

Whitehead C, Bozoglu G.

Constitutive others and the management of difference: museum
representations of Turkish identities.

*In: Whitehead, C; Lloyd, K; Eckersley, S; Mason, R, ed. Museums, Migration
and Identity in Europe. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2015, pp.253-284*

Copyright:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe on 1/5/2015, available online:
<http://www.routledge.com/products/isbn/9781472425188>.

DOI link to article:

<https://www.routledge.com/products/isbn/9781472425188>

Date deposited:

27/07/2016

Embargo release date:

01 November 2016



This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe

ISBN 978-1-4724-2518-8

Final chapter post-print

NB: Page numbers and formatting do not match actual publication

Chapter 10

Constitutive Others and the Management of Difference: Museum Representations of Turkish Identities

Christopher Whitehead and Gönül Bozoğlu

Introduction

Neither the term Orient nor the concept of the West has any ontological stability; each is made up of human effort, partly affirmation, partly identification of the Other. (Edward W. Said 2003: x)

This chapter offers an extensive, two-part exploration of a number of different representations of Turkish identities in museums concerned with the display of history and its connection to the present. Using the analytical framework associated with the ‘museum as map’ (Whitehead 2009; Whitehead et al. 2012), we examine numerous museums in Turkey and in Western Europe and their treatment within displays and interpretation of a number of historical moments. These moments are apparently disconnected and chronologically remote from one another, but this chapter brings them into connection because they are all used within museum representations to show how identity is constituted through the management of difference – repelling difference, assimilating it, marginalizing it or denying it. One theme that emerges from our visits to history museums of different type (city, military, national, maritime, etc.) across Western Europe is the particular significance of Turkish peoples as ‘constitutive others’ for ‘European’ identities, as in much written historiography (Neumann 1998). As always, here it is necessary to recognize the geohistorical contingency of ‘Europe’ and ‘European’ as paired constructs – to borrow Said’s terms, neither of these has ontological stability. But at the same time it is possible to understand the ‘Turkish’ (another identifier to unpick later), in historical and symbolic representations, as the constitutive Other on the margin of Europe or as foreign incomers of one kind or another, be they invaders, rulers or guest workers. In this respect this chapter is a counterweight to the museological literature arising from postcolonial studies that focuses on subjugated, colonized peoples (specifically, peoples colonized by Western European powers) as constitutive Others.

While this literature is of fundamental importance, we suggest that *also* re-examining the memory of the Turks inside, and just outside, of Europe can help us to understand the political and historical construction of identities and modernities (Keyman 2007; Morozov and Rumelili 2012; Delanty 2013).

Meanwhile, a comparative exploration of identities in Turkish museums reveals another kind of argument between (Turkish) self and Other – one with different timescales, somewhat different protagonists and different political methods of remembering and managing difference. In these cases Turkey is also constituted through relations with and distinction from Others. Critically though, the historical moments identified for relative self-constitution are quite different.

In Western European museums we observe attention to the Ottoman incursions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, culminating in the pivotal Sieges of Vienna in 1529 and 1683. We see the incursion of Turkish *Gastarbeiter*, or guest workers, in countries such as Germany and the Netherlands in the later twentieth century. We see the strained dynamics of co-existence between ‘autochthonous’ communities and Turkish ones in urban contexts over recent decades, for example in Berlin. And, in the contemporary context, we see Turkish people and cultures utilized to construct a kind of ideal cosmopolitanism associated with a hybridization of cultural identities and forms (e.g. cuisine) that characterize a beneficial Western-European multiculturalism.

In Turkish museums, on the other hand, we see concentration on the origins in the deep past of the Turkish people (whether we are discussing one ‘people’ or many ‘peoples’ is a matter of contention to be explored below), the conquests and cultural richness of the Ottoman regime, the ‘Armenian-Turkish relations’ leading up to the disputed ‘Events of 1915’ (or as others think of it, the Armenian Genocide), and Atatürk’s progressive modernism, which looked to Western-European culture but involved the affirmation of a uniquely Turkish historical

identity. These are, in a sense, *constitution moments* – temporal equivalents of the notion of the ‘identity place’ (Whitehead et al 2012), in which historicized identities are constituted in museum representations in relation to ‘moments’ of greater or lesser duration selected as being somehow pivotal for and emblematic of those identities. This can be related to Rogers M. Smith’s notion of ‘ethical constitutive stories’, which describe who a given people are in terms of identity, providing a sense of ‘meaning, place, purpose, and pride’ (2003: 98).

This chapter also responds to the critical ‘place’ of Turkey in the world, in both literal and metaphorical senses. As we will see, in some ways it is more accurate to talk of the ‘places’ of Turkey. It is boundary space and bridge between conceptions of East and West; it is frequently cast as the meeting place of Eastern ways of life and beliefs and Western, secular political order; partly in the continent of Europe and partly in Asia, the long-held Turkish aspiration to become a member state of the European Union (EU) sits alongside a keen consciousness on the part of politicians from Turkey and elsewhere of the nation’s key role within the Middle East – not least its strategic importance as a key hub for Western military traffic. Lastly, Turkey was a nation of mass migration in the twentieth century and Turks form some of the largest minority groups in Western European countries (notably the Netherlands and Germany). This means that Turkish cultures, cultural clashes and meldings and constructions of Turkishness ‘take place’ outwith the nation itself and contribute to the production of political and social realities in receiving states in the EU.

Theoretical and Methodological Orientations on Museum Representations

We adopt the theoretical and analytical framework developed by one of the current authors (Whitehead et al. 2012) that analyses museum representations as maps of culture, i.e. as spatial constructions of knowledge that are somewhat (but only somewhat) amenable to remediation in graphic, cartographical form, helping us to understand the significations of displays. The methodology for this is thoroughly explained in Whitehead et al. (2012), but it is worth recalling a few points of importance for this chapter.

Firstly we recall the most axiomatic point, which is that as with any map, the museum's cultural cartography is political, even, or perhaps especially, where it seems to aspire to the status of description.

Secondly, our readings and remediations of this cartography in graphic diagrams (effectively maps of maps) are necessarily subjective and guided by our specific cultural positions, interests and points of enquiry, and hence they too are political. Our own lack of objectivity is not a failing: it accords with a social constructionist perspective on how meaning is made in cultural representations such as museum displays. The unequivocal subjectivity of meaning-making in both production and consumption of displays suggests to us that developing a critical subjectivity of our own is the only appropriate mode of analysis. This also relates to a critical position on display itself as a form of representation that is not wholly decodable or translatable into other media or languages (Whitehead 2009), although that is not to say that the process of remediating displays cannot provoke significant insight. Our textual and graphic analyses thus necessarily represent contributions to a *partial* understanding of the displays in question.

Thirdly, the museum as map is not concerned *only* with geography literally understood (the cartographical representation of landmasses, bodies of water, landscapes and geopolitical objects such as borders and cities), but also with the mapping of non-geographical referents (Gieryn 1999) – for example, communities, family ties, knowledges, affective concepts, social processes and so on. However, because our interest is in displays that are in some way about place, all of the museum displays we analyse in this chapter *also* concern literal (but still in some measure constructed) geographical referents – East and West, Asia and Europe, Turkey, Anatolia, Amsterdam, Berlin, etc. So we analyse museum representations as a form of mapping that organizes geographical and non-geographical referents relationally, as when notions of 'homeland' and 'belonging' are associated with the physical territory of Turkey. These relationships are figured spatially in our graphic remediations. At the same time, we consider that on some level 'geographical' referents are inextricable from socio-historical, political and

affective dimensions. Every time we use the place-names ‘Istanbul’, ‘Germany’, ‘Hungary’ and so on, vast sets of historical relations and social and political tensions are potentially brought into play, irrespective of our sensitivities as speakers. At the same time, we recognize that the ‘place-as-construct’ notion can be overly simplistic, as in the case of Istanbul where the historical bind of morphology, geographical location and culture is most evident.

Lastly, we need to recall that the museum as map has some capacities that are enhanced in relation to plane-surface, two-dimensional maps, as a consequence of the architectural and technological set-up of its representational structures. The museum visit requires time and locomotion, and presupposes a more or less ordered staging of encounters between visitors and stimuli (objects, texts, etc.). This structural spatialized temporality means that the potential to construct and/or to perceive complex narratives exists (although construction and perception may not match, and according to our subjectivist position a mismatch does not imply that the visitor’s understanding of narrative is ‘wrong’ and that the meanings she perceives are ‘not there’). So in this sense the museum as map represents the potential for both a synchronic holding-in-place of relations (places, concepts, affects) as well as a diachronic storying of events. Some of our graphic remediations of the museum cartography we encounter allow for a narrative to emerge based on a convention of left-to-right or top-to-bottom ‘reading’, but they are not mono-directional, and events or affective elements can be as important as narrative developments. Again, we seek to account for this representational compound of diachronic and synchronic dimensions, just as with the geographical and non-geographical dimensions.

