

VISUALIZATION OF CULTURE, HISTORY AND MEMORY IN TURKEY:
MUSEUM POLITICS IN THE POST-1980s

by
Seçil Yılmaz

Submitted to
the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Boğaziçi University
2005

An abstract of the thesis of Seçil Yılmaz for the degree of Master of Arts degree from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History to be taken September 2005

Title: Visualization of Culture, Memory and History:
Museum Politics in the post-1980s Turkey

This thesis explores the museum as an institution of the modern state. It seeks to uncover the transformation in the museum in which the visualization and organization of the information of the past has shaped in Turkey in the post- 1980s. On the one hand, extending beyond the 1980s, the emergence of the modern museum in the nineteenth century is conceptualized as the encyclopedia of the nation building through which its culture and history are represented. On the other hand, the initial practices of the Late Ottoman and Early Republican Era are presented in order to reveal the function of the museum in the power relations. The museum in the modern sense is framed as the public space and the early practices in the Peoples Houses constitutes one of the main axis of this study in order to discuss the publicity in the museum and its function in the building of power relations. The change in the post-1980 context in the museum is examined in effect with the transformation in the concepts of time and space through which the idea of modernity extended in the body of the museum. In this study, the transformation of these basic notions of modernity in the space of museum is basically discussed in terms of the changing representation strategies in the body of the museum by post-1980s. The emergence of private museums, the physical change in the structure of the museum by extending beyond the walls and following a less linear narration and the emergence of multi-cultural representations are put forward as the basic unit of analysis in order to reveal the transforming social space and the politics in the body of the of museum by the post-1980s.

Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Seçil Yılmaz tarafından Eylül 2005'te teslim edilen tezin kısa özeti

Başlık: Kültür, Tarih ve Belleğin Görselleşmesi:
1980 Sonrasında Türkiye'de Müze Politikaları

Bu tez müzeyi modern devletin bir kurumu olarak ele almaktadır. Geçmişin bilgisinin ve organizasyonunun şekillendiği müzenin 1980 sonrasında Türkiye'deki dönüşümünü açıklamayı hedeflemektedir. Bir taraftan 1980 öncesine uzanılarak, ondokuzuncu yüzyılda ortaya çıkan modern müze, ulusal kimliğin tarihinin ve kültürünün temsil edildiği ansiklopedi olarak kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Diğer taraftan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun son döneminin ve erken Cumhuriyet döneminin ilk örnekleri müzenin iktidar ilişkilerinin içindeki yerini açıklayabilmek için sunulabilir. Modern anlamda müze kamusal alan olarak belirlenmekte ve Halkevleri pratikleri çerçevesinde müzedeki kamusal ve bunun iktidar ilişkilerinin kurgulanmasındaki işlevi çalışmanın ana eksenlerinden birini oluşturmaktadır. 1980 sonrası bağlamında müzedeki değişim modernite fikrinin temel kavramları olan zaman ve mekandaki dönüşümle etkileşimli olarak ele alınmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, bu modernitenin temel kavramlarının dönüşümü 1980 sonrasında müze alanında değişen temsiliyet stratejileri olarak incelenmektedir. 1980 sonrasında müzedeki siyasetin ve toplumsal alanın dönüşümünü açıklamakta özel müzelerin açılması, fiziksel olarak müzenin duvarın ötesinde de kurgulanması, çizgisel anlatıya daha az yer vermesi ve müze alanında çokkültürcü temsiliyetlerin ortaya çıkması temel inceleme noktaları olarak ele alınmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my special thanks to my thesis advisor, Nadir Özbek, whose lessons in my first year at the Atatürk Institute developed my theoretical and analytical skills, and who helped me form a consistent body especially by advising a qualified theoretical framework building my thesis.

I am also thankful to Duygu Köksal for her prompting questions, comments and critiques. The perspectives on time and space covered in this thesis were mainly built in effect with hot discussions took place in the course of ATA 592 Topics in the History of the Modern World. I am also grateful to Cengiz Kırılı for his advises and always to-the-point questions in the building of a coherent study.

I must also mention Nur Altınyıldız, whose support was invaluable for me in triggering ideas, indicating the dead-end without hesitation and sharing my enthusiasm in my topic. I am also thankful to Wendy M. K. Shaw, who shared her ideas about the core topics indicated in this study. I am also thankful to Fethiye Erbay and Mutlu Erbay for all their efforts in the search for new resources in order to render this study richer.

I owe much to Tracy Deliismail, who spent much time reading my chapters and shaking me realistically to draw an axis throughout the structure of the thesis. Many thanks go to Kathryn Kranzler for her fastidious editing and always motivating enthusiasm.

I am indebted to Pelin Başaran who read every line with a great effort and always presented her feedback through critical question. I also should thank to Aslı Aydın, Yeliz Dönmez, Cem Bico and Doruk Özdemir beyond the process of my studies at the Atatürk Institute, to create the most valuable reasons to take step in this geography. I am grateful to my colleague Zeynep Aynagöz, who never stopped her support, and all my collegus in the International Relations Office. They are the hidden narrators of this study.

I am thankful to Ferit Öztürk and Burak Gürel for their prompting questions, questions and questions in the essence of being a part of the academia and a human being in the green square (of the South).

In addition, I am indebted to my fellows especially to Özge Ertem, Elif Mahir, Murat Altun, Rober Koptaş, Özkan Akpınar, Hasan Şen, İlker Cörüt, İnanç Özekmekçi, Seda Özdemir and Falma Fhazi and Leyla Abla (Kılıç) at the Atatürk Institute for their invaluable friendship and critical approaches to this study. I must express my special thanks to Burak Gürel who always encouraged me to see the light in the end of the tunnel.

I owe a hundred of thousands thanks to my friends in [laboratuar] Performance Arts Project and Research Laboratory, with whom I shared the most valuable moments of the last two years time in the daily practices of the creation of this study, forcing the meaning of the memory, its body and its space.

Last, but not the least, I thank my nuclear family for their sacrifices and limitless support. I dedicate this study to my grandfather for whom the highways were the geography of memory.

CONTENTS

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION

MUSEUM IN CRISIS: IS THIS THE END OF REPRESENTATION?.....1

II MUSEUM AS AN ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE NATION, CULTURE AND IDENTITY.....12

Entries for Establishment of Nation, Culture and Identity.....14

Public in the Museum: The Peoples Houses and Museum Practices.....28

Between the Unplanned and Planned:
Policy in the Museum in the 1950s and 1960s.....37

III EXHIBITING CULTURE IN TURKEY: AN ANALYSIS FOR THE POST-1980s.....45

Modernity in Crisis, Museum in Crisis.....45

Private in the Museum, Museum in the Private.....56

Cultural Heritage Sites: Re-Mapping Geography of the Memory.....64

Neo-Conservative Memory in Exhibition: Miniaturk.....72

IV CONCLUSION.....89

V BIBLIOGRAPHY.....96

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Istanbul Modern Arts Museum was opened in one of the storehouses which used to function on the coast of Karaköy as storage for incoming industrial spare parts. Called Storehouses Four, it appears as “the other”, in white as the first modern arts museum in Turkey, among the storehouses which continue to function as storage units. Keeping with its post-industrial look, indeed, Istanbul Modern appears to have been designed with the novel perspectives of post-modern museum architecture with flexible space characteristics, specialized education programs for its visitors, a new media space, a library including mainly books and periodicals of the modern arts, a café with a view of Bosphorus and a shop with small souvenirs of the visit. Istanbul Modern can be exemplified as a postmodern museum practice in terms of the patterns followed before, during and after its opening.

The opening of the museum was announced to be open in the mid-February 2005 by the director and main initiator, Oya Eczacıbaşı; however, it had opened on 6 December 2004, two months prior to the announced date, although some parts of it were uncompleted.¹ What is, in fact, interesting about the “timing” of the opening was that Turkey’s EU membership meeting, at which the date for the starting of the membership negotiations would be decided in Brussels, would be held on 17 December 2004. At the opening speech of the museum, Prime Minister of Turkish Republic, R. Tayyip Erdoğan stated that the opening of the museum was a late but an indispensable step in terms of the Turkish modern arts and emphasized that further

¹ “İstanbul Modern Açıldı”, Radikal, 12 December 2004. The Sculpture Garden and the temporary exhibitions were lacking.

steps that would be taken very soon in order to indicate the aspects of Turkish art and culture through the modern ways that the contemporary age required.²

The “timing” of the opening and the approaches in terms of the introduction of a “modern art museum”, in fact, indicated an outlook in terms of how the patterns of identities are constructed at the onset of the preparations of Turkey in the integration to the EU. Imagining the exhibition space as the platform on which the selected story of the basic patterns of a history is narrated, the museum indeed functions as a multilayered social space in which the basic discourses are visualized, as happened in the framework of Istanbul Modern, and it functions as an indicator for the current political agenda throughout the space which is equipped with the visual characteristics of a nation.

The space where the past is represented has had a long journey over the centuries. The idea, in reaching the information of the past, is embodied in collections of many material culture pieces. By the nineteenth century, when ideological and political new structures appeared in the sense of the modern idea, material culture pieces were inserted into newly defined spaces in the form of a public area. The making the concept of citizenship was crystallized in the surface of the museum through the display of material culture.³ Once standing as the media of the upper classes by concentrating the reflection of power in the form of signs and representations, following the French Revolution, the newly structured idea of the making of citizenship appeared in the space of the museum.⁴ On the other hand, the formerly glamorized space by its very upper-class nature, became accessible through

² “İstanbul’da Modern Müze”, *Hürriyet*, 17 December 2004.

³ Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London; New York: Routledge 1995) p. 22 ; Esra Özyürek, “Cumhuriyetle Nikahlanmak: “Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet” ve “Bir Yurttaş Yaratmak” Sergileri” in Esra Özyürek (ed.) *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası* (İstanbul : İletişim, 2001), p. 188 ; Also Sharon Macdonald, “Museums, National, Postnational and Transnational Identities”, *Museum and Society* no.1 (March 2003), p. 2. Also available [online]: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/m&s/mands1.pdf>, March 2003.

⁴ Duncan p. 27.

a new form of regulating mechanism to the working class. The space of museum was identified as a tool of education for the working-classes in the course of this “civilizing culture.”⁵

The objective of this study is to understand how the museum as an institution underwent institutional and phenomenal changes in the post-1980s concentrating on the narration of culture, memory and history. Grounded on these concepts, the main units of analysis will be the museums in the course of which the information of the past and its practices are the basic points. In this sense the art museums, military museums or industry museums will not be included in the extent of this study. In this sense, the main concern will be directed at the changes that came through the period following 1980s. Therefore in the construction of the main frame, it is highly required to analyze the pre-1980s in order to map the basics of the museum practices and introduction of the museum into the politics which dates back to the nineteenth century. All through the basic epistemologies it functions in, such as classifying, ordering and labeling, the museum will be basically examined in the framework of its emergency as the institution of the modernity.

Apart from its structural schema, the inner context is constructed in the museum so as to narrate the outer world through the political, social and cultural directories that the hegemonic power produced and transformed in order to attach the other people in the society.⁶ Hence, in the second chapter of this paper, the onset of museum practices starting from the nineteenth century is traced from the perspectives of the initial function of the museum in representing nation-building patterns and class relations describing the Western European experience in general and

⁵ Jessica Evans, “Introduction to Part Three” in David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) *Representing the Nation: A Reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums* (London, New York: Routledge, 1999) p. 235

⁶ Benedict Anderson, *Hayali Cemaatler : Milliyetçiliğin Kökeni ve Yayılması* (İstanbul ; İletişim Yay.:2004), p. 75.

concentrating on the Ottoman and early Republican eras' experiences in particular. Following the civilizing perspectives inside the museum, the people in the exhibitionary complex in relation to the hegemonic power and its narration will be examined in the framework of social space and public sphere.

What Urry writes, in regard to the museums in the post-1980s, that “what we see in the museum has been transformed.”⁷ I aimed to display this study the transformation of the museum in terms of both physical and contextual conditions in the post-1980s. Indeed, in relation to the shifts in the fundamentals of the modern concepts and their function in the post-1980s, the representation of the material culture and the context through which it is performed appeared to be subjected to a variety of different applications. Therefore, this paper traces the transformation in the body of the museum in two main veins. First, the link between the concepts of the modernity and the museum will be examined so as to analyze the reflections of the globalizing and mostly multicultural approach in the museums of the post-1980s. In this sense, the change in the museum of the postmodern age will be basically examined in the framework of the conversion in the narrator, in the time and in space of the post-1980s museum compared with the museum as we know it in the classical sense. The introduction of the privatization of culture through the philanthropic investments of capital holders, the transformation in the perception of time and the space in the course of the rapid technological effects on these will be the main focus points. Second, the memory practices in the museum in relation to the novel organization of the temporal and spatial in the post-1980s will be traced mainly concentrating on the newest museums constructed in the 1980s era. Departing from these, two main points of this paper aims to map the position of the museum

⁷John Urry, “Gazing On History” in John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (London; Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990), p. 130.

practices through which the technologies of the power and rule of the modern state can be monitored.

The transformation in the spatial and temporal organizations in the late capitalist age is mainly related to the transformation in the mode of production.⁸ Harvey relates these both to the crisis that the capitalism confronted in the mid-1970s; therefore, in order to produce more, according to Harvey, capitalism redesigned the spatial and the temporal.⁹ The organization of time and space, which were embedded in the linear and progressive characteristic of modernity, indicated a turn so that the construction of the temporal and spatial appeared to be designed in the conditions of the fragments of an entirety rather than following the linear and progressive discourse.¹⁰ On the other hand, the acceleration in the sense of the time emerged as another characteristic of the postmodern time. The acceleration in the exchange of the information, product and people reshaped the sense of the temporal and spatial. The turn in the position and role of these basic concepts of the modernity was explained by many as the new form that modernity transferred in order to resist the crisis it confronted.¹¹

The postmodern museum which was set in the conditions of a fragmented and accelerated temporality developed its space in coincidence with these characteristics of the temporal. Hence, the space of the exhibition appeared in distinctive forms than

⁸ Guy Debord, *Gösteri Toplumu ve Yorumlar*; trans. Ayşen Ekmekçi and Okşan Taşkent, (İstanbul : Ayrıntı Yayınları, 1996). pp. 72-83

⁹ David Harvey, *Postmodernliğin Durumu*; trans. Sungur Savran, (İstanbul : Metis Yayınları, 2003). p.22.

¹⁰ Kervin Lee Klein, "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse", *Representations*, 69, (2000). p.128.

¹¹ Sharon Macdonald, "Museums, National, Postnational and Transnational Identities", pp. 4-5 and also Andreas Huyssen, *Alacakaranlık Anıları: Bellek Yitimi Kültüründe Zamanı Belirlemek*. Translated by Kemal Atakay. (İstanbul, Metis Yayınları: 1999), p. 7.

the former styles and mostly appeared to be situated beyond the walls.¹² In the transforming relations of past, present and future, memory practices inside the museum were carried to be set in the old villages, palaces and heritage sites; that is, in the spaces in which basic codes belonging to the past are available. Either situated beyond the walls as in the open air museum practices or in the frame of post-industrial or historical architectures, distinctive management strategies accompanied the flourishing of the museum practices in the post-1980s.

The transformation in the idea of the spatial and temporal appeared to reflect on to the framework of the historical discourse in the form of the implementation of the multiple memory practices of individuals, families and ethnic communities which were embedded in the homogenous and centralized discourses on which the modernity based itself. The outbreak of the linear and progressive mode in the temporal resulted in the revelation of the private and multiple memory practices, basically constructed on the marginalized identity politics.¹³ The flourishing of the memory practices following post-1980s is related mainly to the flexing burdens of the modern idea on the homogenous discourse for the sake of the centralized and unified entities it created. The introduction of the global and the multicultural approach into the politics and the social reinforced the inclusion of the formerly silenced “sub-memories.”

Constructing its discourses on the evidences in the archives, history is mainly defined as formal, objective and certain; whereas memory practices were excluded due to being subjective and informal; therefore it is rendered unreliable. The memory

¹² Richard Sandell, “Social Inclusion, The Museum and the Dynamics of Sectoral Change” in *Museum and Society*, no.1 (March 2003) Also available [online]: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/m&s/mands1.pdf>, (March 2003), p.43.

¹³ Andreas Huyssen, “Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia” in *Public Culture* no: 12-1, (2000), p.27.

practices involved in the historical and cultural studies following 1980s is mainly evaluated as the defeat of the memory of history.¹⁴ According to Nora,

Memory and history, far from being synonymous, appear now to be in fundamental opposition. Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name. It remains permanent evolution; open to dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived. History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer.¹⁵

By the post-1980s the overwhelming flourish in the memory practices brought about the alternative and multiple memories of individuals and subgroups whose experiences were blurred in the course of the homogenous memory tradition. Klein states that “the 1980s we were awash in new historicisms that took memory as a key word”.¹⁶ Indeed, Huyssen examines the memory practices in the period following 1980s as a memory boom due to the temporal crisis that modernity faced.¹⁷ The rapid technological process which transformed the “clock-time” perception into “instantaneous time” led to the breaking of past-present-future imagination.¹⁸ According to Urry, “the future dissolved into the present, that “we want future now” has become emblematic of a panic about the future and a search for an instantaneous gratification.”¹⁹

In the third chapter of this study, grounding the framework on the essences of the transformation in the basic concepts of the modern and the boom in the memory practices with their references to the present-oriented politics, I aim to display three

¹⁴Klein, “On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse”, p.130.

¹⁵ Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire”, Representations 26 (1989). p.8.

¹⁶ Klein, “On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse”, p.127.

¹⁷ Huyssen, Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia, p. 32.

¹⁸ John Urry, Consuming Places. (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 21.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.21.

main issues on the museum practices in the last twenty years in Turkey as the matter of analysis. In the sense of the transformation of the narrator in the museum, the privatization of the museum in the post-1980s will be traced in order to reveal the transforming power relations inside the museum. Basically focusing on the withdrawal of the rigid cultural politics of the state on the right of the exhibition of the narration by the private collection holders in the exhibition space, the emergency of new power relations through the new narrators' perspectives will be the matter of analysis. Examination will be made of the legal allowances in the exhibition of private collections and then by the 1980s the opening of private museums, and the privatization in the museal projects will be analyzed, mainly interrogating the purpose and operation of the private in the museums.

Then, the conservation of the past in these sites will be examined covering the time, space and collective memory aspects in effect with the globalization and multicultural perspectives introduced in the 1980s. These politics and their cultural approaches will be framed in the course of modernity, which appeared to overcome its crisis with the organization of the temporal and spatial, and basically operating through the global and multicultural approaches. In the sense that the existence of the new form of modernity through the globalization process, Dirlik indicates two basic characteristics: first of all, the fragmented nature of newly emerged modernization techniques in order to contain what was left out in the former condition; and second, the survival of the modernity so as to include "a nostalgic embrace of culturalist assumptions about the world which are in fact no longer sustainable."²⁰

Indeed, in addition to the containment of the formerly suppressed ethnic and indigenous identities, one of the most critical perspectives developed in regard to the

²⁰ Arif Dirlik "Modernity as History: Post-Revolutionary China, Globalization and the Question of Modernity." *Social History* 27, no. 1 (2002), p. 23.

collective memory practices in the post-1980s emerged as the revival of the sense and representation of nostalgia. Huyssen, also, indicates that the memory boom and the resistance against the impact of “instantaneous” time resulted in the embracing of nostalgia.²¹ In this sense, the productions and re-productions of the selected past appeared, not necessarily in the museum but in a variety of spaces by inserting the sense of nostalgia into daily life practices. In the search of the forms and memory practices inside the museum, the cultural heritage practices became widespread in the form of the museums without walls. The preservation and conservation of the spaces in which the cultural heritage aspects were revived either through archeological or restoration studies mainly emerged as a new identity-construction project of the multicultural and global effect.²²

In this sense cultural heritage sites through which a sense of nostalgia is inserted, in the space they covered, emerged as the laboratories of the post-1980s modern projects through which the past has been represented and re-produced. Mainly designed as leisure activity sites, cultural heritage sites have also emerged as typical spheres in which cultural management techniques have been applied in the post-1980s. In the course of these, the problematic of the commodification and marketing of the past through the exhibitionary complex have appeared as other aspects that the post-1980s museal projects have introduced.

