

SOVIET STUDIES ON TURKEY, 1917-1991: INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY AND
ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES

LİAİSAN ŞAHİN

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2005

SOVIET STUDIES ON TURKEY, 1917-1991: INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY AND
ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES

by

Liaisan Şahin

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 Liaisan Şahin for the degree of the Master of Arts from the Atatürk
Institute for Modern Turkish History to be taken September 2005

Title: Soviet Studies on Turkey, 1917-1991: Institutional History and Analytical Perspectives

Turkish studies represent one of the oldest and most developed branches of Russian Oriental studies. The peculiarities of Russian-Turkish relations and Russia's consequent close interest in Turkey have determined the fact. In the Soviet period, Turkish studies continued to develop and showed steady proliferation and advance, because Turkey served for Soviet Orientalist scholarship as a model in elaborating many of the problems of the Third World. It stemmed from some peculiarities of Turkish development, namely, the fact that Turkey won its political independent much earlier of the majority of colonial and semi-colonial countries and had a long experience in capitalist way of socioeconomic development. This thesis attempts a comprehensive history of Soviet studies on Turkey, considering them within the context of the overall development of Soviet Oriental studies. Along with institutional history, some aspects of the Soviet analysis of Turkey are dealt with: the Soviet interpretation of the two most important Soviet Turkologist scholarship themes, the Turkish National Struggle and socioeconomic development of the Republic of Turkey, is conveyed. It is indicated that Soviet studies on Turkey showed an obvious continuity with the Tsarist Turkology in regard to the priorities of investigation, as the same focus on contemporary issues and the primary engagement with recent history and economics were the case. Soviet Turkology developed parallel to the overall growth of Soviet Oriental studies and was characterized by a quick response to the state's demands and to the major trends of research. As to the peculiarities of the Soviet analysis, the Turkish National Struggle was considered by Soviet scholars as a bourgeois liberation revolution under the leadership of the native merchant bourgeoisie and big land-owners and its anti-people character was emphasized. The Soviet scholarship was of the opinion that capitalism in Turkey was characterized by the middle level of development; the strong state element; the existence of many feudal remnants and consequent contradictions and disproportions in socioeconomic structure; and unequal dependence on the world capitalist system.

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

Başlık: Sovyetler Birliği'nde Türkiye Üzerine Araştırmalar, 1917-1991: Kurumsal Gelişimin Tarihi ve Analiz Özellikleri

Türk-Rus ilişkilerinin özellikleri dolayısıyla Rusya tarihi boyunca Türkiye'ye yakın ilgi duymuştur. Bu yüzden Türkiye konulu çalışmalar Rus Şarkiyatçılık biliminin en eski ve gelişmiş dallarından birini oluşturmaktadır. Sovyet döneminde de Türkiye üzerine çalışmalar devam etmiş ve hatta daha da yaygınlaşmış ve gelişmiştir, zira Türkiye'nin diğer Doğu ülkelerinden daha uzun olan siyasi bağımsızlık ve kapitalist gelişme tecrübesi Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinin meselelerini incelemek için Sovyet bilimine bir örnek teşkil etmiştir. Bu tez, Sovyetler Birliği'nde Türkiye üzerine yürütülmüş olan çalışmaların tarihsel gelişimini içermektedir. Kurumsal tarihin yanı sıra Sovyetlerin Türkiye analizine de değinilmekte ve Sovyet bilim adamlarını özellikle meşgul etmiş olan iki konu – Milli Mücadele ve Türkiye'nin toplumsal ve ekonomik gelişimi – ele alınmaktadır. Varılan sonuca göre, Sovyetler Birliği'ndeki Türkiye uzmanlarının bilimsel ilgi alanları Çarlık Rusyasında yürütülen çalışmalara benzerlik göstermiş ve aynı şekilde yakın tarih ve ekonomi konularına ağırlık verilmiştir. Sovyetlerin Türkiye üzerinde çalışmaları Sovyet Şarkiyatçılık biliminin genel gelişimi ile birlikte ilerlemiş ve Sovyet devleti tarafından konulan taleplere hızla karşılık vermiştir. Sovyet analizinin özelliklerine gelince, Milli Mücadele sonucu kazanılan zafer Sovyet bilim adamları tarafından bir burjuva ihtilali olarak değerlendirilmiş; yerli ticari burjuvazi sınıfının ve büyük toprak sahiplerinin önderlik yaptığı bu ihtilalin “halk-karşıtı” yönüne vurgu yapılmıştır. Türkiye'deki kapitalist gelişimin özellikleri olarak şunlar belirtilmiştir: orta derecede gelişmişlik; güçlü devlet; birçok feodal kalıntının varlığı ve bundan dolayı toplumsal ve ekonomik yapıda ortaya çıkan çelişkiler ve orantısızlıklar; dünya kapitalist düzeni içinde eşit olmayan bir konum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express first my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Dr. Zafer Toprak, for his guidance and support throughout the development of my thesis. I derived much not only from his precise observations, but also from his calm and positive disposition.

I am also thankful to other professors of the Atatürk Institute, all of whom did their best in providing help and making useful criticism. Special thanks to Associate Prof. Duygu Köksal for her close attention and constant encouragement.

I am indebted to dear Tracy Deliismail for her watchful interest in my thesis and inspiring comments. It has always been pleasure for me to investigate and write; I anticipate that from this time on, my usual pleasure will turn into a real delight, as Tracy helped me to catch the gist of the endeavour.

Sincere thanks to dear Kathryn Kranzler for her company and her tireless efforts to tame all these verbs, prepositions, articles and so on in my writing that stubbornly refused to be in the right forms and places.

My thanks to all of the friends I acquired at Ata, for their precious friendship and for their mere existence. I would like to make special mention of one of them: the world would be certainly darker without dear Özge, with her sensitive and frank nature.

Without doubt, I cannot neglect to mention old friends whose stable support I have enjoyed for a long time: Daniye, Azat, Çulpan, Kamil, Rozaliya and Zoya in Tataristan and Ayşe Gün Soysal, Nesrin Sarıahmetoğlu Karagür, Ahmet Kanlıdere, Dilek, Ruşaniye, İlsöyer and Gülçiçek in Turkey. Friends in Tataristan rendered me also great assistance, supplying an important part of the materials I needed for my thesis.

I owe much to my family and especially to my husband, Erdal Şahin, who never failed in providing thoughtful care. I am afraid that Aysılı, my daughter, suffered the greatest because of her mother's constant business, while being herself the most important source of joy and thought. She made me really glad in the end of my thesis about the result, declaring that she too would "make a book" when she grows up.

CONTENTS

Chapter

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| The Place of Russian/Soviet Oriental Studies within the International Discipline of Oriental Studies..... | 4 |
| Sources of the Thesis..... | 23 |
| Russian Turkology of the Tsarist Period..... | 27 |
| Bibliographical Information about Russian Turkology of the Tsarist Period..... | 47 |
| II. HISTORY OF TURKOLOGICAL STUDIES IN THE SOVIET UNION..... | 52 |
| The Period of the “Disorderly Growth” of the Early Soviet Period (1917-the 1920s)..... | 55 |
| The Period of the “More Orderly and Restricted Development” (The 1930-40s)..... | 65 |
| The Period of the “Fundamental Restructuring” (1950-1961)..... | 74 |
| The Period of the “Organized Growth” of the Late Soviet Era..... | 90 |
| Bibliographical Information about Soviet Turkology..... | 101 |
| III. SOME ASPECTS OF THE SOVIET ANALYSIS OF TURKEY..... | 122 |
| The Turkish National Liberation Revolution..... | 124 |
| Capitalism in Turkey: The Turkish Model of Socioeconomic Development..... | 174 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 203 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 208 |
| APPENDICES..... | 212 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is devoted to studies on Turkey in the Soviet Union. In other words, it deals with one branch of Russian Oriental studies – Turkology¹ – and considers it within chronological limits of the Soviet period. Neither Turkish, Russian nor Western scholars have examined the subject in the way that is attempted in this study: separately from other branches of Russian Oriental studies, thoroughly within defined chronological limits and in a detailed manner. Only some aspects of Turkish studies in the Soviet Union have been elucidated so far by the three scholarships. Everyone will agree that a comprehensive knowledge about something is preferable to fragmented one. In view of this consideration, a difficult though inspiring attempt has been made in this thesis: to create the first comprehensive account of Turkish studies in the Soviet Union.

To examine how some peoples have examined and seen some other peoples is an exciting undertaking indeed. Both sides benefit from the account created by this process: the peoples examined are provided a fresh, unusual look at themselves from the outside, while for the examiners too this account turns ultimately to be a part of their own history and can tell something new about their own being. The problem for the author of this thesis was how to relate

¹ The term “Turkology” has been used in the Western world to refer studies of Turkic peoples. But in the Russian language it refers only to studies of Turkey (*Turkologiia*), while for studies of Turkic peoples, the term “Tiurkology” (*Tiurkologiia*), has been used. This distinction has had geographical, demographical and political meaning for Russia. Almost all Turkic peoples except the Turks have lived within Russia’s borders (The situation changed only with the collapse of the Soviet Union). From the beginning of Russian Oriental studies, Turkish peoples were, so to say, an “external” subject of investigation for Russian Tiurkology. Turkish studies obtained a rather separate position in this context that found its reflection in using a separate term for these studies. This distinctiveness of Turkish studies was strengthened by the fact that Russia during several centuries had in the Ottoman Empire a serious enemy with whom a number of wars was waged and who, therefore, has always been a subject of acute interest for both Russian scholarship and Russian public. I have decided to use the terms as they have been employed in the Russian scholarship i. e. “Turkology” referring to Turkish studies and “Tiurkology” referring to Turkic studies.

one people's look at another people, from which directions proceed so that the outcome would be useful for both sides. I decided that it would be appropriate to describe the process of the study, on the one hand, and its results, on the other. In other words, institutional developments (why, when, where, and how research was organized) are described and content of studies (what was said) are examined.

Having decided on the structure of the thesis, it was equally necessary to settle how to treat its particular subject so that describe it in most comprehensible and thorough way.

No subject can be comprehended thoroughly without its setting. As to studies on Turkey in the Soviet Union, they cannot be comprehended without taking into account their framework - the general discipline of Soviet Oriental studies, which in their turn represent a chronologically limited part of Russia's long tradition in Oriental studies and, in the end, the entire Russian/Soviet experience in Oriental studies cannot be comprehended without being considering as a quite peculiar part of a broader phenomenon, the international discipline of Oriental studies. It must be also kept in mind that each of these phenomena has unfolded and changed over time. Moreover, while speaking of Oriental studies it is inevitable to become engaged in discussion about such relevant topics as imperialism, colonialism, Orientalism (perceived as a kind of discourse) and so on. Undoubtedly, to cover all this issues is far beyond the limited scope of a master thesis. Nevertheless, in order to give a comprehensible account of Soviet studies on Turkey we must necessarily become at least partly engaged in all these issues, that is we must necessarily examine studies on Turkey within the general framework of Soviet Oriental studies and, in order to grasp peculiarities of Soviet Oriental studies, we must again necessarily define them within the Russian Orientalist tradition and then within the international discipline of Oriental studies, while treating these subjects in connection with the issues of imperialism, colonialism, and Orientalism.

How was this extremely broad and difficult task to be handled in this thesis in some meaningful way? I decided to move from the general to the particular, that is, to set first the background by characterizing in Chapter One the place of Russian/Soviet Oriental studies within the international Orientalist scholarship (distinguishing the peculiar Soviet phase within the overall Russian experience) and then proceeding in Chapter Two to give an account of studies on Turkey placed and perceived within the context of the overall development of Soviet Oriental studies. Chapter One includes also a part devoted to history of studies on Turkey in Tsarist Russia, in order to set historical background as well before proceeding to describe developments in the Soviet period.

In Chapter Two a periodization of Soviet Oriental studies is given different from those some Western scholars have made. While the latter have preferred to distinguish phases in the evolution of Soviet Oriental studies based on the sequence of Soviet leaders, the chronology presented here is based on international developments as more appropriate for purposes of this study. Chapters One and Two are supplemented by bibliographical information about studies on Turkey in the Tsarist and Soviet periods to provide a notion about the thematical scope of the studies.

The final chapter of the thesis is devoted to Soviet analysis of Turkey. Undoubtedly, this subject is a capacious and many-sided one and, in order to be handled in useful manner, it needed limitation. In this study, I have focused on two issues that attracted the primary attention of Soviet Turkologists, namely, the Turkish national liberation revolution and the Turkish experience in capitalist development. Just a descriptive account of the main conclusions made by Soviet scholars is given in this thesis. Theoretical or any other kind of assessments of Soviet views have not been attempted on consideration that they are beyond the scope of this study.

The thesis ends with several appendices that give concise historical accounts of developments related to Turkish studies in some Soviet republics and list works on Turkey created by Soviet Orientalists in those republics. In the end, a selected bibliography of works on Turkey by Soviet Orientalists in Moscow and Leningrad is given. Appendices have been prepared in order to give some impression about still other aspects of the subject to contribute to comprehensiveness of the picture.

It is my hope that this study, in spite of its many shortcomings and deficiencies, is capable of making a contribution to the history of Russian Oriental studies as well as to history of Turkey.

The Place of Russian/Soviet Oriental Studies within the International Discipline of Oriental Studies

Before proceeding on the subject, the following moment should be underlined. After the intellectual debates initiated by Edward Said's *Orientalism*, the Orientalist discipline came to be viewed in the Western world as an ideological, political, and sociopsychological phenomenon rather than a purely scientific enterprise. Moreover, the term "Orientalism" acquired a perceptibly negative meaning in this context. It seems to me that the current perception of Orientalism in the West necessitates that a subject related to Oriental studies be treated in a certain manner, i. e. with primary attention to its non-academic background and within the whole network of its relevant implications. Being well aware of this difficulty, I find it necessary to state at the very beginning that I have engaged in this study only in describing academic developments in Russian Oriental studies and not in determining their meaning for Russian intellectual life. Actually, the two are somewhat different undertakings. The former relates to the field of history, and the latter to the field of philosophy. For purposes of this study, I have regarded and treated Russian

Oriental studies as an academic enterprise. As a matter of fact, this way of treating Russian Oriental studies is, perhaps, the most suitable one for them, as these studies represent a quite peculiar thing of its own kind in regard to the Western current perception of Oriental studies.

To begin with, in the Russian language the term used for Oriental studies – *Vostokovedenie* – does not carry any negative meaning in contrary to the Western current understanding of “Orientalism.” Actually, the Russians’ perception of Oriental studies differs significantly from that of Western scholars. Does it mean that Russian Oriental studies do not have much to do with Russian imperialism and colonialism and do not reflected some political, ideological and other concerns? Certainly not, but the Russians have not themselves regarded their Orientalist scholarship in this light and have not attributed to it any pernicious quality. Though being well informed of the Western current view of Orientalism,² the Russians remain convinced today of the primary importance of the academic qualities of the Orientalist discipline in Russia. In other words, while speaking of their native Oriental studies, the Russians understand primarily an academic enterprise, rather than a peculiar political, ideological or other such phenomenon. To put it in Western terms, Russian *Oriental studies* is exactly the case, not Russian *Orientalism*.

In what particular place is the Russian academic discipline of Oriental studies situated within the international Orientalist academic discipline? We will first relate the Russian view of the subject and then proceed to examine the Western stand in regard to Russian Oriental studies.³

² As can be seen from current curricula in Russian universities, the courses on interaction between Western and Eastern civilizations include such themes as “The East as the Other” or “The East Inside Us.” *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia “Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii” (Moskva, 29-31 maia 2000 g.): Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii* [Scientific and Methodological Conference “Oriental Education in Universities of Russia” (Moscow, May of 29-31, 2000) : Theses of Papers and Reports] (Moscow, 2000), p. 86.

³ It seems that the most useful way would be to examine Russian Oriental studies’ relationship and interaction with all other national branches of the discipline. However, it is a formidable task in view of the fact that there are too many national Orientalist scholarships (British, French, German, American, Italian and others) to be considered in this context. We have attempted here to touch upon only one side of the problem, focusing on relations and interaction between Russian and English-speaking (British and American) Orientalist scholarships. The author is of convince that the conclusions reached will have some representative quality, as English-speaking Orientalist

Russian scholars have given proper attention to history of Oriental studies in Russia, while giving them in overall European context.⁴ The sweeping work entitled *Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* [History of Oriental Studies in Europe and Russia]⁵ by V. V. Barthold (1869-1930), the prominent Russian Orientalist of the pre-Soviet generation, comes immediately to one's mind.⁶ Still other accounts by Soviet Orientalists showed the same broad vision of Oriental studies.⁷ As contemporary curricula in Russian universities show, the history of Oriental studies in Russia continues to be taught in the overall context of Western Oriental studies.⁸

Tsarist, Soviet and post-Soviet Orientalists offer somewhat different evaluations of Russian Oriental studies. But all of them agree in attributing to these studies specificity in regard to the Western Orientalist discipline. Barthold argued that Russian attitudes vis-à-vis the East and the whole Oriental science, although heavily influenced by West European scholars, followed their own special path and, as a scientific discipline, should be regarded as separate from that of Western Europe.⁹ During the Soviet period, the feeling of opposition to the West in regard to the quality of Orientalist scholarship even strengthened because of ideological and political moments which we will consider below. Post-Soviet Russian Orientalists, while becoming free from Soviet

scholarship, actually, has become dominant within the international Orientalist discipline because of the range of factors (not the least among them being the fact that the most important recent intellectual debates in the discipline have been unfolded primarily in English-speaking academic environment).