This chapter focuses on displays that involve historicized identities. These are all, of course, *curatorial* constructions and there is the possibility for significant mismatch between museum conferrals of identity and people’s personal readings of such displays or feelings of identity – people may simply not identify with what is on show. While we do not attempt to study responses to displays in this chapter we adopt a contextual and intertextual approach by seeking to situate the displays within contemporary political discourse. We also need to stress that multiple cultural maps can be made in and of one museum, and it is often (but not always) reductive to see

museums as a representational form committed unequivocally and univocally to the reproduction of dominant or pervasive politico-historical ideology. At the same time, museums are not impervious to such ideology and need to be viewed as part of an array of possible technologies for its development. Indeed, the appeal to science and objectivity associated with the museum form makes it a particularly apt technology for constructing authoritative knowledge (Whitehead 2009: 49).

This chapter will now go on to address Turkish museum representations relating to historicized Turkish identities. Part 2 will explore Western European museum representations, from the Ottoman threat to the Turkish guest workers, before a conclusion reflecting on the common theme of the management of difference.

Part 1: Constituting the Self in Turkish Museums

Upon commencing our research we encountered a number of important museum representations of twentieth-century and contemporary migrations from Turkey to Western Europe, for example in the Amsterdam Museum in the Netherlands, in the Museum Europäischer Kulturen - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (Museum of European Cultures), and the Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum in Berlin. We will discuss these examples in the second part of this chapter. That Turkish migrations and identities should figure in museums in Western European metropolitan centres is not surprising. These are museums that seek to characterize and represent places, on different geopolitical scales (supranational entities like 'Europe', nations, cities and districts), and in doing so they look at the inhabitants of such places, including the significant Turkish populations in the Netherlands and in Germany.

However, as summarized above, upon studying museums in Turkey it becomes evident that the European museums' focus on Turkish immigration is not matched by a Turkish focus on *emigration*: there is no potential dovetailing of national stories such as one might observe between migration museums in the 'Old' and 'New' Worlds, for example between the Deutsches Auswanderhaus in Bremerhaven with its focus on emigration, and the Ellis Island Immigration Museum in New York. This is partly due to the different typological specialization of Turkish

museums. They rarely pay attention to late twentieth- and twenty-first-century history while the model of the migration museum has not been influential, and the ‘city museum’ model is not directly adopted other than in the case of Bursa, where a city museum opened in 2004. ‘History’ is channelled through parameters that relate largely to disciplinary institutions such as archaeology, military history, the history of science and the history of art, but not social history as practised in Western European or North American museums. Alternatively, Turkish historic sites are transformed into museums that necessarily concern the history of place (e.g. Topkapı Palace, Hagia Sophia, etc.) or give rise to new museums that focus on specific historical events (e.g. the 1453 Panorama Museum in Istanbul). Aside from the aforementioned Bursa City Museum there are currently no museums that adopt a general social history approach in order to understand societal change over time in Turkey. One consequence of this is that, in our experience, the significant cultural and social phenomenon of Turkish emigration goes unrecognized and unrepresented in Turkish museums.

While recent or contemporary migrations are not explored, representations of historic migrations are important in providing aspects of an origin story for modern Turkish identity. At the same time, in order to understand the role of Turkish museums in representing the issue of cultural and ethnic difference that is usually (in Western Europe) brought to the fore through a focus on migration and its contemporary legacy, we need to look elsewhere. It is here that displays about Armenian–Turkish relations can provide insights, for just as with displays about migration, they relate to the management of difference within a bounded territory. The following account will involve a brief examination of two museums that focus on these issues respectively: the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara and the Istanbul Military Museum. After this we consider the 1453 Panorama Museum in Istanbul as a peculiarly contemporary and politically current geohistorical representation that configures Istanbul (or Constantinople, as it was) as ‘identity place’ and its conquest by the Ottomans (incorporating the defeat of the Christian Other) as ‘constitution moment’ for a state-condoned Turkish identity.

*The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations*¹

The Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara charts the ingress of different peoples in antiquity (Phrygian, Hittite, etc.) with a strong emphasis on places (there are lots of maps) and also places as sites of excavations in the Republican period; they are thus doubled as cultural objects: the sites are not just places of past cultures but also places that signify the Republican respect for, inquiry into and marshalling of, a past based in the territory of Anatolia. The focus on Anatolia centralizes the concept of Turkey geographically in the Republican capital of Ankara and forms the identity place for the unfolding of stories of Turkish origination. In 1930 Atatürk established the Turkish Historical Society, which formulated the *Türk Tarih Tezi* (*Turkish Historical Thesis*). Following the demise of the Ottoman state in 1923, this was intended to provide a common historical identity for the different linguistic, ethnic and religious groups that co-existed in Turkey (Çağaptay 2002: 69–70 and 80–81; Savino 2011: 255). The thesis suggested that the Hittites' prehistoric migration from Central Asia to Anatolia was a constitution moment for modern Turkish identity, as Melania Savino explains:

This Thesis had several goals: firstly, since modern Turks were ethnically related to the Hittites, they could claim territorial rights on the Anatolian land, against other ethnic groups (Greeks, Armenians and Kurds). Secondly, linking Turks to the Hittites would break off the connections with the Ottoman and Islamic heritage, supporting a more secular identity. Lastly, and most importantly, since the Hittites created all the most important civilizations of antiquity, Europeans' origins were also directly linked back to Turkey. (2011: 256)

The *Historical Thesis* was succeeded by the idea of Anatolianism, which 'saw all the civilizations that prospered in Anatolia since prehistoric times till the present as part of the same cultural continuum, which constituted the antecedents of Anatolian culture' (Savino 2011: 257). Both

¹ This discussion is based on research undertaken at the museum in 2011; we note that the museum and the displays discussed here (including the one shown in Figure 10.1) are currently in redevelopment.

narratives used history to create a common identity and to oppose the Western European historiography that presented Ancient Greece as the cradle of civilization (İnan et al. 1930). Museums were used to express this historical identity: the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations itself was founded upon Atatürk's suggestion that a Hittite museum should be developed (Museum of Anatolian Civilizations n.d.: 11). As Carter Vaughan Findlay states, Atatürk understood the power of history 'not just to record the past but to produce the future' (2010: 252).

The museum's teleological story works up until the date of 1923 – the founding of the Republic of Turkey – the moment in which the past is 'fixed'. Even if it is acknowledged that excavations continue after this date, it is with the foundation of the Republic that the historical gaze is established and the political relations between past and present are modelled, determined and resolved.

Within the interior of the museum the figure of Atatürk is prominent on high – he is shown above the excavated artefacts in the form of portraits, flanked by the *Ay-yıldız* Turkish flag (Figure 10.1), or in blown-up photographs in which he is shown visiting archaeological sites. His political authority legitimizes the historicizing gaze; indeed this recognition and valorization of the past is one of the characteristics of the modernity he sought to establish (Özdoğan 1998). Atatürk provides the impulse for surveying the past, promoting archaeology as a way to practice modernity and seeking to incorporate pre-Ottoman Anatolian peoples into Turkish lineage and identity.

[Insert Figure 10.1 here – portrait]

Figure 10.1 Interior of the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara

Source: Christopher Whitehead.