Urry states that “the effect of this commodification of history systematically distorts attention from present, from contemporary polarization and conflicts.”²³ Basically stated as a resistance in order to overcome the new temporal conditions of the modernity, it is stated that the cultural heritage sites and the theme parks

²¹ Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia*, p. 31.

²² Kevin Walsh, *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Postmodern World*, (London: New York: Routledge, 1992) p. 148.

²³ John Urry, *Consuming Places*, p. 157.

reproduced on the nostalgic remembrance of the past from which pain has been removed.²⁴ Basically constructed the aura of which conflicts and struggles are filtered, the heritage sites and the theme parks may be examined as the commodified and un-contextualized mapping of the past.

Another point that I aim to display in this paper is the technologies of rule and power stemmed in the body of the museal projects which will be revealed in the course of privatization, commodification of the past images through the package of nostalgia, which is mainly defined as the distorted image of the past of which social context filtered.²⁵ In this sense, the conservative politics of the post-1980s through the identity politics constructed on the present-oriented nostalgia applications will be the unit of analysis. Marshall states that “monuments and heritage sites are meant to be visited; they are designed for the visitor, including the foreign visitor, the traveler of the tourist. Monuments and heritage sites are thus a vehicle for nation-building, for constructing a new identity, and presenting this identity to the outside.”²⁶ Departing from the example of Miniaturk, which is constructed as a theme park exhibiting miniaturized historical and architectural pieces selected from a wide geography of memory, the approach of the conservatives to the identity politics in the age of multiculturalism and globalism in effect with the tourism will be analyzed to be placed these in the framework of museum studies.

This study aims to indicate the changing projection of the museum practices in coincidence with the shifting approaches of the modernity by mid-1970s. Set as the cultural space in which the people are cultivated through the norms of the middle-

²⁴ David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*. (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985). p.8.

²⁵ John Urry, *Consuming Places*, 218.

²⁶ Sabine Marschall, “Post-apartheid Monuments: The Visual Representation of Heritage and Cultural Tourism” in *Tourism and Postcolonialism : Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations* C. Michael Hall & Hazel Tucker (eds). (London; New York, NY: Routledge, 2004) p. 97.

class politics and culture, the function of the museum space in the age of high capitalism evolved in the course of shifting technologies of cultivation of the mass. In the age of culturalism through which the logic of late capitalism is discussed to be operated,²⁷ the space of the museum appeared to be evolved beyond the narrations of the universal collections; and rather it is fragmented among a variety of channels of narrations. In this sense, in the framework of this study, the possibility of understanding the museum space as a liberating practice overcoming the de-contextualizing and commodifying practices will be examined regarding the neo-conservative politics and liberal capitalist condition of the free market.

²⁷ Frederic Jameson, "Post Modernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" *New Left Review*, no. 146 (1984), pp. 53-92.

CHAPTER 2

MUSEUM AS ENCYCLOPEDIA OF NATION, CULTURE AND IDENTITY

The introduction of public museum dates back to the early nineteenth century in Europe. The Louvre Museum in Paris opened in 1793 is accepted by many²⁸ as the first public art museum. The characteristic of the Louvre is articulated as the transformation of a king's palace into the palace of the public. The transfer in the political and social structure of the space in general; the visualization of culture in the museum space within the early techniques of ordering in particular, brought about by the social scientists of the museum as the unit of analysis for the construction of the idea of modernity, nation and identity.

Özyürek²⁹ mentions that the difference between museum and exhibition is similar to difference between encyclopedia and newspaper. Whereas in the newspaper one can refer to the discussion on the current agenda of society, the encyclopedia includes the very fundamental definitions in regard to a nation's identity and culture through memory practices enacted in it.

This chapter examines the writing of an encyclopedia in general through the theorizing of museal projects, and in particular following the museal projects in Turkey in the experiences of the Late Ottoman and Turkish Republic eras. Although the Late Ottoman era and that of the Turkish Republic differed in the sense of basic ideological practices and politics, there were a plenty of continuities, basically rooted

²⁸ Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London; New York: Routledge1995) p. 21.

²⁹Esra Özyürek, "Cumhuriyetle Nikahlanmak: "Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet" ve "Bir Yurttaş Yaratmak" Sergileri" in Esra Özyürek (ed.) *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası* (İstanbul : İletişim, 2001), p. 188.

in the idea of modernization. Hence, one of the objectives in putting forward the examination of museum practices in those periods is to analyze the similarities and the differences that were applied in the functioning of the museum where the cultural identity, power politics and memory practices are articulated through the exhibition of material culture.

In regard to the period to be covered in this chapter, a wide range of time spheres will be examined in order to map the general framework of the museum. In this sense, Madran and Önal examine the periodization of museal practices in Turkey in five periods. According to this periodization the initial steps took between 1840 and 1880. Following this period is the age of Osman Hamdi, pioneering archeologist, between 1880-1910, the Early Republican Era between 1920-1950; naming the period of political transformation between 1960 and the mid-1970s, cultural transformation period in the 1980s, and last the multicultural transformation period starting from the 1990s until now.³⁰ It is no accident that the time spheres defined are coincident with the basic political, economic and social processes that have been experienced. In this sense, museum politics are easily said to follow these processes and include the new definitions that shade them.

The museum will be examined in this chapter from three perspectives. Initially, the museum as the main definitive storage area where material culture is stored will be traced in the framework of nation and the construction of national identity. The organization of the space where national identity and its codes are stored brings about the ideology, its techniques and its language articulated in that space. In this

³⁰ Burçak Madran Şebnem Önal, “Yerellikten Küreselliğe Uzanan Çizgide Tarihin Çok Paylaşımli Vitrinleri: Müzelere ve Sunumları” in Zeynel Abidin Kızılyaprak (ed.) *Müzecilikte Yeni Yaklaşımlar : Küreselleşme ve Yerelleşme: Üçüncü Uluslararası Tarih Kongresi, Tarih Yazımı ve Müzecilikte Yeni Yaklaşımlar: Küreselleşme ve Yerelleşme* (İstanbul : Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 2000) p. 173.

sense, as the institution of modernity, the museum will be analyzed through the Late Ottoman and Republican Turkey experiences within the major argument on modernization practices and its politics. Second, in relation to the social perspective of the museum, it will be examined the position of the public in the organization of the nation's representation and the museum. Mainly inspired from the arguments by museum as a social space; it will be argued the public in the audience and the actor in the space. Last, the museum will be analyzed from the perspective of the cultural policies which were enacted on them through various legal issues which were invented as tools of periodic political acts on the way to the legitimization of ideological control mechanisms on society. The museum in the framework of nation, public sphere and cultural policy stands as one of the most coded spaces rooting from its performative and visual characteristics.

Entries for Establishment of Nation, Culture and Identity

The introduction of the public museum into the cultural sphere of society is related fundamentally to politics and economics. The early nineteenth century, with the introduction of modern bourgeoisie state techniques, the visualization of culture in the form of displaying of material cultural pieces in space, is mentioned as the birth of museum in Europe.³¹ Basically, the techniques of modernity applied in the early museums regulated the inner organization of space through collecting pieces, classifying them, categorizing and then representing them. As explained by Sherman and Rogoff, “while seemingly representing objectively and empirically located contexts for the objects it displays, [museum] actually participates in the construction

³¹ Tony Bennett, *The Birth of The Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London; New York: Routledge,1995), p.23

of the[se] categories and numerous internal shifts and differentiations they are held to contain.”³² There are many arguments produced in the nature of the categorizing and display of this inner text and its political implications. In the framework of these arguments, two basic points will receive focus: Initially, how the discourse of nation and power are constructed through these categories and second how the public takes place in the regard to this discourse.³³

The frames of newly “imagined communities” in the sense of Anderson³⁴ are subjected to the categories and ordering principles, taken in consideration of linear narration and progressive understanding. The political and theoretical framework of the construction of a national and autonomized past of the imagined community is closely related to those of modernity and its progressive and evolutionary history. In this sense, the natural science museums and the archeology studies were spread widely at the onset of the nineteenth century. In terms of the natural history collections, the idea was to collect and classify the species in nature so that it would be possible to analyze the principles of progress in the Darwinian sense and set the reference points in regard to the developmental idea.

In a parallel sense, the need for archeological search was mainly affected by the motivation to investigate the civilization of antiquity so that the evolutionary and developmental understandings of the present imperial idea in Europe would be laid on the basis of the Greek and Roman heritage. The adoption of those in search of the knowledge of the past with the tools of archeology developed within the imperial motives of the European powers. The framing of national identity by connecting its origin in the context of antiquity provided those powers with the proper instruments

³² Daniel J. Sherman and Irit Rogoff, *Museum Culture : Histories, Discourses, Spectacles* (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, c1994) p. xi.

³³ Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p. 24 ve Macdonald, “Museums, National, Postnational and Transnational Identities”, p. 4.

³⁴ Anderson, *Hayali Cemaatler : Milliyetçiliğin Kökeni ve Yayılması*, (İstanbul ; İletişim Yay:2004)

for legitimizing their current politics which were laid on the progressive and developmental ideas. As mentioned by Shaw, the new mapping of the world through newly remembered schematics and former names of the region where those antique civilizations had been located, as in the example of remembering the name of Mesopotamia which was in fact the Greek name for the region, reflected the ideological approach of the imperial powers.³⁵

In the range of the construction of the imperial narration, the accumulation of the vast antique materials was transferred in the European museums at the onset of the nineteenth century. The audiences, that is, both the state and the masses, were presented those origins, the linear path extending to the present and pointing a future imagination through the concepts of civilization, backwardness and development.³⁶ Hence, this type of the construction of the imagination of the past stood as the self-legitimizing composition of the imperial power politics. That is, the linear line assumed to exist through the developmental line of world history, the civilizations and the communities were placed in order to their level of developedness taking into consideration the criteria that were in agreement with the idea of capitalist development models and their political tools.

Briefly, the birth of the museum in Europe, basically, flourished with the motivation of the setting of the new frames of the newly imagined community idea that would contribute its past so as to differentiate it from its dynastical background by reinforcing the imperial idea and also, to provide the adoption of the principles of the modern idea in the sense of progress and development as a legitimizing tool for the new techniques of bourgeoisie state mechanisms.

³⁵ Wendy M.K. Shaw, *Osmanlı Müzeciliği: Müzeler, Arkeoloji ve Tarihin Görselleştirilmesi*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yay.:2004).

³⁶ Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p. 179.

In the emergence of the museum in the late Ottoman Empire, there may be two basic approaches so as to understand the main tendencies: the politics of Westernization in the form of inserting modern institutions in the newly constructed legal and administrative system on the one hand; on the other hand, the politics in realizing a centralized and unified Ottoman identity. In this sense, the tradition of the collection of unique material pieces dating back to the fifteenth century; that is to the reign of Mehmet II³⁷, by the middle of nineteenth century turned into a modern institutional practice. However, in the sense of adopting the museal techniques and their fundamental ideologies, it appears that the Ottoman museum practice was applied in order to articulate a distinctive problematic of the age and emphasize the specific ongoing politics in the first examples.

The first museum practice in the late Ottoman period in the modern sense was emerged as a weapons collection exhibition at St. Irene, which is located in the outer courtyard of Topkapı Palace.³⁸ As mentioned in the study of Shaw, the collection was presented as weapons ranging from the oldest war models up to the mid-nineteenth century modern ones used by the Ottoman army. In the following exhibition, the museum administrators presented the models of the Janissaries as the former actors of the Ottoman army.³⁹ It is possible to interpret the tendency in these examples so that the point was to come up with the glorious image of the Ottoman army and power in order to cope with the current defeats and vulnerable politics at the inter-state level. These two initial examples, also, indicate that the idea in the visualization of past figures in the late Ottoman political atmosphere was required to

³⁷ Shaw, *Osmanlı Müzeciliği*, p.43.

³⁸ Sümer Atasoy "Türkiye'de Müzecilik" in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yay, 1996), p.1467.

³⁹ Shaw, p. 57.

be used to interfere with the daily politics and create an inter-state negotiation rather than construct a national identity through material culture.

However, with the studies following those, the discourse of installing national identity and legitimizing its power through the constructed narration became more apparent. When it is come to 1877, The Imperial Museum, which was formerly called as *Mecmua-i Asar-i Atika* (1869) and mainly limited to the archeological heritage of the Greek-Byzantine era, was opened instead of the weapons collection. As mentioned by Shaw, it was not a coincidence that there was a tendency in concentrating on antiquity and its heritages in the historical period in which the Ottomans confronted quite vulnerable experiences in terms of internal politics mainly dominated by the nationalist movements in the peripheral territories and the unsuccessful military wing in confronting them.⁴⁰

The necessity of the introduction of an Ottoman identity which would provide the unity of the territories, basically, aimed to be made up with the call for the collection of the pieces around the center under one institution.⁴¹ Hence, it would be possible to visualize a multiplicity of pieces all around the territories in the same “volume of the encyclopedia” with the proper techniques of ordering and representing so as to create a central unique story. In fact, the idea of the centralization of the power in the capital was not new; however, it was the first moment that the reflection of this idea was expressed in the form of cultural and historical material. On the other hand, as analyzed by Shaw, it was even the place of the new Imperial Museum building located at the center with the most crucial state

⁴⁰ Ibid., p.58.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 103.

offices near, that might be evaluated as an indicator of how the state politics were in confluence with the idea of centralizing and self-monitoring power politics.⁴²

In addition to the museal aspect of centralization, the laws enacted with the pioneering of Osman Hamdi, the administrator of the Imperial Museum in the 1880s, reinforced the *centralization* of the archeological pieces in the center. Osman Hamdi, one of the most significant figures among the late Ottoman era intellectuals, had a deep impact on the museum and archeology studies in the Ottoman Empire in the modern sense. Apart from the acceleration of archeological research in Anatolia, the organization and sustainability of the Imperial Museum was realized by Osman Hamdi. Simultaneously, the framework of laws enacted about the research, commerce and transfer of archeological pieces were regulated in agreement with the centralizing politics with his initiative.⁴³ Hence, examined in the frame of private property relations, the legal regulation of the pieces underwent basic changes from 1869 to 1884 in three steps. Whereas the initial legal principles allowed private enterprise to search for archeological artefacts, the owning of pieces and transfer them abroad, the 1884 regulation indicates an abrupt change and, as mentioned by Kılıç,⁴⁴ and introduced a rigid state politics on the controlling of the domestic trade of historical pieces. Hence, in the late Ottoman era, neglecting the initial exhibition practices, the motivation in the construction of a single national discourse also was performed in the body of museal projects in the form of centralizing the pieces in the same space and controlling the mobility and private property rights regarding them.

⁴² Ibid., pp.120-121.

⁴³ Madran and Önal, p. 180.

⁴⁴ Füsun Kılıç, “Beş Yıllık Kakılınma Planları ve İcrasında Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzelerin Değerlendirilmesi”, in “4. Müzecilik Semineri : Bildiriler 16 - 18 Eylül 1998. (İstanbul : Askeri Müze, 1998), p.22.

Examining the arguments on this era, Madran and Önal⁴⁵ write that the collection of all the pieces in Istanbul aimed at rendering of the culture and identity in a single framework. In this framework, the museum practice as a modern practice in the Ottoman era, presented the application of collecting and classifying methods on the archeological pieces, and distinctive form the former exhibition in which the time and space comprehensions were ignored,⁴⁶ the Imperial Museum was designed in agreement with the organization principles of the modern museum. The centralization idea of not only the pieces themselves, but also the concentration of those in the sense of legal practices indicated that the visualization of cultural practices turned out to be a significant issue in state politics.

The museum practices in the early Republican era brought about evidenced continuities with the Ottoman practices, as well as, there followed quite distinctive methods in the museum space and its negotiation with the audiences and the actors. The most significant aspect is that whereas the function of the museum was not perceived as a tool for the education of the masses in the Ottoman practice,⁴⁷ originating from the overall public policies of the early Republican era, the museums were categorized as one of the most significant spaces for the conduction of national identity through educative tools.

There are three points which the general museum politics in the early Republican era might be examined: the politics of aesthetics on the former period's heritage, the invention of the new tradition and the activities of defining those, and lastly, distribution of those new methods and mechanisms through various administrative and public bodies. In this case would be the Museum and Exhibition Branch of the Peoples' Houses.

⁴⁵ Madran and Önal, p. 181.

⁴⁶ Shaw, p. 265.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p.16.

It is put by Madran and Önal that the most significant point in the early Republican era that it is distinctive from the motivation of centralizing the national identity within the museum space in the Ottoman practice. In this period it was the distribution of the cultural identity within the context of the museums aiming at the widening of the consciousness of being a nation.⁴⁸ Below it will be put forwarded that rather than distributing, the museum practices in this period were also a project of concentrating the national identity and cultural capital in the center.

In regard to the initiation of museum practices in this period, the first step was taken in asserting the conversion of Topkapı Palace and the Mevlevihane in Konya into national museums on the 3 March 1924, the date of the legal overthrow of Ottoman dynasty. Contrary to what is claimed by Madran and Önal, in regard to erasing the Ottoman past memories through the conversion of the palace into a museum open to public,⁴⁹ Shaw emphasizes that this conversion of the palace had already been initiated during the former period.⁵⁰ It is certain that the decision of conversion originated from distinct motivations. Whereas the idea in the former period had been to frame the private space which had been the ground of many centuries of hegemony in the glorious memory of the dynasty, the idea in the later period was to turn this private space into a public space. At this point, it is important to put forward, as mentioned by Altınyıldız⁵¹ the memory practices on the surface of the space in the period of the early Republican era were mainly traced the practices of forgetting.

⁴⁸ Madran and Önal, p. 181.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 178.

⁵⁰ Shaw, p. 34.

⁵¹ Nur Altınyıldız, "İmparatorlukla Cumhuriyet Arasındaki Eşikte Siyaset ve Mimarlık", in Murat Belge (ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2004), pp.179-187.

The significant characteristic of Topkapi and the Mevlenihane was that each stood as an icon that the Republican ideology opposed fundamentally. That is; the palace represents the glorious Ottoman pasts and the Mevlevihane stood for the rooted religious practice. The conversion of the both spaces into museums, in fact, can be considered in the frame of politics of aesthetics; that is, rendering those unrooted from their original codes and setting them as pieces of aesthetic. By doing so, those rendered as the “other” in the context of the new system and the distancing of their former codes from the current memory and power relations were realized. Second, new memory sites were invented in the new geography of the Republican regard to construct the knowledge of the historical past. Ankara as the new capital city, where all the political and ideological tools of the new regime concentrated, stood as the major conflicting figure against the memories that Istanbul embed. Hence, it was Ankara where the initial museum practices were realized on the way to create the “encyclopedia” for the new nation.

The dominant tendency in the emergence of the encyclopedia was the search of origins of the Turkish nation in the framework of the antique Anatolian civilizations. The main issue in the search for the origins and the creation of the entire narration of the Turks in Anatolia emerged as the connecting origins of these old civilizations linking the ancient Turks as their ancestors. The early Republican ideology of history; that is, the Turkish History Thesis, adopted mainly modern approaches in the search for these origins such as deepening archeological searches in the peripheral regions.

The archeological studies were mainly based on the search for the pre-Ottoman and the pre-Islamic civilizations that had existed in Anatolia in the early Republican era Turkey. The theoretical basis on which that these studies laid on were basically

the nationalist historiography approaches, i.e., the Turkish History Thesis. The basic objective set in the framework of the nationalist historiography is that the historical existence of the Turks in Anatolia dated back to ancient civilizations. Particularly, the narration was focused on the organic links between the Hittites and the Turks. According to this theory, the Hittites, one of the greatest ancient civilizations to have existed in Anatolia, were the ancestors of the Turks migrated from Central Asia.⁵² Hence, in the sense of Smith's "golden age" imagination of a nation-building process,⁵³ the early Republican era nationalist historiography laid its basis on the past of Hittites. In the framework of the "golden age" imagination, the Turks were described as the developed nations universally in the sense that their contribution to the crucial inventions such as in the way to the progress of civilization that affected human history in the world.⁵⁴ The Turkish history thesis, in the sense of time and space, the construction of which basic point is to create a chronological, linear and deterministic view within the relation of a cause-effect paradigm, exemplifies a modern historiography methodology.