⁴ Some Western scholars have emphasized the Russians' advance in studying general history of Oriental studies. For instance, Anour Abdel-Malek in his article *Orientalism in Crisis* cites the works by Russian Orientalists at the very beginning of the list of major works on history of traditional Oriental studies. While citing an article in *Soviet Encyclopedia*, he notes that there exists nothing in the *Encyclopedie de l'Islam*, nor in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Anouar Abdel-Malek, "Orientalism in Crisis," *Diogenes*, no. 44, 1963, p. 130, n. 1).

⁵ First published in 1911. The second edition of the work that was published in Leningrad in 1925 is known better. Translated into French and published in Paris in 1947.

⁶ This study has been respected much by the Western scholarship, as confirmed by frequent references to it in Western literature.

⁷ For instance, the article devoted to Oriental studies in *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia* describes developments in Oriental studies throughout the world ("Oriental Studies," *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 5 (A Translation of the Third Edition) (New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1974), pp. 308-313).

⁸ *Nauchno-metodicheskaia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii"*, p. 88.

⁹ M. Hauner, *What is Asia to Us? : Russia's Asian Heartland Yesterday and Today* (London; Sydney; Wellington: Unwin Hyman, 1990), p. 15, n. 3.

ideological restrictions and political predispositions, continue to hold Barthold's conviction, asserting that the Russian experience in Oriental studies is truly unique and merits special evaluation.¹⁰

In what does Russian Oriental studies' uniqueness consist? The Russian view can be summarized by pointing out the following points: Russia actually represents a quite peculiar thing of its own kind in regard to the Western world. The peculiarity stems from Russia's duality, its in-between position characterized by being at the same time Europe and Asia in geographical terms and, consequently, the West and the East in civilizational terms.¹¹ Russia's expansion as an empire occurred with the absorption of many Eastern lands and peoples. As a result, Russia has become contiguous to the Eastern world, moreover, it has contained the East inside of its borders. Therefore, the Russian experience in colonialism has been characterized by direct and constant contact; in other words, it has an *internal* dimension. Closeness of contact had far-reaching consequences for the destinies of all peoples in Russia. The Russians brought to the Eastern peoples European civilization and contributed to their cultural advance, while becoming themselves influenced by elements of Eastern cultures.¹² Posing urgent practical problems related to internal life, contacts with Eastern peoples played more significant role in Russian life than in

¹⁰ *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii"*, p. 25.

¹¹ Actually, Western scholarship has long to be of the same opinion. One frequently encounters in Western literature to the observations about Russia's duality. For instance, Paul Kennedy in his *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* defines Russia as an outsider to the Western world, while, at the same time, accepting its European features. As he says in the sub-chapter titled "Two Outsiders – Japan and Russia," "Geographically far removed from the West – partly on account of poor communications, and partly because periodic clashes with Lithuania, Poland, Sweden, and the Ottoman Empire interrupted those routes which did exist – the Kingdom of Muscovy was nevertheless deeply influenced by its European inheritance, not least through the Russian Orthodox Church." Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), p. 15. Another example is Geoffrey Hosking's *Russia and the Russians: A History* where the author speaks of "the polarity between East and West" that has afflicted Russia's political and cultural life "at least since the sixteenth century." Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia and the Russians: A History* (London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 2001), p. 21.

¹² As post-Soviet Orientalists came to argue, Russian culture, in fact, is a synthesis of European roots (Slavic element) with numerous elements of various Eastern cultures (Turkic, Arabic, Indian, Chinese and Byzantine). *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii"*, p. 44.

the Western world. The vital character of this experience made the Russians more aware of the problems of the interaction with the East and more involved in mental activity about the issue.¹³ Extremely broad in geographical terms, the complex and many-sided nature of the Russian experience in contacts with the Eastern peoples resulted, on the one hand, in the breadth and richness of the Russian Orientalist discipline¹⁴ and, on the other hand, in its complex and integrated character as Russian Oriental studies have always combined philological studies with historical and cultural research. However chauvinist the stand of the Russian colonial authorities may have been, Russian Orientalist scholarship itself was distinguished by a humane and respectful attitude toward the Eastern peoples.¹⁵ In fact, Russian Orientalists contributed much to the mutual understanding between the Russians and other peoples of Russia. As one post-Soviet Orientalist puts it, Oriental studies in Russia have been one of the primary factors of Russian culture.¹⁶ According to the Russian perception, all of these factors make the Russian experience in Oriental studies truly unique and worthy of a separate theoretical assessment.¹⁷

¹³ As one Russian Orientalist has put it: “The all-sided and profound study of the Orient has been one of the most vital and basic problems of Russian scholarship (N. I. Borozdin, “Inter-Racial Study in Asia: The Progress of Orientology in the USSR,” *Pacific Affairs* 2, no. 6 (June, 1929), p. 323). It seems that the Western scholarship too has been aware of this specificity of Russian scholarship. As one Western scholar has indicated, “Orientology [is a] field traditionally congenial to Russian scholars” (Joseph Barnes, “Soviet Sinology,” *Pacific Affairs* 7, no. 3 (September 1934), p. 331).

¹⁴ One cannot but be really impressed by the sheer scope of Russian Oriental studies which embrace immense geographical space from the Near to Far East and enormous multitude of different cultures.

¹⁵ As one Soviet source asserts, “To equate the colonial policy and Orientalist discipline is a gross error.” *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR (Azerbaijan, Armeniia, Gruzii, Ukraina)* [Oriental Centers in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine)] (Moscow, 1988), p. 126.

¹⁶ *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia “Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii”*, p. 43.

¹⁷ Apart from Barthold’s dated work, there exists no yet a study in Russia devoted to comprehensive, objective and comparative analysis of Russian Oriental studies. Though some amount of works on history of Russian/Soviet Oriental studies was created during the Soviet era, they suffer from ideological bias and are inadequate in terms of objective analysis.

How have Russian Oriental studies been perceived by the Western scholarship so far? As can be judged from some remarks by Western Orientalists about the subject,¹⁸ Western scholarship has showed a somewhat ambivalent attitude toward Russian Oriental studies. There has been, on the one hand, the feeling of distance that is, as one Western scholar has admitted, related mostly to “obstacle of the Russian language” and “the superiority complex of Western scholars.”¹⁹ On the other hand, despite this perceived distance, Russian Oriental studies have been regarded within Western Orientalist tradition, while some distinguished Russian Orientalists have been respected very much indeed. For example, Hamilton A. R. Gibb, one of the leading Western Orientalists, highly appreciated I. Krachkovskii, the prominent Russian Arabist, speaking about his works as “the only European sources of reference.”²⁰ Anouar Abdel-Malek, who was among the first to question the Orientalist discipline, mentioned Russia among “the principal Western Orientalist schools” along with France, Great Britain, Germany, Spain, Italy, and the United States. According to him, all these schools shared the same mode of thought and the same vision of traditional Orientalism.²¹ Similarly, Francesco Gabrieli, in an article written in response to Abdel-Malek’s cited article, spoke about Soviet Orientalists as European scholars and mentioned Barthold among “the finest Orientalists” and “the greatest and most important European scholars.”²² Bernard Lewis, who too, apparently, regards Russian Oriental studies within the European scholarship notes, however, that “[the Russians’] contribution, though

¹⁸ I did not encounter a long discussion by Western Orientalists of Russian Oriental studies and have relied only on some short remarks scattered throughout the Western literature on general Orientalist matters. As it seems to me, these remarks are helpful in shedding light to Western attitude toward Russian Oriental studies.

¹⁹ Joseph Barnes, p. 333.

²⁰ Hamilton A. R. Gibb, *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, edited by Stanford J. Shaw and William R. Polk (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962), p. 303, n. 3.

²¹ Anouar Abdel-Malek, “Orientalism in Crisis,” *Diogenes*, no. 44 (Winter 1963), p. 106.

²² Francesco Gabrieli, “Apology for Orientalism,” *Diogenes*, no. 50 (Summer 1965), p. 132.

considerable, is less than that of the Germans or even of the British and the French.”²³ So it can be stated that, while perceiving Russian Oriental studies as a somewhat different thing, the Western scholarship, nevertheless, has regarded them as one branch of Western Oriental studies.

How much Russian Oriental studies have been examined by Western scholarship? A considerable amount of work in the Western world has been devoted to the general course of Russian history, peculiarities of Russian culture, various aspects of Russian imperialism and colonialism²⁴ that are capable of providing rather detailed information about historical and intellectual context of Russian Oriental studies, while one encounters in those works here and there pieces of information shedding light on the content of Russian Oriental studies as well. A number of works tracing current developments in Soviet Oriental studies was created during the Cold War era. In recent years, several works devoted to the examination of some aspects of Russian Orientalism (in the Western sense) appeared.²⁵ However, there has been created no study

²³ Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 112.

²⁴ There exists a considerable amount of works dealing with the general history and with certain aspects of Russian imperialism and colonialism (As a matter of fact, all works dealing with history of Russia bound to consider this issue in one or another way, as Russian history means history of Russian colonialism). To list only the most comprehensive of them: F. A. Golder, *Russian Expansion on the Pacific* (Cleveland, O., 1914); B. H. Summer, *Tsardom and Imperialism in the Far and Middle East* (London, 1940); Walter Kolarz, *Russia and Her Colonies* (New York, 1952); Richard Pierce, *Russian Central Asia, 1867-1917: A Study in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley, 1960); Hugh Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967); Edward Allworth, *Central Asia: A Century of Russian Rule* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967); R. J. Kerner, *The Urge to the Sea* (New York, 1971); Taras Hunczak, ed., *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1974); Dietrich Geyer, *Russian Imperialism: The Interaction of Domestic and Foreign Policy, 1860-1914* (New Haven, 1977); L. Kochan and R. Abraham, *The Making of Modern Russia* (Harmondsworth, Md., 1983); Michael Rywkin, ed., *Russian Colonial Expansion to 1917* (London, 1988); Steven G. Marks, *Road to Power: The Trans-Siberian Railroad and the Colonization of Asian Russia, 1850-1917* (Ithaca, New York, 1991); Daniel R. Browe and Edward J. Lazzarini, eds., *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997); etc.

²⁵ For instance: Mark Bassin, “Inventing Siberia: Visions of the Russian East in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *American Historical Review* 96 (1991), pp. 763-794; Mark Batunsky, “Racism in Russian Islamology: Agafangel Krimsky,” *Central Asian Survey* 4 (1992), pp. 75-84; Susan Layton, “Eros and Empire in Russian Literature about Georgia,” *Slavic Review* 51, no. 2 (1992), pp. 195-213; Galya Diment and Yuri Slezkine, eds., *Between Heaven and Hell: The Myth of Siberia in Russian Culture* (New York, 1993); Katya Hokanson, “Literary Imperialism, Narodnost’ and Pushkin’s Invention of the Caucasus,” *The Russian Review* 53, no. 3 (1994), pp. 336-352; Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994); Daniel Brower, “Imperial Russia and Its Orient: The Renown of Nikolai Przhevalsky,” *The Russian Review* 53, no. 3 (1994), pp. 367-381. Articles collected in *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*,

so far devoted to a comprehensive, systematic and comparative assessment of the Russian contribution to the Orientalist discipline.²⁶ Meanwhile, such an assessment of Russian Orientalist scholarship could provide a fertile ground for elaborating many urgent intellectual problems of the Western Orientalist discipline. In particular, it can be argued that the specificity of Russian colonialism has created such circumstances in which internal contradictions and tensions of the Orientalist discipline as they came to be defined since Said (the interaction between ‘The Self’ and ‘The Other,’ that is, the psychological background of Oriental studies related to problems of the colonizer’s identity) have unfolded and showed themselves even in a more conspicuous manner than in Western Orientalism. It would be a really exciting undertaking to compare the Russian Orientalist scholarship with its Western counterpart in this light. Significantly, Said’s *Orientalism* has been criticized for its limitation to exclusively English and French scholarship and ignoring the Russian experience completely.²⁷ Furthermore, to study the Russian Orientalist tradition in a comparative perspective would be useful for broader theoretical considerations too, not just for checking Said’s approach. As one Western scholar points out, “Most recent theoretical works on colonialism are written from the Western perspective in the wake of theories

edited by Daniel R. Browe and Edward J. Lazzerini (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), deserve especial mention. The articles are actually papers presented in the conference devoted to the discussion of the Oriental borderlands of the Russian Empire (held in September 1994 at the university of California). As the editors notes, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the increased access to Russian sources opened up new opportunities for Western scholars specialized in Russian history. Along with new materials provided by these developments, the turn to different kinds of analysis experienced in recent times by the Western scholarship urged the contributors to revise Russian imperial history. *Russia’s Orient*, p. xi.

²⁶ According to the editors of *Russia’s Orient*, “the marginalization of this legacy [the legacy of Russian/Soviet Oriental studies] by the dominant Euro-American academic discourse is testimony to both the linguistic handicaps of non-Russianists and, contrarily, the indifference of Russianists.” *Russia’s Orient*, p. xix, n. 3.

²⁷ Bernard Lewis, pp. 112-113. Lewis says that “It [Russian contribution] could have been useful to him [Said]. . . in that Soviet scholarship, particularly in its treatment of the Islamic and other non-European regions of the Soviet Union, comes closest – far more so than any of the British and French scholars whom he condemns – to precisely the kind of tendentious, denigratory writing that Mr. Said so much dislikes in others. Curiously, however, the Russians, even in their most abusive and contemptuous statements about Islam, enjoy total exemption from Mr. Said’s structures.” Lewis explains Said’s approach by the political purposes of his book, i. e. its anti-Westernism which Lewis sees as directed particularly at the liberal and democratic West, “since Germany is accorded a partial and Russia a total exemption” (Lewis, p. 114).

of modernization, informal empires, and underdevelopment, which do not include the Russian/Soviet experience.”²⁸

The Soviet period in the development of Russian Oriental studies is worth special consideration in view of the fact that in this period a rather particular kind of interaction between Russian and Western Orientalist scholarships was experienced that influenced seriously the overall evolution of the Orientalist discipline as well as Western scholarship’s perception of Russian Oriental studies. Two phases in these interaction can be distinguished basing on changes in the Soviet Union’s weight in international arena: the pre-Cold War era and the Cold War era.

The Pre-Cold War Era: The establishment of the Soviet rule signified a new phase in development of Russian Oriental studies, as the Soviets introduced fundamental novelties to the discipline: the Marxist-Leninist approach in analysis and different from the Tsarist times stand toward Eastern peoples that proclaimed their equality and liberty and condemned imperialism and colonialism. Meanwhile, the Western capitalist world with its “predatory” imperialism and “bourgeois” science came to be furiously scorned. The Soviets’ nihilism extended to such a degree that even the legacy of native scholarship in Oriental studies was rejected on grounds that it served the colonial aspirations of the Tsarist regime.²⁹ As can be understood from the remarks of Western Orientalists, Western scholarship paid the Soviet scholars back in their own coin and met developments in Soviet Oriental studies with scepticism and contempt.³⁰ Such an attitude

²⁸ M. Hauner, p. 3.

²⁹ However, as time went on, this militant stand was abandoned and more tolerable attitude toward Russian Oriental studies of the Tsarist period was formed. In the late Soviet era Soviet Orientalists even came to argue that Soviet Oriental studies inherited a “brilliant tradition” from Tsarist Orientalists. This issue is treated in detail later in this thesis, within the rubric “Russian Turkology of the Tsarist Period.”

