the actors in the historical narrative. These connections will be based on the idea that all human beings have experienced similar incidents throughout history and this idea enables the relationship between the visitor and the museum to become more personal and emotional even though they belong to different accounts.

People are different from each other and have their own ways of living. The variation in these ways is reflected within various aspects of life. Diversity within life styles is traced efficiently through a focus on daily life patterns and practices. Wars, struggles, survival efforts, deaths, famine, illnesses, migration, and losing goods were experienced by the people in Kars within defined periods and had huge impact on human lives regardless of people's cultural and social differences. Through demonstration of those from diverse interests' perspectives is an enhancement of the exploration of the past regarding the new inquiries. One should never give up asking questions and continue research that this would be the real scientific attitude.

The conditions of movement, stability, interactivity, and diversity will be observed and examined through a focus on certain aspects of life and its expressions. Among these, economic life and trade, language, literature, sounds and songs, architecture and housing, urban life patterns, rural life patterns, roles and responsibilities in a society, family relations, cultural expressions like wedding ceremonies, festivals, funerals, and religious practices, diet habits, healing methods, ways and means of transportation, ways and means of communication will be considered.

The important features of the displays will be their audio-visuality and interactivity as well as their locality and authenticity. The audio-visual and interactive displays will be designed in order to attract visitors and stimulate their senses. Displaying local and authentic materials will enable the locals to find something belonging to themselves while outsiders will have a chance to explore a new culture. Exhibitions will reflect the Institution's multiple perspectives. Chronological order combined with the storyline will define the general flow of the exhibitions. The visitor's attention will be attracted from one unit to another in an organized way. Social relations among various groups will be demonstrated, employing scenes from daily life. Since visitors bring their own assumptions, expectations, and experiences with them, the displays would prompt feelings and emotions and alert visitors to make personal connections. Displays will not employ objects as the centers of interest but rather as means of interpretation of the themes. They will be accompanied by other material evidence such as photographs, documents, maps, and additional equipment like audio-visual apparatuses (headphones, screens, stereo), videos, textual explanations, and oral testimony records. Displays will favor internal reconstructions and scenes. Memories, mainly the ones belonging to the people who lived in Kars within the time identified, are highly valued as forms of first person testimonies and will be widely employed within the exhibitions. They will be complemented equally with the other types of evidence.

Exhibitions will be placed in the Museum through the storyline derived from the themes. There will be six main exhibitions in the Museum.

**Part 1** - Visitors entering the Museum will feel as if they are on the way to Kars as a new arrival. The displays in this area will consist of stories of going to Kars. A visitor proceeding through the displays placed in this area would acknowledge the stories that different people moved to Kars because of different reasons in different times. Those stories would contain details about the life on the road. Transportation patterns will be reflected through reconstructions in which original or copied objects are placed. Old photographs and oral testimony records which will be accessible through headphones or video records of the tellers of those memories, textual panels explaining the incidents and the conditions, original documents like diaries, or personal books will be gathered in a way that an environment formed by the voices, the images and the scripts will surround the visitor. This exhibition area will make the visitor curious about the next stage. Within this perspective, the stories displayed in this exhibition area are discussed below.

As a result of the Russian occupation and Russian imperial policies, new groups arrived in Kars and its surroundings as has already been discussed in Chapter 3. In this period, various groups arrived in the region such as the Molokans, Dukhobors, Ukrainians, Germans and Estonians. Stories of these people are an integral part of the history of Kars. These people had to leave their lives in Russia behind. The issues of how they departed, what they left behind, what they could take with them, in what conditions they traveled, their hopes, expectations, and concerns about their new lives in a new place will be presented through evidence like records of oral testimonies of the descendants, photographs, and official records kept by the governmental institutions of the related states. Among these new groups, the arrival of the Molokans and of the Estonians will be displayed here. They emigrated to Kars region in the period between 1879 and 1881 (Türkdoğan, 2005: 27).

In this first section, another group of stories belonging to the new arrivals in the particular region to be displayed will be those in the era of World War I (1914-1918). It was the time when the Russian occupation was continuing in Kars. As has been reflected in the local context, the outbreak of World War I in 1914 caused a new wave of arrivals in Kars from Caucasus. Ayten İlingi, a 41 year-old woman from Kars tells this story<sup>14</sup>: Her grandmother was in her twenties when the war broke out in Europe. Her father was a child at that time. Her grandmother, with her Kurdish family, had to leave Erevan. They emigrated to a village called Çakmak in Kars.

The stories of the people who originated from Caucasus and headed to Kars varied especially in 1917 and after. Following the revolution in Russia in 1917 and the withdrawal of the Russian army from the region, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of 1918 was formed and led to mass migration into the Kars region. Vedat Akçayöz, a 50 year-old man living in Kars, tells another story. His Azeri family emigrated to Kars from Gümrü at that time. His grandmother was 8 years old and was walking by the ox-cart with her family, especially at nights. Kemal Baydar, an 84 year-old man living in Kars has a similar story. His family emigrated to a village called Güvercinköy in the Arpaçay town of Kars from Caucasus together with the sheep herd they had on the eve of the revolution in Russia.

Following the Moscow Treaty/ the Turco-Soviet “Treaty of Friendship and Brotherhood” in 1921, especially the Muslim communities of Caucasus were directed to Kars. This movement of people has been reflected in the local context that the family of Mustafa Boy, a 37 year-old local living in Kars, emigrated to Kars from Tiflis in 1921.

---

<sup>14</sup> The stories told by the locals of Kars that will be given as examples from now on are based on the answers to the survey conducted by the author, which was explained in greater detail in Chapter 4. See appendix.

These last two groups of arrivals in Kars and its surroundings from Caucasus consisted mainly of Muslim groups, but having different ethnicities like Turkish, Kurdish, or Azeri. Currently, the inhabitants of the city mainly consist of two groups. The first group call themselves as “*yerli*” claiming that their families are not immigrants and that they are originally from Kars and its surroundings. The other group of people mainly consists of those whose families originated from other places and have been living in Kars and its surroundings for a period of time. These people are mainly those whose families emigrated to Kars from areas in the Caucasus either in the era of the Russian withdrawal from 1917 onwards or in the time of Turkish authority in the region from 1921 onwards.

**Part 2** - Following the end of this area is the second exhibition hall. This part will be a welcoming area. A visitor who has already acknowledged the stories of going to Kars and the related experiences empathetically will enter Kars through passing this area. This part will stimulate the visitors’ emotions and feelings. The exhibitions placed here contain expressions in different languages as “welcome”, “how are you”, “are you tired?”, or “are you hungry?” Original or new records of local music performances, local songs, wedding and mourning songs, local poems by young or old voices, and old photographs reflecting the different appearances at the time will prepare the visitor for the next stage. Life is composed of feelings and emotions reflected in literature and music in such a way that visitors will be in the heart of the daily life through such expressions. Old photographs, especially portraits in big scale, will reflect the diversity in appearance at the time with different costumes people used to wear. Hearing different musical instruments they used to play will increase the impact of the audio experience on visitors. A portrait of a

Molokan woman covering her head with a “*platok*”, a textile woven in floss silk, a Russian woman wearing a “*jugetka*”, a coat covering her upper body, and a portrait of an Azeri man wearing a fur hat will be some of the photographs to be placed here (Kars, 2005: 246, 247, Türkdoğan, 2005: 118). Contemporary audio recordings, including poems of local poets like Aşık Şenlik (1850-1913), music performances of Azeri artists playing “*tar*”, or “*Azeri kemane*”, a poem voiced by an old Kurdish man, a love song in Armenian performed by a woman are a few of the authentic expressions through which visitors will access this local spirit (Kars, 2005: 261). Visitors will emotionally start to imagine the world that they are about to enter.

**Part 3** - The third exhibition gallery will welcome the visitor in a lively way. The displays here are all about the lives of different groups in different times within the defined period. The importance of this exhibition gallery derives from the fact that this area symbolically represents the city of Kars to live in, to start to live in, and to stay. The visitor, local or outsider, as a new arrival, will start to explore the different lives, experiences, and cultural expressions of the time and will begin communicating and interacting with them. He is in the city in such a way that the life in Kars surrounds him with the help of the displays. He looks around and acknowledges the locals at that time, new arrivals, the ones who recently arrived and living there through the displays; in other words, the time in which the visitor stays in this gallery symbolically refers to the time in which the people arrived, settled and erected a life in Kars within the defined time. This gallery is the heart of the Museum because this is the city; therefore, the visitor is encouraged to stay in this area as long as possible. Visitors communicate and interact with the displays like the different groups used to communicate and interact with each other at the time. The visitor

shares his experiences with these past experiences through empathy just as people used to share their knowledge, experiences, and ideas with the others in the past. Costumed models and reconstructed scenes in which original or copied material will be contextualized will be supported with voiced apparatuses. Different life patterns will be reflected through records of oral testimonies, diaries, personal documents, old photographs, and videos. Lighting of the displays will be triggered by a sensory motor switch. Lighting of each unit will be subdued until the area is approached. When a visitor moves toward a display, the lights will be activated and the display spotlighted. In this way, running to new inquiries will be encouraged and increase the feeling of being wrapped in a new world. Scenes from everyday life, a woman preparing dinner, an old woman cooking over a fire, a family getting ready for a journey, people performing their religious practices, men chatting, people shopping, people gathering for certain functions like weddings and funerals, children going to school or playing in the streets of the city, and general life in the villages, will be reflected.

\* \* \*

When the results of the censuses dating from the period between 1927 and 2000 are examined it can be seen that the population of the villages in Kars has always been greater than the population in the city center. Especially in the period between 1927 and 1985, the total number of people living in the villages in Kars was four times greater than the number of those living in the city center (Kars, 2005: 322). This gallery will be the most important part of the Museum and the displays placed here will symbolically emphasize the issue of being “stable” in Kars. The

number of people living in the rural areas has always been immense therefore their stories will be given great importance.