The accelerated studies on the Hittites resulted in the history publications and the visits of many researchers from Europe.⁵⁵ The excavations and published studies in regard to the archeological and anthropological history of Anatolia was turned into a three dimensional narration⁵⁶ with the introduction of the first archeological museum practice of the early Republican government in Ankara in 1923.⁵⁷ It is no

⁵² Sefa Şimşek "Bir İdeolojik Seferberlik Deneyimi : Halkevleri 1932-1951" (İstanbul : Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2002) , p.154.

⁵³ Anthony Smith, "History and Modernity: Reflections on the Theory of Nationalism" in Boswell, David and Evans, Jessica (ed.) "Representing the Nation: A Reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums" (London, New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 48

⁵⁴ Sefa Şimşek, *Bir İdeolojik Seferberlik Deneyimi :Halkevleri 1932-1951*, p. 154-155.

⁵⁵ Atasoy "Türkiye'de Müzecilik", p.1467.

⁵⁶ Aslı Gür "Üç Boyutlu Öyküler: Türkiyeli Ziyaretçilerin Gözünden Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi ve Temsil Ettiği Ulusal Kimlik" in Esra Özyürek (ed) *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), p.220

⁵⁷ Atasoy, p. 1464.

coincidence that the first museum founded in Ankara was entitled to Hittites Museum. The museum emerged in the *Mahmut Paşa Bedesteni* (covered market) (1464-1471) including the initial archeological objects found in the early excavations. The museum was soon renamed the Ankara Archeological Museum and, by 1967, since the content of the narration included pieces other than those that belonged to Hittites past in Anatolia, such as the Neolithic Age or the Phrygia period in Anatolia, the name was changed to Anatolian Civilization Museum in 1967.

Having neglected the shift in the name of the museum for a moment, the initial period that it was introduced is indicated by Gür⁵⁸ so that apart from the position of the museum functioning as a tool in order to legitimize the existence of Turks in Anatolia, it should be imagined as a part of the project in which the formulations of a national description were sought to be established to put forward the homogenous Turkish culture. Clearly, originating within the perspective of nationalist historiography and its methods, the museum operated as the construction of the unique narration founded on the linear and chronological perspective, narrating the past of the Turks in Anatolia. In this sense, while the ideology of the government was supporting its legitimate existence through the legitimate existence of the Turks in Anatolia, the hegemonic cultural codes were inserted in the structure of homogenous cultural forms through the Hittite models and the constructed memory practices of the Hittites.

The shift in the name and in the content of the first and the most inclusive archeological museum in Turkey indicates that there was a change in the perception of archeological research and the theory on which it was based through the 1930s to the 1970s. That is, the search for the evidences that would legitimize the eternal

⁵⁸ Gür, “Üç Boyutlu Öyküler”, p.220

connection of the Turks and Anatolia through the Hittites past. Gür argues that the cultural policy and the political ideology based on the idea of the Hittites as the descendants of the Turks was changed with the time and in the 1970s the national identity which was adjusted on the national territory resulted in the change in the name and the memory practices enacted in the museum.⁵⁹

The modern museums focused on the natural history or archeological museums within the interrogation of the progressive history of the world, mainly originated from imperialist politics. In the late Ottoman era and early Republican period, the archeological museums come into sight as the main issue in the projects of the government. Apart from the archeological museum established by the early Republic, the Ethnography Museum, located in the *Namazgah* region of Ankara which had been a Muslim district, was initiated as one of the first museal practices in 1925.⁶⁰ The museum was not established in an old building as in the example of the Hittite Museum, but as in the example of Imperial Museum in the Ottoman period, a new space was proposed to be constructed. The architectural project was designed by Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu, and in the sense that it was planned within a special context of being a museum; it is an example of the national architecture school.⁶¹

The first museum building of the Turkish Republic requires analysis in the term that rather than inserting the past knowledge and the narration of the past in its space, the museum was laid on the basis of cultural practice aspects mapping the contemporary and daily habits of the people living in the rural areas rather than the urban dwellers. As noted by Arık, "...ethnographic object was not used in the urban centers. Rather, it is widely used in the rural areas of the country where the old

⁵⁹ Gür, p. 221.

⁶⁰ Atasoy, p. 1465.

⁶¹ Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası : Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür*, (İstanbul : Metis Yayınları ; 2002), p.56.

culture and traditions were alive and making up the large part of the daily practices.”⁶² In this sense, apart from the Turkish artefacts from the Seljuk period to the present, folk attire, ornaments, clogs and shoe examples, local Sivas women's and men's clothes and accesories and all samples of traditional Turkish (folk) handicrafts were put on display in the museum.⁶³

The cultural objects that belong to Anatolian rural life had been collected mainly from the close religious centers around Anatolia.⁶⁴ Rather than referring to the knowledge of the past, the basis of the narration established through these objects provided the contemporary daily life practice indications in respect to how Turkish society lived and practiced their daily lives, how people dressed and what they produced. The initial visual album on culture was established on the practices based on the memory of the society through their daily life tools on the basis of tradition which was mainly conceptualized through rural Anatolia. In this sense, it is clear that the ideology and cultural politics stemmed in the early Republican era sought the conceptualization of cultural practices in the framework of territorial approaches so that the inclusion of a wider geography in the mapping of homogenous cultural construction would be possible. The insertion of “live objects” in the body of the museum appears to be a way to introduce the “present” of the Anatolian population in the visual of the museum.

Thinking of the archeological and the ethnographical museums as the initial steps of in the early Republican era practices in the field of visualizing the nation and culture, it is clear that the newly constructed government and its nationalist ideology were inserted in the body of the museum with the linear and theological time

⁶² Remzi Oğuz Arık, *Halkevlerinde Müze, Tarih ve Folklor Çalışmaları Kılavuzu* (Ankara:C. H. P. Halkevleri Yayınları, 1947), p.21.

⁶³ www.kulturturizm.gov.tr

⁶⁴ Madran and Önal, p. 183.

conception that paves the way for a constructed past and appealed to the future imagination.

Thus, in the early Republican era, mainly in the period when the Republican Peoples Party (RPP) was in power as the single party, the position of the museum and the exhibition branch played crucial roles in terms of the accumulation of the pieces. The acceleration in the collection of that large number of pieces was evaluated by Hasan Ali Yücel, basically, as the achievement of Republican regime.⁶⁵ In his speech in the First Congress of the Advisory Committee for Antique Pieces, Yücel determined the progress in the creation of many national museums with numbered pieces as the indication of the Republican regime's approach to the museum. In this sense, the comparison of the collected pieces and the constructed museums were expressed as the superiority of the Republican regime over the late Ottoman politics in terms of the creation and preservation of the national identity. Yücel, emphasizing the amount archived between 1880-1923 and 1923-1943 aimed to connect the importance given to the national existence through the collection and preservation of those archeological pieces which were perceived as the significant representatives of the national existence.⁶⁶

The general framework in the Republican era museum practices focused on the two main issues: the establishment of the relationship of the geography and the citizens living on it through historical ties legitimizing their eternal existence in agreement with the archeological and anthropological "invented" explanations, and, the representation of the new nation and its citizens within their cultural characteristics. In addition, the museum practices in this period also implemented the

⁶⁵ Atasoy, p.1468.

⁶⁶ Yücel mentions that whereas the collected pieces in the age of Osman Hamdi until the introduction of the Republican regime was 109.000, in the twenty years following 1923 this number was increased to 759.000. in Atasoy, "Türkiye'de Müzecilik", p. 1467.

idea of setting up the concept of “golden age”⁶⁷ thoughts that would undermine the memory codes of Ottoman sovereignty and their practices. Hence, within the framework of the Turkish History Thesis, the linear narration of the Turks in Anatolia was inserted in the space of the museum.

The Public in the Museum and Museum Practices in the Peoples Houses

The museum emerged as the stage on which the fundamental definitions in regard to national existence and its reflection in the form of material culture were displayed from the nineteenth century and onwards. The museum became the sphere in which the bourgeoisie state practices regulated its representational entries in order to raise the historical expression of the ideology it presented through archeological and natural history studies in the museum, in addition to the appearance of art pieces in public art museums. It is clear that the main issue that differentiated the process of the museum within the framework the bourgeoisie political practices was the position of the public in the body and in the narration of the museum.

The preservation and display of the artistic and historical pieces were attributed ritual ceremonial characteristic in antiquity. The cultural capital accumulated in the body of those pieces functioned as the holistic items. Hence, in the course of history, the ruler, the church and the upper classes who were keeping those items in their private realm rose as the focal point of cultural power in the society.⁶⁸ The situation

⁶⁷ Anthony Smith, “History and Modernity: Reflections on the Theory of Nationalism” p. 49.

⁶⁸ Henrietta Lidchi, “Poetics and Politics of Exhibiting Other Cultures” in (ed) Stuart Hall, “Representation : Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices”, (London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage, 1997) p.

of being visible to the power itself but to the masses rendered them more unique and the focus of the representation of the power in the framed ceremonial space.

It was the conversion of the space from the private realm into a publicized space with the introduction of modern state practices. The ideology of the bourgeoisie state practices that emerged in the nineteenth century widely differed in the sense that the representation of power converted its techniques. That is, the holistic nature of the pieces and the exhibition transferred from the private realm of the ruler to the buildings that were organized according to the ordering principles that the modern idea presents. The openness of the pieces in the larger areas to the public emerged as the fundamental politics of the bourgeoisie on the way to the negation of the former politics of the *ancien regime*.

The conversion of the space, as described by Duncan,⁶⁹ also, reflected the meaning of the objects; that is, the material is also assigned with a new symbolic meaning. Through the new symbolic meaning of the material exhibited, it is suggested that it acts as “a mediator between the individual as a citizen and the state as the benefactor.”⁷⁰ Hence the conversion affecting the role of the each part brought about a new method for negotiation. The epistemology of the negotiation revealed the power politics it included and the techniques it introduced in the framework of the conversion of the space and the meaning in it.

In that sense, the main objective of the bourgeoisie practices emerged as the reflection of the regulating and reordering practices inside the museum. Having defined the former applications as disordered and uncategorized,⁷¹ the sphere of the museum as a structure adopted the collecting, classifying, labeling and representing principles introduced by the idea of modernity. Those principles and their interaction

⁶⁹Duncan , p.26

⁷⁰ Ibid., p.72.

⁷¹ Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p.23

within the publicized museum sphere resulted in the articulations of the arguments in regard to the nature of the museum and the politics placed in between the power and the people.

First of all, the issue of governmental techniques inside the museum stands out as one of the most significant in regard to power politics in the nineteenth century museum up to the late twentieth century. Foucault writes that the “instrument of government instead of being laws, now come to be a range of multiform tactics”⁷² through which the function of the museum as a cultural space was included as some part of those tactics. The representation of power in nineteenth century is analyzed by the Foucauldian perspective within the framework of the self-declaration of the power by turning those tactics into the confinement of the social body as it was exemplified in the course the prison, the mental clinic and the asylum. Hence, Foucault categorizes the museums as a confinement tool of disciplinary society in which the surveillance mechanism is adapted to the very foundation of the idea of museum.⁷³

Mainly originating from the power-knowledge relationships established by the same perspective, the inner organization of the museum is analyzed as the establishment of a surveillance system whereby the masses are fragmented, dispersed and individualized under the power. In this sense, it is put forwarded that the regulation of the masses by the power is realized in the course of the disciplinary channels in the frame of the time-space designation, worked out in the lines where the pieces are displayed physically and the linear narration inserted into the context. Following those channels, in the Foucauldian sense, the masses are transferred into a governable populace in the publicized sphere.

⁷² Ibid., p. 38.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 65.

As a critique of the Foucauldian perspective in regard to the confinement of the public in the body of the museum, it is put forward that, on the contrary, the museum came as a unique example of the opening of the doors in an age of confinement in the examples of the prison and the asylum.⁷⁴ In this sense, Bennett, not sharing the approach of the categorization of museum as a confinement apparatus, introduces the Gramscian perspective of the modern state according which the museums are seen as a public sphere in which governmentality is traced by the construction of a social space. Thus, against the surveillance analysis of Foucault, it is argued that the inner organization and the reordering of things are related to both surveillance and to the spectacle of the populace. Accordingly, it is put forward that the position of the masses is not fragmented and lacking of collective entity, but instead, the mechanism of self-regulating of the visitors is emphasized, which is rendered possible by seeing the power and to be seen at once.

Thus, second, the educative point of the modern state conception of Gramsci provides Bennett with the explanation of a new form of museums as the education and culture imposition apparatus of the bourgeoisie so that by showing and telling about itself, that is, by rendering itself not only a spectacle but also something that can be seen.⁷⁵ The point of departure is that the introduction of bourgeoisie power not only was established by rendering the most visible representation of the former period, such as the penalty forms, invisible, but also by declaring its power visible to the rest of the populace. This bears two significant results; firstly there emerges a public sphere in the Habermasian respect constructing the public realm as a unique sphere eliminating the distinctive characteristics of the participants, and second, this

⁷⁴ Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner. "Introduction." *In Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, edited by Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley and Sherry B. Ortner, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994) p. 10.

⁷⁵Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p. 73.

public sphere is established with the differentiation of the population, as against what Habermas offers.

The conversion of the space into a public realm is also pointed out by Duncan as the introduction of the idea of equality in principle. Thus, Duncan theorizes the new realm of the museum as the equally entered area and “finding a culture that unites with the other citizens, regardless of their individual position.”⁷⁶ In this sense, it is put a spatial of Habermasian perspective is put forward in which the equal negotiations are realized.⁷⁷ However, “in practice museums rather than functioning as institutions of homogenization, as reforming thought envisaged, have continued to play a significant role in differentiating the elite from the popular social classes.”⁷⁸ Whereas Bennett constructs the public sphere of museums as an education apparatus of the current bourgeoisie society in imposing its own cultural and moral practices to the working class and providing the tools for the latter in realizing its self-improvement; it is clear that the construction of the sphere does not coincide with the Habermasian position to which the public sphere is design as spatial in which the people participates without their own practices or clothes.⁷⁹ Hence, the class conflict in the museum is kept alive through the bourgeoisie hegemony in the narration and the educative position.

It has been argued that as the cultural apparatus of the bourgeoisie in penetrating the populace, contrary to what Foucault says, the museums should be examined within the democratic public sphere characteristics in which power tells about it so that the consent of the masses is adopted as the one of the main issue of the

⁷⁶ Duncan, p. 35.

⁷⁷ Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p. 72.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p.68.

⁷⁹ Geoff Eley, "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century.", in Craig Calhoun (ed) "Habermas and the Public Sphere", (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1996), pp.289-339.

hegemony of that class.⁸⁰ Hence, the bourgeoisie as the normative and naturalized element creates the discourse of everydayness and its practices in two ways: selectivity of the memory practices those serve to the visualization of the present forms and education on the one hand; on the other hand, it provides the transfer of the elements which do not coincide with the present forms.

In this regard, the governmental techniques inserted in the museum practices in Turkey bring about the interrogation of the public and the realm of the public in the surface of the museum. In the early examples of the Republican regime, basically, in terms of the public sphere was designed and the educative state model was produced through the space of the museum and exhibition branch of the People Houses. The museum and exhibition branch will be examined as the case in terms of how the participator and equal body of the public appeared in the museum.

The museum practices in the early Republican era, apart from the ones initiated in the center of the government, appeared to have been organized in the local areas under the auspices of the Peoples Houses. The introduction of the museum and the exhibition branches were reflected as the basis of museum studies in the periphery. The operation of the branches, although differentiated from region to region, shared the common basis, as mentioned in the regulation of the government.⁸¹ In this sense, it is crucial to analyze the activities of the branches in the frame of the relations that took place within the branches and through the center in order to understand the position of the public and the power in the operation of those facilities.

⁸⁰ Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p. 56 and also Sharon Macdonald "Introduction" in Sharon Macdonald and Gordon Fyfe (ed) "Theorizing Museums", (Oxford : Blackwell, 1996) p. 12.

⁸¹ Arık, "Halkevlerinde Müze Tarih, Folklor Kolunun Amacı Nedir?", in Remzi Oğuz Arık "Halkevlerinde müze, tarih ve folklor çalışmaları kılavuzu" (Ankara:C. H. P. Halkevleri yayımları, 1947), pp. 111-123. This chapter is basically a collection of the RPP's program those announced in the annual congress of the party.

The branches functioned with the participation of the volunteers in the search for archeological and ethnographical items throughout the territory in which they were located. According to the 1934 and 1936 annual reports of the Peoples Houses,⁸² the branches were organized in order to collect pieces all around the locality, and in addition, to arrange yearly activities such as gathering people for seminars and temporary exhibitions. However, it is obvious in the annual reports that the activities in the branches of museums and exhibitions basically were occupied with the collection of archeological and ethnographic pieces. The pieces collected by the local volunteer were either carried to the Peoples' Houses or were sent to the capital city to be added in the national museum.⁸³ Working hand-in-hand with the history and folklore branches, the museum and exhibition branch made up the archive for those pieces according to the modern classification principles, at times even using the technique of photography in order to build up the albums for the pieces that were collected annually.⁸⁴ One of the distinctive characteristics of the museum practices is that the issue was focused on the collection and the preservation of pieces rather than representing the findings. That is, excavations and recoding were the main tasks realized in the branches.

Apart from archeological and ethnographical studies, the other activities were realized by the museum and exhibition branches were the celebration of various national days and weeks providing the participation of the masses. One of the most popular celebrations was Native Goods Week.⁸⁵ Originating from the etatist economic politics of the 1930s, appealing to domestic consumption and discouraging foreign goods consumption so as to overcome the tension and the destruction

⁸² Halkevlerinin Faaliyet Raporları Hulasası. (İstanbul : Hakimiyeti Milliyet Matbaası, 1934-)

⁸³ Halkevlerinin Faaliyet Raporları Hulasası, the reports of Bergama, Denizli, Konya Peoples' Houses Branches.

⁸⁴“Halkevlerinin Faaliyet Raporları Hulasası”, p. 30, p. 38 and p.43.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p.16 and p.73

resulting from the Great Depression of 1929, the significance of Native Goods week is obvious in the annual reports of the Peoples' Houses. During the week, there were exhibitions of the agricultural and handicraft products produced by the local people. It shows that the exhibitions in fact were operated as the festivity areas where those products were sold.

Two aspects of the organization of the branches paved the way for their function in the sense that the meaning of the museum and the politics in it. To begin with, the most significant characteristic of the early museum studies emerged as the educational task of the state. In the search for the goal of the establishment of the museum and the exhibition branch, Arık writes that the crucial aspects of the national culture and the public education were studied in order to set up the consciousness in society by equipping the individual with information.⁸⁶ Hence, in agreement with the official ideology, the activities in the branches were organized in order to instill the fundamentals of the idea of the official nationalist and cultural approaches as the educative function of the state.

Second, in terms of the relation between the state and the individual in the operation of the branches, it is clear that the point in the emergence of voluntary participation mainly originated from the establishment of the imagination of citizenship.⁸⁷ In agreement with the principles of populism in the early Republican era politics, the masses were described as equal in all the spheres. This situation in the museum practice appeared as the negation of the previous applications during the late Ottoman era, in which the public was all but excluded from this sphere. Within the imagination of the equal citizens of the homogenous nation and culture, the activities of the public were inserted in the museum as collective research. Indeed,

⁸⁶ Arık, p.121.

⁸⁷ Duncan, p.24.

originating from the fundamentals of the Peoples Houses, the museum branch also was operated as a center for the common.⁸⁸ Hence, Arık writes that the Peoples' Houses in general and the branches in particular were the places where the volunteers for public work came together and in this sense, the control, was focused on the volunteer.⁸⁹ That is, the distinctive nature of the museum and exhibition branch could be evaluated as one of the spheres in which certain negotiations could be raised by the public.