³⁰ As Joseph Barnes has noted in 1934, “Oriental studies in the Soviet Union are going to be Marxist studies. . . . The chasm which separated Western scholarship on China from that of Russia even before 1917 is likely to be widened by this new development. To the old obstacles of the Russian language and the “superiority complex” of Western scholars there has been added a new and fundamental difference of approach” (Barnes, p. 333). Stephen Clarkson mentions one Western scholar’s opinion expressed in 1937 about Soviet studies on India: the scholar argued that the effort to read the problem of India in the terms of Marxism is rather an exercise in ingenuity than a serious

became firmly established in the Stalin period when Soviet scholarship obviously suffered from Stalin's strict dogmatism and militant stand.³¹ This contemptuous and indifferent attitude toward Soviet Oriental studies on the part of Western scholars lasted well into the 1960s.³² The Soviet isolationist stand in the international arena during the pre-Second-World-War period seems to have contributed to such a state of affairs.

The Cold War Era: With the end of the Second World War, a range of important developments occurred both in the East and in the West which had far-reaching impacts on development of the Orientalist discipline. Apart from the process of decolonization and its consequences, the following factors should be distinguished as sources of paramount impact on the evolution of world Oriental studies: the emergence of the Soviet Union and the United States as two superpowers in the international arena and the establishment of the Cold War as a certain type of international relations affecting the entire world and characterized with extreme tension originated in opposition and rivalry to the death between the two camps. The newly emerged Third World came to be one of the most important fields of competition and opposition.³³ In order to cope with demands presented by this new reality, Oriental studies had to undergo necessary changes.

As can be seen from the Western literature on the post-Second-World-War evolution of Oriental studies, Western scholarship rightly attributes great importance to the Cold War as the

intellectual contribution to socialist advance (Stephen Clarkson's untitled review, *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 32, no. 1 (February 1966), p. 109).

³¹ Lawrence Krader asserted in 1948 about Soviet Oriental studies that they are "weak insofar as their mode of thought, ideas, and categories are completely rigid and fixed." Lawrence Krader, "Soviet Oriental studies – 1940-48," *Far Eastern Survey* 17, no. 14 (July 28, 1948), p. 168.

³² Clarkson wrote in 1966: "Contempt for the dogmatism of Soviet thought has long been a sacred cow of Western opinion. This certainty that Marxism-Leninism is too doctrinaire to merit serious consideration goes a long way to explain the lack of scholarly concern about Soviet views of underdevelopment" (Clarkson, p. 109).

³³ There exists enormous literature on the Cold War as well as on the Third World. For an exemplary general description of the Third World in the context of the Cold War, Paul Kennedy's work can be referred to: "The Cold War and the Third World" in *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, pp. 373-395.

primary driving force in advancing world Oriental studies, but traces the developments in an apparent one-sided manner with the main focus on American Oriental studies, while not clarifying – not even stating – the particular Soviet contribution to the process.³⁴ For the most part, the Soviet Union is treated only as a political factor. However, as the case will be made in the following paragraphs, the academic dimension of the Soviets' impact on the international Oriental studies deserve serious consideration as well.

First of all, it seems that the mere existence of Soviet Oriental studies in the form they obtained after the Second World War and the style in which they developed gave the great impetus to changes international Oriental studies underwent after the war. Actually, the Soviets' role in the process can be described as that of catalyst. The Soviets initiated structural changes in Oriental studies, as these studies in the Soviet Union went through series of fundamental reforms after the Second World War and the result achieved during the 1950s presented to the world a brand-new pattern in Orientalist establishment. What the world saw was a centralized, tightly-organized structure which worked in systematic way, under the state's direction and control, directly involved in foreign-policy making and focused primarily on contemporary issues. The number of Soviet Orientalists and, consequently, the amount of their academic output showed striking growth. At the same time, the thematic scope of Soviet Oriental studies was enlarged. Soviet Orientalists abandoned their previous isolationist stand and became more interested in the experience of their Western counterparts. This was accompanied with the Soviet scholarship's opening to the outside world, as Soviet delegations started to participate in international academic

³⁴ As it is the case, for instance, with Martin Kramer's *Ivory Towers on Sand: The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America* (Washington: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001) and Zachary Lockman's *Contending Visions of the Middle East: The History and Politics of Orientalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). It seems likely that the fact that the United States was the winner side of the Cold War contributed much to such a state of affairs. But, of course, it would be wrong to connect the omission of the Soviet experience only to Western scholars' self-confidence and bias. One can assume that many factors played roles, among which the language obstacles and inadequate communication between Western and Russian scholarships can be indicated as the most important ones.

gatherings.³⁵ Western observers were noticing developments in Soviet Oriental studies with increasing concern, while the previous leaders of Oriental studies in the West Europe – British Orientalists – were complaining that their native Oriental studies were far from the awareness of their discipline’s importance to contemporary affairs.³⁶ Meanwhile, in the opposite superpower the same developments were under way. In the United States, the rivalry with the Soviet Union had led to a new perception of Eastern countries, in particular, of the Middle East as carrying crucial strategic importance.³⁷ It resulted in establishing a network of renewed and greatly strengthened American Oriental studies which enjoyed due to governmental support striking growth and became in twenty years (from 1949 to 1969) an “academic empire.”³⁸

³⁵ The process of the reconstruction of Soviet Oriental studies is traced in detail in Chapter Two.

³⁶ As G. E. Wheeler was noticing in 1959 in regard to the situation in England: “I mentioned just now the systematic research and training in Middle Eastern affairs being carried out in the Soviet Union. The West has fallen most seriously behind in this matter. Britain once led the world in knowledge and sympathetic handling of Middle East problems. Today, when the need for understanding is so much greater, our effort is totally inadequate. Oriental studies as pursued in the universities pay far too little attention to current affairs and to the modern forms of Middle Eastern languages” (G. E. Wheeler, “Russia and the Middle East,” *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 35, no. 3 (July 1959), p. 304).

³⁷ Lockman says: “As the United States began to act like a global superpower . . . and the Cold War got under way, government officials and academic leaders became ever more concerned about the shortage of people who were trained in foreign languages and had some expertise on parts of the world which were now regarded as key fronts in the Cold War and crucial arenas of instability.” Lockman, p. 123. Interestingly, Lockman does not trace whether American authorities were aware of, and concerned with developments in Soviet Oriental studies. Evidently, such an awareness and concern was the case, but this issue escapes Lockman’s notice. Kramer’s description of the process of reshaping the American leadership’s strategic concerns in regard to the Middle East implies the significant role of the Soviet factor. From Kramer’s point of view, while immediately after the Second World War the United States were not very much concerned with the Middle East, it were academics who goaded and tempted the American foreign-policy community to become closely interested in the Middle Eastern affairs and to become inclined to establish Middle Eastern studies. In order to impress the Americans about this issue, the academics played on American sensitiveness about strategic matters and achieved their goal by presenting the Middle East as a crucial area for American interest. As Kramer writes, “[T]he founders knew how to frame their appeals in political terms that made sense to their fellow Americans. In the early years, this framework was the Cold War. . . . In 1949, the Committee on Near Eastern Studies emphasized the location of the region, “just on the hither side of a civilization which is competing with our own for world leadership.” No one in the field recoiled from this kind of appeal because no other kind of appeal worked as well” (Kramer, pp. 10-11).

³⁸ Kramer, p. 13. As Kramer writes, “In a little more than a decade, Oriental studies had been revamped from top to bottom. . . . The results were astonishing. In 1949, the Committee on Near Eastern Studies reported that “at no university does there appear to be a person who would claim to be an expert in the economics, sociology, or politics of the present-day Near East.” Twenty years later, in 1969, there were an estimated 340 full-time faculty members in Middle Eastern studies. . . . So astonishing was the rapid American success that it reverberated even in Britain. In 1960, a delegation of Britain’s Sub-Committee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European, and African Studies visited the United States. . . . From their report, it was evident that American area studies – Middle Eastern studies not the least

Structural developments in Oriental studies were accompanied by important shifts at the intellectual level of the discipline as well. While this process started under the impact of developments in the East since the beginning of the twentieth century and was especially influenced by upheavals in the post-Second-World-War international arena,³⁹ the impulse given by the Soviet Union to intellectual developments in Oriental studies in the Cold War era is worth consideration, too. First of all, the Soviets were pioneers of the Western world in turning Oriental studies toward the present of Eastern peoples, as post-war Soviet Oriental studies became focused on contemporary affairs.⁴⁰ The meaning of this shift consists, in fact, in transforming the very character of the Orientalist discipline: instead of the traditional philological studies, the social sciences came to the fore. In 1950, The Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow was divided functionally into three scientific councils: Historical, Economic and Philosophical. In keeping with the new orientation in Oriental studies, the institute came to be affiliated with the department of history and philosophy of the Academy of Sciences, instead of the literature and language department.⁴¹ Meanwhile, the Western world was still to await a similar shift. As

among them – had become the envy of the world” (Kramer, pp. 11-12). The striking amount of money was involved in American Orientalist affairs. As Abdel-Malek notes, the budget of one sole university institute in the United States – the Near Eastern Center of the University of California – was six times the annual budget of a particular small European country (Abdel-Malek, p. 135, n. 38).

³⁹ As Abdel-Malek wrote in 1963: “[T]he rebirth of the nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, since the end of the nineteenth century, and the very rapid acceleration of this process due to the victory of the national liberation movements in the ex-colonial world, and also to the appearance of the group of socialist states and the subsequent differentiation between the ‘two Europes,’ has shaken the edifice of traditional orientalism to its foundations. Suddenly, specialists and the public at large became aware of the time-lag, not only between orientalist science and the material under study, but also – and this was to be determining – between the conceptions, the methods and the instruments of work in the human and social sciences and those of orientalism. . . . Therefore, the whole problem had to be thought anew.” Abdel-Malek, pp. 111-112.

⁴⁰ Gabrieli wrote in 1965: “[T]he right of the modern peoples of the Orient to feel themselves again a subject of history and to demand that their present be given dignity as an object of study is incontestable. This the ‘classical’ conception of orientalism was inclined to ignore. Today, that disproportion between the past and the present as material for investigation has been largely counterbalanced by the work of the truest and best prepared scholars and writers of the East itself, and of European scholars, among whom the new generations of Soviet orientalists are emerging in greater number if not always higher quality.” Gabrieli, p. 133.

⁴¹ Nisha Sahai-Achuthan, “Soviet Indologists and the Institute of Oriental Studies: Works on Contemporary India in the Soviet Union,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 2 (February, 1983), pp. 328; 341.

Hamilton Gibb wrote as late as in 1956, “The first, and certainly most important, problem in modern Middle Eastern history is to find, and then to find a living for, a few historians fully qualified to investigate its problems. . . . The principal tasks of the orientalist lie in the fields of language, literature and general culture, and history is a by-product of our work in those fields. In England and Europe there are at most three or four orientalist scholars who are professional historians; the difference this makes can be easily seen when their production is compared with the usual orientalist works on Middle Eastern history. In the United States it would be hard to find as many.”⁴² In 1970, the article on Oriental studies in *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia* asserted that “Soviet Oriental studies are typified by the integrated study of the foreign East in all its political, economic, historical, and linguistic aspects.”⁴³ Meanwhile, in the United States the concept of Oriental studies was still to be settled, as the debate about Middle Eastern studies – whether they should be regarded as a special discipline of their own or it is preferable to conduct investigation on the Middle East in the form of an interdisciplinary study – was still going on.⁴⁴ So it can be stated that Soviet Orientalist scholarship was ahead of its Western counterpart in determining and realizing the new concept of Oriental studies that suited contemporary needs.

Another thing that should be underlined about the Soviets’ impact on the Orientalist discipline is that they adopted a particularly new stand in Oriental studies that manifestly took side of “the oppressed nations of the East” against “Western imperialism.” The United States too had proclaimed the anti-colonialist attitude,⁴⁵ but the Soviet stand differed significantly from the American stand due to its anti-Westernist and Marxist specificity. It was boldly put by Soviet

⁴² Gibb, p. 336.

⁴³ “Oriental Studies,” *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 5 (a translation of the third edition) (New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1974), p. 311. The original in Russian was published in Moscow in 1970.

⁴⁴ See Leonard Binder, “Area Studies: A Critical Reassessment,” in *The Study of the Middle East: Research and Scholarship in the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, edited by Leonard Binder (New York: John Wiley, 1976), pp. 1-27.

⁴⁵ Yücel Bulut, *Orientalizmin Eleştirel Kısa Tarihi* (İstanbul: Yöneliş Yay., 2002), p. 149.

scholars that the Eastern peoples had eventually become their own masters and from the object of study turned into the subjects of history.⁴⁶ Therefore, the new principle of Oriental studies was proclaimed: to contribute by scientific investigation to the struggle of the peoples of the East for their national and social liberation. As Anastas Mikoyan said at the opening session of the 25th international congress of Orientalists held in Moscow in 1960:

It goes without saying that the revolutionary changes in the life of Asia and Africa alter in a radical way the character and content of orientalism. It can even be said that the new theoretical particularity of principle of orientalism is that, now, the peoples of the Orient create themselves their own science, elaborate their own history, their culture, their economy; in this way, the peoples of the Orient have been promoted from being objects of history to the rank of creators. This is what differentiates this congress from the others. . . The duty of the orientalists in their work is to reflect objectively on the most important processes of the countries of Asia and Africa, to contribute, in a creative manner, to the elaboration of the fundamental problems of the struggle of the peoples of the Orient for their national and social liberation and to recover from their economic backwardness. One may rightly say that only then can orientalism count on a broad consideration and on success, from the time it serves the interests of the peoples of the Orient.⁴⁷

Meanwhile, “the destructive blow to the theories of europeocentrism” was urged.⁴⁸ As can be supposed, the impact of Soviet Orientalist scholarship gave Eastern scholars additional courage in their attacks on the Western Orientalist discipline.⁴⁹ It should be also noted that the anti-imperialist stand served to uplift the Soviet Orientalists in their own eyes. To the Soviets’ belief, their stand in regard to Eastern peoples was the proper one and this fact assured Soviet Oriental studies a special place within the Orientalist discipline. Soviet Orientalists even objected

⁴⁶ Tellingly, the articles on general history of Oriental studies and its certain branches in *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* gave much place and attention to work done by Eastern authors themselves, while emphasizing that “though it [study of one’s own country] is not always included in the concept of Oriental studies in the countries of the East, it does constitute a valuable and significant contribution to the development of Oriental studies.” (“Oriental Studies,” *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 5 (a translation of the third edition) (New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1974), p. 308).

⁴⁷ Quoted from Abdel-Malek, p. 122.

⁴⁸ Abdel-Malek, p. 124.

⁴⁹ Abdel-Malek’s article is an example in the case. In an article written in response to Abdel-Malek’s article, Gabrieli spoke about “appreciation and gratitude” that Oriental critics of Orientalism felt for Soviet Orientalist scholarship and pointed out those critics’ inclination to regard every Orientalist of the non-Soviet world as an agent of colonialism. Gabrieli implied special interaction between Soviet Orientalists and the Orientals, while indicating the Soviets’ sensitiveness to the Orientals’ moods about the Orientalist discipline. Gabrieli, pp. 130 (n. 2); 131.

to the abolition of the term “Orientalism” at the 29th International Congress of Orientalists held in Paris in 1973, arguing that the word was not discredited in their country.⁵⁰

In view of all these developments and in strained atmosphere of the Cold War with its watchful attention to actions undertaken by the opposite side, the previous indifferent stand toward Soviet Oriental studies was abandoned and developments on the Soviet side came to be closely followed.⁵¹ Western scholars started to speak of the need to take into consideration the content of Soviet Oriental studies too. Whereas some scholars gave more attention to the political aspect of this undertaking and argued that it would be useful in order to properly understand Soviet policy,⁵² others asserted that, apart from political considerations, post-Stalinist Oriental

⁵⁰ Lewis, p. 104. Lewis relates the Soviet delegation’s objection by the following words: “This term, said Ghafurov [director of the Institute for Oriental Studies in Moscow], has served us well for more than a century. Why should we now abandon a word that conveniently designates the work we do and that was borne with pride by our teachers and their teachers for many generations back?”