So what might the figure of Atatürk mean when placed emblematically within archaeological accounts of the origin of the Turkish people? After the founding of the Republic in 1923, Atatürk sought to consolidate a form of Turkish identity that was modern in outlook in the sense that it referenced Western European cultural practices; for example he criminalized the wearing of the

fez, introduced the Latin alphabet, the Gregorian calendar and changed the working week to resemble the Western European one (Findlay 2010: 252). At the same time this new, modern Turkish identity could be seen as an inclusive one, in that all those with Turkish citizenship (including different ethnic and religious groups) were seen as Turks so long as they adhered to the six guiding principles set out by Atatürk: Republicanism; Populism (where power accrues to the citizenry); Secularism; Etatism (love for the state) and Reformism (i.e. replacing concepts and institutions seen to be outdated). As E. Fuat Keyman summarizes:

These reforms defined the nation-state as the sovereign subject of modernity, operating as the dominant actor of political, economic and cultural life spheres, and aimed to construct national identity as an organic unity of the secular non-class based identity which necessarily involved the subjugation of its Other, i.e. the Kurdish identity, Islamic identity and minorities. This identity was the citizen as the symbol of secularism and civilization, virtuous enough to privilege state interest over her/his own interest, and the other was expected to accord primacy to citizenship over difference. (2007: 208)

Atatürk inspired and continues to inspire the devotion of many Turkish people and this is evident in a number of museums – particularly in the Republican capital of Ankara – dedicated to his memory and to his achievements. Showing at least superficial respect for Atatürk and his principles continues, at the time of writing, to be de rigueur for any political party wishing to obtain a majority, even if not entirely heartfelt. However, Atatürk’s inclusive concept of Turkish identity has been problematic, and there are long-standing social tensions and in some cases war between the political mainstream and groups such as Armenians, Kurds and Alevi Muslims. Andrew Finkel gives a sense of these complexities when he notes that the Republican notion of identity is ‘simple enough: If you think you’re Turkish, then you are’. But, he clarifies, in the Turkish constitution and in political discourse, ‘the notion of “Turkishness” is both ill-defined and staunchly defended’ (Finkel 2013).

Nevertheless, the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations makes an indelible association between Atatürk, the modern state and the past. The ‘Civilizations’ may be plural but they course as if naturally into one Turkish people, united under Atatürk.

The cultural mapping of the museum can be remediated as in Figure 10.2. Here different Turkic peoples flow into Anatolia, which overlaps with modern (Republican) Turkey: a relationship stabilized by Ataturk’s presence, bridging past and present and giving licence to attention to the past in the present; at the same time the temporal narrative is that of a teleological movement of civilizations towards a kind of ‘fixing point’ of 1923, the date in which the past is mastered in the service of a contemporary unified Turkish civilization.

[Insert Figure 10.2 here – landscape]

Figure 10.2 Schematic map of the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations

The Istanbul Military Museum

The Istanbul Military Museum’s itinerary begins with copious graphic maps of historic migration flows from Central Asia into Turkish territory, as well as a key depiction of Turkish pedigree in the form of a tree (*Türklerin Soyağacı* – again, the different peoples, e.g. Selçuks, whose confluence created the Turkish), where the highest point represents the founding of the Republic in 1923. This is accompanied by a well-known quotation from Atatürk in which the Turks and the territory they occupy are conflated as one, through force of nature, so that place and identity become inseparable:

These lands were the stage for the appearance of a unique character which the World neither expected nor had ever hoped for. For more than 7000 years have these lands been the Turkish cradle, rocked by the winds of nature and the child it held was washed by nature’s rain; at first [the child] was almost frightened by the thunder and lightning and the storms of nature; then it became used to them, recognized them to be the father of nature and became the son. Then, one day, nature and child became one. It became thunder and lightning and the sun,

it became a Turk. That is the Turk: lightning, storm, the sun which illuminates the world.²

Together, the maps and the quotation invoke an identity for Turks that is based on the confluence of different peoples in one place, whereupon the different peoples become one people, fused with place. This is somewhat akin to the mapping that takes place within the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, where multiple ethnic groups from multiple places are mapped into one culture. This is an attempt to harmonize difference, but it works in the arena of the deep past. The more recent past is harder to manage, where ethnic difference has meant and can still mean bloodshed, as in the case of conflicts between the state and the *Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan* (PKK) or in the case of ‘Turkish–Armenian relations’. This is the anodyne phrasing used in the text panel introducing a room in the Istanbul Military Museum dedicated to what Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan calls ‘the events of 1915’, refusing the term ‘Armenian Genocide’ and the culpability it imposes (Aydemir 2007). The text panel (in Turkish and English, indicating the intended audiences) – nearly 1,000 words in length – contextualizes photographic and physical evidence of Armenian violence towards Turks such as images of Turkish ‘martyrs’ murdered by Armenians and bloodstained clothing, which are indexed in labels to the specific places where the alleged atrocities occurred. The text gives an extensive account of peaceful and integrated co-existence between Turkish and Armenian populations over the centuries, upset by Armenian separatism fomented by outside states interested in pursuing selfish objectives on the global stage (France, England and Russia seeking to gain Ottoman lands in the nineteenth century, and then Russia in the Cold War seeking to destabilize Turkey’s place within NATO). It is external powers that created divides in Turkish society, disrupting the discourse of a Turkish singularity. The

² The text is also given in Turkish: ‘Bu memleket, dünyanın beklemediği, asla ümit etmediği bir eşsiz varlığın yüksek görüntüsüne, yüksek sahne oldu. Bu sahne en aşağı yedi bin senelik bir Türk beşiğidir. Beşik doğanın rüzgarları sallandı; beşiğin içindeki çocuk doğanın yağmurları ile yıkandı; o çocuk doğanın şimşeklerinden, yıldırımlarından, kasırgalarından önce korkar gibi oldu; sonra onlara alıştı; onları doğanın babası tanıdı; onların oğlu oldu. Birgün o doğa çocuğu doğa oldu; Türk oldu. Türk budur: Yıldırımdır, kasırgadır, dünyayı aydınlatan güneştir.’

Armenians (in this story) claim difference for themselves and in so doing effectively ‘other’ themselves, opening a narrative space in which they can be vilified as traitors and murderers, and the ‘Events of 1915’, seen by some to be a genocidal programme of death marches and murders (notably Akçam, e.g. 2012) were simply the state’s attempts to stem their subversion:

These hostile activities of Armenians who made cooperation with the enemy [i.e. Russia], assaulted to Turkish Army, relentlessly killed the innocent people and **“BETRAYED THEIR STATE”** were hindered with the **“TEHCIR KANUNU”** (COMPULSORY IMMIGRATION LAW) taken on May 27, 1915. [Original emphases]

Against the ‘thousands of innocent Turks ... murdered by Armenian terrorist organizations’ founded at the end of the nineteenth century, the Turkish response is presented as being mild, and in no way warranting the label ‘genocide’:³

In 1965, **the announcement of 24 April as “SO-CALLED GENOCIDE DAY”** is the day on which the **OTTOMAN STATE** sent notice to the provinces on April 24, 1915 with the aim of stopping the Armenian gangs who killed innocent people, rebelled against the state and made cooperation with the enemy and in the notice, the **OTTOMAN STATE** wanted **“Armenian Committee Centers”** to be closed, the documents to be seized and the leaders of the committees to be arrested, and as a result, 2345 people making activities against the state were arrested. [Original emphases]

³ For an alternative view see the website of the Armenian Genocide Museum-Institute in Yerevan: ‘Since the 1920s April 24th is the day Armenians commemorate the victims of Armenian Genocide, the most tragic element of Armenian history. On April 24, 1915 hundreds Armenian Intellectuals: poets, musicians, publicists, editors, lawyers, doctors, deputies, were arrested in Constantinople under warrants issued by the Turkish authorities. They were all sent into exile and were horrifically slaughtered. The annihilation of the Armenian Intellectuals was the part of a systematic, fiendish plan to exterminate the Armenian people in their homeland. It was the first state-planned Genocide of the 20th century. On 24 April 1965 Soviet Armenians organized to demand the recognition of the Armenian Genocide, thus, breaking an era of silence that was created during the Soviet rule regarding this issue’ (www.genocide-museum.am/eng/remembrance_day.php).