Thus, combining the educational point of the state and the citizenship imagination in the defined public sphere, the two aspects of the museum practices in the early Republican era emerged through the dominant state perspective, which also can be observed in the content of the realized research in the archives of the branches. The museum and exhibition branch, working hand-in-hand with the history and folklore branches,⁹⁰ in the last analysis, was organized around the masses in the collection of material culture and preservation of those on behalf of the state in the periphery. Accordingly, the organization of the museum research in the periphery worked out infrastructural aspects of the center and rendered its governmental tones active. To be more concrete, the idea of the current regime basically defined the movement of the public in the museum practice. That is, the role of the volunteer in shaping the sphere was arranged clearly in the course of the regulations of the RPP so that it was only permitted to collect and record the pieces, however; the construction of a museum by the branch was not allowed.⁹¹ Hence, the museum practices combined with the participation of the mass was quite official ideology-

⁸⁸ Murat Katođlu, "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Sanat ve Kùltür Hayatının Oluşumunda Kamu Yönetiminin Rolü", *Sanat Dünyamız*, 89 (Fall 2003), p.188.

⁸⁹ Arık, p.7.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.112

⁹¹ Arık, p.114.

oriented and the research was mainly supplied within the context of the hegemonic nationalist approaches of the period.⁹²

In the 1930s, the expanded excavation and archival studies realized in the sphere of the museum and exhibition branch resulted in the collection of an abundant amount of archeological pieces throughout Anatolia. In the First Congress of the Advisory Committee for Ancient Objects, Hasan Ali Yücel evaluated the increase in the museum practices as the success of the Republican regime in the sense that it was an indication of how the regime approached the importance of these as the basis of national existence by comparing the collected pieces in numbers between 1880-1923 of 109,000 and between 1923-1943 of 759,000.⁹³ However, the research of the branches was halted as a result of the abolition of the Peoples' Houses by the Democratic Party government in 1951. Their archives were transferred to the General Directorate of Ancient Pieces to be remembered and reopened in the 1960s.

Between the Unplanned and Planned:

Policy in the Museum in the 1950s and 1960s

The transition in the political atmosphere of the 1950s reflected the cultural policies of the government in the perspective that there emerged deceleration in the museum practices compared with the early Republican era. Apart from the deceleration, the basic concerns considering the position of culture in the politics came out to be altered, mainly in the form of an interrogation of the early Republican era and its epistemology that had protected and cultivated the cultural policy through

⁹² In the annual report of the museum and exhibition branch located in Bergama, it was mentioned that there had been initiations of the publication which proved the roots of the Greek originated from the Turks. That is, the framework of the Turkish History Thesis found its reflections in the peripheral practices as well.

⁹³ Atasoy, p.1465.

the basis of state politics. As mentioned by Zürcher, the application of unplanned politics in all fields was adopted by the DP as the negation of the RPP political tradition on the way to legitimate its own politics. Hence, put by Yaman,⁹⁴ as opposed to the planned steps of the former period's politics in arts and culture, DP distained itself from the planned cultural politics. The alterations in the field of cultural practices were distinctive in the 1950s in the sense that whereas the cultural policies of the 1923-1950 era mainly dominated by the state-oriented practices which were organized around the educative task for the society, the cultural practices in the course of this period emerged with more individualist discourses, mainly benefited from the lack of any cultural policies.⁹⁵ Therefore private initiations in the cultural practices were raised in the 1950s.⁹⁶

In regard to the museums, the point in the establishment of these appeared to be framed in more distinctive arguments than in the previous era. In the late 1950s, the arguments were framed around the preservation of the cultural values through open air public museums and the opportunity to establish these in Anatolia.⁹⁷ In the objectives of raising the idea of establishing of these, Koşay, pioneering archeologist and ethnographer, claimed that the rapid technical developments which homogenized every single aspects and destructive influence of the temporary trends of the cultural practices required the necessity of introducing a public open air museum. In doing that, common language, religion and traditional bond would be kept so strong that the national awareness of Turkish society would be rendered alive.⁹⁸ In this sense, in the questioning of Koşay for the most suitable place for an open air public museum,

⁹⁴ Zeynep Yasa Yaman, "1950'li Yılların Sanatsal Ortamı ve "Temsil" Sorunu", , Toplum ve Bilim, 79 (Fall 2003), 1998. p.96

⁹⁵ Ibid., p.130.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 131.

⁹⁷ Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, *Açıkhava Halk Müzeleri ve Türkiye'de Açıkhava Halk Müzesini Kurma İmkanları* Ankara : Maarif Basımevi, 1958.

⁹⁸ Ibid., pp.26-27

there were a variety of alternatives such as an old village equipped with the traditional artifacts or an attraction park in which traditional Turkish houses could be exhibited.

Thus, Koşay suggested that there were a plenty of areas where those museums could be located, such as the state forest near Afyon, the area around the cemetery of Ertugrul Gazi, and the area around the Lake of Eymir and Mogan in Ankara.⁹⁹ It is no a coincidence that the places mentioned, basically, carried the characteristics of possessing memorial aspects in regard to the national history of Turkey.

The cultural atmosphere of the 1950s in the trace of the arguments and practices rose in the arts and cultural environments put forward that the transition in the politics and the newly emerged social change reflected in the museum practices in a distinctive picture. As said by Yenişehirlioğlu, “by 1950s the visual and constructed collective memory for those of the republican citizens was already present. In this sense, the material environments loaded by those set of memorial backgrounds were ready to be consumed and reproduced by the Republican citizens.”¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, it is clear that the social change, basically originating from the domestic migration, and the rapid industrialization brought about a new agenda in the field of museal projects that were reflected as the developing resistance in order to preserve and spread the traditional culture against the rapid change in the form of ethnographic museums, which were underestimated in the 1950s due to over credited archeological research.¹⁰¹

In the 1960s and 1970s the position of the state ideology in the issue of cultural policy appeared to include a variety of applications. 1971 marked the first to attempt to separate the administration of cultural affairs from the Ministry of National

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 28

¹⁰⁰ Madran and Önal, p. 181.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p.182.

Education with the establishment of the Ministry of Culture.¹⁰² Although the ministry did not trace a stable application field, it would be entirely separated by 1980s within different cultural policy perspectives. Apparently, the acceleration in the museum studies throughout Anatolia by 1960s mainly was related to the approach of the state discourse in the level of the developmental plans.¹⁰³ Thus, Atasoy relates, the attempt of new museum building projects of the government to these planned economy politics.¹⁰⁴ The same way, the expressions in regard to cultural practices in the five-year development plans were clear.¹⁰⁵

Indeed, it is clear that by 1965, the museum practice throughout Anatolia began to accelerate.¹⁰⁶ Accordingly, the storage areas, which had been created in the former period through the research in the Peoples' Houses and of the archeologists, were opened to be reviewed as a museum. By the same way, the early city museums that had been closed due to lack of personnel and budgets were reopened in the 1960s.¹⁰⁷ Thus, the materials in the narration of the museum were based on archeological pieces, and the narration was set up through those materials in the new buildings for the museums.

Having focus on a typical example of a city museum based on the archeological materials narrating the history of the locality, it is clear that the text of the museum was constructed on the context of the nationalist history through local materials.¹⁰⁸ The history of the society in the sense of their daily life practices was mainly

¹⁰² Kılıç, "Beş yıllık Kalkınma Planları ve İcrasında Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzelerin Değerlendirilmesi", p. 25.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁰⁴ Atasoy, p. 1466

¹⁰⁵ Hüseyin Karaduman, "Eski Eser Yasalarında Özel Müzeler, Koleksiyonculuk, Ticaret ve Müzayedeler, in "4. Müzecilik Semineri : bildiriler 16 - 18 Eylül 1998, (İstanbul : Askeri Müze, 1998), pp. 4-15.

¹⁰⁶ The details in regard to the reopened and newly opened museum covering the Republican Era is available at the website of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture. www.kulturturizm.gov.tr

¹⁰⁷ Mehmet Önder, *Türkiye Müzeleri ve Müzelerdeki Şaheserlerden Örnekler* (Ankara : Türkiye İş Bankası, 1977).

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., City Museum of Bolu, City Museum of Burdur, City Museum of Amasya

underestimated on the way to the monitoring of the ideology of the hegemony was set up as the dominant paradigm. On the other hand, the architectural design to be applied in the all new museums to be built was the same for each museal project regardless of the techniques to be required inside the museum depending on the geography, or the climate in which the museums would be inserted.¹⁰⁹ The technically handicapped design of those new buildings resulted in the destruction of many pieces.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, the design of a unique appearance of the museum in the urban center reinforced the control of the state politics of the visualization of the culture in society. The presentation of a nation in the same physical construction through similar materials in the course of the same basis for the narration introduces the politics of the culture of the period strongly shaped by the ideology of the state regardless of public image in the museum.

The visualization of the image of the state in front of the public appears to have been realized as the dominant “show and tell” method of the state itself. Thus, the representation of the power itself turned out to be the articulation of a unique discourse. However, as the distinctive aspects of this period from the early Republican era was that the nationalist history appeared to be shifted in the discourse in regard to the origins of the nation in the museal dimension. That is, the opening of the Anatolian Civilizations Museum, which was formerly the Hittite Museum emerged through as visualization of the Turkish History Thesis, is embracing all the heritages of the antique civilizations in the melting pot of Anatolian and Turkish History. Thus, the establishment of cultural identity was laid on the basis of the Anatolian heritages on the level of an ideological visualization of itself through the material culture.

¹⁰⁹ Madran and Önal, p. 188.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.188.

The last point to be mentioned about the characteristics of the museum practices just before the 1980s distinctive climate of cultural practice is that the narration in the museum mainly was laid on the early Republican encyclopedia for all definitions of culture, history and memory. Through a basic re-reading and shifts in accordance with the hegemonic cultural practices as in the example of the Anatolian Civilization Museum, the museal practices were directed at the operation of the early Republican memories. Indeed, the state practices in the museum were concentrated on the introduction of the image of the nation building and its pioneers, mainly the figure of Atatürk. In this sense, apart from the city museums mainly set up on archeological artifacts, the Atatürk Museum functioned as a visualization realm for the memories of the origins of the Turkish Republic and its political institutions were activated either in the newly built museums or renovated Early Republican buildings.

The 1960s reflects the rapid politicization in society mainly introduced through the motivation of the initiative application inserted by the constitution of 1961. The most significant of these were the emergence of multiple parties and the five-year economic plans. The years following the application of the new constitution brought about the conflicts presented by the introduction of multiple power blocks and the economic plans.¹¹¹ Power blocks ranging from the radical right to the radical left were drawn a variety of coalitions in making up the government.¹¹² However, although the period internalized the rigid politicization in all layers of society and the government, the visual practice of the state through the unique exercises both in the organization of the text and the construction of the building brought about the self-monitoring state politics to be reinforced in this period through the elimination of all public activities in the realm of museums. The period following 1960s, as opposed to

¹¹¹ Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* (trans.) Yasemin Saner Gönen (İstanbul: İletişim, 2004) and also Feroz Ahmad, *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*, (İstanbul: Kaynak Yay. 2002)

¹¹² Zürcher, pp. 359-361.

the DP government, it is obvious that the state had entered back to a cultural field within the framework of planned politics.

In the set of practices dating back to the late Ottoman until today, it is likely to mention basic continuities and the ruptures in the realm of the museum practices. Basically, in terms of the construction of the national through the cultural, the representation of the public in the space of museum and the position of the cultural policies in the realm of the museum the concentration of the ideology of the state appeared as the predominant characteristic in the space. Having defined the “modern” as a dimension of the spatial and the temporal constructed through the linearity and deterministic point of view, the initial examples of the museum practices in Turkey brought about the modern discourse of the state ideology in the visualization of the culture.

In the sense that the bodily representation of the public was in the museum, it is probable to claim that the position of the public in the museum mainly served as a ruling technique of the hegemonic ideology. However, the educative tools were clearly inserted in the context of the museum that it put forward the museum as the space where people entered into the process of learning in their leisure times.¹¹³ In this sense, the museum appeared as the realm where political compromise was aimed to be realized through the educative role of the state. In this sense, the practice of the Peoples’ Houses in the early 1930s until the 1950s exemplifies the cultural identity and remembrance practices enacted in the museum.

The early museum practices in Turkey, in a sense, put forward the melting of the cultural policy into the education policy. The dependency of the cultural in the body of Ministry of National Education indicates that until the 1970s the perception of the

¹¹³ Arık, p. 84.

state of the cultural practices so as to educate the society remained as the basis of the governing practices through culture. In this sense, the insertion of the homogenous cultural practices filtered through the hegemonic politics remained as the most influential aspect of the educative tool of the state. The unique voice in the museum, hence, resulted in the state-dominated public sphere, in which the people covered with the homogenous representation.

CHAPTER 3

EXHIBITING CULTURE IN TURKEY: AN ANALYSIS FOR THE POST-1980s

Modernity in Crisis, Museum in Crisis

The museum practices in the post-1980s emerged with a variety of distinctive practices and methodologies. Replacing the characteristic of “the museum as an encyclopedia,” the concepts of “live museum,” “communicating museum,” “interactive museum,” “virtual museum,” and “experience in the museum” became widespread.¹¹⁴ In regard to the contents and thematic of the museum, the range that the topics covered in the museum evolved and differed in the sense that the discourses in regard to the state and nation turned into the fragments of the nation and its spaces with the invasion of the museum practices with the alternative memories and their narrations. The practices and reflections of the museum following the post-1980s, especially in the 1990s, presented the basic transformation in the perception of the idea of museum and its theories through the practices of globalism and multiculturalism.

One of the most distinctive changes in the museum practices in the post-1980s has been the increase in the number of the museums, mostly in Western Europe and the United States. Related to the increase in the number, another significant issue has been the overwhelming increase in the investments realized by the corporations and

¹¹⁴ Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. (London ; New York : Routledge, 2000). P. 127.

the funds of individuals in the museums. These investments in the museum appeared to stem from either the philanthropic objective of the big capital holders which would reinforce the image for the sake of the cultural capital they hold in the sense that Bourdieu analyzes,¹¹⁵ or, the perception of the museum as a cultural space that can be managed to make an alternative profit.¹¹⁶ The increase of the private investments in the body of the museum, which was increasingly coded as the space in which the hegemonic power sets the representation of the nation and its identity inside, brings about the interrogation of the new forms of power relations inside the museum in particular and in politics in the general sense.

Departing from the cultural capital and symbolic power concepts of Bourdieu, the relation between the investments and the increase in the number of the museums initiated by corporate interventions have been subjected to the power relations in the post-1980s. Bourdieu approaches the cultural capital which emerged within the context of art and cultural affairs, as the instrument of domination.¹¹⁷ Conceptualizing art as a form of hegemonic ideology, the space in which it is exhibited and the actors who initiate these spaces keep the key of “symbolic power.”¹¹⁸ In the case of the museum, formerly grounded on the ideology and politics of the nation-state, the post-1980s has indicated that the domination in the museum space has basically switched to the private collection holders or to the corporations. The representative of the “taste,” in this sense, has emerged in the form of private holders and other narrations which are not necessarily national. On the other hand, it is obvious that the emergence of corporations in the space of the

¹¹⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, “Social Space and Symbolic Power” *Sociological Theory* 7 (1) (1989).

¹¹⁶ Chin-tao Wu, *Privatising Culture : Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s* (London : Verso, 2003), p.12.

¹¹⁷ Bourdieu, “Social Space and Symbolic Power”, p.129. and P. Bourdieu and A. Darbel, and D. Schnapper., *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and Their Public* Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman (trans) (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997, c1991). p.88.

¹¹⁸ Bourdieu, “Social Space and Symbolic Power”, p.127.

museum has brought about new forms of identity constructions in the course of this cultural space that would be in coincident with the representation targeted to be put on the newly emerging class relations.

The introduction of the museums as profit making cultural centers is, in this sense, another aspect of these in the post-1980s. Constructed beyond the target of the exhibition of collections, museums with big archives and permanently exhibited huge collection have faded out¹¹⁹ in favor of the cultural center in which the main components are placed as the café, shop, restaurant, cinema, in the course of which visitors may spend longer amounts of time. As mentioned in the study of Merriman, not only the holder of the cultural capital, but also the people benefit from the space as the visitors, or the clients in the sense of high capitalist forms.¹²⁰

In this sense the varied functions of the museum space, apart from the exhibitionary complex for the collections and their narrations, appear as an opposite entity of which Adorno relates the word “museum” with “mausoleum” in the course of which the museum includes “the object to which the observer no longer has a vital relationship and which are in process of dying.”¹²¹ Indeed, the space of the museum became overwhelmingly “live” by the novel applications inside that the museum of the post-1980s were set as the visual space of the power relations of the modern and these presented the reflection of the post-1980s politics of transnational economic networks and multicultural social construction in the museum practices rendering the space as the laboratory of these complicated processes through the novel discourses of the culture industry.

Second, the fundamental inner organization of the museum, which is grounded on the time and space concepts of the modern, appeared to dissolve through the

¹¹⁹ John Urry, “Gazing on History”, p. 130.

¹²⁰ Walsh, *The Representation of the Past*, pp. 147-148.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p.64.

transformation in the perception and application of these concepts in the post-1980s. Formerly laid on the basis of the linear and deterministic imagination, the spatial and temporal constructions in the museum in the post-1980s indicates the turn in both terms in coincidence with the condition of the postmodern. The organizational characteristic of the classical museum in the representation of the objects was in a defined chronological order and they were behind the protective burdens, which carried them into another spatial atmosphere, so that these separated them from the visitors' universe.¹²²

This appeared to be different in the period following the 1980s. Through the introduction of the new media and its technologies, which resulted in fundamental changes in the representation and performance acts, the burdens between the visitor and the object broke down. Rather, the museum was turned into a space in which the knowledge of the past was turned into the practice of the present through distinctive methodologies such as museum theatre performances.¹²³ In the period following the 1980s, the museum practices through these performance experiences and the organizational method that provided the audience with the opportunity to develop experience by touching the object appeared as one of the most significant characteristic of the museum. Urry mentions that,

There has also been a marked change in the nature of museums themselves. No longer are visitors are expected to stand in awe of the exhibits. More emphasis is being placed on a degree of participation by visitors in the exhibits themselves. 'Living' museums replaced 'dead' museums, open-air museums replace those under cover, sound replaces hushed silence, and visitors are not separated from the exhibits by glass.¹²⁴

¹²² Bennett, *The Birth of Museum*, p. 78.

¹²³ Theatre Museum. Available [online] at: <http://www.theatremuseum.org.uk/>

¹²⁴ John Urry, "Gazing on History" , p. 130.

In the light of these physical changes, in the methods of the museum practices, there are two main characteristics that can be stated in general about the cultural and political aura of the 1980s, and in particular about the change in the museum. That is, the shift in the spatial and temporal characteristics in the museum, which, in fact, coincided with the structural transformations through which the idea of modernity underwent by the mid-1970s. Signaling the crisis for many in the mid-1970s, the 1980s and 1990s appeared as the crystallization of these transformations of the introduction of transnational capitalist affairs and their politics, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the reorganization of the social and the cultural in accordance with the concepts of globalization and multiculturalism.¹²⁵ The transformation in the museum of the 1980s in terms of time, space and the methods of “showing and telling”¹²⁶ may be evaluated as the crystallized changes that cast shadows on the surface of the museum through the crisis of modernity.

First of all, the mobility of information, people, image and product at a higher speed than before emerged as the basic characteristic of the temporal in the 1980s. The introduction of the new technologies reinforced the idea of the accelerated time through their daily practices. Practically, the duration of long journeys was shortening through faster transportation vehicles and, more importantly, the exchange of news throughout the world was turned into be a matter of instance. The reflection of the temporal speed to the organization of the spatial was so apparent

¹²⁵ Guy Debord, *Gösteri Toplumu ve Yorumlar*; trans. Aysen Ekmekçi and Okşan Taşkent, (İstanbul : Ayrıntı Yayınları, 1996); David Harvey, *Postmodernliğin Durumu*; trans. Sungur Savran, (İstanbul : Metis Yayınları, 2003) ; Slavoj Žižek, "Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism." *New Left Review*, no. 225 (1997): 28-51 ; Arif Dirlik "Modernity as History: Post-Revolutionary China, Globalization and the Question of Modernity." *Social History* 27, no. 1 (2002), pp. 16-39 ; Frederic Jameson, "Post Modernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" *New Left Review*, no. 146 (1984), pp. 53-92.