⁵¹ Western literature on Soviet Oriental studies suddenly increases in amount after the Second World War. To cite a few: Lawrence Krader, “Soviet Oriental Studies – 1940-1948,” *Far Eastern Survey* 17, no. 14 (July 28, 1948), pp. 164-168; G. A. von Stackelberg, “The First All-Union Conference of Orientalists,” *Bulletin* (Institute for the Study of the USSR) (July, 1957), pp. 8-14; James W. Morley, “Some Important Soviet Organizations and Periodicals Devoted to the Study of the Modern History of Asia,” *Journal of Asian Studies* (August, 1957), pp. 673-678; Alvin Z. Rubinstein, “Selected Bibliography of Soviet Works on Southern Asia, 1954-56,” *Journal of Asian Studies* (November, 1957), pp. 43-54; A. R. C. B., “A New Pattern in Soviet Middle East Studies,” *World Today* (February, 1958), pp. 71-80; Rodger Swearingen, “Asian Studies in the Soviet Union,” *Journal of Asian Studies* (May, 1958), pp. 515-537; O. Edmund Clubb, “Soviet Oriental Studies and the Asian Revolution,” *Pacific Affairs* 31, no. 4 (December, 1958), pp. 380-389; A. R. C. Bolton, *Soviet Middle Eastern Studies: An Analysis and Bibliography* (London: Oxford University Press for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1959); M. Mancall, “The 21st Party Congress and Soviet Orientalology,” *J. Asian Studies* 19, 1960, no. 2, pp. 18-25; Mary Holdsworth, “African Studies in the USSR,” *African Studies Bulletin* 5, no. 1 (March, 1962), pp. 9-13; David Morison, “African Studies in the Soviet Union,” *Russian Review* 22, no. 3 (July, 1963), pp. 301-314; Hemen Ray, “Changing Soviet Views on Mahatma Gandhi,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 29, no. 1 (November, 1969), pp. 85-106; Wayne S. Vucinich, “Soviet Studies on the Middle East,” in *The Soviet Union and the Middle East: The Post-World War II Era*, ed. by Ivo J. Lederer and Wayne S. Vucinich (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1974), pp. 177-229; E. Stuart Kirby, *Russian Studies of China: Progress and Problems of Soviet Sinology* (London: Macmillan, 1975); Richard B. Remnek, *Soviet Scholars and Soviet Foreign Policy: A Case Study in Soviet Policy Toward India* (Durham, N. C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1975); Nisha Sahai-Achuthan, “Soviet Indologists and the Institute of Oriental Studies: Works on Contemporary India in the Soviet Union,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 2 (February, 1983), pp. 323-343 etc. It should be noted that English-language sources include a certain amount of works by Soviet scholars published in English by the specialized Publishing House of Eastern Literature that was established in Moscow in 1957 (for example, *Fifty Years of Soviet Oriental Studies: Brief Reviews (1917-1967)* (Moscow, 1968). English editions of the Soviet journals *Far Eastern Affairs* and *Asia and Africa Today* should be also mentioned.

⁵² Wheeler wrote in 1959: “No university or learned society in Britain concerns itself with the regular examination of the vast output of Soviet publications on every conceivable aspect of Middle Eastern affairs. These publications include much work which displays great erudition and experience, and they all reflect, either directly or indirectly, Soviet policy, of which they are actually regarded as one of the most important instruments. Their study is therefore

studies deserved serious attention for their intellectual content, as these studies had abandoned many of their previous dogmas and come to be capable of offering fresh and insightful analysis.⁵³ Some works appeared during the Cold War period that acquainted the Western public with Soviet writings.⁵⁴ Soviet and Western Orientalists had opportunities to learn about each other also at international gatherings.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, communication between the two scholarships developed under the constant press of ideological hostility and mutual suspicion and never took form of fully opened and active interaction.⁵⁶ It should be noted here that Western scholarship continued to regard Soviet Orientalists within the Western tradition, as Marxism-Leninism was

indispensable for a proper understanding, not only of the dangers, but of the weaknesses, of Soviet policy” (Wheeler, p. 304).

⁵³ Clarkson wrote in 1966: “. . . academic boycott of Soviet writing on the ex-colonial world is now sadly out of date, for it denies both the political significance of this branch of Soviet ideology and any inherent quality in post-Stalinist orientology. The political interest of the Soviet publications on the underdeveloped world is not limited to their function as the doctrinal reflection of Soviet foreign policy in the developing nations and as recommended strategy for the pro-Soviet communist parties in the various developing nations. . . . Quite apart from their political importance, it is also time to take post-Stalinist writings seriously for their intellectual content. For one consequence of de-Stalinization was Soviet orientology’s liberation from many of its most crippling stereotypes. . . . While certain oversimplifications, such as imperialism’s attempt to prevent the development of its former colonies, still characterize Soviet orthodoxy, it is clear that Russian scholars are abandoning their uncritical generalizations, increasingly conscious of the complexity of the local situations in the “third world.” That their basic categories remain Marxist does not preclude genuine research; on the contrary, they may bring to the examination of underdevelopment certain insights which escape the Liberal, too sensitive to talk in terms of class struggle and exploitation” (Clarkson, p. 110).

⁵⁴ For instance, Thomas Perry Thornton, ed., *The Third World in Soviet Perspective: Studies by Soviet Writers on Developing Areas* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964); *Asian Survey* 14, no. 3, Soviet Scholars View South Asia (March, 1974); Gilbert Rozman, ed., *Soviet Studies of Premodern China. Assessments of Recent Scholarship* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1984).

⁵⁵ As can be understood from the remarks of Western observers, these meetings were an exciting experience for both sides. As one Western scholar relates his impressions about the International Congress of Africanists held in Accra in 1962, “The general atmosphere of the Congress was friendly and academic rather than political. In private conversations one had the feeling that this made an impression on the Soviet scholars; as one Frenchman remarked, “the Russians are beginning to be inoculated.” David Morison, “African Studies in the Soviet Union,” *Russian Review* 22, no. 3 (July 1963), p. 314.

⁵⁶ For instance, the organizers of an international workshop meeting in the United States in August 1973 noted that several scholars invited could not participate because they were denied passports by their governments (evidently, these scholars were from the socialist bloc). One American scholar who participated in the meeting complained in regard to studies on Turkish literature about “less than satisfactory access to very significant work being done in the Soviet Union.” Leonard Binder, ed., *The Study of the Middle East: Research and Scholarship in the Humanities and the Social Sciences* (New York: John Wiley, 1976), pp. 26; 480.

accepted to be a fruit of Western thought.⁵⁷ At the same time, Western scholarship did not perceive the Soviets' experience in relations with Eastern peoples as something entirely new and different in approach comparing with Tsarist times; on the contrary, inconsistencies between ideological stand and real deeds were pointed out and the Soviets' experience was evaluated as continuation of the Russian imperialist tradition.⁵⁸ In sum, it can be stated that in the examination of Soviet Oriental studies the Western scholarship preserved to some degree its conservative approach showed in regard to Russian Oriental studies. It should be noted, moreover, that the West's habitual slightly contemptuous look at the Soviets never was entirely abandoned and displayed itself on some occasions.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the Western scholarship came to recognize some undeniable qualities in Soviet scholarship.

To summarize about Russian/Soviet Oriental studies and their interaction with their Western counterparts, the following main points can be made. Russian Oriental studies represent a peculiar case within the international Orientalist discipline because of specificity of the Russian experience in colonialism, namely closeness and directness of the contact. It resulted in the rich, many-sided and complex character of Russian Oriental studies which, in fact, came to be one of the most important cultural factors of Russian life. Another moment to be underlined about Russian Oriental studies is that they have not undergone a crucial intellectual and moral reassessment as happened to Western Oriental studies and have retained the character and mind of a pure academic discipline. The Soviet period added a new specific dimensions to Russian

⁵⁷ Gabrieli wrote: "Marxism . . . is also itself a fruit of the West, since Hegel, Marx and Lenin do not belong to the history of Oriental thought but properly to Western thought." Gabrieli, p. 134. In the same page, Gabrieli considers "the new generations of Soviet orientalists" among European scholars.

⁵⁸ For instance, see Hugh Seton-Watson, "Nationalism and Imperialism," in *The Impact of the Russian Revolution, 1917-1967: The Influence of Bolshevism on the World Outside Russia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 134-205; Milan Hauner, *The Soviet War in Afghanistan: Patterns of Russian Imperialism* (Philadelphia: University Press of America, 1991).

⁵⁹ As can be sensed, for instance, in the following sentence: "If Soviet foreign policy were not the foreign policy of "a socialist state," international affairs would be a great deal simpler for Russians and for everyone else." David Morison, "USSR and Third World. II. Questions of Foreign Policy," *Mizan* 12, no. 2 (November 1970), p. 69.

Oriental studies that changed their relations with the international scholarship. While Tsarist Oriental studies proceeded largely within the mainstream of the Western tradition, Soviet Oriental studies initiated a new turn in these studies and, moreover, declared their opposition to the Western discipline. And while Tsarist Oriental studies had no considerable influence on the evolution of the international Oriental studies, Soviet Oriental studies became to be one of the primary factors of change in them. During the twentieth century and especially in its second half the international Orientalist discipline went through striking developments which profoundly changed its physiognomy. This process was to a large degree shaped by the Cold War rivalry. In this context, the Soviet Union became the initiator of some significant shifts in the discipline. Apart from the stimulus Soviet Oriental studies gave to structural developments in international Orientalist affairs, the Soviet scholarship's intellectual impact was also of significance. Soviet Oriental studies initiated the discipline's turn toward social sciences and contemporary issues, while influencing to certain degree the criticism launched on the Western Orientalism by Eastern scholars. Viewed in this context, it can be stated that the Soviet Union made its particular and considerable contribution to the evolution of the Orientalist discipline in the twentieth century.

Only the most important issues related to Russian/Soviet Oriental studies were touched on here. Actually, all the questions considered here fully deserve being elaborated at length in separate studies. My objective here was just to create an impression about the overall picture so that prepare the ground for the examination of one branch of Soviet Oriental studies. The branch will be examined as an exemplary one that will provide us with insights about Soviet Oriental studies in general and Soviet studies of the Third World, in particular.

Sources of the Thesis

As was stated above, there exists no comprehensive account of Russian/Soviet Turkological studies. Only some aspects of Russian Turkology have been touched on by Russian, Western and Turkish scholars so far, while the Russian contribution to the subject has been the greatest. Apart from this, scattered pieces of relevant information can be found in Russian and Western works on the general history of Russian/Soviet Oriental studies. As a rule, both in Russian and Western sources Turkological studies are not considered separately but always within the framework of Turkological or Near Eastern/Middle Eastern⁶⁰ studies. Our objective has been to put together the fragmented pieces of information unevenly scattered in various sources in order to attempt a comprehensive and coherent account of the historical development of Soviet Turkological studies.

Soviet Orientalists have created a number of works devoted to the development of Russian/Soviet Oriental studies in general as well as of their particular branches.⁶¹ These works

⁶⁰ The following point should be mentioned: the Soviets use the term ‘Near East’ to indicate the area extending from Turkey to Northeastern Africa, whereas Western scholarship prefers the term ‘Middle East’ to indicate roughly the same area. ‘Middle East’ in the Soviet view includes only Afghanistan and Iran. For the most part, the Soviet term ‘The Near East’ is used in the thesis. Occasionally, the Western term ‘The Middle East’ is used, while referring to Western authors.

⁶¹ As far as I could determine after searching in various bibliographies, the following works exist: V. V. Barthold, *Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* [History of Studying the East in Europe and Russia] (Leningrad, 1925); *Ocherki po istorii russkogo vostokovedeniia* [Essays on History of Russian Orientalology], Vol. 1-6 (Moscow, 1953-63); N. A. Smirnov, *Ocherki istorii izucheniia islama v SSSR* [Essays of History of Studying Islam in the USSR] (Moscow, 1954); V. I. Avdiev, *Sovetskaia nauka o drevnem Vostoke za 40 let* [Soviet Science About Ancient East for 40 Years] (Moscow, 1958); (I. Iu. Krachkovskii, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi arabistiki* [Essays on History of Russian Arabic Studies] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1958); G. Sh. Sharbatov, *Arabistika v SSSR (1917-1959). Filologiiia* [Arabic Studies in the USSR. Philology] (Moscow, 1959); V. V. Struve, “Sovetskoe vostokovedenie za 40 let” [Soviet Oriental Studies for 40 Years], *Uchenye zapiski Instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR*, 1960, vol. 25; N. M. Postovskaia, *Izuchenie drevnei istorii Blizhnego Vostoka v Sovetskoy Soiuzze (1917-1959gg.)* [Studying Ancient History of the Near East in the Soviet Union] (Moscow, 1961); *Fifty Years of Soviet Oriental Studies: Brief Reviews (1917-1967)* (Moscow, 1968); B. M. Dantsig, *Izuchenie Blizhnego Vostoka v Rossii* [Studying the Near East in Russia] (Moscow, 1968); *Velikii Oktiabr’ i razvitie sovetskogo kitaevedeniia* [The Great October and the Development of Soviet Sinology] (Moscow, 1968); A. N. Kononov, *Tiurkskaia filologiiia v SSSR. 1917-1967* [Turkic Philology in the USSR] (Moscow, 1968); Z. V. Udal’tsova, *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie za 50 let* [Soviet Oriental Studies for 50 Years] (Moscow, 1969); N. A. Kuznetsova and L. M. Kulagina, *Iz istorii sovetskogo vostokovedeniia*,

offer considerable factual material, but, for the most part, suffer from inadequacy in terms of giving objective information about trends of development and their political and ideological background. Post-Soviet accounts on the development of Russian Oriental studies are more reliable and useful in terms of objective information, but they remain few in number. Moreover, they cannot be said to be comprehensive or to offer a satisfactory analysis. In fact, they represent just the first attempts in that direction. Post-Soviet Russian Orientalists are themselves aware of this shortcoming, saying that Russian/Soviet Oriental studies are in urgent need of a comprehensive assessment.⁶²

There exist several essays in Russian literature dealing with certain aspects or periods of Russian Turkology.⁶³ Apart from some of them, several works devoted to the development of Russian Oriental studies in general and Tiurkological and Near East branches in particular were used in the thesis.⁶⁴

1917-1967 [From History of Soviet Oriental Studies] (Moscow, 1970); A. N. Kononov, *Istoriia izucheniia tiurkskikh iazykov v Rossii* [History of the Study of Turkic Languages in Russia] (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972); B. M. Dantsig, *Blizhnii Vostok v russkoi nauke i literature* [The Near East in Russian Science and Literature] (Moscow, 1973); *Biobibliograficheskii slovar' otechestvennykh tiurkologov* [Bibliographical dictionary of native Tiurkologists] (Moscow: Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury, 1974); S. D. Miliband, *Biobibliograficheskii slovar' sovetskikh vostokovedov* [Biobibliographical dictionary of Soviet Orientalists] (Moscow, 1975); *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR (Azerbaijan, Armeniia, Gruzii, Ukraina)* [Oriental Centers in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine)] (Moscow, 1988). Unfortunately, the author could not reach all these works.

⁶² *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii"*, pp. 25, 64.

⁶³ As far as I could determine, the following works exist: M. S. Mikhailov, "Ob izuchenii turetskoi literatury v otechestvennoi tiurkologii" [On Studying Turkish Literature in Native Tiurkology], in *Voprosy iazyka i literatury stran Vostoka* (Moscow, 1958), pp. 275-320; A. P. Baziant, "Iz istorii tiurkologii v Lazarevskom institute" [From History of Turkology in the Lazarev Institute], *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta narodov Azii AN SSSR* 30, 1961, pp. 103-119; A. Kh. Rafikov, "Sobranie russkikh izdaniia XVIII v. o Turtsii v Biblioteke AN SSSR" [The Collection of Russian Publications in the 18th Century on Turkey in the Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences], in *Sbornik statei i materialov Biblioteki AN SSSR po knigovedeniiu* (Leningrad, 1965), pp. 292-320; A. S. Tveritina, "V. D. Smirnov – istorik Turtsii" [V. D. Smirnov – Historian of Turkey], *Sovetskaia tiurkologiia*, no. 4, 1971, pp. 105-114; A. D. Zheltikov, "Izuchenie istorii Turtsii" [Studying History of Turkey], in *Aziatskii muzei – Leningradskoe otdelenie instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR* [Asiatic Museum – The Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences] (Moscow, 1972), pp. 428-434; G. A. Kleinman, "Iz istorii izucheniia Turtsii v Rossii. Raboty M. P. Vronchenko" [From History of Studying Turkey in Russia. The Works of M. P. Vronchenko], in *Problemy istorii Turtsii* (Moscow, 1978), pp. 93-101.

⁶⁴ V. V. Barthold, *Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* [History of the Study of the Orient in Europe and Russia] (Leningrad, 1925); A. N. Kononov, *Istoriia izucheniia tiurkskikh iazykov v Rossii* [History of the Study of Turkic Languages in Russia] (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972); B. M. Dantsig, *Blizhnii Vostok v russkoi nauke i literature*

From Western literature those works tracing current developments in Soviet Oriental studies were of great use.⁶⁵ The usefulness of Western authors, in particular, stems from the fact that they provide a look from the outside at Soviet Oriental studies and give much attention to the relationship between Soviet politics, ideology and scholarship, so I could see and evaluate Soviet Oriental studies in a different light.