One way to trace the patterns of rural life in Kars will be presented through the memories of Ramazan Karagöz (1930- ), whose stories illuminate the time between the 1930's and 1955's. He was born in Pekreşen, a village in Çıldır, Kars in 1930. He gathered his memoirs in a book called "Kılıç gibi Dosdoğru" in 2005. It has been employed by the author that the content of the displays would be clarified to a certain extent. When Ramazan was 8 years old he lived with his family in the village of Berne in 1938. One of the features of this village was that it was primarily an Armenian village. Following Armenians' departure, a Kurdish community arrived and settled there. The Kurdish and Turkish communities were the two main groups living in Berne at the time. According to Ramazan Karagöz, there was an Armenian church in the center of the village and an Armenian cemetery on the southern side of the church. The graves in the cemetery were of stone and human figures had been carved on them. The village had been established along a river. The water was distributed via clay pipes and two fountains. There were two water mills both on the eastern and the northern parts of the village (Karagöz, 2005: 14). In June 1939, he witnessed the general elections. The villagers employed the system called "*taş atma*" to vote for demarch in their village because most of the inhabitants of Berne could not read and write. Villagers voted by putting stones into the cups devoted to each candidate. His uncle was a candidate in 1939. He took a Russian made cup in bronze called "*cürdek*" with him as his own voting cup (Karagöz, 2005: 17).

In terms of architectural appearance, certain features will be acknowledged and employed through the reconstructions in this gallery. Through these architectural features, certain details concerning the family relations in Kars will be gathered as

well. The roofs and floors of their houses were made of soil. They had two rooms, two barns, and a “*tandır*”. Besides the “*tandır*”, they had another kind of oven that the family used for cooking, boiling milk, making cheese, and melting grease. “*Tandır*” had a social importance in the sense that following the baking of the bread, they used to put the “*kürsü*” on it, which was a kind of table having four legs. They used to have their meals on it and get warm by sitting around it (Karagöz, 2005: 15).

The displays installed here will contain details concerning the economic activities in the region at the time. Ramazan Karagöz has informed Kurdish people were involved with stock-breeding while the Turkish community was involved with agriculture in Berne. Among the Turkish community some people used to carry equipment and food for the military units in the region via ox-carts and sledges harnessed with two horses. Trading rock salt was a popular economic activity in the region at the time. The dealers used to buy the blocks of rock salt gathered from the mine in Kağızman and sell them in Kars. The journey, going to Kağızman, gathering the blocks, and returning to Kars, took four days via ox-carts. The blocks of rock salt were quite heavy, ranging from seventy kilos to a hundred each, and one could hardly scale and put them in an ox-cart. However, the main difficulty was gathering the blocks and dynamite was employed for this reason. One had to collect the blocks immediately after the explosion before the blocks were soiled (Karagöz, 2005: 22, 24). İsmail Habib Sevük (1892-1954) travelled to the region in May 1937 and presented another point related to the people and the mining of rock salt in Kağızman in his work called “Yurttan Yazılar”. In the winter, workers carrying carbide lamps on their heads used to advance through tunnels that were around 5 meters wide. In the summer around two hundred workers used to work outside the tunnels and dig the mountains of rock salt (Sevük, 2002: 409). In terms of economic patterns in the

region, Ramazan Karagöz reported that the inhabitants of Berne did not sell the products they produced. Extra goods used to be exchanged. Cereals, wool, milk, and grease were among the products exchanged. People used to produce their own socks, carpets, and rugs using the looms they had in their houses (Karagöz, 2005: 31). The barter system has also been reflected in the local context that Turan Atalay, a 41 year-old man living in Kars tells about his grandfather's experiences as a trader. Atalay's grandfather used to deal with the trade of goods in the sense that he was a kind of dealer providing the exchange of goods like salt and wheat between the interests. He used to travel to Kars from Posof. On the road to Kars, he used to stay in Kağızman for a night. During this journey, which lasted for four days, he used to exchange the goods.

In terms of the people's day-to-day struggles, the struggles belonging to the children in the villages at the time will also be reflected through the displays. The author will acknowledge certain details regarding this issue through the memories of Ramazan Karagöz. Karagöz explained that children had various responsibilities and used to have to work hard. Seeding, harvesting, carrying the harvest to the threshing place, driving "*döven*" which was used for separating grain from straw harnessed by either oxes or horses, shepherding, feeding the animals, cleaning their shelters, picking dried dung and gathering a kind of fuel made by dung concluded with the process called "*dağın odunu*" were among the duties that children were responsible for (Karagöz, 2005: 23). When he was a teacher in İncesu in 1954 he saw children taking blocks of dried dung with them to the school to warm up (Karagöz, 2005: 60). When he was assigned to the "İsmet Paşa İlkokulu" for the fifth grades in the city center in 1957 he realized that children in the villages and children in the city center lived in different conditions. Their situations became especially visible in the

opportunities they had. Children in the villages mostly used to wear old clothes and sometimes they had no shoes to wear, whereas the students in the “İsmet Paşa İlkokulu” wore clean and neat school clothes (Karagöz, 2005: 69).

The story of the “Cilavuz Köy Enstitüsü” needs to be told here to clearly demonstrate the education of the children living in the rural areas of the region and presented through this institution. Initially the buildings had been built by the Russians and therefore they had been in the service of the Russian soldiers. Following the Russian departure in 1918, the buildings were converted into a boarding school in 1930’s. In 1940, with the initiation of the institutions called “köy enstitüsü” in the villages throughout Turkey, this school served as “köy enstitüsü”. Students living in the villages were admitted to these institutions without an admittance test, after graduating from an elementary school. Following their graduation, they became teachers working in the village schools. Ramazan Karagöz stated that he was registered as a student in the school in Cilavuz on February 16<sup>th</sup> 1946. Following the abandonment of these institutions in 1954, these buildings began to be employed as the “Kazım Karabekir Öğretmen Lisesi” (Karagöz, 2005: 19, 27, 32, 33).

Clues to understanding life in the rural areas will be gathered through examining the memories of Ramazan Karagöz since he graduated from “Cilavuz Köy Enstitüsü” and worked as a teacher in certain villages in the region at the time. Between 1952 and 1953, he was assigned to the village called “Komasor” which was 15 kilometers away from Kars. When he arrived at Komasor he realized that the Terekeme people had been brought from Caucasus to settle in this village as part of the Treaty of Kars of 1921. The Russians who had previously lived in Komasor returned to Russia through the same process that concluded with the same treaty. In

the case of the former, the people who arrived at Kars and settled there, in other words the people who experienced the sense of “stability” will be acknowledged.

The Russians in Komazor had produced their own electricity via the water mills they built (Karagöz, 2005: 45). There was still a Russian man in Komazor living in the water mill he had. He was the only one who could employ electricity at the time in the village to the other inhabitants of Komazor. Similarly, he was the only one who was still dealing with beekeeping at the time. The water mill and beekeeping would be accepted as illustrations of an effort that this Russian man was trying to maintain the routines of his community that once existed in the region (Karagöz, 2005: 45, 46).

Another important pattern of the region concerning the ways and means of transportation at the time can be observed in the village of Komazor. On the northern side of the village there was a railroad which was part of the main Kars-Erzurum “*dekovil*” line at the time. “*Dekovil*” was a kind of small scale railroad with rails 60 centimeters each, sometimes narrower, and the wagons on it used to be run by steam, animal, or human power (Karagöz, 2005: 45).

In 1954 Karagöz was assigned to another village called “İncesu”, 30 kilometers away from Kars. The village had been established along the road between Kars and Ardahan. On both sides of the road the houses were juxtaposed (Karagöz, 2005: 51). İsmail Habib Sevük stated in his memories that in May 1937 he departed from Iğdır to Kars. The villages he saw on the road appeared as having been juxtaposed along the road on both sides (Sevük, 2002: 411). Following the Russian hegemony in the region and the arrival of new groups to the region, the Russian authority established new villages and juxtaposed them along the roads. İsmail Habib Sevük described this pattern. Roofs of the houses he saw were in appropriate form so

that they permitted the melting of snow deposited on them. The houses had gardens on the road side called “*efkere*”. Vegetable gardens were located at the back sides of the houses called “*tabuzar*”. Sevük especially described the bulls, cows, and oxes, grazing as fat and healthy (Sevük, 2002: 411).

Sevük noted stockbreeding as the main economic activity in Kars and its surroundings. He listed three main markets for the stockbreeding in Kars. The one in İstanbul used to buy animals which were fat and healthy, for butchery. The ones in Sivas and in Kayseri required meat to produce pastrami. Because the Russians had meat factories for canned food, they bought all the waste products. However he imagined that Kars would have its own factories for meat, milk, and cheese (Sevük, 2002: 422). Kemal Baydar, an 84 year-old local living in Kars remembers those times. Tradesmen from İstanbul, Konya, and Kayseri used to go to Kars and deal with the trade of animals. Those animals were transported first from Kars to Hopa and then to İstanbul via ships.

Natural appearances and climate in the region have partially defined the life in the region. The climate of the region was cold, with long winters lasting for five months a year and geologic features like high mountains leading to hard conditions that restricted the economic activities of the locals.

Agriculture and stock-breeding have appeared as the two main economic activities. In the yearly official records of 1925 and 1926 kept by the Turkish government, “*Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devlet Salnamesi*”, Kars appeared as having three cheese factories located in Boğaztepe, Büyüktikme, and Selim (Kars, 2005: 120). According to the annual records of 1928 concerning the trade activities throughout Anatolia, “*Büyük Ticaret Salnamesi*”, Kars had five ironsmiths, six carpenters, three building contractors, six farriers, one stove maker, and one rifle

maker (Kars, 2005: 120). These were all small-scale craftsmen. Interestingly enough it was not until 1968 when the first state controlled factory concerning milk products, called the Corporation of Milk Industry, “*Süt Endüstrisi Kurumu*” was established in Kars. The Corporation of Meat and Fish, “*Et Balık Kurumu, Kars Et Kombinasi*” was activated in 1972. The factory for the production of bait, “*Kars Yem Fabrikası*” was established in 1974. In 1978, another state controlled factory responsible for the production of flour, “*Kars Un Fabrikası*” was activated in Kars. Likewise, in the case of the refinery for the processed rock salt, “*Kristal Tuz Rafinerisi*”, was opened in Kağızman in 1978 (Kars, 2005: 120, 121).