¹²⁶ Tony Bennett, "Exhibitionary Complex" in in *Representing the Nation: A Reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) (London, New York: Routledge, 1999). p. 335.

that the understanding of “distance” underwent a crucial change. Huyssen relates the turn between time and space; “Speed destructs the extent and time erases the distance.”¹²⁷ Referring to Harvey’s analysis on the time and space compression in the condition of postmodernity, Walsh states that as a response to the acceleration of the temporal, the orientation of the spatial was lost by the fact that there decreased the horizon of the spatial and reinforced the togetherness of all presents.¹²⁸

Second, the linearity which emerged as the one of the most significant dimensions of modernity was subjected to withdrawal from the organization of the temporal and spatial. According to Debord, linear dimension arose as the shift of the pre-industrial age, of which temporality was cyclical, to the industrial temporality of irreversible time. Categorizing the pre-industrial era as the set of repeated actions of a “frozen society”¹²⁹, the modern temporal construction came up with the accelerated and ordered mode of production based on the irreversible time understanding.¹³⁰ The temporality qualified with the irreversibility, on the one hand, by rejecting the repetition of the past and freezing it and, on the other hand, reinforcing the idea of future.

According to Debord, the idea of linear time construction was replaced by pseudo-cyclical time.¹³¹ Debord relates shift of the irreversible time to the pseudo-cyclical time in the framework of the shift in the mode of production mentioning the emergence of the new temporal construction as an issue of the “modern economic survival, of increased survival.”¹³² In that framework, the effort of modern economic

¹²⁷ Andreas Huyssen, *Alacakaranlık Anıları*, p.182.

¹²⁸ Walsh, p. 67

¹²⁹ Debord, p. 74

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 77.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 85

¹³² www.situationist.cjb.net, p.67

survival turned the temporal into a meta to be consumed in the society of the spectacle.¹³³

The characteristics of the temporal and spatial also were analyzed in the framework of the mode of production by Harvey. In that sense, Harvey mentions that the objectivity of time and space was created by the material practice of reproduction in society. Thus, being differed in these practices in the sense of social geography and temporality, according to Harvey, there emerged different experiences in different places.¹³⁴ Thus, the spatial and the temporal in society with the mode of production were constructed in relation. In this sense, the linear temporality and the shift realized by the postmodern era on the sovereignty of the linear time construction were basically in touch with revealing of the social orientation in regard to how they refer to power relations.

The shift in the temporal and spatial reflected into the space of the museum in the form of multiplication of the memories. First of all, Huyssen put forward that there experienced a museum-mania at the onset of the 1980s.¹³⁵ The acceleration of the temporal and the breaking of the linear and progressive approaches reflected in the space of museum not as a destruction but as the insertion of new forms and transformation inside the museum without pushing out the former discourses. These forms of the museal projects, in fact, mapping the visual culture of the 1980s in a wider sense, mainly originate from the temporal and spatial composition of the postmodern.

Therefore, according to Huyssen, the transformation in the spatial in the postmodern age brought about the amnesia and the obsession with memory at the same time. That is, the rapidity in the mobility of information and the disorientation

¹³³ Debord, *Gösteri Toplumu*, p. 75

¹³⁴ Harvey, *Postmodernliğin Durumu*, p.328.

¹³⁵ Huyssen, *Alacakaranlık Anıları*, p. 27.

in the information of the space, which mainly emerged in the course of overwhelmed development in the mass communication tools, led to amnesia based on the change in the agenda instantaneously. On the other hand, reading the flourishing amnesic situation in another way Huyssen states that the over-development in the recording systems of the digitalized world created an obsession with the archiving of pieces. The amnesia reproach is invariably couched in a critique of the media, while it is precisely these media – from print and television to CD-ROMs and the Internet- that make ever more memory available to us day by day.¹³⁶ Huyssen mentions that the boom in the memory practices in the postmodern age is related deeply to the anxiety of people in regard to their survival so that this obsession is mainly the reaction to the rapid technological processes that change our living space (*Lebenswelt*).¹³⁷

Therefore two main issues arise in terms of the insertion of memory practices and the politics in the post-1980s. First, the breaking of the linearity and progress in the perception of the temporal led to the weakening of the imagination of the future. The rapid mobility in the exchange of information led to instantaneously created agendas. Hence, the perception of the past and the future began to be affected by the melting borders of the present as a result of the transforming perception. Therefore, memory and its practices came to evolve into the new conditions of time-space compression. Second, the resistance against the instantaneous time orientation introduced nostalgia and an appeal to the heritage by soon after.

While describing the 1980s as the age of escaping from amnesia, Huyssen puts forward that while, on the one hand, there was experienced an instantaneous time, on the other hand, the obsession with the memory resulted in the practices of nostalgia

¹³⁶ Huyssen, “Present Pasts”, p. 25

¹³⁷ Huyssen, *Alacakaranlık Anıları*, pp.17-19.

as an act of resistance.¹³⁸ In the weakened condition of the imagination of the “future”, an appeal to the past through the revival of nostalgia emerged as the mean of conservative ideology. Basically, conservative ideology, defined as a philosophy resistive to the modern,¹³⁹ appears to insert the escape from amnesia in the form of the reinforcement of nostalgia in daily practices by the 1980s. In addition, the loosening image of the nostalgic remembrance bears about the sense of harmony, which also supports the conservative approach against the revolutionary idea. In this sense Lowenthal states that, “attachment to familiar places may buffer social upheaval, attachment to familiar faces may be necessary for enduring association.”¹⁴⁰

The transformation in the temporal and spatial dimensions of the modern idea presented distinctive memory practices imbedded in the daily life practices through the conservation of the spatial in coincidence with the past characteristics that would allow the presentation of the pre-modern golden age. The flourishing heritage sites by the post-1980s indicate the common tendency developed as the mode of reaction to the escape from amnesia in the postmodern age. One of the main issues that should be considered is that the re-production and re-construction of the heritage sites in the post-1980s not only take place in the museum in the classical sense, but also they functioned as the spaces where the management and commodification of culture and history were crystallized.

In the institutional examples of spaces of the twentieth century, in addition to the physical structure, the textual narration of the collections were changed and redefined in the sense of ordering and representing. Basically, the ideology that unifies cultural activities and tourism were reflected in the content of the narration.

¹³⁸ Huyssen, “Present Pasts”, p. 28.

¹³⁹ Tanıl Bora, “Muhafazakarlığın Değişimi ve Türk muhafazakarlığında Bazı Yol İzleri”, *Toplum ve bilim*, 74 Güz, 1997. p. 34.

¹⁴⁰ Lowenthal, *Past is a Foreign Country*, p.13.

The museal projects, distinctive from their earlier formations, were much more planned on the basis of marketing strategies and introduced to the audiences in the form of productions.¹⁴¹ Apparently, shifting degrees from one another, mainly heritage sites and theme parks were subjected to strong marketing strategies in order to attract audiences.

The change in the institutional and management forms of museums and exhibitions also serves as a subject for analysis in terms of the political implication of these changes. The definition of new museum, ranging from science museum to art museum, as a space to be managed, and the supply of content as a production to be consumed, in fact, reflects the basic lines of the post-1980s social project.¹⁴² The insertion of global politics and transnational capitalist economic systems brought about a highly organized mass production and, by the same token, mass consumption. The development in technologies not only reflected to the media and rapidity of communication, but also these methodologies reflected to and changed the content of the information to be conducted to the masses. The cultural management methodologies lead distinctive ways so as to increase the “audience” in the exhibitionary space which was already equipped with a range of different departments such as new media centers or activities such as children’s education in the museum.

In Turkey, the museum practices following the 1980s appeared to have been shaped by this agenda fundamentally. In the post-1980s regarding the museum politics in Turkey, there were introduced novel relations and application in the course

¹⁴¹Jessica Evans, “ Introduction to Part Four” in *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) (London, New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 366.

¹⁴² Ibid., p.368.

of the merge in the transforming political and cultural aspects following the trauma of the post- coup d'état period and these have evolved in three main veins. First of all, the introduction of the private museum attempts in the post-1980s appeared as the first step in the evolving museum politics. The investments in the visualization of the cultural and historical by private hands, mostly big capital holders triggered new museum practices and the power relations in the space of the museum.

In addition, the self-representation of Turkey on the international platform in the course of the image of multicultural geography appeared to be turned into an active cultural politics. In this sense, the participation of Turkey in the convention of the world heritage with the onset of the 1980s brought about the further politics that would be constructed on the idea and the image of the past in the course of museum practices. The remapping of a variety of geographies in coincident with the selected memory practices combining with the new tourism methods brought about museums without walls and adapted to the daily life practices in the context of 1980s Turkey as well.

Third, one of the most significant characteristic of the memory practices in post-1980s in Turkey is that it is constructed mainly on the multicultural and nostalgic co-existence images, along with the current ideological movements introduced in the course of the transforming modern idea. The visualization of this narration organized in the framework of multicultural and coexistence of the communities in harmony in the geography, basically representing the golden age of the Ottoman Empire, appear in the space of *Miniaturk*. In essence, the space of *Miniaturk* in this case will be the point in terms of the analysis of the motivations of neo-conservative politics in the post-1980s context in Turkey.

Private in the Museum, Museum in the Private

The post-1980s indicates a period throughout which a number of private museums were established and the catalogues of several private collections were published in Turkey. Starting early 1980s, a number of private museums in the name of the people or a variety of foundations, associations and banks were opened for the visit of the people. In addition to the varied and developed techniques in the forms of exhibiting in this period, within the introduction of those private collections into the museum space, the practice in the museum indicated a clear differentiation compared with the former practices in Turkey.

The establishment of the private museums and the presentation of the private collection, whether in the form of publications¹⁴³ and virtually¹⁴⁴ became widespread just after the enacted laws those made the rearrangement on the property and exhibition relation of the cultural assets.¹⁴⁵ Until 1973, the law applied in the field of exhibition of the objects was the set of laws once created by Osman Hamdi. The basic characteristic of these laws was that they were arranged in order to prevent the transfer and commerce of the objects without permission of the state. According to these, the state was rendered the unique body that is provided with the capability of opening a museum. In this sense, Karaduman mentions that it is no accident that there were not any private museums and exhibitions existed in Turkey until 1973.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Resim Koleksiyonu, ed. Zahir Güvemli (İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1984). , see also Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: The Sabancı Heykel ve Porselen, ed. Fulya Bodur (İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1986). See also Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Hat Koleksiyonu, ed. Cenap Yazansoy, Abdülkadir Karahan (İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1985).

¹⁴⁴ See Eczacıbaşı Virtual Museum at <http://www.sanalmuze.org/>

¹⁴⁵ Hüseyin Karaduman, "Eski Eser Yasalarında Özel Müzeler, Koleksiyonculuk, Ticaret ve Müzayedeler, in "4. Müzecilik Semineri : bildiriler 16 - 18 Eylül 1998, (İstanbul : Askeri Müze, 1998), pp. 4-15.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p.9.

The law enacted in the issue of the private collection holders of the opening the museums and the exhibition of their collections was legalized provided that the objects would be detected by the related museums that were depended on the General Directorate of the Museums and Monuments¹⁴⁷. Karaduman says that by the media of these museums, the objects in the collections would be approved in their eligibility to be exhibited in the museum, and also, they were recorded in the archives. The record system was also a measure taken in order to prevent the commercial objectives on these objects. The commercial of the objects that were included in the collection was forbidden by the law.¹⁴⁸

The revisions and arrangements in the law enacted in 1973, 1983 and 1984 respectively indicated that the museum practices in Turkey were in the process of a change structurally. The laws initiated were also the signs for the change in the cultural policy of the state in the visualization of the past and culture through the object. It appeared that there emerged private collections in hands of private bodies which turned into museum practices just after the announcement of the law.

The structural change in the museum practices in Turkey following 1980s in the framework of the legal rearrangements may be examined under three points. First of all, the alternative memory practices had the opportunity to be involved in the space of the museum theoretically. Thus, although General Directorate of the Museums and Cultural Assets stood as the chief organ controlling categories and objects, multiple memory practices which were coded as the “other” before, were brought into the basis of the visualization.

In relation to this, second, the monopoly of the state on the visualization of the national and cultural identity through was broken by the insertion of the private

¹⁴⁷ The name of the state office was changed to General Directorate of Museums and Cultural Assets.

¹⁴⁸ Karaduman, p.10.

collections of the non-governmental bodies and individuals. By the time, apart from the private museums that were established in the professional sense, many institutions such as universities and associations were involved in the organization of a museum narrating their own histories in the form of a subway of a general history.¹⁴⁹

Lastly, among the small scale memory practices which were emerged as the museum initiations, the laws enacted on the private museums and collections, in fact, provided large private collections of the pioneering bourgeoisie families such as Sabancı and Koç, to be opened to public in the form of private museum. The content and context of those collections mainly included peculiar objects throughout a wide range of disciplines from ancient archeology to contemporary paintings. Hence, the entrance of the new memories and collections introduced the new power politics emerging through the space of the museum in the 1980s.

To begin with, *Sadberk Hanım Museum* emerges as the first private museum which was established by Vehbi Koç Foundation in the memory of Vehbi Koç's wife, Sadberk Hanım in October 1980. The museum was placed in *Azaryan Yalısı* which was in fact the summer house of Vehbi Koç. In the catalogue of the museum it is mentioned that having included the big collection of *Hüseyin Kocabaş*, the museum was enlarged by restoration of the other strand in the same garden in 1998. With this new addition, *Sadberk Hanım Museum* included a wide range of objects in its space from pre-Islamic archeological objects such as *sikke* (coin) and a variety of daily tools from Anatolia and Middle East on the one hand, and on the other hand, many ethnographic pieces which were exhibited in a composition representing the moments of traditional occasions such as *Kına Gecesi* (Henna Party), *Lohusa Odası*

¹⁴⁹ "Cartoon and Humor Museum" which was opened by the Cartoonist Association in 1975 . Boğaziçi University Cultural Heritage Museum was opened in 1986.

(Chieldbed Customs) or *Sünnet Odası* (Circumcision Bed). The exhibition space, apart from the collections, also includes a café, a research laboratory and a library.

Similar to *Sadberk Hanım Museum*, *Sakıp Sabancı Museum* was established in 2002. Most of the objects in the museum were published in the catalogues of the collection of paintings, porcelain, sculpture and Ottoman calligraphy pieces in the mid-1980s.¹⁵⁰ Sabancı says that the transformation of these collections into a museum had been a long process which was traced through many years in the framework of many negotiations of the professionals.¹⁵¹ Indeed, as mentioned on the website of the museum, *Atlı Köşk* (Horse Mansion), the residence where Sakıp Sabancı and his family lived in between 1969 and 1999, “together with its antique furnishings and art collections, was leased to Sabancı University for a period of 49 years in 1998, and opened as the Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum”.¹⁵² The content of the museum was made with the inclusion of paintings, porcelains, sculptures and calligraphy pieces belong to Ottoman and Republican history.

These two examples sharing similar characteristics, in fact, draws the general outline of the main attitude in the establishment of museums by the bourgeoisie initiation in the 1980s and 1990s. First of all, the space that the museum inserted in both examples presented the transformation of the private sphere in which the holders of these collections lived in. Before diverged into a museum, it is possible to get the impression from the words of Sabancı,¹⁵³ the objects which were carried into the context of the museum were the parts of daily practices of the people living

¹⁵⁰ Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Resim Koleksiyonu, ed. Zahir Güvemli (Istanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1984). , see also Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: The Sabancı Heykel ve Porselen, ed. Fulya Bodur (Istanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1986). See also Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Hat Koleksiyonu, ed. Cenap Yazansoy, Abdülkadir Karahan (Istanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1985).

¹⁵¹ Sakıp Sabancı, “Preface” in M. Uğur Derman, Kıymet Giray, Fulya Bodur Eruz, *Sabancı Koleksiyonu* (Istanbul : Akbank, 1995), pp.7-11.

¹⁵² Information available on <http://muze.sabanciuniv.edu>

¹⁵³ Sakıp Sabancı, “Preface”, in *Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Resim Koleksiyonu*, ed. Zahir Güvemli (Istanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1984). p. 1.

inside. Sabancı mentions that the collection expanded so much inside the mansion so that they immediately transferred the space into a museum with the motivation of sharing the space with these objects with public.¹⁵⁴ Similarly, the *sünnet* (circumcision) bed of *Vehbi Koç* which was exhibited in the Traditions section of the Sadberk Hanım Museum exemplifies how the private whether it is the space of the object itself was inserted into the museal collection. Second, the content of the exhibition in these private museum bring about the discussion of the power politics on a clear basis. Sadberk Hanım Museum extends through multi-disciplinary collection including parts such as archaeological objects of Anatolian antiquities and ethnographic objects from Anatolia.

The exhibition of the private sphere appeared as one of the significant tendencies of the post-1980s. Mentioned by Gürbilek, the general attitude in the exhibition of the private by the articulation of the “private sphere” often within a widespread space of the daily life practices following 1980s emerged as the general attitude in this era different from what was experienced in the former. According to Gürbilek, the withdrawal of the state from the public sphere which was mainly coded and politicized through the state activities, by the 1980s replaced by the new emerging bourgeoisie mode of production and consumption habits.¹⁵⁵ In this sense, it is clear that the exhibition of the private objects in the private sphere implied the power imagination (*tahayyül*) that bourgeoisie put on through the onset of the 1980s.

In the light of the discussion of the public and private sphere grounding it on the space of the museum, there are three crucial points that should be examined in the terms of the content and context of these museums. First of all, the representations of the objects which are exhibited in the spaces include a variety of meanings through

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁵⁵ Nurdan Gürbilek, *Vitrinde Yaşamak: 1980lerin Kültürel İklimi*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001), p. 64.

which the idea of power is constructed and concentrated on. As mentioned by Bourdeiu “A work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses cultural competence, that is the code, into which it is encoded”.¹⁵⁶ Thus, representation of the Ottoman calligraphy pieces by Sabancı or pre-Islamic archeological objects by Koç relate them with a set of relations of cultural capital and power politics.

Second, the stories narrated in the sections of these museums are in fact the objects of history which are shared by the “imagined community” “made up of thousands or millions of people most of whom one would never meet but entailing a particular feat of the imagination”¹⁵⁷ appeared to articulate the memory practices filtering through another power discourse other than the state. That is, the content and context of the museums are not narrating the personal or private stories in accordance with the space they were inserted in but rather the objects represents a general history of exemplifying antique, pre-Islamic, Islamic and Ottoman periods . Hence, representing a wider time and space sphere there appeared to be a set of mapped identities through which can be claimed that it is not only representation of these cultures and histories but also the collection holders’ identities were constructed. To be more concrete, the pieces which were exhibited in the representation of a modernist narration of a nation through basic state politics, through which state ideology also constructed it, now appears to be centered in the private sphere of the individual indicating the shift in the center of the discourse.

Third, the most significant point in regard to emergence of these private initiations was that there appeared a discourse emphasizing the objective of the exhibition for the good of public. In the preface of catalogue for paintings published

¹⁵⁶ Walsh, p.184.

¹⁵⁷ Sharon Macdonald, “Museums, National, Postnational and Transnational Identities”, , p. 2.

in 1984, Sabancı drew the objective and mission of presentation of the catalogue in accordance which the cultural activities such as opening museums were classified under the responsibilities of the businessmen. Sabancı says that:

Today it is no more possible thinking of the businessman apart from culture and art services. It is necessary to define businessman clearly. I am businessman and, for my part, it is to establish factories, but also to construct schools, to open dormitories, establish museums. One should not expect all these from the state. The state and the private sector must work hand-in-hand.¹⁵⁸

Bali states that one of the major characteristics of the post-1980s bourgeoisie was the involvement in the cultural sphere so that drawing a new picture for the bourgeoisie that was different from the 1970s. In Bali's words, the image of "comprador businessman" of the seventies was replaced by the image of a businessman who had the relations with the public in the agenda and that were activated.¹⁵⁹ The bourgeoisie of whose connection with the mass was rendered visible was articulated in the discourses of the social responsibility and services, which were predominantly embodied in the culture and art in the 1990s. In this sense, private universities of Koç, Sabancı and Kadir Has; foundations supporting culture and art in the example of Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts initiated by Eczacıbaşı; the research centers for historical and archeological studies as in the example of Suna and İnan Kıraç Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations within the Vehbi Koç Foundation established in 1996 were started in the 1980s and 1990s by the pioneering bourgeoisie. Thus, the entrance of the bourgeoisie in the culture and arts field brought about a new dimension in the search for diffusion of the

¹⁵⁸ Sabancı, "Preface", in *Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Resim Koleksiyonu*, p.1.