The meagerest information on Soviet Oriental studies exists in Turkish literature. It is somewhat incomprehensible in view of the fact that, considering a range of factors – namely, that Russia is Turkey’s greatest neighbor, that the majority of Turkic peoples live in Russia and Russian Oriental studies have been strong in Turkological investigations and others – interest in Russian Oriental studies and, in particular, in its Turkological branch would be quite natural for Turkey. However, I did not encounter in Turkish literature any formidable evidence that would refer to the existence of such an interest. There exist few articles dealing with Soviet Turkological studies;⁶⁶ some of them are translated works of Soviet Turkologists.⁶⁷ Still little

[The Near East in Russian Science and Literature] (Moscow, 1973); *Biobibliograficheskii slovar’ otechestvennykh tiurkologov* [Biobibliographical dictionary of native Turkologists] (Moscow: Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury, 1974); *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR (Azerbaijan, Armeniia, Gruzii, Ukraina)* [Oriental Centers in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine)] (Moscow, 1988); *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia “Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii” (Moskva, 29-31 maia 2000 g.): Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii* [Scientific and Methodological Conference “Oriental Education in Universities of Russia” (Moscow, May of 29-31, 2000): Theses of Papers and Reports] (Moscow, 2000); *Vostokovedy Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga: Osnovnye napravleniia sovremennykh issledovani. Vostokovednye nauchnye tsentry. Personalii* [Orientalists of Moscow and St. Petersburg: Major Directions of Contemporary Research. Oriental Scientific Centers. Personalities.] (Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia RAN, 2000).

⁶⁵ O. Edmund Clubb, “Soviet Oriental Studies and the Asian Revolution,” *Pacific Affairs* 31, no. 4 (December, 1958), pp. 380-389; G. E. Wheeler, “Russia and the Middle East,” *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 35, no. 3 (July, 1959), pp. 295-304; Elibazeth Kridl Valkenier, “Recent Trends in Soviet Research on the Developing Countries,” *World Politics* 20, no. 4 (July, 1968), pp. 644-659; Wayne S. Vucinich, “Soviet Studies on the Middle East,” in *The Soviet Union and the Middle East: The Post-World War II Era*, ed. by Ivo J. Lederer and Wayne S. Vucinich (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1974), pp. 177-229; Fred Halliday, “Current Soviet Policy and the Middle East: A Report,” *MERIP Reports*, no. 111, Rapid Deployment and Nuclear War (January, 1983), pp. 19-22; Nisha Sahai-Achuthan, “Soviet Indologists and the Institute of Oriental Studies: Works on Contemporary India in the Soviet Union,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 2 (February, 1983), pp. 323-343.

⁶⁶ The following are devoted to a short description of Soviet Turkological studies: T. Tekin, “Sovyet Rusya’da Savaşan Sonra Türkoloji Çalışmaları,” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı (Belleten)*, 1959, pp. 379-406; Türkkaya Ataöv, “Sovyetler Birliği’nde Türkoloji Çalışmaları,” *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*,

information can be found in Turkish literature about Soviet studies on Turkey. Actually, there exists just one article dealing with Russian Turkology which limits its focus to Tsarist and Soviet investigations on Turkish history.⁶⁸ Recently, a work on the history of world Orientalist discipline appeared that traces the subject completely from the Western point of view and devotes only one and a half page to Soviet Oriental studies.⁶⁹ This dearth of literature on Russian/Soviet Oriental studies in Turkey can be partly explained by the peculiarities of Soviet-Turkish relations and Turkey's relations with the West during the Cold War era. The strained character of Soviet-Turkish relations between the late 1930s and the middle of the 1960s and the specificities of Turkey's domestic and foreign politics during the Cold War seem to have affected negatively scholarly relations between the USSR and Turkey,⁷⁰ on the one hand, and the Turkish attitude toward Soviet Oriental studies,⁷¹ on the other.

XXVII/1, (1972), pp. 25-52; "Sovyet Sosyalist Cumhuriyetler Birliđi," in *Türk İncelemeleri Yapan Kuruluşlar: Kılavuz* by İsmail Soysal and Mihin Eren (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1977), pp. 195-201. The first and second articles concentrate mainly on a description of philological studies. Ataöv also gives attention to historical, economic, and geographical studies, mentioning the major themes, names of investigators, and some major works. Among these some works on Turkey are mentioned. The last article gives short information about major Soviet Oriental institutions and lists the titles of Oriental periodicals. The names of eminent scholars are also listed and their fields of research are indicated. In September 1986 the conference "Tiurkological Studies in the World and Turkey" was held in İstanbul at Marmara University, but Soviet Tiurkological studies were not considered at this conference at all. The materials of the conference were published as a book: N. Devlet, İ. Enginün, and E. Gürsoy-Naskali, eds., *Dünyada Türklük Araştırmaları ve Türkiye. M. Ü. Türkiyat Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi tarafından 29-30 Eylül 1986'da düzenlenen milletlerarası sempozyumun tebliğleri* (İstanbul: Fatih Yayınevi, 1987). The only paper related to the Soviet Union was A. A. Rorlich's essay devoted to the description of Turkic peoples in the USSR. The most recent article dealing with one aspect of Soviet Tiurkological studies is Ahmet Kanlıdere's "Soviet ve Türk Tarih Yazıcılığında Rusya Müslümanlarının Düşünce Tarihi" in *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi: Türk Siyaset Tarihi (Tanzimat Sonrası)* 2, no. 1 (2004), pp. 149-181. This article is of significance as it represents the first attempt in Turkey to examine Soviet Tiurkological studies in a comparative light.

⁶⁷ For example, A. N. Kononov, "Son Yıllarda SSCB'de Türkoloji Araştırmaları," *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı (Belleten)* (1964), pp. 113-126.

⁶⁸ Nadir Devlet, "Çarlık Rusyası ve Sovyetler Birliđi'nin Türk Tarihine Bakışı," *Avrasya Etüdüleri* Cilt 2, Sayı 4 (1995/96), pp. 92-104. Devlet gives the quantitative characteristics of the topics of investigation on Turkey's history, relying on two Soviet bibliographical works. Devlet also gives some extracts from one Soviet book on Turkish early history in order to show the differences between the Soviet and Turkish points of view.

⁶⁹ Yücel Bulut, *Oryantalizmin Eleştirel Kısa Tarihi* (İstanbul: Yöneliş Yay., 2002), pp. 172-173. Soviet Oriental studies are described here based solely on Western sources. Bulut's conclusion about Soviet Oriental studies is that they were determined by Soviet foreign policy priorities and that the relationship between Orientalism and politics in the Soviet Union showed itself in a more obvious manner than in the Western world.

⁷⁰ The following event is telling in the case: After his visit to the Soviet Union in 1964, in the course of which an agreement on developing cultural and scholarly relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union was signed, F. C.

In view of the described quantity and quality of existant literature on Russian/Soviet Oriental studies, the thesis came to be based primarily on Russian and Western sources.

Russian Turkology of the Tsarist Period

Turkology is one of the oldest branches of Russian Oriental studies. This fact makes it necessary to give at first an account of the development of Russian Turkology in the Tsarist period, before proceeding to Soviet Turkological studies.

It is not necessary to talk at length here about the reasons for Russia's long interest in Turkey as it is a well elaborated subject. Only some briefs remarks are needed. This interest is determined by Turkey's strategic significance for Russia, as, first, Turkey is a neighbor with whom Russia shares a long land border and, second, Turkey controls the Black Sea passage. The question of the Straits represents a historical problem in Russian foreign policy and is well known internationally (the so-called "Eastern Question"). Another factor that has stimulated Russian watchfulness about Turkey is Islam. The fact that the Russian Empire included a number of Eastern peoples the majority of whom were Muslims and Turkic-speaking made the Tsarist authorities feel constantly suspicious about relations between them and the Sultan's Turkey that represented the center of the Islamic world as the Sultan carried at the same time the title of

Erkin, the Turkish Foreign Minister, underlined in his report that the Turkish side limited the spheres of cultural contacts with the USSR, did not agree to student-exchange, and accepted the exchange of only those works on science, technology and art that "would not create the atmosphere of propaganda." Even this limited agreement was not ratified by the Turkish parliament. *SSSR i Turtsiia, 1917-1979* [The USSR and Turkey] (Moscow, 1981), p. 220-221.

⁷¹ For instance, in the following essays a marked bias toward Soviet Oriental studies can be sensed: A. Caferoğlu, "İstanbul Fethinin Beşinci Yüzyılı Dolayısıyla Sovyetler Yaygarası," *Türk Kültürü*, no. 8 (Ankara, 1963), pp. 5-10; by the same author, "Sovyetler Birliği Türkoloji Araştırmalarındaki Rus Kültür Üstünlüğü Davası," *Azerbaycan*, no. 205 (Ankara, 1972), pp. 31-45. The author of the two articles censured the Soviet Turkologists' historical investigation as aiming primarily at humiliating Turkic peoples and blackening the Turks, while praising, in contrary, Russian Turkologists of the Tsarist time as 'honest' scholars.

Caliph. All of these factors contributed to the development of Turkological studies in the Tsarist period and, as we will see further, determined the peculiarities of these studies, for instance, their thematic priorities.

First of all, a few words should be said about Tsarist Oriental studies in general. It seems to be accepted generally today by both the Western and Russian scholars that the Russian Oriental studies of the Tsarist period were highly developed and that the Soviet Orientalists inherited a rich and strongly established tradition. However, it should be noted that the Russian scholarship has not always been of such opinion and that the Russian evaluation of the legacy of Tsarist Oriental studies showed serious fluctuations especially during the Soviet era.

The opinion of Russian Orientalists of the pre-Soviet generation about Tsarist Oriental studies is conveyed by Barthold's remarks on the subject. He was somewhat sceptical about the achievements of Tsarist Oriental studies. As he wrote in 1925, "In view of Russia's geographical location, population composition, and activities of many generations since Peter the Great, we see that the expected success was not realized. Despite certain achievements, the state of Russian Oriental studies as well as the state of Russian scholarship in general is a clear sign of a general backwardness of Russian culture . . . Being the neighbor of the Orient, Russia has preferred to study the Orient by reading bad Western books on the subject instead of examining the Orient directly."⁷²

The evaluation of Russian Oriental studies of the Tsarist period by Soviet scholars underwent changes during the Soviet period. In the beginning, it was criticized as a part of "bourgeois science" and also because of the fact that it "served the colonial aspiration of the Tsarist regime." The inadequacy of Russian Oriental studies of the Tsarist period to meet the practical needs of the state as well as to the requirements of a scientific discipline was also

⁷² V. V. Barthold, *Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* (Leningrad, 1925), p. 453.

pointed out. Academician I. Iu. Krachkovskii wrote that in the 1920s it was evident that Oriental studies needed “the transition from sometimes home-made forms of individual working of small organizations to complex big institutions with numerous staff . . . [and] with wide plans.”⁷³

The following words of N. I. Borozdin, director of the Association for Oriental Studies, written in 1929, are worth quoting at some length, as they give a general impression about the Soviet view at that time on the issue:

Besides the Academy of Science there were before the Revolution a few scientific societies and organizations of Orientology. True enough, they were compelled to limit their research work to Russian territory and their results were not significant. . . The contemporary Orient was little studied. The economics and politics of the Near and Far East were at times mentioned in the pages of state official publications, but they were rarely seen by the wider circle of the reading public. The problems of the Orient in our foreign policy, for example, the Near East and Pacific problems, were treated by our historians, internationalists and publicists, but even here the literature was not voluminous in comparison with the importance of the problems. The revolution of 1917 which at the very basis changed the Oriental policy of Russia, presented a new problem to the Russian Orientologists. Now it became particularly necessary to study in detail the countries and the peoples of the East in all their peculiarities. . . . Our Orientologists, receiving a fresh impulse, quickly and energetically commenced to solve these problems and during a short period have already accomplished much. . . . Orientology in the USSR is on the right way. It is energetically moving ahead.⁷⁴

As we see, the Soviet concern was rather exalting Soviet Orientology than giving an objective evaluation to Tsarist Orientology.

Some later Soviet Orientalists became more tolerable in their evaluations. Although Tsarist Orientalists were still criticized for their “bourgeois and idealist” standpoint, many of them came to be highly praised for their scholarship and abundant factual content. A. P. Barannikov, the editor of *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie* [Soviet Orientology], in an article on the current problems of Soviet Orientology in the first issue of the journal (1940), defended the Russian tradition in Oriental studies against attacks from within and without and, taking issue with the poor opinion

⁷³ *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, p. 124.

⁷⁴ Borozdin, pp. 323-328.

held of Russian Oriental studies by V. V. Barthold, cited a host of names, among them that of Barthold himself, to refute this view.⁷⁵ According to one Western observer who evaluated this new departure in the light of significant organizational changes in Soviet Orientology in the post-Second World War era, one of the main purposes of this new stand was “to establish the superiority of Russian Oriental scholarship as a whole over that of any other people.”⁷⁶

In the last decades of the Soviet state Soviet Orientalists became firmly established in the conviction that Soviet Oriental studies had inherited a “brilliant tradition” from the Russian Orientology of the Tsarist period. Moreover, it was asserted that Russian Oriental studies, differing from that of the West, did not serve colonial ends, the development of a scientific discipline carrying the scholarly spirit of investigation was rather the case.⁷⁷ So it can be stated that the evaluation of Russian Oriental studies of the Tsarist period underwent changes during the Soviet period in accordance with ideological demands and, in the end, these studies came to be highly appreciated so as to give Soviet Orientology a more solid base. At the same time, however, it was constantly underlined that Tsarist Oriental studies had some shortcomings, that Soviet Orientalists gave Russian Orientology a much greater scope and that Oriental studies had obtained their full development exactly in the Soviet period.

⁷⁵ Lawrence Krader, “Soviet Oriental Studies – 1940-1948,” *Far Eastern Survey* 17, no. 14 (July 28, 1948), pp. 164-168.

⁷⁶ Review by Geoffrey Wheeler of N. A. Smirnov’s book *Ocherki istorii izucheniia Islama v SSSR* (1954) in *Soviet Studies* 7, no. 3 (January, 1956), pp. 296-298.

⁷⁷ *Vostokovednye tsenry v SSSR*, p. 126. According to Soviet authors, it was because of the fact that development of Orientology in Russia proceeded in different historical circumstances than in Europe. Russia was directly contiguous to its colonies. This geographical proximity led to close economic and cultural contacts and created mutual interest between Russians and other peoples of the Russian Empire. Russian progressive, democratic and revolutionary philosophy and culture had a positive influence on cultural development of other peoples. In its turn, Russian public were becoming acquainted with the Eastern history, culture and literature. Despite official ideology, progressive Russian intelligentsia and Eastern intellectuals were tied with bonds of friendship. Soviet Orientalist A. N. Kononov gives a different comment on that issue. As he argues, Russian Oriental studies never served colonial politics of Tsarist government or missionary objectives of Russian Church, as Tsarist government and the Church had their special institutions for realization of their political and ideological aspirations (A. N. Kononov, *Istoriia izucheniia tiurkskikh iazykov v Rossii* [History of the Study of Turkic Languages in Russia] (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972), p. 255).

As for the evaluation of the Russian Turkology of the Tsarist period by Soviet scholars, we see here a vivid instance of the Soviet stand described above. It was stated that the “blossoming” Soviet Turkology inherited a big and rich legacy from pre-revolutionary Russian Turkology.⁷⁸ At the same time, it was pointed out that the pre-revolutionary literature on Turkey “suffered from being somewhat one-sided, as considerable amount of very important and actual problems of that time was not within eyeshot of scholars and politicians.” It was emphasized that literature on Turkey published after the October Revolution was “totally different in terms of content and meaning” and had a “many-sided” nature.⁷⁹

What was the real achievement of Russian Turkology in the Tsarist period? If we refer to Barthold again, we will see that he had a poor opinion of Russian Turkology as well. According to Barthold, Russian literature on the Near East is not so rich as one could expect in view of Russia’s geographical location and the composition of its population. It was interesting, he argued, that in Russia, with its considerable Muslim population, there was not created any serious work on Islam.⁸⁰

In order to assess the veracity of the opinions described above, let us trace the development of Turkological studies in the Tsarist period.

One Soviet scholar asserts that relations between Russia and the Near East were established in the 6th-7th centuries, that is, long before the creation of the Ottoman Empire.⁸¹ Long economic and cultural contacts between Russia and the peoples of the Near East led to the practical knowledge by Russians of the languages of these peoples. It is known that in the 17th century

⁷⁸ A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)* (Moscow, 1959), p. 3.

⁷⁹ A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)* (Moscow, 1961), p. 3.

⁸⁰ Barthold, p. 439.