Having stated these, it would be wise to ask this question: Why were these factories that processed the main economical resources of the region activated so late? In this sense the displays issuing these would include official records regarding the establishment of these regional state controlled factories, oral testimonies of the related figures involved in the establishment efforts both in the local and in the wider contexts, and oral testimonies of the workers who worked for these factories at the time including their personal opinions about these initiatives in particular and Kars in general. Metin Bekiz, a 30 year-old man living in Kars, remembers the beer factory in the city and asks questions about its closure.

The local press activities are crucial in a sense that they will be among the primary evidence to consult regarding the displays. It will be essential to trace the current agenda of the region through the newspapers that started at that time. The newspaper called “*Varlık*” published in Sarıkamış, and the one called “*Kars Gazetesi*” will be consulted to trace the current agenda of the city within the time between 1925 and 1926 (Kars, 2005: 157). “*Hüryurt*” was published from 1955 onwards, “*Serhat Kars*” from 1977 onwards, “*Halk Gazetesi*” from 1972 onwards,

and the one published in Sarıkamış, called “*Halkın Sesi*” from 1978 onwards (Kars, 2005: 158).

Within the perspective examining the rural life in the region, the village called İncesu and the Molokans deserve to be discussed regarding this exhibition area. İncesu was one of the places in the region in which the Molokans lived. Because the new Turkish State wanted to mobilize them for the war with the Greek army on the Western front in 1921, some of them left İncesu for Russia (Karagöz, 2005: 51). Following their departure, a certain amount of Terekeme people emigrated to İncesu from Georgia, Caucasus (Karagöz, 2005: 51). Here certain issues unique to the lives of Molokans will be discussed specifically. Molokans introduced the horses known as “*wladmir horses*” or “*kadana horses*” in agricultural use instead of oxes. They introduced certain apparatuses which were then new to the ways and means of agriculture. A horserake instead of a modest rake by hand, an apparatus for harvest drawn by horses instead of a scythe, and a plough drawn by horses instead of the one by hand were among them. Following their arrival in the region, new agricultural products began to be cultivated. Potato, cabbage, tobacco, and sunflower are among those. Molokans gave a big amount of importance to beekeeping (Karagöz, 2005: 52). We could acknowledge through the memories of Ramazan Karagöz that both the Molokans and the Terekeme people could do their own cultural practices without any hostility to each other. They used to attend each other’s funerals. They used the same cemetery for their burials. Molokans used to dress their deceased with new clothes while the Terekeme people used to cover them with a shroud (Karagöz, 2005: 53).

Displays reflecting the life in the city center during the period stated above will be placed in this exhibition area as well. Stories situating people and places in

the city and the relationships between them are valued in a sense that the importance of the places to the people will be investigated.

Kars gained a different entity during the Russian occupation period in the sense that the city was endowed with new buildings having their own characteristics due to the new administrative structure which was called “*oblast*”. The city of Kars as an “*oblast*” will be reflected within the displays in this area. Features of being an “*oblast*”, Kars’s relationship with the other oblasts in the province called “Zakafkazya” and with Tiflis, which was the capital city of this province, urban appearances and the people’s routines are certain topics to be examined regarding the displays. In terms of illustrative material, the records of certain censuses like the one dating from 1897 and the one dating from 1916 will be employed to note who lived in the city during this time. During this period, interaction between diverse groups will be reflected through an examination of languages spoken by different groups in the region due to the fact that certain expressions found places in different languages. For instance, certain expressions in Russian started to be used such as “*maşin*” for a machine, “*kartop*” or “*kartol*” for potato, “*çaynik*” for a teapot, “*rubaşka*” for a shirt by the Turkish speakers in the region.

Certain places will be defined in the city which had a social importance for people gather at these places. This is crucial in that an examination of these places provides an overview of the social life in different times. In other words, routines in social life will be reflected through an investigation of the meanings of these places to the people, reasons that people gathered at these places, relations between these places and the people who used them, and of the people who appeared at these places. Reconstructions of them are highly credited within the displays in this area in

which either original or copied objects will be contextualized supported with the audio apparatuses and the photographs.

In 1930's, people, especially the ones living in the rural areas of Kars used to go to "*Faytonlar Caddesi*" for shopping. "*Furgon*" was the name of the ox-cart which was used for transportation in the region in the 1930's. In 1937, İsmail Habib Sevük defined "*Kazımpaşa Caddesi*" as the market area of the city where quite fancy shops were located (Sevük, 2002: 416). In the 1950's, this street still appeared as an important place both economically and socially. The material evidence including either the photographs reflecting the people and the shops on this street at the time or the records in written and oral forms concerning the information on the goods that were sold, the cost of each to the buyers, the ways through which they were carried by their new owners and such will be gathered regarding the displays.

Bekir Sayılan, a 46 year-old local man, is equipped with the information on the life in the city in 1950's. This is a common feature among the locals especially for those between 30 and 50 years old. Either they can remember those times or they are equipped with the memories derived from their relatives, parents, or friends. He remembers the ice skating contest in the city that took place at the end of the 1950's. He could not remember the name of the winner but he said that the winner was a distinguished character of Kars at the time. This ice skating contest and "*Mamoş Dayı Dondurmacısı*" located next to the "*Cumhuriyet Lisesi*" were two popular memories of those times. Murat Kaman who is a 35 year-old man living in Kars remembers the phaetons in the streets and the children hanging on the backs of the carriages in the 1970's. He mentions the "*Kars Radyosu*" in the city at the end of the 1970's. Locals used to listen to this radio broadcast which featured the voice of the city.

Certain clues to illuminate life in the city center with its certain components will be gathered through the memories of Ramazan Karagöz because he was a teacher in the “*Kars Lisesi*” in the city center during the early 1960’s. He claimed that following the military coup in 1960, Kars became a place where the conflicts of politically opposite ideas were on the agenda of the city. Reflection of the tension between these opposite sides could be gathered through analyzing the local press openly devoted to different ideologies. The local newspaper called “*Gökbörü*” held a rightist ideology and reported the activities of the Association for the Fight over the Communist Activities, “*Komünizm ile Mücadele Derneği*”, and the Group of Volunteers for the Peace, “*Barış Gönüllüleri*”, an American rooted movement, will be acknowledged. Another local newspaper called “*Mücadele Dergisi*” had a leftist voice but as it has been expressed by Erkan Karagöz, a local living in İstanbul, that the leftist press was not as popular as the rightist one at the time in the city (Karagöz, 2005: 83, 84).

The displays showing the people who are chatting, listening to a radio, and reading newspapers and flyers, in other words communicating with the world outside of Kars, are important regarding the fact that those are preparatory units leading to the fourth exhibition hall. For instance, as it has been acknowledged through the memories of Ramazan Karagöz, the inhabitants of the village called “Berne” used to hear the news of World War II on the radio which was located in the house of the landowner of Berne (Karagöz, 2005: 30). These examples will be diversified according to which media the locals acknowledged the world outside of Kars and that each would touch upon certain historic events.

**Part 4** - The displays in this exhibition area will examine the impressions of the people of Kars about the world outside their city and the tools that they used for communication. The former will touch upon the issues of wars, peace treaties, mobilization of armies, exchange of goods, people, and of captives between the related states, and changing agendas of politics constantly while the latter will regard the means of exchange of information which mirror the mobile lives in the region. The issues of “war and people”, “life on the front”, and “attacking and withdrawing – constantly changing maps and borders” will be primarily discussed within the displays placed in this area. Either records of original radio broadcasts or their imitations, telegraph texts, texts of treaties, mails, newspapers, diaries, personal notebooks, letters, and photographs can be widely used for the displays.

Kars and its people have suffered tremendously from the conflicts between the Ottoman and the Russian empires, especially from the ones in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and during the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. During this time the city has been a scene for sieges occurring repeatedly and the circumstances of living under siege will be a significant fact to include in the displays. Since the city was located on the Caucasian front, it was occupied by the Russian forces during these wars. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century Kars was occupied by the Russian forces three times.

The first occupation occurred during the war lasting between 1828 and 1829. The war concluded with the Edirne Treaty of 1829 returning Kars to the Ottoman Empire. The second one occurred during the war between 1854 and 1856. The city was captured by the Russian forces in June 1855. The siege was broken thanks to local support. The victory over the Russian forces was so prized by the Porte in İstanbul that the “*Gazi*” title was given to the city. On the Turkish side, the feelings of the locals and of the soldiers were echoed with poems by the local poets like Aşık

Bahri and Aşık İbrahim (Sevük, 2002: 416, 425). The question to be answered here is how the other side should be presented regarding the displays.

Finally, Kars was occupied by the Russian forces during the 1877 – 78 war. Nihal Şamiloğlu, a 35 year-old woman living in Kars, tells his grandfather's story. His name was Mühür Ali and he was known as Mehrali as well. The Ottoman forces in the region were headed by Gazi Ahmet Muhtar Paşa. The Treaty of Ayastefanos and the Treaty of Berlin in 1878 defined the new authority in the region including Kars. The works of the local poets Aşık Şenlik from Çıldır and Aşık Sadi reflect what happened in the region at the time (Sevük, 2002: 436, 443).

The wars that occurred on the Caucasian front were continuing during the World War I (1914-1918) as well. The display reflecting the story of the Ottoman soldiers that froze to death while crossing the Allahüekber Mountains in Sarıkamış in January 1915 would find a place here. As a common feature of the war conditions at the time, the soldiers, regardless of being on different sides, had to experience the same fatigue because of continuous walking, limited hours of resting, and the restrictions on food and other supplies.