¹⁵⁹ Bali, *Tarz-ı Hayat'tan Life Style'a*, p.62

power politics in the 1980s and 1990s in terms of the concentration of power-knowledge.

The museumization of the private collections following 1980s accelerated in relation to the legal arrangements. In addition, the newly emerged perspective in the field of arts and culture predominantly shaped in the framework of merits of the bourgeoisie within the discourses of philanthropy, the private museums indicated a different way of development in this period. First, the regulations in the field of the visualization and exhibition of the private pieces presented the opportunity of the introduction of a variety of alternative collections. Furthermore, state-centered visualization of the culture since 1864, following 1973, 1983 and 1984 revisions in the law indicated the decentralization in the politics of the exhibiting history and culture. The decentralization, on the one hand, opened the space for the alternative memories and narrations which were marginalized in the modernist museum¹⁶⁰ for the sake of the homogenous narration, and on the other hand, it revealed the new power relations.

¹⁶⁰ Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture* (London ; New York : Routledge, 2000) pp.142-143.

Cultural Heritage Sites: Remapping the Geography of Memory

“Heritage is bogus history.”¹⁶¹

The post-1980s museums and exhibition analysis explains the changes in theory and practices through the transformations that appeared in the replacement of the nation-state and its ideologies by global capitalist and transnational relations by which fragmented versus unitary, linear versus timeless or multilayered-time, and pluralist versus singular became dominant through material representations. The hardcore voice of the singular national discourses was expressed their positions within the macro politics of global and multicultural politics. Considering the museum practices, the initiations of several private museums can be viewed as the triggers in the sense that the narrating actors altered in the 1980s in Turkey.

The museum practices in the period following the post-1980s indicated that there emerged a shift in terms of the narrator in the museum in Turkey. Mainly launched by the philanthropy-oriented foundations initiated by the biggest capital holders, the museum practices started to function as the investments for culture and art. The emergence of the “other” performers than the state, which was the mere dominant narrator in the museum formerly, signaled the new power politics in Turkey throughout the practice of the museum.

Apart from the privatization of the museum in the 1980s, widespread cultural heritage practices were introduced in Turkey as an evolved version of the contemporary museum practices. Extending in the larger spaces, the cultural heritage

¹⁶¹ John Urry, “Gazing On History”, p. 110.

practices all around the world in general, and in Turkey in particular, represent the multicultural and global politics in the culture of exhibiting. In regard to the position of heritage politics in the age of globalization Bartu states that heritage politics became integrated in to the daily life practices in the course of memory practices in the post-1980s so that “cities, as physical embodiments of histories, become crucial sites where different claims to the past are formulated and contested. This formulation provides opportunities to explore the reworkings of modernity and globalization through the politics of heritage in urban contexts.”¹⁶²

The cultural heritage practices and the heritage industry, mainly in Western Europe and the United States, became widespread by the 1970s and 1980s. Cultural heritage appear to have emerged with the motivation of the preservation and conservation of the historical places and monument “as a response to a perceived need for the past during a period when the rigor of the (post)modern life eroded as sense of history and rootedness”.¹⁶³ Hence, the resistive preservation of the spaces of the past turned out to create a sense of place, which was fragmented and dissolved in the course of time-space compression. In this sense, Lowenthal states that, “the enormous popularity of reconstructed ‘landscaped that we never knew, but wish we had’ suggests refusal to face up to the dilemmas of the present.”¹⁶⁴

Cultural heritage practices, which would turn into an industry, were institutionalized within the framework of the international projects of UNESCO¹⁶⁵ and the MEDA project of the European Commission¹⁶⁶ in the 1980s and 1990s. Both transnational organizations, in which states are represented at the level of their high

¹⁶² Ayfer Bartu, “Rethinking Heritage Politics in a Global Context: A View from Istanbul” in *Hybrid Urbanism: on the Identity Discourse and the Built Environment* Nezar AlSayyad (ed). (Westport; Conn.: Praeger, 2001), pp. 152-153.

¹⁶³ Walsh, p. 116.

¹⁶⁴ David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*. (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985). P.13

¹⁶⁵Please see <http://whc.unesco.org>

¹⁶⁶ Please see http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/meda.htm

offices, basically set the criteria in order to decide on the historical and cultural assets that will be included in the lists.¹⁶⁷ The organization of a common list requires the nomination of the historical and cultural assets of the countries' or regions' sites "that must be outstanding universal value," in addition to their characteristics of "bearing a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is no longer living or which has disappeared."¹⁶⁸ Therefore, the major concerns in institutionalizing these sites under high offices appears to be an effort to render these visible and to revive them under the title of "universal values," and which is mainly carrying the global effect and its identity process to the local.

The representation of the past by these heritage areas and indigenous history narratives came up as the "new trend" in these display practices. The sense of civilization and universality was constructed by these heritage politics so that identity politics and cultural implications were provided with both global labels of transnational understanding and the local needs. Turkey joined the convention of UNESCO in 1983.¹⁶⁹ Following these steps, historical and architectural assets including Istanbul, Safranbolu, Boğazköy-Hattush, Mt. Nemrut Remains, Xanthos-Lethoon, Divriği Great Mosque and Hospital, Troy, Pamukkale and Göreme-Cappadocia are registered as cultural and natural assets into the World Heritage List.¹⁷⁰

In the framework of memory practices, the introduction of heritage politics appears to function as a method of globalization politics, and also, it came through as one of the means of conservative politics in the sense of resisting the present by

¹⁶⁷ In detail information is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria>

¹⁶⁸ Please see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/nominationprocess>

¹⁶⁹ http://www.kultur.gov.tr/portal/arkeoloji_en.asp?belgeno=1832TURKEY_ON_WORLD_HERITAGE_LIST

¹⁷⁰ http://www.kultur.gov.tr/portal/arkeoloji_en.asp?belgeno=1832TURKEY_ON_WORLD_HERITAGE_LIST

glamorizing the past. Integrated in the multilayered politics, heritage practices bear out an identity construction aspect though the memory codes put on the region in the course of remembrance of the memory codes, preferably carrying a universal value. In this sense, as stated by Marshall, “heritage is a key mechanism in defining community, ethnic or national identity and re-inscribing the post-colonial landscape. Constructing identity often involves introspection, an “inward journey”, in Galini-Moutafi’s words, a look into the past, an inspection and discovery of the Self, in order to determine who we are and where we come from.”¹⁷¹

It is obvious that the heritage site operates as a key method in the definition of a variety of identity-construction; however, as opposed to the optimistic view stated by Marshall, the selectivity in the memory practices applied in the region brings about the question regarding the reality of the past that is described in the body of the site. In this sense, the visual in the site as a tale-like space, the story reflected in “the agenda of the heritage promotes a mythical harmony and community; on the other hand, a romanticized and glamorized past.”¹⁷² Reconstructing the space it extended by a set of filtered and reorganized fragments, the narration in the space “represents the isolated event, we are removed from history.”¹⁷³

Furthermore, heritage politics, according to Walsh, not only function as a dimension in order to flex the need for the past but “it should also be considered as a product of the expansion of the wider leisure and tourism services sector, and articulation of a service-class culture.”¹⁷⁴ In this sense, appeared as the museums without walls, the heritage sites are operated as an alternative profit-making mechanism through the newly invented methods of tourism. In the sense of the

¹⁷¹ Sabine Marschall, “Commodifying Heritage”, p. 95.

¹⁷² John Urry, *Consuming Places*, p.155.

¹⁷³ Walsh, p. 137.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 116

modern tourism techniques, according to Hall and Tucker, “concern over image and representation have become major concerns in some areas of tourism in recent year, but particularly with respect to the development of indigenous and so-called “ethnic” tourism as well as heritage.”¹⁷⁵

The tours are organized to the sites and these are represented within borders that are removed from their “present” contexts and basically constructed on the nostalgic display. On the one hand the time gap created between the visitor and display in the temporal perception; on the other, “the removal of thus from the wider process and context serves the promotion of the distancing of people from the place.”¹⁷⁶ As stated by Schouten, “visitors to historic sites are looking for an experience, a new reality based on the tangible remains of the past. For them, this very essence of the heritage experience. Heritage is not the same as history. Heritage is history processed through mythology, ideology, nationalism, local pride, romantic ideas or just plain marketing, into a commodity.”¹⁷⁷

In this sense, the distancing in the space and the removal from the historical context bear about the creation of the perception of the “self” and the “other” in the museum without the walls in the course of commodified and unrooted context of the space.

In the context of the heritage experience in Turkey, participating to the World Heritage Convention was the first step. Following the participation, a number of cultural and historical assets were declared as world heritages. The requirements of the convention hence were applied in the conservation and preservation. In this sense, as the most significant assets, Historical Peninsula of Istanbul, Göreme-

¹⁷⁵ C. Michael Hall and Hazel Tucker, “Tourism and Post-colonialism: An introduction”, p. 9.

¹⁷⁶ Walsh, p.137.

¹⁷⁷ Frans Schouten, “Heritage as a Historical Reality” in Herbert, David T. (ed) *Heritage, Tourism and Society*. (London, England; New York, NY, USA: Mansell, 1995). p. 21

Cappadocia, Nemrut and Troy were introduced as the heritage sites. The memory practices articulated in the course of these regions have been the ground for the new identity and cultural politics in Turkey in the period following the memories of coup *d'état*. The emphasis made on the coexistence of a variety of cultures in the course of history in the same geography created the basis of the multicultural remembrance practices.

The images of these heritagized regions have not been operated only for the identity-construction, but also those functioned as the major points in the course of which tourism practices were realized. In this sense, Istanbul, for example, has become one of the most significant image through which the Turkey is coded and produced. Bartu states that “cultural heritage, preservation and conservation become contested domains through which the past, present and future are (re)worked and (re)formulated. Globalization is inscribed within the particular social, cultural and historical contexts. Within this framework, heritage and the politics of the past take on a very different meaning, and which past to preserve and market, and to whom market it to, become political questions.”¹⁷⁸ In the framework of these political questions, the Ottoman heritage remembrances which coexisted with the “contemporary” code, mainly signifying the level of being modern, created the post-1980s new memory mapping of Istanbul.

In this sense, Mardin which was declared as a nominee in the World Heritage List in 2000 presents a more concrete example in terms how the heritage politics in a region functions on the remapping of the memory practices, identity constructions and consumption motivations. The remembrance of Mardin as one of the ancient centers of world civilizations is not only rooted in its cosmopolitan character, but

¹⁷⁸ Ayfer Bartu, pp. 152-153.

also in the fact that Assyrian Christians, one of the most ancient Christian branches in the Middle East, also, were started to be narrated in the indigenous histories. The history narrated in Mardin is rather fragmented and the practice of remembrance picks up the stories of a cosmopolitan past. Therefore, in fact, the space which is rendered timeless emerges as the homogenous heritage area and the example of a melting pot of cultures. However, such contextualization such as presenting Mardin as a space in harmony and untouched throughout the course of centuries denies historical processes, and radiates only the historical surface of the *medreses* and Assyrian churches.¹⁷⁹

The display of Mardin in the form of a historical surface, in fact, worked as reflecting the society not with highlighted differences but rather as a continuous picture extending from antiquity. Hence, as Walsh mentions, the history of the space is presented as one which is continuous, homogenous and without discord.¹⁸⁰ Hence, the commodification of the area by a highlighted cultural identity in the form of universal but an indigenous historical narration emerged as the most classical example of 1990s of remembrance and museum practices in Mardin. The formation of the newly constructed narration of Mardin has resulted in the reflection of the space as a form of theme park for visitors whereas there is an ongoing life independent from all cultural attributions.

Another example of commodified and universalized space by post-1980s may be mentioned as Zelve in Cappadocia. As examined by Hazel Tucker a similar politics of exhibition to Mardin was applied in Zelve.¹⁸¹ As Tucker underlined there were

¹⁷⁹ Walsh, p.183.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹⁸¹ Tucker, Hazel. 'Kapadokya'da, Zelve'de Bellek ve Deneyim'' in *Hatırladıklarıyla ve unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin toplumsal hafızası* edited by Esra Özyürek. (İstanbul : İletişim, 2001) p.255.

two major points to be problematized pertaining to the case.¹⁸² One of them is that the narration constructed in Zelve underlines merely the Christian past of the area. As Urry mentions,

“heritage history is distorted because of the predominant emphasis as visualization, on presenting visitors with an array of artifacts, including buildings (either real or manufactured), and then trying to visualize patterns of that would have emerged around them. This is an essentially ‘artefactual history’, in which a whole variety of social experiences are necessarily ignored, trivialized, such as war, exploitation, disease, law and so on.”¹⁸³

Hence in a similar vein to Mardin, in Zelve the commodification and the marketing of the heritage past have resulted in the homogenization of the current situation through historical surface narrations.

To sum up, the post-1980 political agenda which emerged as the introduction of neo-liberal politics of governmentality through state, strong transnational corporations and global politics, found its expression in the practices of museums and exhibitions. The agenda of power and its agencies came up with their remembrance practices which perfectly extracted present-oriented issues. The identity politics and their cultural practices, at first hand, introduce the sense that the push of the hardcore linear, progressive and singular discourse of the former practices would be replaced through more liberating practices in which the public sphere would emerge with flexible borders and more inclusive attitudes.

However, as the marketing and commodification methods of heritage politics put forward, the novel museum practices, also, have emerged as the area where power exhibited itself by these remembrance practices. The post-1990s emergency of cultural politics has emphasized and mostly visualized the coexistence of religions

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 255

¹⁸³ John Urry, “Gazing On History”, p. 115.

and nations in Anatolia throughout the centuries in the Turkish context. The political agenda of recent governments has largely been preoccupied by the issue of European Union criterias so that the remembrance practices have focused on developing a sense of belonging to Europe, the idea of coexistence and the hints buried in the past of Anatolia. These concrete steps emerge have also, also, as the newly constructed citizenship and identity models. The sense of belonging to a community in which different religions and cultures have coexisted in the course of centuries – that should be in coincidence with the set “universal values” - presented the realm of new political practices of power.

Neo-Conservative Memory in Exhibition: Miniaturk

“*Miniaturk: Showcase of Turkey*”, as a recent example, presents a clear model for the post-1980s museal projects in the sense of both its physical construction and the content of the narration. Both the former and latter served as the basis of experiences that were quite distinctive than museums in the modern sense. Basically, focused on the role of reviving the dead memories of the cultural and social geography where the initial modernization practices were bodily represented in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the *Miniaturk* exhibition complex situated on the shore of the Golden Horn, as a tool of a nostalgic remembrance through the contents it covers with the aura of a fairy tale.

In addition, the physical construction of the exhibition is set in coincidence with the postmodern museum style which appeared to be designed distinctively compared with the former examples. The fragmented and non-linear structure of the museum

presents the experience process in the museum in a distinctive form which is set as a tool of communication between the object and audience in the framework of the content and exhibition practices. Furthermore, this physical structure appears to allow a ground for the eclectic type of memory practice. In this sense, *Miniaturk* functions as a postmodern exhibitionary complex in which the power strategies and codes of post-1980s Turkey, mainly of conservative politics are rendered concrete with the basic memory practice strategies.

Miniaturk, Minyatür Türkiye Parkı, was initiated in 2003 by a company called Culture A.Ş., which was once depended on the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, but then was privatized. The park is located on the northern coast of the The Golden Horn in the distinct known as *Sütlüce*, covering 60.000 square meters. The Golden Horn, one of the oldest areas in Istanbul, has been loaded with various memorial and identity projects on its surface since the beginning of the post-1980s. Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality Programs inserted the Golden Horn on the agenda for rehabilitation and reconstruction programs during the 1980s.¹⁸⁴ As a part of the initiation of *Bedrettin Dalan*, the candidate of Motherland Party for mayor of Istanbul in the 1980s, the revival of the environment in the Golden Horn Project was realized and the memories of this initiation confluence in the name of *Dalan*, mainly turning it into a prestigious credit in his later projects.¹⁸⁵

Miniaturk was thus constructed in the rehabilitated environment of The Golden Horn as a part of the “Cultural Region Project” of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality¹⁸⁶ that was planned to be realized along the entire northern shore of the estuary which would be turned the space into an entertainment and leisure time

¹⁸⁴ “Bir İstanbul Rüyası”, *Radikal*, 6 June 2001

¹⁸⁵ Bedrettin Dalan, *Haliç Neydi, Ne Oluyor, Ne Olacak*, 1986. (There is no publish information available)

¹⁸⁶ Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality Yearly Plan, 1997 available [online]: <http://www.ibb.gov.tr/index.htm>

activities space. The main perspective in the cultural politics has been developed into projects in the area mainly reflecting the memory practices those will revive the *sefahat* (dissipation) of the Ottoman era understanding of entertainment dating back to Tulip Era (1718-1730), define, in the Golden Horn.¹⁸⁷ Hence, it is important to examine the space where the context in which *Miniaturk* has been built and to analyze the historically tied memory and identity relations¹⁸⁸ that appear as the main vein of the hegemonic cultural politics of the 1980s.

The area has the characteristics of including multiple cultures since the Byzantine age. During the Ottoman era, the area was mainly populated by Jews on the southern coast, and mainly by Greek and Armenian on the northern coast.¹⁸⁹ The multicultural population inhabited the area until the growth of industrial workshops and factories in the middle of nineteenth century. The construction of rather small capacity ship building facilities along the coast of at *Kasımpaşa* turned the area into an industrial space.

This change in the area resulted in a trend of the de-population and the pollution on the coast in the long term. The withdrawal of the inhabitants starting with the

¹⁸⁷Radikal,6 August 2001, Haliç'te Sefahat

”Haliç, tamamen kültür, sanat ve eğlence merkezi olacak. İnce uzun nostalji kayıklarıyla gezinti yapan insanlar, Sütlüce Kültür Konferans ve Sergi Sarayı'nın önüne yanaşarak sinema, tiyatro, konser gibi etkinliklere katılabilecek. Kayıklarla Haliç sefasının diğer bir durağı ise Haliç adacıklarının üzerindeki çay bahçeleri olacak. Vapurlar ve deniz otobüsleri Haliç'e sürekli sefer yapacak. Bir zamanlar bataklığa dönüşen Haliç'in sularında insanlar yüzecek, oltalar atılacak. Altın Boynuz'un diğer bir güzelliği inşa edilen marinadaki yatlar olacak. Kıyıda ise faytonlar kendileri için ayrılmış yollarda, insanları taşıyacak.

Türkiye'nin tarihi yapılarının maketleri ise kıyıyı süsleyecek. Haliç kıyılarında Galata Kulesi, Anadolu, Rumelihisarı, Süleymaniye Camii, Dolmabahçe Sarayı gibi yapıların gerçeğine uygun maketleri yapılacak. Kentin tarihi güzelliklerini görmek isteyen turistlerin ilk durağı minyatür şehir olacak, geziler burada planlanacak. Haliç'in üzerinden geçen teleferik, kentin en güzel manzaralarından birine sahip olacak.

Haliç, beş sinema, 1300 kişilik tiyatro salonu, açık hava tiyatrosu, gezi ve seyir alanları, kayak iskeleleri, fuar alanları, onlarca sergi salonu, fayton parkları ve yolları, temizlenen Kâğıthane ve Alibeyköy derelerinin çevresinde ise büyük mesire alanlarına sahip olacak. “

¹⁸⁸ John R Gillis, (ed.) “Introduction” in *Commemorations : The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press,1994), p.26.

¹⁸⁹ Murat Belge. *İstanbul Gezi Rehberi*. (İstanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), p. 112.

industrialization period accelerated during the 1940s and 1950s with the politics developed against the non-Muslim population. The area was mostly de-populated and the skirts of the *Hasköy*, on the one hand; and *Eyüp*, on the other hand, were turned into new neighborhoods. The Golden Horn predominantly is loaded with the memory and identity relations, which are historically bonded, going back to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with the contents of multicultural, modernity and coexistence politics, mainly originating from the idea of tolerance in Ottoman state politics.