In Wodak et al.'s view of the discursive construction of national identity (2009: 36–7) the display operates as a 'strategy of justification and relativisation', through 'victim-perpetrator inversion' and 'downplaying/trivialisation' by the attempt to balance one thing against another, i.e. the thousands of innocent Turks murdered by Armenians against the arrest of Armenian dissidents and terrorists, thus delegitimizing the Armenian claim. In the narrative of the text panel this leads to Turkey's exclusion from Western politics. This has clear connections with contemporary issues such as Turkey's stalling accession to the EU, which has been associated with (amongst other things) Turkey's refusal to recognize the events of 1915 as a 'genocide' perpetrated by Turks (e.g. Özdemir 2005). The text panel concludes:

By the way, from 1994, by changing tactics, Armenian terrorist organizations left the bloody-assault method and by the help of **“the Armenian Diaspora”** making activities in **USA** and **EUROPEAN UNION COUNTRIES**, Armenians started to apply pressure policies by using **SO-CALLED GENOCIDE CLAIMS** against **THE REPUBLIC OF TÜRKIYE** and **THE TURKS**. [Original emphases]

The aim of these **“UNFOUNDED GENOCIDE CLAIMS”** is to decrease the power of **TÜRKIYE** in the region by leaving **TÜRKIYE** alone in the international arena, to separate the country by taking some part of east and southeast of Anatolia to establish **“SO-CALLED GREAT ARMENIA”** and to sentence **TÜRKIYE** to pay indemnity. [Original emphases]

The Military Museum in Istanbul was established by the military and is still run by it. The military and the ruling *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* (AKP) have been in tacit conflict because the military is entirely secularist in orientation and has a history of staging coups when governments do not sufficiently align with Kemalist ideas; the current administration is seen to have attempted to weaken the military in recent years through a programme of incarcerating potential agitators (Pamuk and Solaker 2013; Yetkin 2013). Notwithstanding these fundamental differences between the AKP and the military, their presentations of the events of 1915 are perfectly aligned. The 'genocide' is presented both in the museum and in AKP rhetoric – for example in many of former

Minister Egemen Bağış's⁴ genocide denials – as a Western imposition or 'myth' (*Spiegel* 2010) catalysed by outside (notably Russian) forces. The Military Museum display on Armenian–Turkish Relations functions as an example of the complexity of different political positions in Turkey, which can appear to be singular but are in fact plural, and of the continued political significance of key historical moments for the definition of identities. It should also be pointed out that the display at the Military Museum is not atypical. Even in fiction the notion of Armenians as perpetrators and not victims finds voice, for example in Orhan Pamuk's novel *Snow*, when the protagonists Ka and İpek visit the museum in Kars, a section of which commemorates the 'Armenian Massacre'. 'Naturally', it is explained, 'some tourists came expecting to learn of a Turkish massacre of Armenians, so it was always a jolt for them to discover that in this museum the story was the other way around' (Pamuk 2004: 32). In Iğdır there is a monument to the Turkish victims of Armenian violence and a Genocide Museum dedicated to the Turkish dead. Such apparent reversals illustrate precisely the slippages available in managing difference, managing history and maintaining identities in relation to historical difference. The cultural mapping at the Istanbul Military Museum (Figure 10.3) is highly narrativized story of Turkish blamelessness, shored up by the material and photographic proofs of Armenian hostility.

[Insert 10.3 here – landscape]

**Figure 10.3 Schematic map of the display on 'Turk–Armenian Relations in History',
Istanbul Military Museum**

What we see in these two museums – the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations and the Istanbul Military Museum – are particular constructions of Turkish identity in relation to place. In the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations the territory is settled by the multiple precursors of the Turks. This history is ratified by Atatürk, who effectively constructs a bridge between the present and

⁴ Bağış was removed from his post as the Minister for European Union after the breaking of the corruption scandal in late 2013.

pre-Republican history going into the deep past, while harmonizing pre-Ottoman peoples into one territorial group, just as the Kemalist notion of Turkish citizenship attempts to erase the importance of ethnic difference. In the Istanbul Military Museum the nation is seen to be betrayed from within by an alien force (or rather, a force that perversely alienates itself along separatist-ethnic lines, contravening the state's apparently inclusive model of citizenship) committing purported atrocities against Turkish people in identified places. The alien force is then 'displaced', but the legacies of this event (different accounts of what happened and their political consequences) continue to affect the place of Turkey on the world stage. The representation of Armenian–Turkish conflict relates to the 'events of 1915' and to one particular ethnic-social division, but may also be extended to suggest the theoretical dangers of any other impulse towards self-differencing and/or separatism, ultimately potentializing state action against any minority group whose practices or identities are perceived as threatening to a singular national and political identity. This singular identity may well appear to be fixed in museum displays, in part because they tend to be relatively static after their initial development. But this fixity aligns imperfectly with changing political discourses that may emphasize and de-emphasize particular identities according to the contemporary culture and administration, as at the time of writing when conservative and Sunni Muslim identities are effectively condoned and some others openly disparaged – notably Alevi, as a religious group (Çarkoğlu and Çağın Bilgili 2011), or indeed those of the 2013 protestors who opposed the government's anti-democratic bearing, disparaged as *çapulcu* (looters) by Erdoğan. Tellingly, many protestors embraced the identifier in an act of resignification (Harding 2013).

This state-condoned identity is sustained in the recent development of the 1453 Panorama Museum in Istanbul, the centerpiece of which is a spectacular 360° painting of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople with 3D elements (e.g. cannons) and a dramatic audiotrack. The display of Ottoman supremacy and the story of the defeat of Christian Byzantium relates to the construction of a contemporary Ottoman nostalgia likely to appeal to the Sunni Muslim electorate and presents a glorious alternative to the constitution moments identified in Republican-era

museums and historiography (e.g. the Hittite migration and the 1923 foundation of the Republic). As Keyman notes, the Islamic resurgence in Turkish politics connected to the rise of the AKP has ‘created Islamic-based identity claims in the political, economic and cultural realms of social life’, although neither such claims nor the claimants can be homogenized, as the spectrum comprehends everything between fundamentalism and moderate conservatism (Keyman 2007: 210). Nevertheless, a specific mapping between the Ottoman past and the contemporary is offered, not by museum representations *per se* but by way of the political discourse surrounding them. Erdoğan himself opened the museum in 2009. During the protests in Gezi Park in June 2013 he also opened the new building for the Prime Ministry’s Ottoman Archives in Istanbul, giving a speech that covered both the importance of preserving and celebrating Ottoman heritage and the denigration of the contemporary protestors in Taksim Square. Commentators have been quick to characterize this celebration of the Ottoman past as an instrumentalized nostalgia where once again the management of difference is of critical importance and history is mapped in relation to the present in order to lend authority to governmental techniques of such management. As Adak argues, the proponents of this nostalgia (notably the AKP) recast the Ottoman Millet system (of allowing non-Muslim communities such as Jews and Armenians to exist while enjoying fewer rights and paying higher taxes) as ‘tolerance’ in the contemporary sense. In this way the past is used ‘to cover and justify what is going on in the present: the creation of an atmosphere of intolerance towards dissent, religious difference, and – most patently to the [Summer 2013] protestors’ many supporters – towards different lifestyles in contemporary Turkey’ (Adak 2013).

Part 2: The Turks in Western European Museums

The Turkish practices of dealing with ethnic and cultural difference explored in the first part of this chapter are crystallized in alternative ways in Western European museums which explore

Turkish identities,⁵ in different constitutive moments. Firstly, the repelling of the Ottoman threat in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be seen as pivotal in the protection and consolidation of European culture and European identities. Secondly, in the accommodation and assimilation of the migrant Other in modernity, self-constitution works in relation to the indulgence of a kind of autochthonous embarrassment about the historical exploitation or disempowerment of the Other (e.g. immigrants who experienced suffering and disadvantage in order to work in Western European countries). But in some cases this embarrassment can be countered or even remedied by contemporary celebrations of multiculturalist and cosmopolitan cultures.

The 'Ottoman Threat'

Until the end of the seventeenth century the 'Ottoman peril' lurked alongside Europe to represent for the whole of Christian civilisation a constant danger, and in time European civilization incorporated that peril and its lore, its great events, figures, virtues, and vices, as something woven into the fabric of life. (Said 1978: 59–60)

The 'Ottoman threat' forms an important component of a number of displays across Western European museums with a focus on relations between places, peoples and cultures. The historical narrative relates to the European invasion of 'Turkish' forces (as they were known to Europeans), involving the occupation and administration of significant parts of the Kingdom of Hungary (e.g. National Museum of Hungary, Budapest), the Genoese surrender of the (now Greek) island of Chios to the Turks in the sixteenth century (e.g. Museo del Mare, Genoa), the Battle of Lepanto in 1571 (e.g. Armeria del Palacio Real de Madrid, V&A and National Maritime Museum, London) and the repulsion of the Turks at the two Sieges of Vienna – the first in 1529 and the second in 1683 (Deutsches Historisches Museum, Berlin, National Museum of Denmark and

⁵ We leave to one side for the purposes of this chapter some significant museum representations in Greece, such as the Athens Byzantine Museum display on the fall of Constantinople, which warrant a separate research project, e.g. comparing Turkish and Greek accounts of the fall.