Following the revolution in Russia in 1917, the new regime decided that they would cede Kars and its surroundings. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was ratified between the Ottoman State and the Bolsheviks in 1918. The story of the withdrawal of the Russian forces from Kars and its surroundings will be reflected through the displays in this area. In this sense the issue of how they were transported will be one of the issues to focus on. The story of the railway constructed by the Russian forces, especially focusing on the people who worked on its construction, the people who were employed to build it, the goods which were transported through it, and finally the route and the stations along its route are highly credited matters to display. The

story of the withdrawal of the Armenian forces that were simultaneously moving with the Russian soldiers will be told here as well. They were moving to the east of the River Arpaçay in April, 1918. In the meantime, the Ottoman army headed by Kazım Karabekir was advancing towards the region. In his memoirs, Kazım Karabekir stated that he saw fires everywhere including the market area, the storehouses, and the arsenals in Sarıkamış in April 1918 (Karabekir, 1994: 83). Kazım Karabekir described the goods that the Russian forces left behind and signified their importance to the Ottoman soldiers. The Ottomans searched for goods that were crucial for survival because they always required ammunition, clothes, shoes, and food. In his memoirs, he listed the goods they found (Karabekir, 1994: 85). The list included canned food like 10 tons of meat, 3 tons of sausages, 5 tons of fish, 20 tons of salted cabbage, 380 chests of Russian-made bullets, telegraph poles, barbed wires, and such. Besides these, they found Russian-made maps in different scales which signified that they were highly elaborated (Karabekir, 1994: 83, 85).

The story about the hats of the Russian soldiers deserves to be told here regarding the issues discussed above. In his memoirs Kazım Karabekir claimed that once they found the hats of the Russian soldiers. Following certain alterations, they were used by the Ottoman soldiers whose hats were old (Karabekir, 1994: 100).

In order to illustrate the movement of the people, the story of the plane which was in the service of the Ottoman army will also be told here. It flew over the region covering the area between Sarıkamış and Erzurum for an inspection and identified 20 cavaliers, 30 cars, a group of thirty people, and a burning building (Karabekir, 1994: 108). When Kazım Karabekir entered Kars on April 25<sup>th</sup> 1918, he came across around 400 Greek cavaliers and infantrymen, 400 Russian soldiers, 20 Russian families, and a few Armenian families who were about to leave the city (Karabekir,

1994: 186). He reported that the Russians had built tunnels in the surrounding hills of Kars which provided protection from hard winter conditions, air attacks, or inspection flights for soldiers. He recognized the importance of the railroad that originated from Russia and went through Kars and Sarıkamış and the storehouses built along this railway network (Karabekir, 1994: 199). Another interesting story that will be employed to understand the issue of being a soldier is that on April 27<sup>th</sup> 1918, on the day of the 9<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the sovereignty of Sultan Mehmed V, the soldiers were distributed pilav, meat and halva, and extra tobacco. They were allowed to communicate with their families via the telegraph system of the Army. Because of heavy snow, they could all gather inside the Kars Castle and spent time together (Karabekir, 1994: 201). Serhat Kars who is a 22 year-old man living in Kars tells the story of his grandfather. He was a fellow soldier of Kazım Karabekir. The grandfather of Ayten Yılmaz who is 40 year-old woman living in Kars, Emin Bey fought with the Nationalists against the Armenian forces in the region. She has his grandfather's rifle, a Russian made "*lagan*" in her house.

During World War I, the issue of the Ottoman prisoners including soldiers, officers, and civilians captured by the Russian army has been already discussed in Chapter 3. They were deported to the prison camps in Siberia during the winter of 1915. Regarding this, the author has come across the name of Siberia in the local context through a historical survey. One of the figures of the resistance movements in Kars and its surroundings in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Fahrettin Erdoğan, was arrested and put in prison in Kars in October in 1914. He reported that he and 50 other men were captured and put in a wagon that night. They were deported to Siberia through the route starting from Kars to the cities Gümrü, Tiflis, Baku, Rostof, Harkof, Tula, Samara, Domuski, Irğuski, and finally Orenburg. He explained that

when they reached Orenburg they were 500 people including the Austrian, the German, and other Turkish prisoners. The journey lasted for 120 days. There were newspapers in Turkish in Orenburg which were called “*Vakit*” and “*Kazan*”. He was able to return to Kars four years later (Erdoğan, 1954: 57, 64, 71, 72, 130, Köse, 2003: 47, 48). In his memoirs he explained that when he was in Orenburg he heard of the relocation of the Armenian population in Anatolia to Syria; however, unfortunately, he did not give any specific information concerning the Armenians living in Kars and its surroundings and who experienced this incident (Erdoğan, 1954: 87).

In Kazım Karabekir’s memoirs the readers can acknowledge the stories of the captives who were captured by the Ottoman forces while they were in Gümrü in May 1918. They captured two trains full of people, mainly Armenians, various supplies, 9 engines, 120 wagons, 9 artilleries in the eastern part of Gümrü. There they arrested around 780 Armenian soldiers and sent them to Kars via the trains they captured. The trains were driven by Georgian, Polish, and Russian engine drivers (Karabekir, 1994: 247, 248). He reported that they captured young Russian and Armenian men in the villages in Gümrü who would fight against the Ottoman soldiers and were sent to Kars as well (Karabekir, 1994: 252, 258). He also described wagon types that varied according to what they carried, like the wagons for jail, sanitation, mail, cargo, kerosene, and water (Karabekir, 1994: 308).

Regarding the issue of “being a captive” during the war times in the local context, the story belonging to the members of the “Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti” will be told here as well. Following the abandonment of the Government in April 1919, its members including names like Cihangirzade İbrahim Bey, Cihangirzade Aziz Bey, Alibeğzade Mehmet Bey, Mamiloğlu Tevhidüddin, Simon

Raçinski, Vafyades Stephan, Pavlo Çamuşov, and Ali Rıza Bey were arrested by the British forces in the region and were deported to Malta (Erdoğan, 1954: 207). The story of this journey which started in Kars and ended in Malta will be reflected through the displays in this area.

Stories of the people who endeavored to be stable in Kars will be told in this exhibition area as well. The displays showcasing the local resistance will be placed here within this perspective. One of them will be the one belonging to the local intellectuals and their separatist activities in the 1910's, during the World War I. The branches of the different organizations which were against the Russian authority in the region like the Ottoman Red Crescent, the "*Gizli İslam Cemiyeti*", the "*Difai Partisi*", and the "*İslam Neşr-i Maarif*" were activated in Kars at the time. Yusuf Zülali, Molla Muhiddin, Fahreddin Bey, Cihangirzade İbrahim, Hasan Han, and Settar Bey were among the members of these organizations (Erdoğan, 1954: 43, Gökdemir, 1998: 13, 14, Köse, 2003: 33). The story of a meeting which was held secretly in the city will be reflected by a reconstruction placed in this area.

The story of the "plebiscite" giving the definition of the new authority in the region will be displayed here regarding the perspective stated above. Ottoman officers from İstanbul, Abdülhalik Renda, Hilmi Uran, Mehmet Ali, Sadi Rıza, Burhanettin Bey, and Mehmet Efendi first traveled to Batum via the steamboat called "*Gülnehal*"; afterwards they arrived in Kars in May 1918. They prepared for this activity for two months. The plebiscite started on July 14<sup>th</sup> 1918. The results were announced in August, 1918. They returned to İstanbul accompanied by a group of twenty people including the representatives from Kars. The Ottoman State announced the participation of the region into the Ottoman lands on August 15<sup>th</sup> 1918 via a document (Gökdemir, 1998: 20, Köse, 2003: 70, 71).

The story of the “*Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti*” will be told here as well regarding the efforts to be stable in the region. Having been previously discussed, the Ottoman army had to leave the region according to the related article of the Armistice of Mondros. However there were locals who wanted to stay in Kars and its surrounding villages. Following the Porte’s negative response to this desire they initiated their own independence. The stories describing the establishment of the local authorities and the Wilson principals will be examined within this perspective. The letters reflecting the relations between the local initiators and the Ottoman commanders in the region like Yakup Şevki Paşa and Kazım Karabekir will be employed regarding the displays. Especially the one written by Emir Ekberzade who was the president of the local authority called the “*Aras Türk Cumhuriyeti*” will be an example in a sense that he asked the commander Yakup Şevki Paşa to give these supplies: artilleries, machine guns, bullets, clothes for the locals who would be soldiers, military officers who would be responsible for the military training exercises of the locals, vehicles for transportation, cars, tires, 400 tons of stored food, and some soldiers (Gökdemir, 1998: 52).

The people who wanted to stay in Kars and in the region gathered together at the congresses in Kars. Members of the local authorities in the region like Oltu, Ardahan, and Kağızman went to Kars and participated in the congresses. The meeting of the “*Kars İslam Şurası*” occurred on December 14<sup>th</sup> 1918, Thursday in the Municipality building in Kars. Delegates of all the local authorities gathered in Kars at the “*Büyük Kars Kongresi*” on January 17<sup>th</sup> 1919. “*Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti*” was announced at this congress held in the House of the Governor, “*Vali Konağı*”. The list of the members of the Government included names like “İrevanlı Hakim Ağabababeğoğlu Abbas Ali Bey” as the justice minister, “Piroğlu Fahreddin

Bey” as the foreign affairs minister, “Gümrülü Hudadbeyoğlu Mehmet Bey” as the finance minister, and “Mihail Andreyanot” as the minister responsible for education. In terms of the lists and the names on them, “Rum Arlof” appeared as the head of the directorate for the postal service (Erdoğan, 1954: 166, 182, Gökdemir, 1998: 69, 90).

The efforts of the Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti were echoed in İstanbul by the “*Karşılar Cemiyeti*” and its activities in 1919. The office was located in the “*Hüsnüpaşazadeler Yazıhanesi*” of the “*Ömerabid Han*”, Galata. Two representatives of the Government, Ali Bey and Asaf Bey were active in İstanbul and wanted to go to the Peace Conference in Paris. They were staying at the “*Emperyal Otel*” in İstanbul and waiting for the money for their travel (Erdoğan, 1954: 186, Gökdemir, 1998: 124). The abandonment of the “*Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti*” was announced by the British forces in the region on April 12<sup>th</sup> 1919 via two documents distributed in different languages. The one in Russian dated April 12<sup>th</sup> 1919 was voiced by the general Davies while the other one in Turkish was distributed to the villages via planes on April 10<sup>th</sup> 1919 (Erdoğan, 1954: 205). A display of these documents, either the original texts or the copied versions, will find a place in this area.