Miniaturk, with the internal context it includes, stands as one of the realized projects of the official agenda of the municipality. *Cengiz Özdemir*, the pioneer of the project and the current manager of *Miniaturk*, declares that the location of the project was not a random choice.¹⁹⁰ The region is coded with the memorials of the Ottoman modernization period on the one hand; and on the other hand, the multicultural social background coincides with the current global politics and multicultural social theories of the post-1980s.

Miniaturk exhibits one hundred and five selected miniaturized models of historical, national and natural pieces ranging from the Antiquity of the Anatolian past to Ottoman past in a wider geography. The physical construction of the exhibition in the space and the context of the narration established by these pieces are required to be examined in regard to the ideologies and memory politics inserted in the historical skin of the Golden Horn. However, it should be kept in mind that the exhibition area is not a monolog-oriented space as opposed to the narrations in an exhibitionary space in the classical sense.

¹⁹⁰ “Minyatür Mirasa Akın”, Cumhuriyet, 17 March 2003.

Foucault argues that the order of displayed materials presents the mentality in regard to the construction of the social and cultural in that society.¹⁹¹ However, the perspective accepting the set narrative as the main text and keeping its composition as the given, results in the distortion of the underlying integrated narratives of multi-layer structures and political relations between them. The main concern in analyzing the context and the organization of the space is to put forward the clues mapping the ideologies underlying the narration.

Entering a gate with a magnetic ticket which is also equipped as a tool for audio guidance, the visitor follows the way to the exhibition space. As Sherman and Rogoff comment “classifying functions through the imposition of order and meaning in objects and through the positing of objects as triggers of ideas”¹⁹². In regard to how it appears in the guide booklet, the space and the “ideas triggered” are organized in three sections: Anatolia, Istanbul and the section pieces from former Ottoman territories.¹⁹³

The basic characteristic of the exhibition space is the organization of the pieces breaking through the linear time conception and organization of those with a space-oriented method. Whereas the issue in the origin of modern museum planning was to insert a defined time sphere in a linearity within the relationship of cause and effect so as to emphasize the progress and the ideology of development, in the organization of *Miniaturk* it is not possible to define any kind of time concept that relates the objects in the same category.

¹⁹¹ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things : An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York : Vintage Books, 1973), p. 12.

¹⁹² Daniel J. Sherman and Irit Rogoff (eds.) *Museum Culture : Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*. (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1994), p. xi.

¹⁹³ The section is named as “Abroad”. Basically, it is constructed as a present to the 500th anniversary Conquer of Istanbul.

In relation to time-space definition and their slippage with the introduction of postmodern idea relates the experience of industrialization and rapid urbanization with the destruction of the idea of organic contingent past for many people.¹⁹⁴ In the early modern examples of museum practices, it was an obligation to expose a definite time concept in order to create the past as an undifferentiated path of progress in which the masses stabilize their positions and construct the idea of the past as frozen and left back and the future to be developed.¹⁹⁵ The contemporary age, with the introduction of global politics, enables the movement of masses and of information both rapid and easily so that the time and space conceptions change and vary. The loosening of dependency on the defined space is not only realized in the mobilization experiences of the masses but also in the information traveled so quickly. The rapidity in the motion and transmission of knowledge is reflected into the understanding of time and space. The introduction of new technologies in the process of learning and teaching and the insertion of these in daily life practices pave the way for a variety of new definitions in the sense of farness and multi-spaces. The reflection of these in the museum, where the past and its ideologies represented inevitably has undergone a significant change in regard to the organization of the pieces and the tools that are used to represent such as new media technologies and the organization of the space.

In the case of *Miniaturk*, the uncovering of a unique time sphere is resulted in the “togetherness” of the past and the present under the same categories. What is derived from the institutional vision that appears in the guide booklet is that packing the idea of past and present “at the same time” is the basis of the time conception in the exhibition. Hence, for instance, the visitor is able to reach the information of a piece that belongs to the antiquity just before that of a monument that date back to the late

¹⁹⁴ Walsh, p. 12

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.* , p.64

nineteenth century. The basic relation appears to be established between these in the form of categorizing within the same space orientation. There are two main implications that can be analyzed as a result of this constructed “togetherness”. Initially, from an optimistic point of view, the experience of the visitor is rendered free of any outer decision-maker in the making of its narration, and the visitor is provided with the opportunity to stroll around independently. The breaking of linear narration provides the reader of the museal text with the opportunity to reach the omitted or covered details to reveal the “others” narration. In the seeking of a democratized discourse in the body of the museum, the overthrow of hegemony of time and space over the visitors’ experiences, hence, would pioneer the “articulating the liberating potential of the museum that has never been entirely realized.”¹⁹⁶

However, the case in *Miniaturk* emerges as the de-contextualization of the narration with the de-historicized characteristic of objects both by the lack of time perception and the presentation of those as miniaturized models. Initially, the de-historicized objects in a blurred order of things pave the way for the de-contextualization of the object itself, as well. Although the object carries plenty of social and historical narratives and discourses in the original framework in which it stands, in the exhibition where it is located, it is lost in all of these discourses.

The decrease in the size of the models and the condition of negotiation of these with their real location and with the other reproductions bring about some other problems. That is, the size of the models in *Miniaturk* are arranged and designed in accordance with their counterparts in Europe; that is, the models to be viewed are scale 1/25 reduced of their real sizes.¹⁹⁷ The miniaturized model is rendered an icon in the eye of the visitor for whom the information of its reality is reachable. The

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁹⁷ “Türkiye’nin Minyatürü Avrupa Birliği’ne Girdi”, Milliyet, 30 October 2002.

status of turning into an icon reinforces the de-contextualization condition since the size of the reproduced construction turns out to be an object or a symbol which is separated and neutralized from its political meaning. That is, the reduced pieces which are pushed out of their original size, space and time sphere, in the end, appear as homogenized pieces. Whereas the original pieces continue their functions where they are located, the reproduced model in the exhibition area produces a distinctive narration within the conditions of negotiating with the other pieces and loses its communication with its real version. In addition, it appears in the space separated from its own narration as either a unique piece or an aesthetic form.

In regard to the analysis for the timeless togetherness of the miniaturized models and the multicultural value of the timeless construction Urry¹⁹⁸ mentions that it results in the erasing of the social realities held on around those representations. In a similar vein, in the article, *Oktay Ekinçi*¹⁹⁹ argues that separating the narration of the object from its original space and inserting the miniaturized model into a theme park can be understood as a kind of cultural *takkiye*. In a parallel view, although one can seek for a liberating opportunity in the multicultural and counter-linear text of the exhibition itself, the de-historicized and de-contextualized narration results in the commodification of the object itself. That is why the presentation of *Miniaturk* as the “Showcase of Turkey” is possible.²⁰⁰ The analysis of de-historicizing and de-contextualizing epistemology is indispensable in order to dissolve the logic and the narration of multicultural ideology inserted in the narration of the exhibition in *Miniaturk*.

¹⁹⁸ John Urry, “Gazing on History” in *Representing the Nation: A Reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) (London, New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 172.

¹⁹⁹ Oktay Ekinçi, “Dünya Mirasında ‘Miniaturk’”, *Cumhuriyet*, 15 June 2003.

²⁰⁰ Please see Guide Book of Miniaturk, Cover; Also available [online]: www.Miniaturk.com.tr

Miniaturk as an overall stage in representing the unique historical and natural pieces around the Anatolian geography introduces a plenty of memory practices. The categories and the inner organization of each section reveals the narrator's basic point as presenting those unique pieces within the framework of the uncovering of the time concept, and in return, it is the reinforcement of space. Therefore, the classification is not based on the time circulation, but on the geographic labeling, which briefly reminds one of the administrative *eyalet* (provincial) system of the Ottoman. In regard to how it appears in the guide booklet, the space of *Miniaturk* is organized in three sections: Anatolia, Istanbul, and the section pieces from former Ottoman territories.²⁰¹ The revealing of these objects and monuments as the signifiers of memories, as mentioned by Crane,²⁰² then become components of identities under these categories.

In the search of memory practices in the Anatolia section which is constructed as the initial section, it includes not only the models of historic monuments or religious buildings, but also civil constructions such as *Mardin* Houses and natural sites such as *Pamukkale*. The largest part of this section emphasizes the Turkish and Islamic identity through models of mosques, castles and houses belong to this geography. The pieces belonging to antiquity are the only non-Islamic and non-Turkish items that are placed in this section, although it is known that Anatolia has been home to many communities apart from its antique past. However, the most interesting side of the section is that the exhibition is started to be viewed first the *Mevlana Türbesi* (tomb), coded as the symbol of the tolerance in Anatolia. It is explained in the booklet of the

²⁰¹ The section is named as "Yurtdışı".

²⁰² Susan Crane A., *Museums and Memory*, (Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press, 2000), p. 2.

exhibition that the miniature of the tomb stands as the representation of the voice of multiculturalism in and around Anatolia.²⁰³

In the last analysis, the general memory practice developed in the Anatolia section is mainly that it stands on the idea of construction of Anatolia as the motherland and confirms the former civilization heritages as the gains and the wealth of the Turkish cultural heritage and its characteristics. The ideology on Anatolia is mainly rooted in the nationalist ideology of the early Republican era in the search for to create a national history. The Turkish History Thesis of early 1930s was constructed on the ideology of defining the cultural borders of Anatolia. On the other hand, the idea of Anatolia was adopted mainly by the conservative ideology as a tool to overcome the dilemmas of a modernizing of the new and of dissolving former territories.²⁰⁴ Hence, the heritage of the East and the West, as crystallized in the ideas of *Peyami Safa*, was adopted for the basis for the Turkish cultural codes.

The multicultural framework for the Anatolian section excludes the recent past and current multicultural structure of Anatolia. Although the pieces have been selected from a wide range of time sphere, the political agenda in regard to cultural identity of Anatolia tends to define its component mainly on the Turkish-Islam identity basis. The mere sub-contents of the cultural identity established in the framework appear as the Greco-Roman heritage. The inclusion of a variety of construction forms selected in consideration of the distinctive regions of Anatolia, although none of the representations of current Arab, Armenian or Kurdish monuments are included, are declared as the plural vision of Anatolia. The inclusion in *Miniaturk* the section of Anatolia can be understood as the insertion of the neo-

²⁰³ Miniaturk Guide Booklet, p.4

²⁰⁴ For further reseraches Peyami Safa, *20. Asır Avrupa ve Biz*, (İstanbul : Ötüken Yayınevi, 1976); Peyami Safa, *Doğu-Batı Sentezi*, (İstanbul : Yağmur Yayınevi, 1976); Peyami Safa, *Türk İnkılabına Bakışlar* (Ankara : Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1988)

conservative politics of the 1980s in general, and the politics represented by the main actors initiated *Miniaturk*, in particular.

The ideological discourse and memory practices on the surface of the Istanbul section are constructed through a wide range of time spheres of Istanbul from Byzantium until today. A nostalgic map of Istanbul is offered that includes a map of the historical peninsula, including pieces such as Hagia Sofia and Blue Mosque on the one hand, and on the other hand, the emphasis given to contemporary pieces with the representations of the Bosphorus Bridge and *Atatürk* Airport. The inclusion of very contemporary models in this section such as *Profilo* Shopping Center and the *Yapı Kredi* Banking Base not only stands as a marketing strategy, but also brings about the vision for a representation of modern Istanbul and its modern inhabitants.

The memory practice throughout the Istanbul section paves the way for a clear ‘‘coexistence’’ of politics, distinctive from the emphasis made in the Anatolia section. The significant examples of Christian and Jewish communities, such as St. Antoine Church or the Synagogue of *Ahır Kapı* are exhibited along the section siding with the Turkish and Islamic models as the examples of this coexistence strategy.

Last section includes the pieces from former Ottoman territories and can be analyzed in three perspectives: first, the multicultural identity is predominantly underlined, and second, the Ottoman modernization and the existence of European identity are articulated in the form of objects in this section. Apart from these, basically, the traces of the Ottoman past in the creation of peaceful coexistence in those regions are emphasized. It can be claimed that the most significant memory expression posited in this section is the revival of the former borders of ‘‘Ottoman Golden Age.’’ Here, the pieces from Balkans, Middle East and partly North Africa, of which the basic characteristic pieces were constructed either in the period of Ottoman

reign or by Turkish provinces or they are Islamic pieces are exhibited. Through the representation of these models the wide geography over which the Ottoman Empire extended through Middle East and the Balkans is shown. The pieces are emphasized in the booklet either as a space where great victories took place such as the Castle of Ecyad or the hint for the Ottoman or Islamic existence in the European geography extending in the course of centuries, as in the example of the Mostar Bridge. The recalling of the former realms through the Middle East and Balkans reveals the extension of the ideology constructing exhibition so that the coexistence and multicultural in-harmony were not only peculiar to Anatolia, but throughout the territories that Turkish-Islam past touched upon had contributed to these peaceful politics. In another sense, the imperial body of the Ottoman is reconstructed through these remembrance practices. Through de-historicized and de-contextualized models, the context of the exhibitionary area is laid on the homogenized and equally set community signifiers as the display of a political body.

The memory that is articulated in the context of *Miniaturk* predominantly is based on the existence of Turkish and Islamic identity in a vast realm basically emphasized with the key words of multiculturalism and coexistence. The revival of memories on the other side of the border brings about questions of the timing of this remembrance, on the one hand and, on the other hand, the political implication that could be derived from this text from the point of view of the visitor to *Miniaturk* in the form of experience. Apparently, the memory is the articulation of present needs in the form of past materials.²⁰⁵ From this point of view, the political agenda is occupied predominantly with the integration process to Europe and with the ideology dragged from the early 1980s pioneered by *Turgut Özal* as the revival of the new Ottoman

²⁰⁵ Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering*, (Open University Press: Maidenhead, Philadelphia, 2003), p. 25.

idea through the motto of “peace with history and geography” in the form of cultural discourse.²⁰⁶

In regard to the political agenda and cultural identity represented in *Miniaturk*, the interrogation of Neo-Ottomanism may lead the argument over it a step forward. As mentioned by Çetinsaya²⁰⁷, the neo-Ottomanism of the 1990s was mostly developed in the framework of change in the mapping of world (politics) by the dissolution of huge political systems such as Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia, both of which either included Turkic population or the heritage of the Ottomans. Hence as stated by Çetinsaya²⁰⁸ in the interrogation of the basic politics of Turgut Özal, it was the revival of imperial identity of Ottoman would provide Turkey with the imperial vision that was required in tackling the shifting balances in the area through the re-imagining of pre-World War I Ottoman realms and administrative system. The remembrance of Muslim communities inhabited in the Balkan region or the Kurdish population dispersed in the north of the region called the Middle East, were turned into political insertion of the 1980s neo-liberal in the extended form of neo-Ottomanism.

In the sense of the 1990s, Çandar²⁰⁹ mentions that neo-Ottomanism ideology sought redefinition in the region. This redefinition may be sought in the overall context of *Miniaturk*. The eagerness to take part in the postcolonial period with the neo-Ottomanist political projects represented in the exhibition as the revival of Ottoman borders in the surface of The Golden Horn. As mentioned formerly, *Miniaturk* stands as a space where an imperial past is re-imagined around the coexistence of a multicultural social structure within the nostalgia of the late

²⁰⁶ Gökhan Çetinsaya, “Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinde Osmanlıcılık” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Vol 5. Muhafazakarlık* edited by Murat Belge (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2004), p. 378.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 375.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 377.

²⁰⁹ in Çetinsaya, p. 379.

nineteenth century Ottoman Empire; on the other hand, the idea of the making of a modern society is inserted into the narration of the exhibition through the display of contemporary buildings.

The projection of a modern society image coincides with the European integration process that Turkish politics is currently experiencing. As mentioned in the news about the article, *Miniaturk* has entered the European Union before Turkey has been included as an official member.²¹⁰ The emphasis on the European identity through geographical references, as in the example of pieces from Balkans, and the narration of Modern Turkey through the pieces of the Empire Train Station built in the late nineteenth century in Damascus by the Ottomans as well as the shopping malls, airport, financial center and bridge belonging to contemporary age stand as the images of defined identity references.

The exhibition in *Miniaturk* with architectural models of various signs representing Turkish-Islam and the Anatolian past presents a set of identity politics and a sense of struggle in the public sphere paving the way to a new citizenship construction through memories pertaining to a wider geography and a past emphasized within Anatolia, Istanbul, the Balkans and the Middle East.

There are three basic characteristics introduced by *Miniaturk* as example of postmodern museum practice. Initially, the time sphere defined is fragmented and timeless. Hence, the monuments and the objects are rendered lacking their historical and social context and reduced to the de-historicized and de-contextualized commodified pieces. The timeless positions of the pieces, therefore, result in the overemphasis of the space and the piece itself.

²¹⁰ “Türkiye’nin Minyatürü Avrupa Birliği’ne girdi”, Milliyet, 30 October 2002

Second, the main emphasis roots from the exhibition is the coexistence of various cultures and the religions “at the same time, all together in Anatolia.” While the timeless character of the exhibition directly reinforces “simultaneity and togetherness”, by the way, the message to be given by the ideology of the exhibition can be well analyzed. The initiator and the main sponsor of the exhibition is the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, the political position of which is reflected within conservative democratic principles. The main emphasis of political agenda was constructed through tolerance, coexistence and European Union integration. The memory practices were focused on the multicultural past of Anatolia as the homeland on the one hand; on the other hand, the veins through European and Middle Eastern territories where Ottoman aid were remembered in order to underline the harmonious imperial past. Therefore, on the one hand the ideological stand point that the exhibition points not only as a display for a design of European identity but also it aims to create the attachment of imperial senses that the former ideologies of museum practices underestimated by the Republican citizenship model. Hence, the memory practices which construct the Ottoman period as a time sphere when all the cultures lived together peacefully is pointed to as a citizenship model that the visitors are directed to be connected in the exhibition, and therefore they are able to experience the context of the narration.

The exhibition , hence, not only underlines its already gifted European identity within the examples the ones situated in the Western territories, but also it indicates its further existence through contemporary pieces. *Miniaturk*, which is constructed in the form of a theme park with its café, restaurant, kindergarten and shopping center, presents visitors a past through all the times and all the spaces on the coast of the

golden Horne where the nostalgic aura of the Tulip Era (1718-1730), which was the onset of Westernization practices at the same coast.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

This study presents the analysis of the museum practices in Turkey in the post-1980 period in the framework of museum politics in the course of which power relations, identity construction and technologies of rule are examined. First of all, the museum is examined as social space in which the culture, history and memory codes are visualized, there arose the relationship among the multilayered and integrated layers of the society. In the second chapter, the basis of the analysis indicated that the museum in the modern sense functioned as a “contact zone”²¹¹ in the course of which the hegemonic power and its components sought for the methods in exploiting the space as an ideological tool in the imposition of its own norms and culture. Constructing its norms and culture as the fundamentals of the rule and power, the organization of the museum context and structure, therefore, were established on the cultivated veins of those norms. The museum emerged as the “encyclopedic tool” of the modern state and its cultural habits, the ground for the visualization of the power and its definitions, functioning as the education material of the hegemonic power.

In the framework of this paper the museum practice in the context of the late Ottoman and early Republican eras indicated that the museum functioned as one of the significant spaces in the course of which the fundamentals of the modern idea was operated so as to fix the narration of the past and the direction of the temporal. The

²¹¹ James Clifford “Museums as Contact Zones” in *Representing the Nation: A Reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) (London, New York: Routledge, 1999). pp. 434-437.

narration of the birth of a nation, the uniqueness of a culture basically depended on the rural identity and the roots of this identity in the invented golden age were subjected to the construction of national and cultural identities. In that sense, the encyclopedic function of the museum was the insertion of the fundamental entries of the memory practices that would be the basis of the further museal projects, especially in the political instants in the course of which the national memory practices were required to be revived as occurred in the post-1960s.

Through the novel applications in the space of the museum which was now designed distinctively from the museum in the classical sense, the construction of national identity and ordering of cultural codes in the museum appeared in a variety of dispersed and differentiated forms of representations by the post-1980s, which makes up the other main concern of this paper. Whereas the former emergency mission was to pass on the information to itself and to the audience in the form of text and symbol, the 1980s came up with the change in the transition of information in the form of presenting experience, basically in the form of digitalized information through new media technologies or virtual techniques.