Vienna City Museum⁶). The Turkish threat is in a sense a ‘long’ or ‘meta’- constitution moment for modern Europe, because it allows for practices of self-identification against an Other – for Iver B. Neumann the ‘dominant other’ in the history of the European state system (1998: 39), at times to be feared and vilified and at other times to be accommodated (e.g. in occupied Hungary) or domesticated through artistic practice (e.g. the adoption of Ottoman artistic forms in decorative art, or the ‘*alla Turca*’ musical form). The historical form of alterity here is complex, for arguably the only sense in which the Turks were seen as *sub-altern* was in relation to their perceived barbarism, both in terms of the organization of society and their behaviour on and off the battlefield. Indeed, the Turks cultivated the idea of themselves as a brutal enemy as a form of psychological warfare (Kumrular 2005; Morozov and Rumelili 2012: 35). It is, if anything, historically an alterity associated as much with fear as with inferiority. Turkey emerges in this sense as a ‘Europe-maker’ in the sense developed by Morozov and Rumelili (2012: 35), who draw on Neumann (1998: 41, 44) to note that it is only after the Conquest of Constantinople in 1453 that ‘Europe’ is frequently invoked at all, and this was because it was a useful political referent in papal appeals to Christian unity to counter the Turkish threat.

Of particular importance in this long constitution moment are shorter moments of perceived culmination, when the tide is seen to turn against the Turks (often singularized as ‘the Turk’), or rather, to use a more active turn of phrase, European forces co-operated to vanquish them. Europe, at these moments, is almost miraculously brought back from the very brink of defeat and is effectively saved. It is also consolidated as fundamentally Christian (notwithstanding persistent conflicts between Catholic and Protestant ideologies).

Common elements within displays of this kind are examples of the material culture associated with the sieges and battles: the captured ‘booty’ of exotically unfamiliar weaponry,

⁶ This is by no means a comprehensive list of museums dealing with the Ottoman threat; rather, it represents the museums visited during research for this chapter.

tuğlar,⁷ armour and costume. An exception is the National Museum of Denmark, which presents ‘booty’ as well as Western European decorative art (in this case a carved *memento mori* tablet) with arabesque design influenced by Turkish artistic forms. In the Deutsches Historisches Museum, visitors encounter a huge Ottoman tent, captured from the battlefield, with all of its accoutrements and furnishings. Alongside this we see commemorative objects such as the ‘Captured Turks’ statuettes (Figure 10.4) and a plethora of stereotyping, seventeenth-century representations of Turkish barbarism in engravings, print publications and decorative art. These emphasize the historical importance of the ‘constitution moment’ as something that is in fact a long-standing construction. But it is the centrality of the repulsion story and its dialectical operation with the display of exotic military spoils that emphasizes difference and points to the expulsion of the Turks as positively formative for modern historical identities in European countries, or indeed in Europe as a (changing) whole.

[Insert Figure 10.4 here – portrait]

Figure 10.4 Captured Turk figurines and Ottoman weaponry and armour, German Historical Museum

Source: Christopher Whitehead, courtesy of Deutsches Historisches Museum, Berlin.

We do not need to labour a point here about the possible contemporary resonances of these accounts of Euro-Turkish relations at the time of writing, during a critical, albeit long, moment both in the expansion of the EU and in Turkey’s EU candidacy. This is a moment when the cultural mappings made in history museums relate closely to the geopolitical maps drawn and redrawn by political elites and by electorates. The political importance of the demise of the Ottoman threat is quite evident in accession debates: for just one oft-cited example we recall former European Commissioner for the Internal Market, Taxation and Customs Union Frits Bolkenstein’s 2004 statement that Turkey’s accession would mean that ‘the liberation of Vienna

⁷ Wooden staffs decorated with ironwork and dyed horsehair awarded by sultans as markers of status.

in 1683 will have been in vain' (Caldwell 2004: 1; Traynor 2004; Morozov and Rumelili 2012: 38; Jacoby 2010: 109), supporting Julio Crespo MacLennan's argument that 'there is a strong perception among Europeans of Turkey as a historic enemy and its entry into the EU as a new siege of Vienna' (2009: 24).

Turkish Immigrants

So far as the economy of the metropolitan country is concerned, migrant workers are immortal: immortal because continually interchangeable. They are not born: they are not brought up: they do not age: they do not get tired: they do not die. They have a single function – to work. All other functions of their lives are the responsibility of the country they come from. (Berger 1975: 68)

Within Western European museum representations of history, Turkish identities drop out of sight between the demise of the Ottoman threat and the later twentieth century⁸ and the ingress of Turkish labour migrants into countries such as West Germany and the Netherlands, through bilateral agreements for Turkish labour recruitment signed in 1961 and 1964, respectively. The subject position imposed on such migrants was one of subalterity insofar as they were essentially instrumentalized while simultaneously being socially marginalized in political, cultural and literal senses, as John Berger noted of the labour migrants' plight in *A Seventh Man* (Berger and Mohr 1975). This subalterity was in some ways a market consequence of international economic relations and the demand by industrialized countries for labour from less industrialized ones, but was also arguably informed by post-1683 European discourses of the Turks as no longer fearsome, but reprobate and backward (Morozov and Rumelili 2012: 37; Kuran-Burçoğlu 2003: 28).

Companies were largely interested in semi-skilled or unskilled labourers recruited from the poorer regions of Turkey after dehumanizing examinations conducted in centres such as Istanbul. Low levels of literacy, low pay, long working hours and (for many) barrack lodgings near to the workplace ensured a low level of participation in the host society, which they were

⁸ A notable exception was the 'Expulsion and Exchange of Populations (Turkey – Greece: 1922–1924)' exhibition held at the Benaki Museum in Athens in 2012.

expected to leave after a few years of work (Chin 2007; Bartsch et al. 2010). The majority of guest workers did not return to their ‘home’ countries, leaving a legacy of very large multi-generational Turkish (and other) communities in Germany.

‘Camp Atatürk’ at the Amsterdam Museum

In the Amsterdam Museum there is a long-standing display about the ‘Camp Atatürk’ barracks established for migrant shipyard workers in 1964 (Figure 10.5). The barracks accommodated up to 500 Turkish guest workers for over a decade (Alexander 2007: 174). The text panel explains:

In the 1950s the economic growth of Amsterdam increased. Lots of firms had a shortage of workers. Hence the need to attract ‘guest workers’ from abroad. Many ‘guest workers’ who came to Amsterdam looked for a bed in one of the numerous overcrowded boarding houses in the city centre. A few residential centres were built where firms could temporarily house their workers. From 1964 to 1979 Turkish ‘guest workers’ lived in Atatürk on Klaprozenweg in North Amsterdam. Many of them were employed by the shipbuilding and repair concerns NDSM and ADM. Atatürk developed into a social centre for all Turks living in Amsterdam. During film evenings the canteen was packed to the doors. Turkish artists gave performances and important festivals were celebrated. Amsterdam’s only mosque was in the centre. (Amsterdam Museum: ‘Atatürk’ panel)

[Insert Figure 9.5 here – portrait]

Figure 10.5 ‘Atatürk’ display, Amsterdam Museum

Source: Christopher Whitehead.

In the display we encounter a body of material culture relating to the guest worker community, such as lunchboxes (presented as significant because their owners disliked Netherlandish food, and would therefore bring their own), protective clothing for welding and a metal clothes hook fashioned by one of the guest workers for use in the cramped accommodation (each small room was home to seven workers). Additionally there are a number of photographs documenting life

in the barracks, as well as videos excerpted from the 1982 documentary *Gebroken Tijd* (Broken Time), which focused on the guest workers' conditions and their discontent.

[Insert Figure 10.6 here – landscape]

Figure 10.6 Schematic map 'Atatürk' display, Amsterdam Museum

This is an affective-chronological map; schematised here as Figure 10.6 with 'home' (Turkey) on one side – a place of poverty that is also the location of affective notions of home and belonging. On the other side is '*Gurbet*' (i.e. 'place that is not home'). This is the smaller of the territories and is bridged by a series of struggles – cultural, living and working conditions, iniquity, heritage preservation (the persistence of Turkish culinary and social practices, the naming of the guest workers' football club as '*Ataspor*', alluding to ancestry), and cultural memory. Whether the Turkish guest workers were able to 'adapt' and 'assimilate' are paramount questions, and there seems to be no easy resolution – guest workers were not invited to integrate themselves into the receiving state and were encouraged to maintain their own cultural traditions and homeland links in order to increase the likelihood of a return 'home'.