The newspapers, “*İstikbal*” and “*İkbal*” published in Trabzon, “*Sada-yı Millet*” published in Batum, “*Albayrak*” in Erzurum, “*Açıkgöz*” and “*Basiret*”, in Baku, “*Alemdar*” in Batum, “*Çağadamart*” and “*Vakit*” in İstanbul, and the “*Yerkir*” published in Armenian would be certain media materials to consult regarding the struggles between different sides at the time in the region.

**Part 5** - In the fifth part of the exhibitions, the visitor who has already experienced the previous sections will begin to acknowledge the feeling of leaving

the city. The stories about the people who left Kars and went to other places will be reflected through the displays placed in this area. The situation of leaving the city and the mood of the “life on the road” will be reflected through material evidence like original and copied artefacts, old photographs, and records of oral testimonies. The records of local songs and poems will be employed to attract the visitor emotionally. The visitor will leave the Museum equipped with information on experiences and lives of the people who lived in the city’s recent past, which will be new to him regardless whether he is a local or an outsider. When he is on his way to other places in his life time he will have them in his mind like the people who already experienced this in the city.

In the recent past of the city, many people had to leave Kars for various reasons whether they had different ethnicities, religious practices, or spoke different languages because of ongoing wars, political instabilities, and economic restrictions. Stories of different groups who had to leave the region will be told in this part of the exhibition. The stories of people who had to leave their homes behind and were about to start new lives in different places will be displayed in this gallery. Regarding this view, the departure of the Armenians from Kars and its surroundings will be one of the stories displayed. The Armenians had to leave the region especially during war times in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although there is not any specific information concerning the Armenians who lived in Kars and its surroundings and experienced the relocation of the Armenian population in Anatolia to Syria in 1915, this will be one of the stories displayed here. Based on the memoirs of Kazım Karabekir, readers will acknowledge that the Armenian community in the region was extensively emptying their villages simultaneously with the withdrawal of the Russian army from the region in 1918 as well. They were emigrating to Gümrü and

Erevan (Karabekir, 1994: 150). The Turkish hegemony in the region in 1920 led to the fact that the Armenian community kept leaving the region (Zürcher, 2001: 171).

Following the Russian occupation, new groups arrived in Kars and its surrounding villages as has already been discussed in Chapter 3. This led to the fact that a certain amount of Turkish-Muslim people departed from Kars and headed to cities like Erzurum, Erzincan, Sivas, Çorum, and Yozgat.

Another story will be the one belonging to the departure of the Molokan community from the region. As was already discussed in Chapter 3, the Nationalists had the desire to mobilize the Molokan men against the Greek forces on the Western front which had caused tension between the Bolsheviks and the Nationalists in 1921. This issue will be examined as a possible cause affecting the circumstances in which the Molokans lived and led to their departure from the region at the time (Gökay, 1997: 117). Based on the memoirs of Ramazan Karagöz, the Molokan community left Kars and its surrounding villages in the 1950's. He made mention of the fact that they had to leave because their sons could not marry the Turkish girls and therefore this situation threatened their existence (Karagöz, 2005: 63).

When the results of the censuses in the period between 1927 and 2000 are examined, another story could be acknowledged regarding the departures from Kars. The population in the rural areas of Kars was more than the population in the center during the period between 1927 and 2000. Between 1927 and 1985 the population in the rural areas was four times bigger than the population in the center on average. Especially in this period, the population in Kars, covering the city and the villages, increased consistently. However, the censuses of 1990, 1997, and 2000 demonstrated that from 1985 onwards the population both in the city center and in the villages decreased, and that particularly the village population drastically changed (Kars,

2005: 322). There were 525.731 people in the villages in 1985 (Kars, 2005: 322). The population in the rural areas was 452.692 in 1990. The censuses dated 1997 and 2000 demonstrated that the number of people in the villages was 173.826 in 1997 and 183.719 in 2000. The stories belonging to the people who were actual figures of these official records will be told in this exhibition area to demonstrate that the change in numbers meant a change in lives. Within this perspective, the reasons that led to the movement of the people will be examined here (Kars, 2005: 322). Records of oral testimonies, official records kept by the related governmental institutions like the State Planning Organization, the Turkish Statistical Institute, and the Internal Revenue Office in Kars will be used. The stories of Kars communities living in other places, especially in the cities like İstanbul, İzmir, Bursa, Kocaeli, and Mersin and even in Chicago, USA will be told in this area. Gürbüz Çapan, a local businessman living in İstanbul, points out that the gas stations in Chicago are mostly administered by immigrants from Kars. He adds that the men in the ticket booths of the subway in the city are mostly men who came from Kars. The news headlines “The Anatolia living in İstanbul”, published on July 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 in the newspaper “Akşam”, demonstrated that Avcılar, Bağcılar, Beykoz, Esenler, Güngören, Kağıthane, Küçükçekmece, Sarıyer, Ümraniye, Üsküdar, and Zeytinburnu, districts of İstanbul, are the places in which the immigrants from Kars are widely living today.

**Part 6** - This exhibition hall symbolically functions as a farewell area. In this part, the visitor will leave the Museum in a mood that he will want to visit it again. Some of the displays placed here need to be connected with the city in the 2000's in such a way that when the visitor steps out of the Museum he will be wrapped by the life in the streets. The feeling of having seen and acknowledged everything related to

the city should not be the experience the visitor should have; rather he should be in a mood that he has new questions to investigate, and new ideas to consider about the life in Kars.

The Kars History Museum also holds temporary exhibitions in certain times. They will be based on different contents and themes which are sometimes directly derived from the scope or which are connected with the current agenda of the city. The Kars History Museum favors temporary exhibitions regarding two points. People will be able to access distant collections and material evidence in them. Through collaborations and partnerships with other educational institutions, enhancement in the gathering of evidence and in knowledge of history will be achieved.

## **5.5. Collections**

The scope of The Kars History Museum defines the scope of the collections. The collections are composed of material including artefacts, documents, and oral records. Although being local and being authentic are the two criteria that primarily define the materials in the collections, materials that are not local but authentic in other contexts will be part of the collections as being tightly connected with the scope of the Museum. They will enhance the exhibitions contextually and meaningfully in a wider perspective. The importance of the locality of the collections derives from the fact that the locals will make personal connections with and acknowledge the local experiences.

Historic artefacts are evaluated as one of the resources of the Museum. They are given importance according to their contribution to the knowledge of local history. Inherited personal artefacts, artefacts belonging to the local elders, the

artefacts individually documented, and those that had everyday usage in local or in wider contexts constitute this group of the collections. Documents are other resources for the Museum. In other words, memories in written and in visual forms will be collected, documented, and researched in the collections. These will be personal dairies, letters, newspapers, magazines, official records like health, finance, education, property, personal date books, notebooks, governmental records, propagandist flyers belonging to different actions, and literature like local poems, songs, books, articles, and photographs, maps, and gravings. Oral testimonies are other sources for the Museum. Memoirs in oral forms are in the mouths of the owners. They will be gathered through research and recorded.

Gathering the collections will be achieved through collaborations with civil institutions, cultural organizations, administrative bodies in the city like the Municipality, the Governor, the bodies responsible for health, education, population work, and the land registry. Gifts, donations, purchases, exchanges, and short-term borrowing will be methods of acquisition. Local personalities who have an impact on the society, and volunteers, local or outsiders will also be collaborated with. A campaign will be undertaken to announce the gathering of the collections. A team composed of volunteers will visit specified local families, primarily those who are wealthy and have a reputation, secondarily those especially living in the historic parts of the city, and thirdly those living in various parts of the city. The team will investigate the historical materials they have while at the same time explaining the scope, the aim, and the function of the Museum.

## **5.6. Research**

The concept of research in The Kars History Museum can be evaluated in three ways. The first one concerns the accession of material evidence into the collections. The material evidence is ethically and functionally researched in order to determine whether it fits with the ethics and the scope of the Museum. The second one concerns the collections and equally the exhibitions. The exhibitions, both the permanent ones and the temporary ones, will be formed through research and interpretation of the collections. Regarding this view, certain issues which have been ignored or given little importance within the records will be signified so that they will be unearthed to the attention of the academic research environment. The third one concerns the Institution itself. Researchers, interested people, locals, students, academicians, and like would consult the Museum's collections for their research purposes.

The Kars History Museum will collaborate with other museums, research institutions, libraries, archives, and with governmental bodies to gather various types of material evidence, original or copied.

## **5.7. Education**

The education policy of the Museum will mainly focus on the appreciation of the recent history of the region by the locals. In order to achieve this, the Museum will try to function as a bridge between the unpleasant memories of the past, the awareness of the present, and the optimism of the future. In this sense, the educational responsibility of the Museum plays a crucial role.

To bring the people of Kars and their recent history together, various education programmes can be designed, both for the children and adults. These programmes can be organized inside the Museum as history workshops, public talks but elsewhere as well, such as significant public places, schools, community centers, historical buildings and sites, nearby villages, which may also be collaboration with the local authorities. The main target of these events will be the children and their families through them.

There will also be programmes designed specifically for the tourists who are in the region for a short period. Souvenirs prepared for this purpose besides the regular museum gifts, such as various publications, pictures, maps, and puzzles with affordable prices will be available.

## **5.8. Outreach**

The Kars History Museum favors outreach regarding two points. The first one emphasizes that through outreach activities, the Museum will be a lively place both for the locals and outsiders. The second one concerns the enhancement of the knowledge of history. In this sense, through such outreach activities, the Museum will become a place where ideas and information will be exchanged so that the Museum can advance to new sources in the reinterpretation of the collections.