Apart from the cyber techniques inserted in the museum, experience in the museum was created in other ways through peculiar architectural design such as in the striking example of the space of the Jewish Museum (Berlin). In the museum, rather than the existence of original and classified material itself, the space is designed so that the audience is presented with texture in the form of experience.²¹² The insertion of the emotion and experience with the layers of political agenda in the form of memory practices was turned into a mainstream tool of conducting cultural identity in the body of museum in the post-1980s.

²¹² James E Young, "Memory, Countermemory, and the End of Monument" in *At Memory's Edge's: After Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. (New Haven : Yale University Press, 2000), p. 46.

In the construction of the cultural identity, the collective memory practices of the post-1980s appeared as the other means in the museal project that included and exhibited itself. Principally operated as a present-oriented phenomenon, collective memory practices in the post-1980s appeared in fragmented forms, basically affected and shaped by global and multicultural approaches through which the memories of the marginalized included separated categories. However, it is striking that these categories, on the other hand, were re-classified under the category of “distinctive” or the “other” in many ways. Therefore the museumization of the indigenous and ethnic communities became a widespread application in the space of the museum.

The position of the museum in politics and society expanded in the post-1980s, extending beyond the walls and beyond the huge collections and archives. It has extended beyond the walls through the heritagization of larger places and the reproduction of the image of the past in theme parks. For instance, in regard to the space of representation, theme parks and open-air museums were established, such as the first miniature parks *Madurodam*, Disneyland or Alton Towers. On the other hand, whereas the idea of “museum architecture”²¹³ had been invented by the onset of twentieth century as a result of various practical discourses, recently abandoned industrial areas were turned into museums or cultural centers, as in the example of the Tate Modern in London or Istanbul Modern in Istanbul.

The space of the museum has evolved as well as the inner context it used to present. The extension of the museum beyond the collection in the space in the course of the other cultivating activities turned the space into a multilayered cultural center. The accumulation of the current hegemonic power then turned its educative

²¹³ Bennett, “Exhibitionary Complex”, p. 337.

tools in the course of distinctive application, such as art workshops for children, which rendered the characteristics of the space beyond the collection. The organization of the museum space with additional components such as thematic movie activities, cafés or libraries as well as the temporary activities arranged inside the building; such as seminars or the concerts, then rendered it as one of the zones in which the habit of spending time, which has become a part of the daily practices of the people in the course of the postmodern temporal perception.

The extension of the idea of the museum in the space also worked out through the transformation of the temporal. The transformation of perception by breaking the linear and progressive narration has brought about the collapse in the usual imagination of the past, present and future. Hence, the temporal has been followed through its fragments, basically in the form of instants. This could result in the creation of the liberating practice inside the museum within the conditions of grasping the instants in their fragments. In a sense, the liberation of the narration from the teleological line and its suppressing obligations could be imagined. However, the over-rapidly alteration of the instants is very much reflected the emergence of the nostalgia project of the memory practices. In this sense, the resistance against the condition of the rapid temporal perception, as well as the physically extended and fragmented organization that changed with it, resulted in the need for a buffer effect for instantaneous forgetting. What post-1980s memory and museum practices therefore do not use the evaluation of the instantaneous as a liberating practice, but rather as a conservative position?

The opportunity of using the space as a liberating practice have faded due to two clear problematic of the museum practices in the post-1980s. First of all, the de-contextual representation of the past in the narration of the indigenous and ethnic

pasts has become the sole epistemology traced in the exhibition space. Therefore, the image of the “frozen past” in the surface of the space and in the language of the narration rendered the perception of the culture and its memories out of present and mostly for the interests of the tourists. Therefore, the discourse, which describes the postmodern techniques and approach in the museum as demarcating in the sense that the representation of the formerly suppressed identities have become realized, can be falsified due to its hidden characteristic of inclusion of the containment politics in its very nature. The cultural heritage projects mostly aimed to be established on geography with the motivation of reviving the lost or just disappeared cultures throughout the “universal values”, exemplifies well the mapping of the ideology that brings about the concept of containment.

Second, the hegemony of the upper classes on the imperial representations has resulted in the re-production of those in the hands of them as a tool of power. From this perspective, it is obvious that the self-definition of the power through the imperialistic images, which have been located in the living-room, have become the expression of the “norms” of the hegemonic power in the post-1980s. This self-definition which has been stemmed from the revival of the imperialist image constructed the self-definition of the audience, the public, in the museum. In this sense, as Debord writes, the spectacle society monitors the performance of the hegemonic power in its own environment.

Established as the basic concern of this paper, the analysis of post-1980s museum politics within the context of the analysis of Turkey, hence, pointed to the changing characteristics in the surface of the museum in coincidence with the transforming concepts and epistemology of modernity and the conduction of the cultural identity

throughout the memory practices. Grounded on the traumatic conditions of the *coup d'etat* in 1980, and simultaneous application of the free market economy politics, the location and the penetration techniques of the hegemonic power blocs appeared to set themselves in a more fragmented position and free from the former effects of the state.

The shift in the power relations that basically stemmed from the reorganization of the upper and middle-classes²¹⁴ was reflected into the self-representation of these through the mechanism of symbolic power in the sense that Bourdieu conceptualizes.²¹⁵ In the social space of the museum, the material object, through which the bourgeoisie represent itself, also functioned as the cultural capital. Hence formerly exploited by the state for the sake of the national politics, the assets belonging to a past functioned as the mostly aestheticized and possessed domination instrument over the public. The private in the museum space in the post-1980s Turkey, as indicated in the third chapter, emerged as one of the most significant projects in the cultural politics of the period.

The insertion of the nostalgic remembrance practices as a form of cultural policy into the context of post-1980s Turkey appears to be crystallized through the introduction of heritage politics. Basically stemmed from the integration of the formerly shaded geographies of the Middle East and Balkans, the national values and identities were rediscovered in the course of a variety of distinctive region through heritage politics. As stated by Schouten,

Heritage is a product, and as a product, it is as subject to differences in validation and interpretation as the historical process itself. Heritage changes

²¹⁴ Can Kozanoğlu, *Yenişehir Notları*, İstanbul: İletişim Yay, 2000.

²¹⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, “Social Space and Symbolic Power”, p.225.

over time in the way it is presented and also in the ways in which public reacts to its presentation.²¹⁶

The reaction of the people to heritage is beyond the scope of this study. However, the politics produced through these heritage sites basically carried postcolonial characteristics. Heritage politics puts on this post-colonial characteristic by the invention of the traditions, the recreation of the cultural identities and integration of those as the authenticated into the daily practices.²¹⁷ In the traces of the heritage politics, the remapping of Mardin and Cappadocia were examined as the two distinctive examples in this paper.

The representation of the past appears to be deeply engaged with the nostalgic forms of memory practices in the post-1980s beyond the application of the heritage politics. In the scope of this study the existing forms of the nostalgic representations in the space of the museum in the post 1980s and the politics produced in the course of these were built as another concern. In the last analysis, the visualization of the conservative politics and neo-liberal economy politics hand in hand in the postmodern age in the space of the postmodern museum coexisted in the course of these nostalgic practices. Urry emphasizes that “furthermore, nostalgic memory is quite different from the total recall; it is a socially organized construction. The question is not whether we should or should not preserve the past, but what kind of past we have chosen to preserve.”²¹⁸

The past that the neo-conservative politics have chosen to preserve and represent themselves through emerged as the nostalgic remembrance of the Ottoman Golden Age. Constructing the identity on the glamorized image of the Ottoman identity,

²¹⁶ Schouten, p.26

²¹⁷ Marschall, pp. 98-99.

²¹⁸ John Urry, “Gazing on History”, p. 212

although it is equipped with the dominant Turkish and Islamic marks, the multicultural politics were contextualized through the same framework by the reproduction of the “tolerance” and “coexistence” discourses. The construction of the overall social identity in the course of the “in harmony” imagination of the social through this neo-conservative construction in the museum space successfully benefits from the fragmented and non-linear temporality of the exhibitionary space. The non-linear design, as examined in the *Miniaturk* example, de-contextualized the relationship among the distinctive social actors so that the togetherness and simultaneity could be read as an indication of the tolerance and coexistence.

This study, in the last analysis, aimed to indicate that the museum space in the post-1980s functioned as a technology of rule in the framework that the collective identities were constructed through the memory practices in the age of multicultural and global politics through a variety of different channels, but mainly through the commodification of the present-oriented extractions of the past in the form of new narrations to be marketed in the exhibitionary complex.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmad, Feroz. *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*. Translated by Yavuz Alogan. İstanbul: Kaynak: 1999.

Altınıyıldız, Nur “İmparatorlukla Cumhuriyet Arasındaki Eşikte Siyaset ve Mimarlık” in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Vol 5. Muhafazakarlık* Murat Belge (ed.). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2004.

Anderson, Benedict. *Hayali Cemaatler : Milliyetçiliğin Kökeni ve Yayılması*. İstanbul ; İletişim Yay.:2004.

Arık, Remzi Oğuz. *Halkevlerinde Müze, Tarih ve Folklor Çalışmaları Kılavuzu*. Ankara:C. H. P. Halkevleri Yayınları, 1947.

Atasoy, Sümer. “Türkiye’de Müzecilik”. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay, 1996.

Bali, Rıfat N. *Tarz-ı Hayat'tan Life Style'a : Yeni Seçkinler, Yeni Mekanlar, Yeni Yaşamlar*. İstanbul : İletişim , 2005.

Bartu, Ayfer. “Rethinking Heritage Politics in a Global Context: A View from Istanbul” in *Hybrid Urbanism: on the Identity Discourse and the Built Environment* Nezar AlSayyad (ed). Westport; Conn.: Praeger, 2001.

Belge, Murat. *İstanbul Gezi Rehberi*. İstanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.

Bennett, Tony. “Exhibitionary Complex” in in *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds), London, New York: Routledge, 1999.

Bodur, Fulya. (ed) *Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Heykel ve Porselen Koleksiyonu*. İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1986.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups" in *Theory and Society*, no.14, 1985.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Social Space and Symbolic Power", *Sociological Theory*, 7 (1), 1989.

Bourdieu, Pierre. Darbel, Alain and Schnapper Dominique. *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and Their Public* Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman (trans) Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997, c1991.

Bora, Tanıl. "Muhafazakarlığın Değişimi ve Türk muhafazakarlığında Bazı Yol İzleri", *Toplum ve bilim*, 74 Güz, 1997.

Bozdoğan, Sibel. *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası : Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür*. Translated by Tuncay Birkan. İstanbul : Metis Yayınları, 2002.

Crane A., Susan. (ed.) *Museums and Memory*. Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press, 2000.

Çetinsaya, Gökhan. "Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Osmanlılık" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Vol 5. Muhafazakarlık*. Murat Belge (ed.). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2004.

Debord, Guy. *Gösteri Toplumu ve Yorumlar*. Translated by Ayşen Ekmekçi and Okşan Taşkent. İstanbul : Ayrıntı Yayınları, 1996.

Derman, M. Uğur and Giray, Kıymet and Eruz, Fulya Bodur (eds) *Sabancı Koleksiyonu*. İstanbul : Akbank, 1995.

Dicks, Bella. "Heritage, Governance and Marketization; A Case Study from Wales" in *Museum and Society*, no.1 (March 2003) Also available [online]: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/m&s/mands1.pdf>, March 2003.

Dirlik, Arif. "Modernity as History: Post-Revolutionary China, Globalization and the Question of Modernity." *Social History* 27, no. 1 (2002)

Duncan, Carol *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.

Eley, Geoff. "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century." in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Craig Calhoun (ed). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1996.

Evans, Jessica. " Introduction to Part Three" in *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) London, New York: Routledge, 1999.

Evans, Jessica. " Introduction to Part Four" in *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) London, New York: Routledge, 1999.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things : An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York : Vintage Books, 1973.

Frederic, Jameson. "Post Modernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" *New Left Review*, no. 146 (1984)

Gillis, John R. (ed.) *Commemorations : The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1994.

Grunffudd, Pyrs. "Heritage as National Identity" in Herbert, David T. (ed) *Heritage, Tourism and Society*. London, England; New York, NY, USA: Mansell, 1995.

Gür, Aslı. "Üç boyutlu Öyküler: Türkiyeli Ziyaretçilerin Gözünden Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi ve Temsil Ettiği Ulusal Kimlik". in *Hatırladıklarıyla ve unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası* Esra Özyürek (ed.) İstanbul : İletişim 2001.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. *Vitrinde Yaşamak: 1980lerin Kültürel İklimi*. İstanbul : Metis Yayınları, 2001.

Güvemli, Zahir. (ed) *Akbank'ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Resim Koleksiyonu*. İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1984.

Hall, Michael and Tucker, Hazel. "Tourism and Postcolonialism : An Introduction" in *Tourism and Postcolonialism : Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations* C. Michael Hall & Hazel Tucker (eds). London; New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.

Hall, Stuart (ed) *Representation : Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* . London;Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage, 1997

Halkevlerinin Faaliyet Raporları Hulasası. İstanbul: Hakimiyeti Milliye Matbaası, 1934.

Halkevlerinin Faaliyet Raporları Hulasası. İstanbul: Hakimiyeti Milliye Matbaası, 1936.

Harvey, David. *Postmodernliğin Durumu*; Translated by Sungur Savran. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003.

Herbert, David T. (ed) *Heritage, Tourism and Society*. London, England; New York, NY, USA: Mansell, 1995.

Huyssen, Andreas. *Alacakaranlık Anıları: Bellek Yitimi Kültüründe Zamanı Belirlemek*. Translated by Kemal Atakay. İstanbul, Metis Yayınları: 1999.

Huyssen, Andreas. "Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia" in *Public Culture* no: 12-1, 2000.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. London ; New York : Routledge, 2000.

Katoğlu,Murat. "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Sanat ve Kültür Hayatının Oluşumunda Kamu Yönetiminin Rolü". *Sanat Dünyamız*, no.89 (Güz 2003).

Karaduman, Hüseyin "Eski Eser Yasalarında Özel Müzeler, Koleksiyonculuk, Ticaret ve Müzayedeler, in *4. Müzecilik Semineri : bildiriler 16 - 18 Eylül 1998*. İstanbul : Askeri Müze, 1998.

Karp, Ivan and Lavine Steven D. (eds) *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

Kılıç, Füsün “Beş Yıllık Kakılınma Planları ve İcrasında Kùltür Varlıkları ve Müzelerin Deęerlendirilmesi”, in *4. Müzecilik Semineri : Bildiriler 16 - 18 Eylül 1998*. İstanbul : Askeri Müze, 1998.

Kervin Lee Klein, “On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse”, *Representations*, 69, 2000.

Koşay, Hamit Zübeyr. *Açık hava Halk Müzeleri ve Türkiye’de Açık hava Halk Müzesini Kurma İmkanları*. Ankara : Maarif Basımevi, 1958.

Kozanoęlu, Can. *Yeni Şehir Notları*, İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2000.

Lowenthal, David. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985

Lidchi, Henrietta. “Poetics and Politics of Exhibiting Other Cultures” in *Representation : Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* Stuart Hall (ed). London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage, 1997.

Macdonald, Sharon and Fyfe, Gordon eds. *Theorizing Museums*. Oxford : Blackwell, 1996.

Macdonald, Sharon and Silverstone Roger “Rewriting the Museums Fictions: Taxonomies, Stories, and Readers” in *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds) London, New York : Routledge, 1999.

Macdonald, Sharon. “Museums, National, Postnational and Transnational Identities” in *Museum and Society*, no.1 (March 2003) Also available [online]: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/m&s/mands1.pdf>, March 2003.

Madran, Burçak and Önal, Şebnem “Yerellikten Küresellięe Uzanan Çizgide Tarihin Çok Paylaşımli Vitrinleri: Müzelere ve Sunumları” in *Müzecilikte Yeni yaklaşımlar : Küreselleşme ve Yerelleşme: Üçüncü Uluslararası Tarih Kongresi, Tarih Yazımı ve Müzecilikte Yeni Yaklaşımlar: Küreselleşme ve Yerelleşme*

Zeynel Abidin Kızılyaprak (ed.). İstanbul : Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 2000.

Madran Burçak. (ed.) *Kent, Toplum, Müze: Deneyimler, Katkılar*. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 2001.

Marschall, Sabine. “Post-apartheid Monuments: The Visual Representation of Heritage and Cultural Tourism” / in *Tourism and Postcolonialism: Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations* C. Michael Hall & Hazel Tucker (eds). London; New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.

Misztal, Barbara A. *Theories of Social Remebering*. Open University Press: Maidenhead, Philadelphia, 2003.

Nora, Pierre. “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire”, *Representations*, 26, 1989.

Önder, Mehmet. *Türkiye Müzeleri ve Müzelerdeki Şaheserlerden Örnekler*. Ankara : Türkiye İş Bankası, 1977.

Özyürek, Esra “Cumhuriyetle Nikahlanmak: “Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet” ve “Bir Yurttaş Yaratmak” Sergileri” in *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası* Esra Özyürek (ed.). İstanbul : İletişim, 2001.

Rojeck, Chris. “Fatal Attractions” in Boswell, David and Evans, Jessica eds. *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. London, New York: Routledge, 1999.

Sandell, Richard. “Social Inclusion, The Museum and the Dynamics of Sectoral Change” in *Museum and Society*, no.1 (March 2003) Also available [online]: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/m&s/mands1.pdf>, March 2003.

Schouten, Frans. “Heritage as a Historical Reality” in Herbert, David T. (ed) *Heritage, Tourism and Society* London, England; New York, NY, USA: Mansell, 1995.

Shaw K., Wendy M. Osmanlı Müzeciliği: Müzeler, Arekoloji ve Tarihin Görselleştirilmesi. Translated by Esin Soğancılar. İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.

Sherman, Daniel J. and Rogoff, Irit (eds.) *Museum Culture : Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Smith, Anthony. "History and Modernity: Reflections on the Theory of Nationalism" in Boswell, David and Evans, Jessica eds. *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. London, New York: Routledge, 1999.

Şimşek, Sefa. *Bir İdeolojik Seferberlik Deneyimi : Halkevleri 1932-1951*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 2002.

Tucker, Hazel. 'Kapadokya'da, Zelve'de Bellek ve Deneyim'' in *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası* edited by Esra Özyürek, İstanbul : İletişim, 2001.

Turan, İlter "1972-1996 Döneminde İstanbul'da Derneksel Hayat". in *Tanzimattan Günümüze İstanbul'da Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları* Ahmet N. Yücekök, İlter Turan, Mehmet Ö. Alkan (eds) İstanbul : Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları Bilgi Merkezi, 1998.

Urry, John. "Gazing On History" in *the Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London; Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990.

Urry, John. "Gazing on History" in *Representing the Nation: A Reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds). London, New York: Routledge, 1999.

Urry, John. *Consuming Places*. London ; New York : Routledge, 1995.

Wall, Geoffrey. "Partnerships Involving Indigenous Peoples in the Management of Heritage Sites" in *Tourism and Cultural Conflicts* Mike Robinson and Priscilla Boniface (eds) Oxon; New York: CABI Pub., c1999.

Walsh, Kevin. *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Postmodern World*. London: New York: Routledge, 1992.

Wu, Chin-tao. *Privatising Culture : Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s*. London : Verso, 2003.

Yasa Yaman, Zeynep “1950’li Yılların Sanatsal Ortamı ve “Temsil” Sorunu”
Toplum ve Bilim, no:79, (Kış1998).

Yazansoy, Cenap and Karahan, Abdülkadir (ed.) *Akbank’ın Bir Kültür Hizmeti: Sabancı Hat Koleksiyonu*. İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1985.

Young, James E., “Memory, Countermemory, and the End of Monument” in *At Memory’s Edge’s: After Images of the Holocaust in contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven : Yale University Press, 2000.

Zizek, Slavoj. "Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism." *New Left Review*, no. 225 (1997)

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Modernleşen Türkiye’nin Tarihi*. Translated by Yasemin Saner Gönen. İstanbul : İletişim, 2004.