This is in some ways a 'closed' history (as the museum text points out, Camp Atatürk shut down in 1979), and there is no real sign of any kind of happy epilogue, or any attention to the lives of the former guest workers today. How, we may ask, do they negotiate life in the Netherlands now (assuming some of them are still there)? What are their children's and grandchildren's lives and prospects like? There is another, weaker territory overlapping with '*Gurbet*', which is 'objective memory', signalled by the loaning of objects from now-elderly guest workers and implying that the struggle to exist in an alien receiving state has subsided or been overcome. Also, the notion that the objects were loaned and not gifted provides a sense of the

personal and cultural value of these otherwise modest possessions.⁹ But these are parts of a narrative that many visitors, unconcerned with the technicalities of provenance data, will be unlikely to notice. Much stronger is the sense of the Turkish workers' unresolved struggle to exist in a place where they were seen not really as 'guests' but as expedient. As Mireille Rosello points out, the term 'guest worker' is practically oxymoronic:

Isn't a guest always implicitly an equal, who could, presumably, reciprocate at a later date, in a different space, at a different time? Confusing the guest and the employee risks depriving the so-called guest of the type of contract that exists in a business-like relationship. If you are a tenant or a worker, you are not at the mercy of a benevolent host who has the power to invite you or disinvite you, whose perfect right it is to let you stay or kick you out when he or she decides that you have overstayed your welcome. (Rosello 2001: 9)

So 'Atatürk' is a story about how difference was managed through marginalization. It documents and recognizes the realities experienced by a migrant group and does not operate in any positive way as a manifesto for the management of social relations. (Not far from the 'Atatürk' display is another on migrant stories that presents a much more positive view of (non-guest worker) migration legacies in relation to migrants' civic virtues and hybridized cultural forms – see Chapter 1, this volume.) Within the museum context the 'Atatürk' display can be read as a kind of essentialist-idealist historiographical gesture (the 'it-happened-so-we-talk-about-it' position); but also as a political-affective position on the part of the curators: the indulgence of retrospective embarrassment at the casual meting out of disadvantage in the past and the corollary need to recognize others' history in the 'receiving state'. Of course, at stake here is the issue of demographics within the cultural production and reception of such representations. Were the cultural producers (e.g. curators) of Turkish descent? And do people of Turkish descent form a significant visitor group at the museum? Who is speaking about whom, and to whom? What are

⁹ However, it should be pointed out that soliciting loans rather than gifts is common practice at the museum in brokering relationships with communities (de Wildt, pers. comm., 2013).

the affective politics of an expression, mediated in the museum by a majority group, which recognizes an ethical historical failure of the ‘receiving state’ within the civic context of Amsterdam? We suggest, for now, that this question (in its relation to migrant stories) can add a new strand to reflections on difficult histories and heritages.

Contesting Görlitzer Park at the Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum

This recognition of historical disadvantage and civic failure is something we also find in relation to an account of civil participation on the part of Turkish communities in Berlin. In the Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum (FKXB) in 2012 there was a display relating to the failed attempt, over the 1970s and 1980s, to build a Turkish Cultural Centre in Görlitzer Park:

In the 1960s and 70s the West Berlin senate planned to build a city motorway straight through Kreuzberg and across the grounds of the Görlitzer Railway Station. This was part of a bigger renovation project: old buildings were to be torn down, new residential complexes built. Many Kreuzbergers defended themselves against it. They demanded to be involved directly in the city planning. They occupied and renovated buildings and founded citizens’ groups. In this way they put their demands into action. Residents of the Railway Station area made efforts to get a city park. The Berlin Senate finally recognized their commitment. In two competitions, in 1977 and 1984, the citizens could make proposals for the use and design of the area.

Today the realization of the park concept is seen as an example of the political culture of civil participation in Kreuzberg. However, whose ideas would be realized? The proposal for a Turkish Cultural Centre with prayer space did not win a majority of votes. The [Turkish] mosque congregation had to give way, as did the [Turkish] businesspeople. (FKXB text panel)

The display was information-rich, including committee documents, architectural plans and considerable evidence of the vibrancy and significance of the Turkish community in Kreuzberg at the time, and their cultural input into civic life. It documents the activities of groups such as the Association of Türkischen Akademiker und Künstlerverein (Turkish Academics and Artists), who organized large-scale exhibitions and event series such as those relating to the poet Nâzım Hikmet

in 1977; and the Türkischer Arbeiterchor (Turkish Workers' Choir), some of whose songs could be listened to in the display, including *Kindergeldlied*, which criticized the law of 1975 that determined that parents received child benefit only for children living in their household, and not for those living in their homeland. The FKXB's own activity in relation to the Turkish community is documented with catalogues of exhibitions such as *Mehmet kam aus Anatolien* ('Mehmet Came From Anatolia', 1971, featuring the works of artists Mehmet Hanefi Yeter, Mehmet Çağlayan and Mehmet Aksoy) and *Morgens Deutschland abends Türkei* ('Morning Germany, Evening Turkey', 1981), which focused through a display of photographs on the 'social and political situation in Turkey, the foreigner laws [and] the situation of migrants in companies, schools and the housing market in Germany'. In this way the social context was set for the story of the failure of the Turkish community to register on a civic level and their failure to successfully claim, or make an impression on, Kreuzberg by seeking to refashion it with Turkish cultural forms. A strategic coalition of religious and non-religious Turkish migrants promoted the project, the story of whose demise is recounted in video monologues by a number of protagonists. The text panel reads:

In the late 1970s, Turkish and German social workers founded the AG Ausländer within the SO 36 Association, an association of Kreuzberg residents and district representatives. The AG Ausländer made efforts in the interests of Turkish immigrants. It presented the concept for a Turkish Cultural Centre within the framework of the park planning. It would accommodate assembly and festival rooms, a library, a hammam [*sic* steam bath], a coffee house with garden and a prayer space. In 1984, the district authorities deleted the idea of a Turkish Cultural Centre prematurely from the design competition. (FKXB label)

In the exhibition we learn from the architect Tural Türkeli, in one of the video monologues, of the failure of the Turkish socialists' appeal to political solidarity with the German socialist counterparts involved in the decision-making process; with relation to the proposed cultural centre the spokesperson of the latter group announced that 'there will be no mosque built in Kreuzberg'.

In an affirmation of the primacy of cultural difference over ideological commonality, the leader of the Turkish socialists condemned them: ‘Now we see the truth. What we have in common [is this]: we are socialists. You are also socialists. But in your hearts is a cross. In our hearts is the crescent.’

In an ironic twist, while we see how the Turkish community was disempowered to make a mark on their surroundings, the display involved a separate focus on the 1998 development in Görlitzer Park of a reinterpretation by artist Wigand Witting of the ancient Turkish site of Pamukkale. This extraordinary landscape in southwestern Turkey of bright white travertine terraces and hot springs is, with the possible exception of Cappadocia, perhaps the most alien and exotic of all Turkish places that could have been chosen for reconstruction in a German park. It was intended to honour Turkish communities, literally ‘re-placing’ a Turkish landscape into Berlin, with all that this suggests about the politics of hospitality and belonging. In an extension of Derrida’s ideas on (conditional) hospitality (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 1997; see also Rosello 2001 and Still 2012), the invitation to make the guest ‘feel at home’ – in this case an embodied invitation in the form of a reconstructed ‘home’ (the metonymic Pamukkale) – is always and inevitably an assertion that the guest is in fact *not* at home. Notwithstanding the symbolism and rhetoric of welcome, in the mind of the host the guest really belongs elsewhere, and does not have the power (that is, while still perceived by the host *as* a guest) to shape place in such a way that it can *become* home. In fact, the reconstruction of Pamukkale quickly became a ruin because of water and frost damage – the Portuguese limestone employed was no match for the German climate – and it was finally demolished in 2011. The display shows how, while the Turks were unable to impose a Turkish identity on place, the Germans ultimately did so on their behalf.

[Insert Figure 10.7 here – landscape]

Figure 10.7 Schematic map ‘A City Park for Everybody?’ display, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum

In Figure 10.7 we see allied Turkish communities occupying different spaces – the physical space of Kreuzberg and cultural space of Turkey, from which they draw cultural resources (artists, traditions, etc.) to be mediated in the new context of Kreuzberg (performances, events, exhibitions, etc.). These mediated cultural resources function as performances of identity but also as transcultural offers (even gifts) to the ‘host’ community. The *civic* space of Kreuzberg is, however, outwith the influence of the Turkish communities, who are nevertheless ‘honoured’ by the host through the process of reconstructing a notional Turkish landscape. The map represents the way in which actors shape Kreuzberg as place, or fail to shape it, in relation to notional ‘Turkeys’ – one is a territory of ‘live’ cultural resources (artists, poetry, song, etc.) upon which Turkish communities draw; the other is a conferred ‘identity place’ (Whitehead et al. 2012) in the form of an exotic and alien landscape which forms a metonym of the Other’s homeland. Note that the proposed Turkish cultural centre does not figure and that the Turkish communities’ civic input does not have purchase in the wider context of Kreuzberg society.