⁸¹ Sverchevskaia, Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*, p. 5 (“Introduction” by B. M. Dantsig).

there were translators from Turkish in the staff of *Posolskii Prikaz* (The Department of Foreign Affairs) in Moscow.⁸²

It is accepted by Soviet scholars that the prerequisites for scholarly Oriental research in Russia were established by Peter the Great. Peter's active Eastern policy as well as his efforts to give impetus to the development of science in Russia had themselves a direct stimulating effect on Oriental studies. In the Petrian time the first official measures aimed at preparing specialists on the East were taken. Due to his foreign policy objectives, Peter was greatly interested in the Near East and this interest resulted in measures taken in order to prepare specialists of the Turkish, Arabian and Persian languages. As early as in 1716 a decree was issued to select five pupils to be attached to the *Posolskii Prikaz* and trained in these three languages.⁸³

Peter's counsellor on the Ottoman Empire was Dmitrii Kantemir (1673-1723), a Moldavian who had spent 22 years (1688-1710) in Istanbul. Encouraged by Peter the Great, Kantemir completed in 1716 a work called *The Rise and Fall of the Ottoman Kingdom*,⁸⁴ the first systematic account of the political and military conditions of the Ottoman Empire. In 1720 Kantemir completed another work, *The System of Religion and State of the Turkish Empire*.⁸⁵ On Peter's order, Kantemir established the first printing-house with Arabic type in Russia in the course of the Persian campaign of 1722. In this printing house Peter's manifesto was printed in Ottoman Turkish toward Turkic population in the area of military operations.⁸⁶

⁸² *Biobibliograficheskii slovar' otechestvennykh tiurkologov* [Biobibliographical dictionary of native Tiurkologists] (Moscow: Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury, 1974), p. 10.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁸⁴ The work was written in Latin (original title - *Incrementa atque decrementa aulae Othomanicae*), published first in English translation (1734-1735, 1756), then in French (1743), German (1745), and Romanian (1872) translations.

⁸⁵ This work too was written in Latin (original title – *Systema de religione et statu Imperii Turcicii*) and translated into Russian by I. Iu. Il'inskii, Kantemir's secretary. Published in 1722.

⁸⁶ A. N. Kononov, *Istoriia izuchenii tiurkskikh iazykov v Rossii* [History of the Study of Turkic Languages in Russia] (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972), pp. 29-30.

In 1724, on the occasion of the departure of the Russian mission to Istanbul, Peter the Great ordered the selection of four young men from the Academy to be sent to Istanbul to study Turkish.⁸⁷ Since that time, the staff of the Russian mission in Istanbul included students who were being trained in languages. In 1741, they numbered six. As seen from its financial reports, the mission regularly paid wages to teachers of the Turkish and Greek languages.⁸⁸

A significant contribution to the development of Russian Orientology was made by European scholars invited to Russia. So George J. Kehr (1692-1740), a prominent specialist on Near Eastern languages, arrived in St. Petersburg in 1732 on the invitation of Russian officials. The Russian government a contract concluded with him in accordance with which he was obliged to teach Russian students Arabian, Persian and Turkish. Kehr trained five specialists who later served as officials in Turkey and Persia.⁸⁹

It is generally accepted that Peter's greatest contribution to Russian science was the establishment of the Academy of Sciences in 1724. Dealing with Oriental subjects was among the activities of the Academy from the very beginning. The Academy continued Peter's initiative by publishing two works on Turkey's history translated from European authors in 1737-1738.⁹⁰

After Peter the Great, the general state of affairs in Russia was not favourable for the development of the sciences and a marked stagnation in activities related to Oriental issues was observable. However, Russian public interest in Turkey did not decrease. During the eighteenth century, especially in its second half, many translated and original works on Turkey appeared. In addition, in the first Russian newspapers – *Vedomosti* (News) from 1702, *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* (St. Petersburg News) from 1727, and *Moskovskie vedomosti* (Moscow News) from

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 28.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 43.

⁸⁹ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 14.

⁹⁰ Kononov, p. 44.

1756 – paragraphs on Turkey were abundant. *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* was supplemented between 1727 and 1742 by *Primechaniia* (Notes) – in fact, the first Russian journal – in which articles on Turkey’s history and geography were frequently published.⁹¹ Soon after the conclusion of the 1774 Peace Treaty with the Ottoman Empire, the first Turkish grammar was published (in 1776 in Moscow and in 1777 in St. Petersburg), translated from the French original.⁹² So it can be stated that in the very beginning of Russian Oriental studies an impulse for the development of Turkology was present and activities in that direction were marked with steady growth. As Soviet Orientalist A. N. Kononov writes, “Preparing translators in Constantinople, translating books on Turkey, attention to Turkish literature – all this showed clearly that not only an intense interest in Turkey, in its history, language, literature and contemporary state was present, but also persons able to satisfy this interest were existent.”⁹³

The trend continued in the nineteenth century. As Tveritina argues, the history of Turkology in the nineteenth century was characterized, on the one hand, by the Russian public’s constant high interest in the Ottoman Empire and the appearance of a number of descriptive, compilative and translated works on Turkey and the Turks, and, on the other hand, with the establishment of Oriental educational and scholarly centers in which Turkological studies started.⁹⁴

Before examining the evolution of Russian Turkology in the nineteenth century a few remarks about the general development of Russian Oriental studies at that time are in order. It should be underlined at first that in the nineteenth century Russian Oriental studies experienced

⁹¹ Sverchevskaia, Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*, p. 6.

⁹² *Biobibliograficheskii slovar’*, p. 18. The French original was J. B. D. Holdermann’s *Grammaire turque* published in 1730.

⁹³ Kononov, p. 44.

⁹⁴ A. S. Tveritina, “V. D. Smirnov – istorik Turtsii” [V. D. Smirnov – Historian of Turkey], *Sovetskaia tiurkologiia*, no. 4, 1971, p. 105.

significant advances, as the Russian state became much more aware of their importance and started to give much more attention to their development. Oriental studies became institutionalized in a number of Orientalist institutions and started to develop as a scholarly discipline. At the same time, educational activities advanced. Educational as well as scholarly activities were concentrated mainly in St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kazan.

Another point to be indicated is that Russian Orientalist scholarship in the nineteenth century arose as a complex discipline, occupied with languages, ethnography, literature, and history of the Eastern peoples. By force of the fact that materials of investigation were complicated and insufficiently studied, Russian Orientalists were obliged to be universal scholars combining the skills of linguists, literators, ethnographers, and historians. Moreover, Orientalists were specialized on a number of the Eastern peoples at the same time (for example, it was usual to combine specialization on Arabian, Persian and Turkic peoples).

As for the evolution of Turkological studies in the nineteenth century, it will be interesting to trace how the contents of these studies were affected by measures taken by the state and how they were shaped by the individual efforts of some Orientalists. It also will be useful to evaluate achievements, distinguishing educational and research levels.

To begin with educational affairs, instruction in Turkish language, Turkish history and literature developed especially from the 1820s on. In particular, educational institutions in Kazan must be distinguished in the case.

The start for teaching Eastern languages was given by the first General Regulations of Universities (1804), which ordered the creation of sub-faculties of the Eastern languages at each

university.⁹⁵ These sub-faculties were established at Moscow University and the newly established Kazan and Kharkov Universities.⁹⁶

Instruction in Turkish was introduced at the official level first not at universities, but at educational institutions founded with practical governmental objectives. Turkish was introduced to universities' programs some time later, in 1835.⁹⁷ The first institution to begin teaching Turkish was the Educational Branch of the Eastern Languages in the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg,⁹⁸ which was established in 1823 as a two-year courses with limited practical aim: to prepare dragomans for the Russian missions in Turkey and Persia. The number of students was limited to six. In the beginning, three Eastern languages (Persian, Turkish, and Arabic) and two European languages (French and English) were taught.⁹⁹

Another two institutions at which teaching Turkish began in the late 1820s were the Lazarev Institute of Eastern Languages in Moscow and The Eastern Institute attached to Rishelievskii High School in Odessa.

⁹⁵ In fact, teaching Eastern languages at the university level was proposed by M. V. Lomonosov (the founder of Moscow University) as early as 1754.

⁹⁶ Kononov, p. 126. But at Moscow University Turkic languages were not taught until the Soviet era. At Kharkov University teaching Eastern languages lasted very short (1829-1835) and it is not clear whether Turkish was among the languages taught. At Kazan University the sub-faculty of the Turko-Tatar Philology was established in 1828. It was headed by A. K. Kazem-Bek (1802-1870) between 1828 and 1845. Ottoman Turkish was not taught here until 1836.

⁹⁷ At St. Petersburg University (established in 1819) O. I. Senkovskii started to teach Turkish in 1822, but the lessons were "so to speak, of private character", Senkovskii gave lessons only to students of the last course, two times in a week (Kononov, p. 140).

⁹⁸ It was usually named as Oriental Institute (L'Institut des langues orientales du Ministère des affaires étrangères) and existed between 1823 and 1918 (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 30).

⁹⁹ Kononov, pp. 161-162. As time went on, new disciplines were added: Italian language (1835), Greek language (1851), Islamic law (1873), international law (1883), and Tatar language (1888). In 1835 the first sub-faculty of history of the Muslim East was created, during all period of its existence (1835-1843) the course on history and geography of Asia was taught by B. A. Dorn (1805-1881), a prominent Orientalist, specialist on history and geography of Caucasus and the Near East. Turkish was taught by F. B. Sharmua between 1823 and 1835 and P. I. Desmaisons between 1836 and 1872. Practical training in Turkish was conducted between 1823-1844 by Chorbadžioglu, a Greek from Istanbul. He was replaced by Okhannes Amidi (1844-1949), an Armenian from Istanbul. The following trainers were Turks: Vehbi Efendi (1852-1856), Akif Efendi (1857-1859), and Osman Nuri (1862-1877). Since 1878 practical training on Turkish was conducted by Fardis and later by Vamvaki, two Greeks from Istanbul. In 1883 in the Institute a "trial three-year course of the Eastern languages for officers" were created. Among the students of these courses P. P. Tsvetkov who compiled Turkish-Russian and Russian-Turkish dictionaries (St. P., 1902) and four-volume compilative work *Islamism* (Ashkhabad, 1912-1913) should be mentioned.

The Lazarev Institute (founded in 1828) was based on a private Armenian school which had been established in Moscow in 1815. In the beginning Armenian, Arabic, Persian, and Turkish were taught, a “general perspective of history, geography and literature of Armenians, Arabs, Persians, and Turks and other Eastern peoples” was also given. In 1835 the Lazarev Institute was equated with educational institutions of the second category. Its purpose was designed as “firstly, to provide experienced translators of the Eastern languages with theoretical and practical knowledge; secondly, to prepare teachers for the rest of Armenian educational institutions and educated priests for Christians of the Gregorian religion.”¹⁰⁰

The Eastern Institute attached to Rishelievskii High School in Odessa (1828-1854) was established in order to train educated translators. Similar to the Oriental institute of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the number of students was limited to six young men. Arabic, Persian and Turkish were taught.¹⁰¹

On July 26, 1835 new regulations for universities were confirmed by which universities were reorganized and in Oriental sub-faculties the teaching of Arabic, Persian and Turkish; and Mongolian and Tatar languages was ordered. On the base of these regulations, teaching Turkish began at Kazan University in the Sub-Faculty of Turko-Tatar Philology and the Sub-Faculty of

¹⁰⁰ Kononov, p. 154. The first teacher of Eastern languages was Mikhail Salatian. In the early 1830s Turkish and Arabian were taught by Arakel Shakhumov, an Armenian of Ottoman citizenship and commercial agent. By the 1848 regulations the Lazarev Institute became a High School where the following Eastern languages were taught: Armenian, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Georgian, Tatar. Since 1850 Turkish was taught by L. E. Lazarev (1822-1884), the author of a Turkish grammar and reader (1864). Later he became the first head of the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty which was established in the Lazarev Institute in 1872. After the death of Lazarev, the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty was headed by S. Ie. Sakov (1846-1921), a Greek of Minor Asian origins, who taught Turkish between 1871 and 1908. Since 1885, practical training in Turkish was conducted by S. G. Tserunian (1860-1931), the author of a textbook on Turkish spoken language (1909) (A. N. Kononov, pp. 155-158).

¹⁰¹ B. M. Dantsig, *Blizhnii Vostok v russkoi nauke i literature* [The Near East in Russian Science and Literature] (Moscow, 1973), pp. 234-237. The first teacher of Turkish was G. Rhasis, the author of a French-Turkish dictionary (St. Petersburg, 1828). After his departure to Istanbul as the Russian mission’s dragoman, the Eastern languages were taught by V. V. Grigoriev (1838-1843), V. N. Kuzmin (1845-1852) and I. N. Kholmogorov (1852-1854).

the Turkish Language was established at St. Petersburg University.¹⁰² In 1836, Turkish was introduced by special regulations to the program of Kazan High School (established in 1758).¹⁰³

The regulations by which Turkish was introduced to Kazan High School are worth citation at some length for they provide information about the official attitude toward Oriental education at that time. The regulations “On Teaching Eastern Languages in the First Kazan High School” confirmed on January 2, 1836 by Nikolai II ordered that: “1. It is prescribed to teach in The First Kazan High School beyond the disciplines stated in the 1828 Educational Regulations the following subjects: 1) Arabic, 2) Persian, 3) Turko-Tatar, 4) Mongolian. 2. The studying of Eastern languages aims at preparing officials mastering these languages in order to appoint them to: 1) the Ministry of National Education as teachers of Eastern languages; 2) the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as translators and dragomans; 3) the Ministry of Domestic Affairs as translators

¹⁰² Kononov, pp. 131, 143-144. The first professor of the Turkish language was O. I. Senkovskii (1800-1858). Senkovskii graduated from Vilnius University in 1819. In the same year he travelled throughout the Near East. In 1820, he was appointed as the dragoman of Russian embassy in Istanbul. Since 1822 became a Professor at St. Petersburg University. Senkovskii had perfect knowledge of Arabic and Turkish, knew Persian, Greek, Italian, was well informed on life and culture of Eastern peoples and was an excellent teacher. According to Barthold, “Senkovskii and Kazem-Bek have created Russian Orientalology by their lectures; almost all Russian Orientalists of following generations were their students or students of their students.” Senkovskii prepared *Karmanaia kniga dlia russkikh voinov v turetskikh pokhodakh* (Pocket Book for Russian Soldiers in Turkish Campaigns) made up of a Russian-Turkish conversational textbook, a Russian-Turkish dictionary and a Turkish grammar (published in two volumes in St. Petersburg in 1828-1829). Senkovskii taught Turkish in this faculty until 1839 (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, pp. 258-259). The following years Turkish was taught by A. O. Mukhlinskii (1839-1845), M. D. Topchibashev (1845-46 and 1848-49); V. F. Dittel (1846-1848) and Mukhlinskii again (1849-1866) (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, pp. 26-27).

¹⁰³ Kononov, 121. The teacher of Turkish at Kazan universty as well as at Kazan High School was Kazem-Bek. In 1836, Kazem-Bek prepared a methodological textbook and program for teachers of Arabic, Persian and Turko-Tatar languages which was confirmed by the Ministry of National Education and served as the methodological instruction in Kazan High School for 15 years. Instruction in the Turko-Tatar language was conducted in theoretical and practical levels. Broad information about etymology, syntax, dialectology, literature was given. Kazem-Bek taught Turkish in comparative perspective, pointing out deviations from Turkish in Tatar and other Turkic dialects (Kononov, pp. 121-125). At Kazan University Kazem-Bek lectured in the following manner: “explained to students the broad Turko-Tatar grammar basing on his own work, read selected parts from *Kabusname*, *History of Chingis-khan*, works of Abulghazi Bakhadur Khan, Riza's *History of Seven Planets*, works of Ragib Pasha, Rami Efendi and Ageli; trained them in reading newspapers from Constantinople and Aleksandria, and translating into Turkish and gave lectures on history of Turkish literature and history of education in the East, 6 hours in a week” (Kononov, p. 132). Besides that, Kazem-Bek taught Tatar, Turkish and Arabic at Kazan Religious Academy where two sub-faculties (Mongol-Kalmyk and Turko-Tatar) existed since 1845 (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 35). It is interesting to note that Kazem-Bek trained Russian classic L. Tolstoi in Turkish and Arabic in order to prepare him to the entrance examinations at Kazan University. L. Tolstoi passed the examinations and was admitted to the Oriental sub-faculty of Kazan University. But after a year passed to the Faculty of Law.

and officials attached to governors of areas extending along Asian frontier, to khans and sultans who are Russian subjects, and to governors of non-Christians; 4) the Ministry of Finances to be attached to heads of custom-houses along the Eastern frontier of Russia and to governmental institutions of provinces contiguous to Asian regions.”¹⁰⁴

The list of Oriental subjects confirmed by the Ministry of National Education on March 26, 1843 for Kazan University reveals the details of Oriental education in Kazan at that time. In the Sub-Faculty of Turko-Tatar Philology the following disciplines were taught: “*I course*. Primary subjects: 1) Turkish, 2) Arabic; Secondary subjects: 1) English, 2) History of the Church, 3) Ancient History, 4) General History. *II course*. Primary subjects: 1) Arabic, 2) Turkish, 3) History of Ancient Turkic peoples; Secondary subjects: 1) English, 2) Contemplative Theology, 3) Middle and New History, 4) History of General Literature. *III course*. Primary subjects: 1) Turkish, 2) Arabic, 3) Political History of the Ottoman State; Secondary subjects: 1) English, 2) Moral Theology, 3) History of Russia, 4) History of General Literature. *IV course* Primary subjects: 1) Turkish, 2) Arabian, 3) History of Ottoman Philology; Secondary subjects: 1) English, 2) History of Philosophical Systems, 3) History of General Literature. Optional: 1) Persian, 2) French.”¹⁰⁵

The high quality of Oriental education at Kazan University is testified by the fact that the Board of Kazan University ordered each professor to present annual “historical accounts about the direction his discipline has gone in Europe and achievements obtained in the field.” Students were ordered to write papers on assigned themes¹⁰⁶ and were sent on long travels to Eastern

¹⁰⁴ Kononov, p. 121.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 132-133.