The Museum gives importance to publicize itself equally to the locals, the recent arrivals, the tourists, and the outsiders. The objects will not be in the Museum all the time but sometimes among people in the streets, in the civil places, at homes, or at schools. The Museum gives importance to people's impressions about the Museum. For this purpose, the Museum will ask people's opinions about the exhibitions and the social programs in certain periods. It will designate its outreach projects considering interests, needs, and expectations of its present and future

visitors. The Institution is interested in people's lives in the city in a general sense. People's contemporary concerns and current local, national, and international agendas affecting the lives in the city will therefore be investigated by the Museum. The Kars History Museum would launch permanent social programs and initiate temporary social projects or events. These would be thematic ones directly connected with the scope of the Museum or with the current agenda of the city. It would collaborate with the locals, the local civil actors, and the schools. Activities would take place in the Museum or outside of the Museum. Social history workshops, conferences, reminiscence days equally gathering different generations together, thematic events in the streets, thematic picture, story, or photograph competitions will be held by the Museum.

\* \* \*

The concept of the Museum proposed above, brings the question of which backgrounds the Museum staff should have and how many people should be employed. At this stage, the staff can be formed as follows: a director responsible for the functioning of the Museum, one person that will take care or the maintenance of the collections, one person dealing with the communications including outreach and education programmes, one person who will maintain the contacts with other researchers and create a research environment in the Museum, one technician who will repair the technical equipment when necessary, and two guards. It should be mentioned here that this crew has been suggested in a modest scale and the temporary staff such as web designers, historians that will work on exhibitions, promoters and fundraisers, etc. have not been included.

## **6. Conclusion**

Although the history of Kars goes back to very early times and the city and its surroundings have continuously been inhabited by various groups, the locals believe that they are not sufficiently equipped with the information concerning their history and people when compared with the richness of this heritage. This need introduces its own opportunity and the suggested Kars History Museum contributes to the people's lives in this sense. As the locals could primarily memorize the recent past of the city, they are not completely aware of the heritage having its roots from previous times. Through the Museum focusing on the recent history of Kars, the locals, and the outsiders as well, would be able to place themselves into the history of the city. Through this museum experience, the visitors would acknowledge that history is not a dead thing, but alive, and continuous. Through this vision the visitors would start to evaluate the older times and the future times in a dynamic way.

In recent years, due to the welcoming and encouraging attitudes of the locals, the Municipality, more recently of the Governor, and of the educational directorate of the city, Kars has become a place where those local actors, university people from other cities, national and international non-governmental organizations, and other interests have collaborated and initiated projects aiming equally social, cultural, and economic progress for the people of Kars. These are all encouraging factors for the establishment of The Kars History Museum.

Although the locals have mentioned and accepted their careless attitudes towards existing Kars Archaeological Museum, they have criticized it in such a way that their observations and proposals for the solution are sincere and constructive ones on behalf of this institution. In other words they are not indifferent to The Kars

Archaeological Museum as much as they think they were. When they were asked to evaluate this institution, they have taken this into account so seriously that they would care about anything regarding its benefits for the public. This vision would work for the idea of Kars History Museum. The homogeneity of the survey's responses, regardless of being derived from different voices, would be an indicator of the fact that the people of Kars would agree on the issues concerning the city. The locals signify the moral values instead of the economic ones through their social relationships, both in the local context and in the wider contexts. When they were asked about their opinions about the preservation of the historical heritage, they highly signified the moral values emphasizing the close ties that must be established between the past and present. The preservation of the past for economic benefits, such as tourism or new income opportunities, has been stated secondarily. They have perceived the life in the past primarily based on the human factor. According to them, ideas, beliefs, and experiences of the past have been mostly transferred from human to human in Kars. This situation is evident in today's Kars in a sense that the world is still being perceived based on the human factor in the eyes of the locals.

They have expressed their desire for new research opportunities concerning Kars and its recent history through certain new initiatives; therefore they have signified a new museum having the concerns stated above, such as bridging the past with present and creating new opportunities. They are excited about the New Museum, subjecting the local recent past in the city and its surroundings covering local portraits and their experiences through aspects of contemporary museology, and equally embodying itself in the locals through activities it will organize.

They sentimentally believe that the New Museum, Kars History Museum would be initiated through a purely civil drive that would be an initiation for the

locals by the locals. This is a real opportunity. In addition to this, although Kars is a small city, this situation introduces its own opportunity regarding the establishment of the Museum and maintaining its sustainability. Although governmental and civil actors, individually or institutionally, in the city may have had limited sources, they are there and visible. Their existence and operations are clear in this small city and this can be regarded as an advantage for network. The definition of responsibilities and efforts dealing with the establishment of Kars History Museum and keeping it alive could be achieved efficiently because related decisions would be taken without loss of time. Human resources about those would be operated conveniently.

Publicity of this new institution would be initially undertaken through a campaign in the city. An organized a team of volunteers consisting of the locals (anyone interested in the local history), the academicians, the museum people, and the specialists interested in Kars from other cities will be the human resources of this initiative at the first stage. The campaign would not be named as “Kars is establishing its first History Museum” but rather “on the way to a new formation to explore the recent past - Kars is in movement but this time it is different”, in order to prepare the locals emotionally in a sense that they would experience and constantly achieve this kind of an act in an organized way for the first time. Serial talks lasting for two days would be undertaken in a modest way in the city. As many people as possible in Kars are informed on and invited to this event. Museum people, specialists, and citizens of other cities, especially the ones having had similar experiences before, from Turkey and abroad, would be gathered through the efforts of the team of the volunteers. The guests would mingle with the locals and the life in the city and equally transfer their experiences. First day of the event would be allocated for those guests, while in the second day the locals, individually or

institutionally participated, talk about the city and the life in it in the recent past and in the present. At the end of the second day, the idea “how about having a similar experience for the recent history in Kars” would be introduced and the participants would be given a time period to make some homework. The team of the volunteers follows up this period sticking to the people and encouraging them through creative activities. Some of the volunteers simultaneously study on the feasibility of the gathering of the material evidence. At the end of this period, another meeting would be held, widely participated, and the results would be transferred. Every participant would be encouraged to express his opinions. Through these meetings, the team of the volunteers aims to increase its members. Formation of the boards, the advisory and the directors, in the near future would be primarily originated from the team of the volunteers. Consequently, the efforts for fundraising for the Museum would be initiated. Various institutions, local, national, or international ones, are consulted as well. Wealthy locals, living in the city or in other cities, are the ones that are primarily consulted to. They are encouraged to make allocations of money especially for the Museum as well as giving logistic support. For fundraising, another campaign but this time just for the people in the streets of the city would be undertaken aiming to make them participate into these efforts regardless of the amount of their contribution. In addition to financial contributions, logistic ones are highly valued and encouraged as well. Regarding the issues of the sustainability of the Museum, forming the budget and defining the fundamental expenses of the Museum, defining the fundamental expenses concerning the social programs in the Museum or outside of it held permanently or temporarily, and of ways of fundraising, one person from the team of the volunteers is provided an education concerning the museum operation and management. Following this education, he would share his experiences

with his one or two colleagues and all together they would study about the Kars case specifically, equally collaborating with the boards.

The ownership of the Museum is an important issue to consider within these efforts. The actor to administer the Museum institutionally should be clarified especially for the initial parts of the formation process. This issue would be quite connected with the accommodation issue including the location of the Museum. In which building the collections are housed would define this situation. When the locals were asked their opinions on the housing and the location of the New Museum, they have agreed that the New Museum would be embodied in a historical building placed in the historic part of the city, especially the former residence of the Governor and the former building of the Municipality have been suggested frequently. Keeping this in mind, I do not favor this type of housing for The Kars History Museum. An exhibition area in which there are many rooms in different sizes could not properly accommodate the displays. Rather an exhibition area that has no characteristic divisions, already lost them or never had them, is preferable so that the building is not more attractive than the content of the exhibitions, or the Museum itself does not interfere with the unity of the exhibitions. The historical building which has a well preserved framework but no characteristic divisions inside could be the appropriate solution to house the collections of The Kars History Museum after necessary alterations. However, a new stone building constructed in a modest style through a civil collaboration will be the preferred accommodation for the Museum also due to the fact that it would be a complete culmination of the civil life in Kars.

\* \* \*

The author of this thesis has largely benefited from a study combining the dynamics of new museology and its practices in general and history museums in particular, as well as the new approaches to historiography that place the ordinary people in a central position for a better understanding of the past. This research has inspired her by bringing out the main components that eventually became a group of systemized ideas. The readings of the historical survey have, in addition to the information they give on the events, enabled her to ask questions and look beyond what has been already told and discussed. It is the hope of the author that this thesis, with its interdisciplinary approach, will contribute to the new initiatives of museology in Turkey, and although it focuses only on the region of Kars, may encourage similar attempts concerning a better understanding of Turkey's recent past.

## **Appendix 1**

Dear Participant,

The attached questionnaire is part of the study called “Kars Historical Heritage and its Preservation- Awareness Survey”. This research is being undertaken as part of my Masters thesis in the Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities in Koç University. Before the proposal concerning the concept of a new museum in Kars which is subject to the thesis, Kars people’s attitudes toward their historical wealth are investigated through this questionnaire in a sense that local people’s opinions and expectations about preservation efforts in Kars especially focusing on a museum practice will be of benefit to the author in formulating the conceptual frame of the New Museum.

All information gathered will be treated in the strictest of confidence. Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Mehpare Özlem Başdoğan  
Koç University  
Master Program in Anatolian Civilizations and Cultural Heritage Management

## **I- Section on Personal Information**

1. Name, Surname
2. Age
3. Gender
4. Employment status
5. Marital status
6. Educational status
7. Occupation
8. Are you originally from Kars?
9. Please identify your ethnicity
10. What are your leisure time activities?

## **II. Section on Perception of Historical Heritage**

11. Please choose among the sources previously used for gathering information on the history of Kars so far

- \_History books/ documents
- \_Newspaper/ magazine (local/ national)
- \_School
- \_Family, relatives/ neighbors/ friends
- \_TV/ radio
- \_Web pages
- \_Other

12. Please choose among the sources to consult that provide historical information in a general sense

- \_History books
- \_Dairy, personal notebooks covering notes and memories
- \_Official records
- \_Story, myth
- \_Photographs
- \_Engraving, painting, drawing
- \_Maps
- \_Archaeological remains
- \_Personal belongings
- \_Historical buildings

13. Please choose among the sources on the history in Kars to be used in the case of making research on history in Kars

- \_Book
- \_Museum
- \_TV/ radio
- \_Seminar/ talk
- \_Library/ archive
- \_Web pages
- \_Movie/ documentary
- \_Photograph archive

14. Please write down the historical places in Kars and its surroundings? Please indicate the ones that you have visited.