Both the Atatürk display and the Görlitzer Park displays function as acknowledgements of problems and failings in the state handling of immigration. But as ‘historical’ events they may also provide the suggestion that the exploitation or disadvantaging of non-autochthonous people is now literally a thing of the past (cf. Hintermann and Johansson 2010: 141 and Chapter 1, this volume). In this sense, the history of the guest workers or of the marginalization of the Turkish community in Kreuzberg is also a constitution moment of a peculiarly negative kind for autochthonous groups, as in: ‘this is who we no longer are’. For Turkish groups it forms a different constitution moment: ‘this is how we suffered disadvantage’. In our final example, to which we turn now, this self/other, us/them dichotomy is collapsed in an idealised constitution moment where difference is hybridized out of existence.

The Museum of European Cultures in Berlin: Idealized Hybridities

Our last example is the most contemporary museum representation in the sense that it aims to reflect a contemporary reality rather than a concluded or ‘closed’ history. At the Museum of European Cultures in Berlin there are two notable displays concerning German-Turkish identities:

one involving paraphernalia from a kebab shop in Berlin, and the other representing the integration and assimilation of people of different ethnic origin through the display of two football shirts, belonging to a member of the men's and women's national teams respectively (Figure 10.8).

[Insert Figure 10.8 here – portrait]

Figure 10.8 Mesut Özil's and Fatmire 'Lira' Bajramaj's German national football teams' shirts, on display at the Museum of European Cultures, Berlin

Source: Christopher Whitehead, courtesy of Museum Europäischer Kulturen – Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.

One of the shirts is that of Mesut Özil.¹⁰ The döner kebab, we learn in the display, is a German invention developed in the early 1970s by a former guest worker and now at the heart of a transnational industry:

What had initially been regarded as a 'typically Turkish' dish in Germany has long since lost its national stereotyping. The doner [*sic*] has meanwhile continued its campaign of conquest via Europe all the way to China. It has gone global. (Museum of European Cultures)

In a case of immigration turned outwards the display functions as a mapping of the confluence and fusion of cultures leading to cultural novelty with positive ramifications for international cultural contact and enterprise. As Sharon Macdonald notes, drawing on Ayşe Çağlar's analysis (1995), for non-Turkish Germans, 'the döner (symbolically and literally) fed into their pre-existing readiness to seek out and consume authentic ethnic food, partly as an enactment of multicultural openness'. The döner so embodied this outlook that it became a byword for multiculturalism itself, ironically, given that a product 'specially adapted for the local market [should become] the symbol of acceptable difference' (Macdonald 2013: 126). Of the football shirts we learn that while they may be a national identification symbol they have an international background:

¹⁰ The other shirt is that of Fatmire 'Lira' Bajramaj, who migrated from Istok in Kosovo to Germany as a small child.

They are distributed by a German manufacturer of sports equipment, but produced in Thailand, and some of their wearers have not only German roots: Mesut Özil is the child of Turkish immigrants and grew up in Gelsenkirchen. (Museum of European Cultures)

While this is not the first or only time that Mesut Özil has been held up as an emblem (see Bartsch et al. 2010), the blunt point being made is that someone of ethnic Turkish origin can now literally represent Germany, and that Germany itself is profoundly multicultural. It can be seen as a particularly positive account of an embodied cosmopolitanism (embodied in people, objects and practices) emerging because of major changes to the social fabric (e.g. resulting from immigration). Such changes erode ‘the very notion of a bounded conception of the social’ (Delanty 2006: 31) and radically reconfigure people’s patterns of identification and sense of identity (Mason 2013: 44). Key to this, in the museum representation, is the sense that this reconfiguration is for the better, and culturally enriches society (cf. Goodnow 2008: 230–245).

In one sense this can be seen as a ‘folding’ of the ‘guest’ into the ‘host’ – the collapse of alterity. In another sense this hybridization perversely involves the persistence of self and other (see Bhabha 2005), for it necessarily historicizes them as a set of ‘before-and-after’ states. Also, while ‘hybridity’ has been critiqued because of its biological ramifications (Macdonald 2013: 164), in this case the biological metaphor is an apt means of capturing the logic of these museum representations of a generative meeting of cultures.

There are specific silences in this cultural mapping, for example pertaining to the tensions that emerge when Özil scores against Turkey, as in the 2010 European Championship (Özil quoted in Radikal 2010). At the same time, in such accounts of the positive importance of migration we do not learn in this display about pertinent issues and events in German society, such as the August 1992 riot and burning of the asylum-seekers’ and Vietnamese contract-workers’ hostel in Rostock-Lichtenhagen by far-right groups, while the occupants were inside, or the ‘Döner Murders’ carried out by the far-right *Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund*, who targeted and killed ethnic Turkish döner vendors and greengrocers between 2000 and 2006 (Taras 2012:

171; Conrad and Langenbacher 2013: 126). There is also a profound disconnection between the displays and political discourse on multiculturalism as the legacy of migration. For example, there is no reference to anti-immigration stances in right-leaning or far-right parties in Germany or Europe, nor to high-profile claims from the political class about the failure of multiculturalism. Most notably, Angela Merkel's much-reported comments on multiculturalism were made in October 2010, when the MEC redevelopment was in full swing (it opened in December 2011). As she put it, the idea of people from different cultural backgrounds living happily 'side by side' did not work (Weaver 2010). Given the timings, it is hard not to see the exclusion of reference to such events as a deliberate representational strategy to promote the social benefits of multiculturalism. While an ideal cosmopolitanism of openness to intercultural contact and transformation/hybridization of the social is proposed in the display, in another way representative polyvocality is disabled, for there is limited recognition that a plurality of views exists, and that many of these views will conflict with one another and be unsavoury or unacceptable to some, for example those expressed by members of far-right groups. This brings into view the situated institutional and political limits to which museum representations of difference are subject (Mason 2013: 59; Chapter 1, this volume).

Concluding Thoughts: Managing Difference

What we have seen are museum representations focusing on Turkish migrations that have different political orientations and imperatives. Those at the Turkish museums are concerned with mapping a people in relation to a place, through focus on historic confluent migrations and the management of those who inhabit Turkey as place but whose identity is at odds with a ratified Turkish identity. There are various 'Others' in the Turkish museum representations: the disparate peoples who become one within the territory of Anatolia and are 'Turkified' retrospectively, the Western Europeans from whom Atatürk sought to reclaim Turkish history and the Armenians and those who incited them to insurrection. There are different constitution moments and nostalgias for different identities, as we see in the forging of new links to the Ottoman state as a glorious, unifying force – an alternative to the culminatory 'fixing point' of Turkish civilization in the 1923

foundation of the Republic. In the Western European museums we find representations of the Ottoman state as a fearsome Other from which Europe barely saved itself. In a sense this constitution moment, still present in the minds of some politicians, perpetuated an exclusionary logic and a sense of Turkish alterity within the organization of Western European society. Proceeding from this we see museum representations of disadvantage, suffering and marginalization as Turkish communities work and settle away from their homeland; there are clear issues with the difficulty of belonging in the ‘receiving state’, where people live (barracks, hostels, etc.) and what agency (if any) they can have in the refashioning of non-Turkish places (e.g. the failed attempt to build a Turkish Cultural Centre in Kreuzberg). There are also cultural practices at play in the museums, such as that of laying open to scrutiny historical disadvantages and injustices perpetrated by the state or by civic government, such as the exclusion of communities. One could argue that *contemporary* disadvantage is rarely addressed (a temporal delay typical of museum representations, as discussed by Whitehead et al., Chapter 1, this volume). However, in the final example of the Museum of European Cultures the existence of a positively hybridized bi- and multi-cultural identity is mapped, bespeaking an unproblematic and idealized cosmopolitanism in which multiple belongings are negotiated peacefully and multiple places (of ancestry, ethnic origin, of allegiance) are refracted in fused identities.