¹⁰⁶ For example, “The Causes and the Course of Migration of Turkic and Mongolian Peoples from the East to the West,” “Historico-Pragmatical Survey of the Development and Decay of Muslim (Persian and Turkish) Rule in Caucasia” and others.

countries. For example, when Kazem-Bek's pupil, I. N. Berezin,¹⁰⁷ became the head of the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty after Kazem-Bek's appointment to the Sub-Faculty of Arabian and Persian Philology in 1846, he had just returned from a three-year journey throughout the Near East, which he had conducted following the program prepared by his teacher.¹⁰⁸

In 1854-1855 Oriental education in Russia went through a fundamental reform which resulted in uniting all Oriental educational institutions at St. Petersburg University in the Faculty of the Eastern Languages. The teaching of Eastern languages at Kazan¹⁰⁹ and Odessa was stopped and many Orientalists were transferred to St. Petersburg.¹¹⁰ Some Soviet scholars explained this step of the Russian government by "a crisis the Oriental departments at Kazan and St. Petersburg universities were experiencing in the 1840s caused by the deficiency of qualified lectors and uncertainty of objectives of Oriental education which found its reflection in difficulties that the graduates met in searching for job."¹¹¹ Kononov seems to regret the stopping of Oriental education in Kazan, which had developed to such an excellent state. He pointed out that this abrupt interruption had occurred just at a moment when "teaching Eastern languages in Kazan had achieved a wide character."¹¹² Perhaps, the advanced character Oriental studies had obtained in Kazan, the acknowledged spiritual center of Russian Muslims which had contacts with the

¹⁰⁷ Berezin (1818-1896) headed the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty between 1846 and 1855. He taught in the following manner: "alternately with the students translated selected parts from *Tutiname*, *Iuss-i Zafer*, works of Evliia Chelebi, *Book of Forty Viziers*, travel accounts of Mohammad Seid Vakhit Efendi, Baki's *Divan*, Ottoman official acts and Khans' 'iarlyks'; trained the students in translating from Russian and French into Turkish, from literary Turkish into colloquial Turkish and gave lectures on the history of Turkic peoples, the history of the Turkish Empire, and the history of Turkish literature, 8 hours in a week" (Kononov, p. 133).

¹⁰⁸ Kononov, p. 135.

¹⁰⁹ In Kazan the teaching of the Tatar language was preserved "on the respect of local circumstances." The teaching of Turkish and Arabic for the interested was organized again (the lector was N. I. Ilminskii) in 1861, but after the lector's appointment to another position in 1872, the sub-faculty ceased its existence. In 1888, the sub-faculty of the Eastern languages was established again at Kazan University. It had two divisions: Turkic and Finnic languages. The Tatar language, the history of Turkic peoples, the history of Turko-Tatar literature (Ottoman, Chagatai and general Turkic literatures), the comparative grammar of Turkic languages were taught (Kononov, pp. 136-138).

¹¹⁰ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 27.

¹¹¹ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 27.

¹¹² Kononov, p. 125.

Muslim world outside Russia, played certain role in the Russian government's decision to move the center of these studies to St. Petersburg. Though, evidently, the Russian government was concerned with broader political considerations.

The Faculty of Eastern Languages at St. Petersburg University was established in 1854 with the following sub-faculties: 1) Arabic, 2) Persian, 3) Turko-Tatar,¹¹³ 4) Mongolian and Kalmyk, 5) Chinese, 6) Hebrew; 7) Armenian, 8) Georgian, and 9) Manchu.¹¹⁴ In 1863, the history of the East became a separate discipline,¹¹⁵ as the first sub-faculty of History of the East was established.¹¹⁶ In the 1880s, Oriental education at St. Petersburg University obtained its final shape. As seen from the examination requirements confirmed in 1885, at the Sub-Faculty of Turko-Tatar Philology disciplines of general Tiurkology and Ottoman philology were taught.¹¹⁷ In 1913 new examination requirements were confirmed in accordance to which requirements on Ottoman literature and on a special course of Turkish history were introduced.¹¹⁸

Some remarks on the development of the Lazarev Institute should be made. In 1872 the Lazarev Institute was reorganized to combine two types of educational institutions: a high school and three-year Special Classes (equal to college). Special Classes consisted of the following sub-faculties: 1) Armenian philology, 2) Arabic philology, 3) Persian philology, 4) Turko-Tatar language, 5) History of the East, 6) Russian philology, and 7) Georgian language.¹¹⁹ Toward the

¹¹³ Turkish was taught by A. O. Mukhlinskii (1855-1866), A. O. Maksimov (1866-1867), L. Z. Budagov (1868-1869), I. N. Berezin (1869-1873), V. D. Smirnov (1873-1919). Between 1886 and 1897 Smirnov was assisted by Abdurakhman Shevket, a Turk from Salonika. Between 1898 and 1908 spoken Turkish and Turkish calligraphy were taught by Ilias Murza Baraganskii who had received his education in Istanbul. Between 1909 and 1918 Turkish was taught by S. M. Shapshal.

¹¹⁴ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 27.

¹¹⁵ Kononov asserts that it was for the first time in the all world.

¹¹⁶ Kononov, p. 4. According to Kononov, the Russian school of history of the East began with this event. This school in Tiurkology was represented by V. V. Grigoriev, P. S. Saveliev, I. N. Berezin, V. G. Tizengauzen, V. V. Veliaminov-Zernov, N. I. Veselovskii, V. V. Barthold, V. D. Smirnov, A. Iu. Iakubovskii, A. A. Semenov.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

end of the nineteenth century the Lazarev Institute became the most advanced Oriental institution in Russia due to its outstanding professors, such as V. F. Miller (1878-1913), the eminent specialist on Iranian and Slavic studies and director of the Institute between 1897 and 1911; F. Ie. Korsh (1843-1915), specialist on Iranian, Slavic, Arabic, Tiurkological, Sanskrit studies; A. Ie. Krymskii (1871-1942), specialist on Arabic, Iranian, Tiurkological studies; V. I. Gerie (1837-1919), historian of the East; and V. A. Gordlevskii (1876-1956), specialist on Turkish language, literature, and ethnography.¹²⁰ The Institute had its own printshop and published *Papers in Oriental Studies* from 1899 to 1917.¹²¹

It should be noted that in the nineteenth century, Turkish was also taught in a number of primary schools in Crimea and Caucasia, and in two high schools in Tiflis and Kutaisi (Georgia).¹²²

In 1900, the Society of Orientology was founded in St. Petersburg with the sponsorship of the Ministry of Finance and on the initiative of O. S. Lebedeva, prominent translator of Russian classics into Turkish, known by her pseudonym “Giulnar Khanum.” Aiming “exclusively at the practical study of the contemporary East,” the Society had branches in Ashkhabad, Bukhara, Tashkent, Odessa, Tiflis, Khabarovsk, Kharbin and other cities. As Kononov argues, the Society had the intent to serve the political and economic interests of Russian capitalists, but concealed these true objectives, stating instead that it had the humanitarian aspirations “to spread among Eastern peoples correct data about Russia, to make Russian public acquainted with material needs and spiritual life of the East, to assist the rapprochement of Russia with Eastern countries” and so on. Kononov pointed out that eminent Russian Orientalists were not members of this

¹²⁰ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 30.

¹²¹ *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 5 (a translation of the third edition) (New York: Macmillan, Inc.; London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1974), p. 308.

¹²² *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 33.

society. In 1901, the Society opened Courses of the Eastern Languages. In 1906, they were reorganized as Oriental Courses, which in 1910 were turned into a three-year Practical Oriental Academy with the following sections and departments: Japanese, Chinese, Mongolian, Persian, Balkan sections and military, commercial, consulate, regional-administrative departments. Turkish language was taught among the disciplines of the Balkan section.¹²³

In conclusion, during the nineteenth century, educational activities related to teaching Turkish language, literature and history developed considerably, especially from the 1830s. Kononov asserts that with the intensive development of educational activities, the gradual formation of Turkology ('Ottoman studies') as a separate branch of Tiurkology began. According to Kononov, the first representative of this branch was O. I. Senkovskii, who was followed by A. O. Mukhlinskii,¹²⁴ I. B. Petrashevskii,¹²⁵ V. F. Dittel,¹²⁶ V. D. Smirnov,¹²⁷ S. M. Shapshal¹²⁸ in

¹²³ Kononov, pp. 167-169. Between 1911 and 1917 the teacher of Turkish was A. N. Samoilovich, who was assisted by Khasan Nuri Kadizade, a Turk from Konia. Samoilovich and Kadizade prepared for Academy's students' use "The Manual for Practical Study of the Ottoman Turkish" (St. Petersburg, 1915-1917). The Society of Orientology and Practical Oriental Academy were liquidated in 1918.

¹²⁴ Mukhlinskii (1808-1977) graduated from the Oriental Institute of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Taught Turkish at St. Petersburg University in 1839-1845 and 1849-1866. Gave lectures on Ottoman literature (1843-1844, 1849-1866), history of Turkish and Turkic languages (1844-1845), history and geography of the Ottoman Empire (1855-1866).

¹²⁵ Petrashevskii (1796-1869) graduated from the Oriental Institute of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Between 1833 and 1840 served in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a dragoman, then became the secretary of the Russian mission in Istanbul. Served as Russian consul in Izmir, Iaffa, Aleksandria and Salonika. Between 1842 and 1844 assisted Mukhlinskii at St. Petersburg University in teaching Turkish. Between 1847 and 1869 gave lectures on Eastern languages at Berlin University.

¹²⁶ Dittel (1816-1848) graduated from Kazan University, taught Turkish at St. Petersburg University between 1846-1848.

¹²⁷ Smirnov (1846-1922) graduated from St. Petersburg University. In 1873 received his magister degree by the dissertation *Kuchubei Gumurdzhinskii and Other Ottoman Writers of the Seventeenth Century on Causes of Turkey's Decline* (published in 1873 in St. Petersburg). Since 1873 and until his death gave lectures at St. Petersburg University on Turkish language, history of Turkish literature and, for a while, history of Turkey. In 1887 received his doctor degree by the dissertation *Crimean Khanate under the Ottoman Domination until the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century* (St. Petersburg, 1887). The author of many important works on Turkish literature and history such as *Crimean Khanate under the Ottoman Domination During the Eighteenth Century* (Odessa, 1889), *Exemplary Works of Ottoman Literature, Essays on the History of Turkish Literature* (St. Petersburg, 1891), *Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of the Educational Branch of Eastern Languages of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs* and others.

¹²⁸ Shapshal (1873-1961) graduated from St. Petersburg University, taught Turkish at St. Petersburg University between 1909 and 1918.

St. Petersburg; L. E. Lazarev,¹²⁹ S. Ie. Sakov,¹³⁰ S. G. Tserunian,¹³¹ V. A. Gordlevskii¹³² in Moscow. Kononov does not include on this list I. N. Berezin, arguing that though he taught Turkish, he cannot be considered to be a Turkologist, for his scholarly interests lay in the field of general Tiurkology. Kononov singles out Smirnov and Gordlevskii among Turkologists as having “scholarly interests extending to Turkish history, literature and philology.”¹³³

There are some inconsistencies in Kononov’s evaluation. First, Kononov’s opinion about Berezin is somewhat incomprehensible, taking into consideration the fact that Russian Orientalist at that time were for the most part universal scholars combining various specializations. While it was usual at that time to combine Arabic, Persian and Tiurkological knowledge (actually, all scholars listed had received such a universal education), it is odd to exclude Berezin only on the base of the fact that he was interested in broad Tiurkological issues, especially taking into consideration the fact that Turkish is a Turkic language. If Kononov wants to underline that the establishment of Turkology as a separate branch was related to scholarly activities, why does he then list among Turkologists such ordinary teachers of Turkish language as Petrashevskii and Dittel who did not give scholarly works?

It is strange also that Kononov, while appreciating Kazem-Bek highly as an outstanding Tiurkologist, does not consider him to have connection with the development of Turkological

¹²⁹ Lazarev (1822-1884) taught Turkish at the Lazarev Institute since 1850. Between 1872 and 1884 headed the sub-faculty of Turko-Tatar language.

¹³⁰ Sakov (1846-1921) graduated from the Lazarev Institute. Taught Turkish at the Lazarev Institute between 1871 and 1908. After Lazarev’s death headed the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty. The author of three textbooks of Turkish grammar.

¹³¹ Tserunian (1860-1931) was born in Constantinople. Conducted practical lessons of Turkish at the Lazarev Institute since 1885.

¹³² Gordlevskii (1876-1956) graduated from the Lazarev Institute and the Historico-Philological Faculty of Moscow University. In 1904-1907 travelled to Turkey, Syria and France. Since 1907 taught Turkish language and literature at the Lazarev Institute. Since 1905 became interested in Turkish folklor and ethnography, later in Turkish literature and history. Scholarly activities of Gordlevskii developed mainly in the Soviet period. According to Soviet scholars, Gordlevskii was the founder of the Moscow school in Turkology (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar’*, p. 149).

¹³³ Kononov, p. 206.

studies. Actually, Kazem-Bek deserves appreciation as one of the founders of Russian Turkology who had made significant contribution to the development of this branch both by his scholarly and educational activities. At least, his long occupation with teaching Turkish language and philology, his linguistic work aimed at the comparative analysis of Turkic languages (*General Grammar of Turko-Tatar Language*, 1839) in which, as Kononov himself accepts, he gave the first in Russian literature detailed grammar of the Turkish language in comparison with other Turkic languages,¹³⁴ his methodological textbook (1836) including instructions on teaching Turkish philology and his special work on Turkish (*Textbook for Temporary Courses of Turkish*, St. Petersburg, 1854) could be considered as an undeniable contribution to Russian Turkology. It should be pointed out that Mukhlinskii and Dittel (Kazem-Bek's pupils), appreciated by Kononov as Turkologists, applied in their lectures Kazem-Bek's grammar and followed the course of lectures the same way Kazem-Bek had followed them, i.e. translations from selected parts of Ottoman literature, reading Turkish newspapers and so on.

Kononov's other weak point is to be found in his assertion that Smirnov and Gordlevskii had "scholarly interests extending to Turkish history, literature and philology." It is implied by this somewhat vague sentence that other Turkologists were occupied only with Turkish language. However, as we have seen in the course of creating our account, teaching Turkish language was closely related to dealing with Turkish philology and literature, and sometimes with Turkish history. Perhaps it would be correct to say that Smirnov and Gordlevskii should be distinguished not by their "scholarly interests," but by their practical achievements in studying Turkish history, literature and philology.

¹³⁴ This book was used at all Russian universities as a textbook until the beginning of the twentieth century. Moreover, it was translated into German and was used at foreign universities as well.

It can be stated that in the nineteenth century educational and scholarly activities relating to Turkology became established and developed considerably within the general framework of Tiurkological or Near Eastern educational and scholarly activities. In the 1820s-1830s Turkish was for the first time introduced to programs of Russian educational institutions. The initiative came from the Russian government, which was pursuing practical objectives and was interested mainly in training officials with good knowledge of Eastern languages. During the nineteenth century, mainly with the individual efforts of Russian Orientalists, the scope of Oriental education was widened to include information about the philology, history and culture of Eastern peoples. In the development of Turkological education it found its reflection in the fact that Turkish philology, literature and the history of the Ottoman Empire was taught along with training in Turkish.