15. If “No”, why not?

16. What kind of cultural and artistic activities are organized in Kars and by whom?

17. What is the most attractive thing in the city for the tourists?

18. Which places do you recommend the tourists to visit?

19. What are the unforgettable historical periods of the history in Kars based on your personal view?

20. What are the unforgettable historical events and personalities of the history in Kars based on your personal view?

21. What is your opinion about past research initiatives on Kars? Are you satisfied or not by their results?

22. Do you favor participation in traditional practices?

23. Do you know which traditional practices, customs, beliefs, rituals, and habits did disappear in Kars?

24. Do you recall any stories and/or memories on the history in Kars belonging to your close environment?

25. Do you have any objects that you keep for its historical value?

26. What would be the distinguishing character(s) of Kars culture?

27. Do you favor in the efforts for the preservation of the historical heritage of Kars?

### III. Section on a “Museum” as a Tool of Preservation

28. Have you ever been to the Kars Archaeological Museum?
29. If “No”, why not?
30. If “Yes”, your motives and reasons?
31. If “Yes”, with any companion?
32. If “Yes”, positive and negative opinions?
33. What would be your suggestions for the Kars Archaeological Museum to make it more attractive?
34. According to your observations who visits the Kars Archaeological Museum?
35. Do you recommend your guests and the outsiders to visit the Kars Archaeological Museum?
36. Which museums did you visit before?
37. Which of the followings would define a “museum”?
  - \_is a place for education and learning of the past
  - \_introduces different cultures and life styles
  - \_collects historical evidence, preserves, and exhibits
  - \_provides information on the city and makes it publicized
  - \_stimulates economic activity
  - \_is a leisure time activity
38. Do you advocate for a New Museum in Kars?
39. If “No”, why not?
40. If “Yes”, why?
41. If “Yes”, what would be its subject? What would be its collections about?
42. If “Yes”, who would constitute the audience?
43. If “Yes”, where would it be located? In what building would it be accommodated?
44. If “Yes”, who would establish it? Whose responsibility would it be?
45. If “Yes”, would it be responsible for the promotion of the other historical places in the city?

46. If “Yes”, what would you suggest as supportive activities?

47. Referring to the questions of 19 and 20- Could the New Museum be a place to enliven them?

48. If “No”, why not?

49. Referring to the question of 23- Could the New Museum be a place to enliven them?

50. If “No”, why not?

51. What would you suggest to be displayed in the New Museum?

52. What the New Museum would contribute to the quality of life in Kars?

53. Any additional provisions?

Thank you for your participation.

## Appendix 2

**Table**

Question no	Question	Number of Yes	Number of No
22	Do you favor participation in traditional practices?	32	8
27	Do you favor in the efforts for the preservation of the historical heritage of Kars?	40	0
28	Have you ever been to the Kars Archelogical Museum?	36	4
38	Do you advocate for a New Museum in Kars?	30	10

Question No	Question	Family, relatives/ neighbors/ friends	History books/ documents	School	Newspaper/ magazine(local /national)	Web Pages
11	Sources previously used for gathering information on the history of Kars	34	25	15	7	7

Question No	Question	Library / archive	Museum	Photograph archive	Movie / Documentary	Semin ar talk	Book	TV/ radio	Web pages
13	Sources to be used in the case of making research on the history of Kars	22	20	16	14	14	14	9	7

Question No	Question	Ani	The Castle of Kars	The Church of the Holy Apostles	The Russian period buildings	The Stone Bridge	Mazlumağa Bath	Kars Archaeological Museum
14	Historical places in Kars and its surroundings	36	29	20	20	14	14	7

Question No	Question	1st rank	2nd rank	3rd rank
26	Distinguishing character(s) of Kars culture	being "multicultural"	wealthy historical heritage	hospitality

## **Bibliography**

- Abram, Ruth J. "Using the Past to Shape the Future: New Concepts for a Historic Site." Museum International 53 (2001): 4-9.
- Ahmad, Feroz. The Making of Modern Turkey. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Ahmad, Feroz. Turkey – The Quest for Identity. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2003.
- Alexander, Edward P. Museums in Motion. An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums. California: Altamira Press, 1996.
- Allen, W.E.D. "New Political Boundaries in the Caucasus." The Geographical Journal 69 (1927): 430-441.
- Allen, W.E.D and Paul Muratoff. Caucasian Battlefields. A History of the Wars on the Turco-Caucasian Border. Nashville: The Battery Press: 1999.
- Altınay, Ahmet Refik. Kafkas Yollarında. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1981.
- Ambrose, Timothy and Crispin Paine. Museum Basics. Oxon: Routledge, 2006.
- Arizpe, Lourdes. "Intangible Cultural Heritage. Diversity and Coherence." Museum International 56 (2004): 130-136.
- Arslanian, Artin H. "British Wartime Pledges, 1917-18: the Armenian Case." Journal of Contemporary History 13 (1978): 517-530.
- Artun, Ali. Müze ve Modernlik. Tarih Sahneleri – Sanat Müzeleri I. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.
- Aslan, Yavuz. "Demokrat Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Cumhuriyeti." Toplumsal Tarih 67 (1999): 38-42.
- Bernard, H.Russell. Social Research Methods. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. USA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000.
- Bessire, Marc H.C. "History, context and identity at the Sukuma Museum." Museum International 49 (1997): 53-58.
- Bisley, Nick. The End of the Cold War and the Causes of Soviet Collapse. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.
- Bıyıklıoğlu, Tefik. "Mondros Mütarekenamesinde Elviye Selase ile İlgili Yeni Vesikalar." Belleten 21 (1957): 567-580.
- Breisach, Ernst. Historiography. Ancient, Medieval, & Modern. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Buckley, Anthony D. "Why Not Invent the Past We Display in Museums?" Making Histories in Museums. Ed. Gaynor Kavanagh. London: Leicester University Press, 1996. 42-53.

Burcaw, G. Ellis. Introduction to Museum Work. California: Altamira Press, 1997.

Burke, Peter. "Overture: the New History, its Past and its Future." New Perspectives on Historical Writing. Ed. Peter Burke. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992. 1-23.

Çelik, Fahrettin. Kars. İstanbul: İstanbul Yeni Sabah Matbaası, 1943.

Coates, Tim (Ed.). The Siege of Kars 1855. London: The Stationary Office, 2000.

Corrin, Lisa G. "Mining the Museum. Artists Look at Museums, Museums Look at Themselves." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 381-402.

Crane, Susan A. "Of Museums and Memory." Museums and Memory. Ed. Susan A. Crane. California: Stanford University Press, 2000. 1-13.

Crane, Susan A. "Memory, Distortion, and History in the Museum." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 318-334.

Davis, Paul K. Ends and Means. The British Mesopotamian Campaign and Commission. USA: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994.

Davison, Roderic H. "Russian Skill and Turkish Imbecility: The Treaty of Kuchuk Kainardji." Slavic Review 35 (1976): 463-483.

Deetz, James. "A Sense of Another World. History Museums and Cultural Change." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 375-380.

Dekmejian, R.H. "Soviet-Turkish Relations and Politics in the Armenian SSR." Soviet Studies 19 (1968): 510-525.

Desforges, Luke and Joanne Maddern. "Front Doors to Freedom, Portal to the Past: History at the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, New York." Social & Cultural Geography 5 (2004): 437-457.

Dewar, Mickey and Clayton Fredericksen. "Prison Heritage, Public History and Archaeology at Fannie Bay Gaol, Northern Australia." International Journal of Heritage Studies 9 (2003): 45-63.

Edson, Gary. "Socioexhibitory as Popular Communication." Museum International 53 (2001): 40-44.

- Ekinci, Oktay. Kars Kitabı. İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınevi, 2006.
- Erdoğan, Fahrettin. Türk Ellerde Hatıralarım. İstanbul: Yeni Matbaa, 1954.
- Fairburn, Miles. Social History. Problems, Strategies and Methods. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1999.
- Fernanda, Luisa and Rico Mansard. "Past and Present in the Museums of Chiapas. An Alternative Approach." Museum International 53 (2001): 32-37.
- Fleming, David. "Making City Histories." Making Histories in Museums. Ed. Gaynor Kavanagh. London: Leicester University Press, 1996. 131-142.
- Flower, William Henry. "Local Museums." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 315-317.
- Gable, Eric and Richard Handler. "Public History, Private Memory: Notes from the Ethnography of Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, USA." Ethnos 65 (2000): 237-252.
- Gökay, Bülent. A Clash of Empires: Turkey between Russian Bolshevizm and British Imperialism 1918-1923. London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1997.
- Gökdemir, Ahmet Ender. Cenub-i Garbi Kafkas Hükümeti. Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1998.
- Goldenberg, Suzanne. Pride of Small Nations. London: Zed Books Ltd, 1994.
- Gorgas, Monica Risnicoff. "Reality as Illusion, the Historic Houses that Became Museums." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 356-361.
- Guerrieri, Marcella. "Müze: Hatıra ve Gerçeğin Sahnesi." Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi. Bir Kuruluşun Öyküsü. Ed. Reyhan Alp. İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, 2002. 53-106.
- Guthe, Carl E. The Management of Small History Museums. Nashville: The American Association for State and Local History, 1977.
- Heper, Metin. "Center and Periphery in the Ottoman Empire: with Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century." International Political Science Review 1 (1980): 81-105.
- Herle, Anita. "Exhibition and Representation: Stories from the Torres Strait Islanders Exhibition." Museum International 53 (2001): 8-18.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Hovannisian, Richard G. "The Allies and Armenia, 1915-18." Journal of Contemporary History 3 (1968): 145-168.

Hovannisian, Richard G. "Armenia and the Caucasus in the Genesis of the Soviet-Turkish Entente." International Journal of Middle East Studies 4 (1973): 129-147.