The two vectors explored in this chapter have been the constitution of the self in relation to the Other and the construction of identity in reference to the past, and both of these are processes that are situated in places both geographical and imaginative. As stated earlier in this chapter, the museum should not be seen as a merely passive vehicle for hegemonic expression (see also Mason 2013: 46), yet the cultural cartography embodied and enacted by museum representations of Turkish identities is also part of the broader political cartography of the management of history and society, even where this mapping contains discord and complex internal contradiction. This cartographic work is animated by different affective motivations: desire for historical continuities or cultural hybridizations, indignant denials of wrongdoing, anxiety about threats to identity, and the embarrassment and regret of the poor host. Through the

figuring of self and Other in place and time, museum representations offer political-cultural resources for the constitution of identity and society and for the negotiation of societal division – for a historical sorting out of who we are now, and who we are not, and for modelling accounts of the world that might allow us to live with ourselves and our pasts.

References

- Adak, U. 2013. Ottomanalgia and the Protests in Turkey [Online *Jadaliyya*] Available at: <http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/12253/ottomanalgia-and-the-protests-in-turkey> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Akçam, T. 2012. *The Young Turks' Crime Against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Alexander, M. 2007. *Cities and Labour Immigration: Comparing Policy Responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Aydemir, B. 2007. 1915 yılı olayları, *Sabah*, 28 July, available at: <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2007/07/28/haber,C7B8DF9C11C040F785183D0B06FDE27C.html> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Bartsch, M., Brandt, A. and Steinvoth, D. 2010. Turkish Immigration to Germany, Spiegel Online International, available at: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/turkish-immigration-to-germany-a-sorry-history-of-self-deception-and-wasted-opportunities-a-716067.html> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Berger, J. 1975. *A Seventh Man*. London: Verso.
- Berger, J and Mohr, J. 2010 [1975]. *A Seventh Man: Migrant Workers in Europe*. New York: Verso.
- Bhabha, H. [1994] 2005. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge Classics.
- BBC 2004. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4092933.stm> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Çağaptay, S. 2002. Reconfiguring the Turkish Nation in the 1930s. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 8 (2), 67–82.

- Çağlar, A.S. 1995. McDöner: Döner Kebap and the Social Positioning Struggle of German Turks, in *Marketing in a Multicultural World: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Cultural Identity*, edited by J.A. Kosta and G.J. Bamossy. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 209–30.
- Caldwell, C. 2004. Islamic Europe? *The Weekly Standard*, 10 (4) (October 4), [Online] Available at:
<http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/004/685ozxcq.asp?pg=1> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Çarkoğlu, A. and Çağın Bilgili, N. 2011. A Precarious Relationship: The Alevi Minority, the Turkish State and the EU. *South European Society and Politics*, 16 (2), 351–64.
- Chin, R. 2007. *The Guestworker Question in Postwar Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conradt, D.P. and Langenbacher, E. 2013. *The German Polity*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Delanty, G. 2006. *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delanty, G. 2013. *Formations of European Modernity: A Historical and Political Sociology of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Derrida, J. and Dufourmantelle, A. 1997. *Anne Dufourmantelle invite Jacques Derrida à répondre: de l'hospitalité*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.
- Findlay, C.V. 2010. *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism and Modernity: A History*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Finkel, A. 2013. The Curse of Atatürk, *International New York Times*, 5 April, available at:
http://latitude.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/04/05/the-curse-of-ataturk/?_r=0, [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Gieryn, T.F. 1999. *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Goodnow, K. 2008. Exhibition Forms and Influential Circumstances, in *Scandinavian Museums and Cultural Diversity*, edited by K. Goodnow and H. Ackman. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 230–243.
- Harding, L. 2013. Turkish Protesters Embrace Erdoğan Insult and Start ‘Capuling’ Craze, *Guardian*, 11 June, available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/10/turkish-protesters-capuling-erdogan> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Hintermann, C. and Johansson, C. (eds) 2010. *Migration & Memory: Representations of Migration in Europe since 1960*. Innsbruck, Wien and Bozen: StudienVerlag.
- İnan, A., Bıyıklıoğlu, M.T., Rifat, S. Akçora, Y., Galip, R., Çambel, H.C., Arsal, S.M., Günaltay, M.Ş., Çınar, H.V. and Özer, Y.Z. 1930. *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları*. Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası.
- Jacoby, T. 2010. Identity Politics, Turkey and the European Union. *Mediterranean Politics*, 15 (1), 109–19.
- Keyman, E.F. 2007. Turkey Between Europe and Asia, in *Europe and Asia Between East and West*, edited by G. Delanty. London: Routledge, 203–14.
- Kumrular, Ö. 2005. Kanuni’nin Batı Siyasetinin Bir İzdüşümü Olarak Türk İmajı, in *Dünyada Türk İmgesi*, edited by Ö Kumrular. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 109–28.
- Kuran-Burçoğlu, N. 2003. A Glimpse at Various Stages of the Evolution of the Image of the Turk in Europe: 15th to 21st Centuries, in *Historical Image of the Turk in Europe: 15th Century to Present*, edited by M. Soykut. Istanbul: ISIS Press, 15–27.
- Macdonald, S. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London: Routledge.
- MacLennan, J.C. 2009. The EU-Turkey Negotiations: Between the Siege of Vienna and the Reconquest of Constantinople, in *Turkey’s Accession to the European Union: An Unusual Candidacy*, edited by C. Arvanitopoulos. New York: Springer, 21–30.

- Mason, R. 2013. National Museums, Globalization, and Postnationalism: Imagining a Cosmopolitan Museology. *Museum Worlds: Advances in Research*, 1, 40–64.
- Morozov, V. and Rumelili, B. 2012. The External Constitution of European Identity: Russia and Turkey as Europe-makers. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47 (1), 28–48.
- Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, n.d. *Museum of Anatolian Civilizations Guidebook*. Ankara.
- Neumann, I.B. 1998. *Uses of the Other: The 'East' in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Özdemir, H. 2005. We Did Not Commit Genocide. *Turkish Historical Society* [Online] available at: <http://www.ttk.gov.tr/index.php?Page=Sayfa&No=91> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Özdoğan, M. 1998. Ideology and Archaeology in Turkey, in *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, edited by L. Meskell. London: Routledge, 111–24.
- Pamuk, H. and Solaker, G. 2013. Turkey's Kemalists see Secularist Legacy Under Threat, *Reuters*, 17 November [Online] available at: <http://mobile.reuters.com/article/topNews/idUSBRE9AG0HQ20131118?irpc=932>, [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Pamuk, O. 2004. *Snow*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Radikal 2010. Özil: Gol attıktan sonra tabii ki çok sevindim, 10 October [Online] available at: http://www.radikal.com.tr/spor/ozil_gol_attiktan_sonra_tabii_ki_cok_sevindim-1023032, [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Rosello, M. 2001. *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Savino, M. 2011. Narrating the 'New' History: Museums in the Construction of the Turkish Republic, in *Great Narratives of the Past Traditions and Revisions in National Museums: Conference Proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics*,

- the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen*, edited by D. Poulot, F. Bodenstein and J.M Lanzarote Guiral, available at: http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_home/index.en.aspx?issue=078 [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Smith, R.M. 2003. *Stories of Peoplehood: The Politics and Morals of Political Membership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spiegel 2010. Turkish EU Minister on the Armenian Genocide Controversy: ‘We Are Very Sensitive About This Issue’ [Online] available at: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/turkish-eu-minister-on-the-armenian-genocide-controversy-we-are-very-sensitive-about-this-issue-a-683701.html> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Still, J. 2012. *Derrida and Hospitality: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Taras, R. 2012. *Xenophobia and Islamophobia in Europe*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Traynor, I. 2004. In 1683 Turkey was the Invader. In 2004 Much of Europe Still Sees it that Way, *Guardian*, 22 September [Online] available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/sep/22/eu.turkey> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Weaver, M. 2010. Angela Merkel: German Multiculturalism has ‘Utterly Failed’, *Guardian*, 17 October [Online] available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-german-multiculturalism-failed> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- Whitehead, C. 2009. *Museums and the Construction of Disciplines: Art and Archaeology in 19th Century Britain*. London: Duckworth Academic/Bloomsbury.
- Whitehead, C., Eckersley, S. and Mason, R. 2012. *Placing Migration in European Museums: Theoretical, Contextual and Methodological Foundations*. Milan: Politecnico di Milano DPA Press, [Online] available at: <http://www.mela-project.eu/publications/948> [accessed 14 April 2014].
- de Wildt, A. Interview with C. Whitehead, Amsterdam Museum, 22 January 2013.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Liebhart, K. 2009. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Yetkin, M. 2013. Ergenekon davası amacına ulaştı, *Radikal*, 6 August [Online] available at: http://www.radikal.com.tr/yazarlar/murat_yetkin/ergenekon_davasi_amacina_ulasti-1145077 [accessed 14 April 2014].