Hovannisian, Richard G. The Republic of Armenia. Volume IV Between Crescent and Sickle: Partition and Sovietization. London: University of California Press, 1996.

İlter, Erdal. Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri Bibliyografyası. Bibliography of Turco-Armenian Relations. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2004.

İnalçık, Halil. "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600." An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914. Eds. Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 9-380.

Jenkins, Keith. Re-thinking History. London: Routledge, 2003.

Karabekir, Kazım. Birinci Cihan Harbine Nasıl Girdik? Cilt:2. İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1994.

Karabekir, Kazım. Birinci Cihan Harbini Nasıl İdare Ettik? Cilt:4. İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1994.

Karagöz, Erkan. Kars ve Çevresinde Aydınlanma Hareketleri ve Sol Geleneğin Tarihsel Kökenleri 1878-1921. İstanbul: Asya Şafak Yayınları, 2005.

Karagöz, Ramazan. Kılıç Gibi Dosdoğru. İstanbul: Alternatif Süreç Yayınları, 2005.

Karaman, Sami Sabit. Trabzon ve Kars Hatıraları 1921-1922. İstiklal Mücadelesi ve Enver Paşa. İstanbul: Arma Yayınları, 2002.

Kars İli Yıllığı. Ankara: Kars Valiliği, 1967.

Kars 2005. Ankara: Kars Valiliği, 2005.

Karpat, Kemal H. "The Transformation of the Ottoman State, 1789-1908." International Journal of Middle East Studies 3 (1972): 243-281.

Kasfir, Sidney Littlefield and Olabiyi Babalola Joseph Yai. "Current Debate. Authenticity and Diaspora." Museum International 56 (2004): 190-197.

Kavanagh, Gaynor. Museums and the First World War. London: Leicester University Press, 1994.

Kavanagh, Gaynor. "Making Histories, Making Memories." Making Histories in Museums. Ed. Gaynor Kavanagh. London: Leicester University Press, 1996. 1-14.

Kavanagh, Gaynor. Memory and the Museum. London: Leicester University Press, 2000.

Kavanagh, Gaynor. "Melodrama, Pantomime or Portrayal? Representing Ourselves and the British Past through Exhibitions in History Museums." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 348-355.

Kedourie, Elie. "The End of the Ottoman Empire." Journal of Contemporary History 3 (1968): 19-28.

Kelly, John D. "Nature, Natives, and Nations: Glorification and Asymmetries in Museum Representation, Fiji and Hawaii." Ethnos 65 (2000): 195-216.

Kelly, Susan and Stephen Morton. "Annie Moore and the Archives of Displacement: towards an Immigrant History of the Present." Social & Cultural Geography 5 (2004): 633-650.

Kerner, Robert J. "Russia, the Straits, and Constantinople." The Journal of Modern History 1 (1929): 400-415.

Kırzıoğlu, Fahrettin M. Milli Mücadelede Kars. İstanbul: Hamle Matbaası, 1960.

Kırzıoğlu, Fahrettin M. "Kars Kalemizin 900 Yılına Bir Bakış." Türk Dili Dergisi 155 (1964): 809-813.

Kırzıoğlu, Fahrettin M. Kars İli ve Çevresinde Ermeni Mezalimi. Ankara: Kardeş Matbaası, 1970.

Kırzıoğlu, Fahrettin M. Kuruluşunun 150.Yıldönümünde Kanada Karsı'na Türkiye Karsı ve Atatürk Üniversitesi'nden Armağan (10 Temmuz 1972). Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1972.

Kırzıoğlu, Fahrettin M. "Cihangiroğlu İbrahim Aydın (1874-1948)'daki Milli Mücadele'de Kars ve Atatürk ile İlgili Belgeler." Bellekten 189-190 (1984): 109-217.

Köse, Mürsel. 'Elviye-i Selase' Kars Ardahan Batum 1877-1920. İşgalden Kurtuluşa. 'Kırk Yıllık Kara Günler' ve Ermeniler. Ankara: Kuban Matbaacılık Yayıncılık, 2003.

Kumkale, Tahir Tamer. Tarihten Günümüze Türk-Rus İlişkileri. İstanbul: Harp Akademileri Basımevi, 1994.

Le Corbusier. "Other Icons. The Museums." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 403-407.

Leffler, Melvyn P. "Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: the United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952." The Journal of American History 71 (1985): 807-825.

Leone, Mark P. and Barbara J. Little. "Artifacts as Expressions of Society and Culture. Subversive Genealogy and the Value of History." Museum Studies. An

Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 362-374.

Lewis, Bernard. The Emergence of Modern Turkey. London: Issued under the Auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs Oxford Univ., 1968.

Lewis, Bernard. "The Ottoman Empire and its Aftermath." Journal of Contemporary History 15 (1980): 27-36.

Lieven, Dominic. "Dilemmas of Empire 1850-1918. Power, Territory, Identity." Journal of Contemporary History 34 (1999): 163-200.

Maleuvre, Didier. Museum Memories. History, Technology, Art. California: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Marin, Jean-Yves. "How Europe is Portrayed in Exhibitions." Museum International 53 (2001): 4-7.

Merriman, Nick and Nima Poovaya-Smith. "Making Culturally Diverse Histories." Making Histories in Museums. Ed. Gaynor Kavanagh. London: Leicester University Press, 1996. 176-187.

Milgrim, Michael R. "An Overlooked Problem in Turkish-Russian Relations: The 1878 War Indemnity." International Journal of Middle East Studies 9 (1978): 519-537.

Moran, Joe. "History, Memory and the Everyday." Rethinking History 8 (2004): 51-68.

Murphy, Bernice. "Memory, History and Museums." Museum International 57 (2005): 70-78.

Muzaini, Hamzah and Brenda S.A. Yeoh. "Contesting 'Local' Commemoration of the Second World War: the Case of the Changi Chapel and Museum in Singapore." Australian Geographer 36 (2005): 1-17.

Nettleford, Rex. "Migration, Transmission and Maintenance of the Intangible Heritage." Museum International 56 (2004): 78-83.

Nora, Pierre. "General Introduction: Between Memory and History." Rethinking the French Past of Memory. Volume I: Conflicts and Divisions. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996. 1-20.

Ortaylı, İlber. "Çarlık Rusyası Yönetiminde Kars." Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İktisadi ve Sosyal Değişim – Makaleler 1. Ed. İlber Ortaylı. Ankara: Turhan Kitapevi Yayınları, 2004. 399-415.

Ortaylı, İlber. "18.yy Türk-Rus İlişkileri." Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İktisadi ve Sosyal Değişim – Makaleler 1. Ed. İlber Ortaylı. Ankara: Turhan Kitapevi Yayınları, 2004. 377-386.

Palmer, R.R. and Joel Colton. A History of the Modern World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, 1978.

Paul, Michael C. "The Military Revolution in Russia." The Journal of Military History 68 (2004): 9-45.

Pogosyan, A.M. Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskaya Politicheskaya Istoriya Karsskoy Oblasti (1878-1921). Erevan: Akademiya Nauk Arm. SSR Institut Istorii, 1965.

Potto, Vasili. Kavkazskaya Voyna.C.4. Tsentropoligraf, Moskova, 2006.

Prior, Nick. "Museums: Leisure between State and Distinction." Histories of Leisure. Ed. Rudy Koshar. Oxford: Berg, 2002. 27-44.

Rubinstein, Alvin Z. Soviet Foreign Policy since World War II. Imperial and Global. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992.

Rutland, Peter. "Democracy and Nationalism in Armenia." Europe-Asia Studies 46 (1994): 839-861.

Sand, Jordan. "Monumentalizing the Everyday. The Edo-Tokyo Museum." Critical Asian Studies 33 (2001): 351-378.

Saydam, Abdullah. Kafkasya'da Bağımsızlık Mücadeleleri ve Türkiye. Trabzon: T.C. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Kafkasya ve Orta Asya Ülkeleri Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi, 1993.

Schlereth, Thomas J. "Collecting Ideas and Artifacts. Common Problems of History Museums and History Texts." Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 335- 347.

Scott, Julie. "Mapping the Past: Turkish Cypriot Narratives of Time and Place in the Canbulat Museum, Northern Cyprus." History and Anthropology 13 (2002): 217-230.

Shackley, Myra. "Potential Futures for Robben Island: Shrine, Museum or Theme Park?" International Journal of Heritage Studies 7 (2001): 355-363.

Sharpe, Jim. "History from Below." New Perspectives on History Writing. Ed. Peter Burke. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992. 24-41.

Sherman, Rogoff, 1994

Segal, Rafi. "The Palmach History Museum, Tel Aviv." The Journal of Architecture 8 (2003): 251-263.

Sevük, İsmail Habib. Yurttan Yazılar. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2002.

Tosh, John. The Pursuit of History. New York: Longman, 1991.

Türkdoğan, Orhan. Kars'ta Bir Etnik Grup. Malakanlar'ın Toplumsal Yapısı. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2005.

Walsh, Kevin. The Representation of the Past. Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World. London: Routledge, 1992.

Walsh, Kevin. "Collective Amnesia and the Mediation of Painful Pasts: the Representation of France in the Second World War." International Journal of Heritage Studies 7 (2001): 83-98.

Witcomb, Andrea. Re-Imagining the Museum. Beyond the Mausoleum. London: Routledge, 2003.

Yanıkdağ, Yücel. "Ottoman Prisoners of War in Russia, 1914-22." Journal of Contemporary History 34 (1999): 69-85.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. Birinci Dünya Savaşı ve Ermeni Sorunu. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Forumu, 2002.

Zavriyev, D.S. K Noveyşey İstorii Severo-Vostoçnih Vilayetov Turtsii. Tibilisi, 1947.

Zeyrek, Yunus. "Prof.Dr. Fahrettin Kırzioğlu M. Fahrettin." Türk Kültürü 480 (2003): 129-179.

Zürcher, Erik J. "The Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic: an Attempt at a New Periodization." Die Welt des Islams 32 (1992): 237-253.

Zürcher, Erik J. Turkey. A Modern History. London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd, 2001.