By the end of the pre-revolutionary period, Turkish language was taught as well as information about Turkish philology, literature and history was given in almost all major Orientalist institutions which were concentrated in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Though it cannot be stated that Turkology became established as a totally separate discipline with its own institutions and the range of specialists, we can speak at least of some scholars who have directed their research exclusively at the field of Turkish philology, literature and history. In the end of the nineteenth century, Smirnov¹³⁵ became distinguished as such a scholar and at the beginning of the twentieth century, Gordlevskii began his career in that direction.

¹³⁵ In contrast with Kononov who starts Turkology with Senkovskii, some Soviet scholars assert that it was Smirnov who “created in Russian Tiurkology a separate Turkological (Ottoman) branch” (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, p. 261). It should be noted that for Smirnov a certain chauvinistic stand toward Turkey and the Turks was characteristic (Tveritina, p. 112). As Tveritina says, “[Smirnov’s chauvinistic] judgements and statements were distinguished by inconsistency and often did not correspond to the character of his major occupation as the historian of Turkey and Turkish literature. In spite of the fact that V. D. Smirnov were ahead of his time in the range of his Turkological studies, he was not able to overcome the influence of the attitudes of those social and official environments in which his activities were proceeding.”

Bibliographical Information about Russian Turkology of the Tsarist Period

Two bibliographical works have been compiled in Russia about Russian Turkological studies of the Tsarist period. Information provided by these bibliographies will help us to supplement our impression about the real state of affairs in the Russian pre-revolutionary Turkology.

The first bibliography compiled by Soviet authors¹³⁶ contains 4,789 references to academic and popular works, including books, chapters of books, journal and bulletin articles¹³⁷ and other works published from 1713 to 1917. They are said to be compiled from the catalogues of major libraries, various bibliographies, reference books, and annuals. The references are divided thematically into the following groups:

Table 1

Thematical Division of Works on the Ottoman Empire by Russian Authors (1713-1917)

| SUBJECTS | REFERENCES |
|--------------------------|------------|
| General works. | 48 |
| Geography. | 91 |
| Population. Ethnography. | 86 |
| Travel accounts. | 332 |
| Economics. | |

¹³⁶ A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)* (Moscow, 1961).

¹³⁷ Titles of 120 journals and bulletins are listed in the list of abbreviations.

| | |
|---|-----|
| General works. | 38 |
| Agriculture. | 21 |
| Industry. | 13 |
| Foreign trade. | 180 |
| Finances. | 73 |
| Means of communication. | 77 |
| Economic relations between Russia and Turkey. | 64 |
| History. | |
| Turkey in the Middle Ages. | 77 |
| Turkey in modern time. | 404 |
| Young Turk revolution. | 91 |
| Ottoman-Persian War. | 25 |
| Balkan Wars. | 122 |
| Turkey in the First World War. | 118 |
| Russia and Turkey. | 272 |
| Russian-Ottoman Wars in general. | 155 |
| Russian-Ottoman Wars until 1768. | 62 |
| Russian-Ottoman War of 1768-1774. | 64 |
| Russian-Ottoman War of 1787-1791. | 72 |
| Russian-Ottoman War of 1806-1812. | 65 |
| Russian-Ottoman War of 1828-1829. | 152 |
| Crimean War of 1853-1856. | 156 |
| Russian-Ottoman War of 1877-1878. | 673 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| National question. | |
| Armenians. | 94 |
| Balkan people. | 393 |
| Kurds. | 47 |
| Other nationalities. | 37 |
| Women's conditions. | 18 |
| Political system. Legislation. | 28 |
| Military forces. | 263 |
| Philology. | |
| Language. Writing. | 19 |
| Grammars. Textbooks. | 23 |
| Dictionaries. Conversational books. | 28 |
| Literature. | 64 |
| Religion. Islam. | 164 |
| Education. Press. | 41 |
| Art. | 38 |
| Total. | 4,789 |

The second bibliography published in the post-Soviet era¹³⁸ provides additional information about Russian scholarship of the Tsarist period on Turkey. This bibliography is devoted to Arabic, Persian and Turkic studies in Russia and contains a list of articles from 1818 to 1917

¹³⁸ L. N. Karskaia, *Annotirovannaia bibliografiia otechestvennykh rabot po arabistike, iranistike i tiurkologii. 1818-1917 gg.* (The Annotated Bibliography of the Native Works on Arabic, Persian and Turkic Studies), (Moscow, 2000).

compiled from academic periodicals (journals, bulletins, annuals, reports, materials) and various scholarly reference books, collections, surveys.¹³⁹ The part devoted to Turkey includes 539 references which are divided thematically into the following groups:

Table 2

Thematical Division of Scholarly Articles on the Ottoman Empire by Russian Authors (1818-1917)

| SUBJECTS | REFERENCES |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Ottoman Turkish. | 26 |
| Ottoman literature. Folklore. | 42 |
| Pre-Ottoman history of Minor Asia. | 13 |
| History of the Ottoman Empire. | 214 |
| Turkish army. | 37 |
| Archaeology. Numismatics. Epigraphy. | 11 |
| Geography. Travel accounts. | 76 |
| Population statistics. | 19 |
| Ethnography. Antropology. | 28 |
| Economics. Trade. | 38 |
| Education. Press. | 22 |
| Art. Theatre. Architecture. | 13 |

¹³⁹ In total, about 170 various periodicals and collections were examined.

| | |
|--------|-----|
| Total. | 539 |
|--------|-----|

We see that Russian intellectual and scholarly circles of the Tsarist era were interested in a rather broad range of topics in relation to Turkey, while devoting their primary attention to history (in particular, the history of the Russian-Ottoman wars); the national question, with the main focus on Balkan peoples; geography; economics; Ottoman military forces; and religion. In spite of the fact that Russian Oriental studies of the Tsarist time were primarily a philological affair, it can be asserted that philological studies did not constitute the major body of investigations on Turkey. Moreover, among non-philological investigations the actual political and economic issues were at the fore (unlike, for example, Indological studies which were concentrated mainly on ancient and medieval history¹⁴⁰). This, evidently, has been determined by the peculiarities of Russian-Turkish relations, i. e. the urgent significance the Ottoman Empire presented to Russia in political terms and, consequently, the Russian public's high interest in contemporary topics related to Turkey and the Turks.

¹⁴⁰ Nisha Sahai-Achuthan, "Soviet Indologists and the Institute of Oriental Studies: Works on Contemporary India in the Soviet Union," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 2 (February, 1983), p. 323.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF TURKOLOGICAL STUDIES IN THE SOVIET UNION

Almost every aspects of Russian life underwent profound changes with the establishment of the Soviet rule. Perhaps intellectual and scholarly activities were the fields which experienced these changes in the most abrupt and fundamental manner, as Marxist-Leninist ideology came to be the cornerstone of the Soviet state. One Western scholar describes the situation in Oriental studies immediately after the establishment of Bolshevik rule as follows: “During the First World War and immediately afterward, a number of Russian Orientalists died. Some left Russia as political refugees to continue their work abroad. Many of those who remained were thwarted by the unsettled conditions, by their inability to conform to communist ideological requirements and to secure institutional sponsorship, and by limited opportunities for publication. The few who were able to adjust to the new circumstances became the founders and pillars of contemporary Soviet Oriental studies.”¹⁴¹

Unfortunately, the convulsions of change were to become the fate of Soviet scholars, as the ideological stands of the Soviet leaders were not distinguished by constancy and throughout the Soviet period, intellectual and scholarly life was exposed to frequent shifts in official line. As a result, scholarship in the Soviet Union turned into a really difficult occupation. As Anatole G. Mazour notes in regard to Soviet historiography, “By the time the Soviet regime was to celebrate

¹⁴¹ Wayne S. Vucinich, “Soviet Studies on the Middle East,” in *The Soviet Union and the Middle East: The Post-World War II Era*, ed. by Ivo J. Lederer and Wayne S. Vucinich (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1974), p. 177.

its fiftieth anniversary there was a considerable accumulation of conflicting theories, criss-cross party lines, and ideological taboos to contend with.”¹⁴²

As for Oriental studies, their close connection to the foreign policy-making process in the Soviet state should be underlined here as an important factor that affected the development of these studies along with the factors mentioned above. The fact that the Soviets gave importance to Oriental studies primarily in relation to foreign policy-making became evident from the very outset of the Soviet rule and found its expression in frequent organizational changes in Oriental studies in close connection with political developments in the East.

Before concentrating on the development of Soviet Turkological studies, the stages of the general development of Soviet Oriental studies should be outlined.

N. Sahai-Achuthan prefers to look at the sequence of Soviet leaders in distinguishing phases in the evolution of Soviet Oriental studies and traces the developments in Soviet Indology through the following periods: the Lenin and Stalin period, the Khrushchev period, and the Post-Khrushchev period.¹⁴³ In fact, this type of periodization is justified as Sahai-Achuthan concentrates mainly on tracing the shifts in Soviet analysis in relation to changes in the Soviet leadership’s attitudes.¹⁴⁴

As institutional developments are the main focus of this chapter, a different type of periodization is needed. Taking into consideration the close relationship that existed in the Soviet state between Oriental studies and foreign policy-making, it seems to be more appropriate here to

¹⁴² Anatole G. Mazour, *The Writing of History in the Soviet Union* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1971), p. xii.

¹⁴³ Nisha Sahai-Achuthan, p. 324.

¹⁴⁴ Especially Stalin should be pointed out in this context as a person who had the gravest impact on the intellectual life of his country. Stalin’s influence created such a lasting negative effect that the special terms (‘de-Stalinization’ and ‘thaw’) were coined to define the post-Stalin intellectual atmosphere in the Soviet Union. As Mazour asserts in regard to Soviet historiography, “The Stalin regime itself contributed irreparable damage to historical science. Stalin’s political omnipotence carried with it an academic dictum that made objective historical research impossible, as Stalin wrote history himself or censored works written by others. . . . Stalinism cannot be dismissed as a mere paranoid fancy either; historical interpretation was simply a reflection of an established tyranny forced upon writers. Consensus by terror became the rule in all fields, including the writing of history” (A. Mazour, p. xii).

distinguish the phases of development in Soviet Oriental studies in relation to the following factors: a) changes in the international position of the Soviet state, b) political developments in the East and c) the Soviets' changing strategical and ideological concerns in relation to these two factors.

Based on these considerations, we can distinguish the following broad stages in development of Soviet Oriental studies: the first period of the “disorderly growth” of the early Soviet era (1917-the 1920s); the second period of the “more orderly and restricted development” (the 1930-40s); the third period of the “fundamental restructuring” (1950-1961); and the fourth period of the “organized growth” of the late Soviet era. It can be stated in very rough terms that at the first stage, the Soviet state was concerned primarily with surviving and establishing itself in the international arena; in the first half of the second period, it was preoccupied with domestic affairs aimed at constructing the national economy (the task of “building socialism in one country”); the second half of the same period covers the war and immediate post-war years; and in the third and fourth periods, the Soviet state was present in the international arena as a super-power with corresponding political and ideological aspirations. These developments on the Soviet side coincided with independent movements in contiguous to Soviet Russia Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan in the early 1920s, with the period of relative quiet in the Eastern countries after that period and with the great wave of de-colonization and emerging of the so-called “Third World” after the Second World War.

The developments in Soviet Turkology will be discussed within the framework of the general evolution of Soviet Oriental studies through these four stages. The peculiarities of Soviet stand toward Turkey during all the Soviet period will be also pointed out.

The Period of the “Disorderly Growth” of the Early Soviet Period (1917 - the 1920s)

The first years of the Soviet rule was marked with interruption in many fields of scholarly investigation caused by the general disorder and war situation. However, the interruption was not the case for Oriental studies or, at least, it can be stated that the interruption in Oriental studies lasted a short time. From the very beginning, the Soviet government showed great interest in developing Oriental studies and the first Soviet institutions on Oriental studies were reorganized from Tsarist institutions or established newly as early as in the years of civil war and foreign intervention. Thus the Institute of Eastern Languages was founded in Kiev in 1918, an Oriental division was created in the People’s Commissariat of Education in 1919, and The Collegium of Orientalists was founded in the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad in 1921. During the 1920s the number of Oriental institutions increased, so to speak, by leaps and bounds.¹⁴⁵ While some Oriental centers were attached to academic institutions, others were affiliated with the government, the Communist party, or the army.¹⁴⁶

This intense interest in Oriental studies was related closely to the significance the Soviets gave to their policies in Asia and was determined both by the strategic and ideological concerns

¹⁴⁵ The All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientology (VNAV) was organized in 1922 as part of the People’s Commissariat of Nationalities, with *Novyi Vostok* (New East) as its organ (published from 1922 to 1930). One Western scholar described this group of Soviet Orientalists as “communists without academic training, but with academic ambitions, some quite capable and others of no distinction whatever” (Walter L. Laqueur, “The Shifting Line in Soviet Orientology,” *Problems of Communism*, no. 2 (March-April 1956), p. 21) (Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 325). VNAV was followed by the Institute of the Peoples of the USSR East, the Erukidze Institute of Living Oriental Languages, the Museum of Oriental Culture, Yafetic Institute, and the Institute of Buddhist Culture. Meanwhile, the Asiatic Museum (opened in St. Petersburg in 1818) was enlarged and the former Lazarev Institute was reorganized as the Moscow Oriental Institute in 1921 in which socioeconomic disciplines were introduced. At the Military Academy a special Oriental department was created. In order to establish contacts with working masses of the East, the Stalin Communist University for the Toilers of the East and the Sun Yat-Sen University for the Toilers of China, having their own scientific research institutes were founded. Several institutions on Oriental studies were established in provinces as well, thus the Oriental faculty was established at Azerbaijan State University in 1922 and the All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Orientology (VUNAV) was established in 1926 with the departments in Kharkov, Kiev and Odessa (Borozdin, pp. 323-328).

¹⁴⁶ Vucinich, p. 178.

of the new-born Soviet state.¹⁴⁷ To the Soviets, who were preoccupied in these years with the struggle for survival, drawing the Eastern peoples inside Russia and in contiguous Asian countries into an alliance with them mattered greatly in regard to safeguarding the security of the Soviet state.¹⁴⁸ As early as December 5, 1917, i. e. within a month of the Bolshevik takeover, *Appeal to the Muslims of Russia and the East* was published by which the new Soviet state proclaimed its peaceful intentions to the Muslim populations of its own Central Asian provinces and of the neighboring states to the south. The government also published and repudiated the secret treaties the Tsar had signed with the Western powers which included provisions for post-war Russian control of Constantinople and the acquisition of several Turkish and Persian provinces. These steps signified a desire to establish mutually beneficial relations with the Eastern peoples as early as possible.¹⁴⁹ According to one Western scholar, the growth of Oriental studies in the period following the October Revolution should be attributed to the need felt by the Bolsheviks to develop “area expertise” for Eastern regions. As the same scholar argues, “the first actual foreign policy research programs began to develop early in the twenties, in the field of Oriental studies.”¹⁵⁰

Another factor, an ideological one, that affected the development of Oriental studies was the Bolsheviks’ objective of world revolution. Asia as such was not incorporated into the European scheme of the class war by Marx. In the beginning, the Bolsheviks put their hopes of

¹⁴⁷ On the peculiarities of Soviet policy toward Asia in the early years of the Soviet state, see Harish Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia, 1917-1927: A Study of Soviet Policy Towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan* (Geneva: Mishael Joseph Limited, 1966).

¹⁴⁸ Harish Kapur argues that, as far as the Near and Middle East were concerned, the basic objective of Soviet policy was to diminish British influence there and as such the Soviets were continuing old Russian tradition at that region. Harish Kapur, 85-86. On the rivalry between Britain and Soviet Russia over establishing their influence over Turkey during the early Soviet period, see Bülent Gökay, *A Clash of Empires: Turkey Between Russian Bolshevism and British Imperialism, 1918-1923* (London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 1997).

¹⁴⁹ Erica Schoenberger; Stephanie Reich, “Soviet Policy in the Middle East,” *MERIP Reports*, no. 39 (July, 1975), p. 3.

¹⁵⁰ Eran, Oded. *Mezhdunarodniki: An Assessment of Professional Expertise in the Making of Soviet Foreign Policy* (Tel Aviv: Turtledove Publishing, 1979), pp. 18-27. Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 325.

world revolution entirely on the Western proletariat, but disturbances in the colonies made them to take into consideration the oppressed peoples of the East as well. As socialist revolutions failed in Europe, Lenin began to argue that the Western proletariat “will not be victorious without the aid of the toiling masses of all the oppressed colonial people and of the Eastern people in the first place.”¹⁵¹ However, Asia posed a theoretical problem to the Communists at that point. The so-called “worker class,” as an organized and revolutionary-conscious force that was to lead “proletarian revolution,” did not exist in Asia and the question of the leadership in the revolutionary movements of the Eastern peoples emerged. Therefore, it was necessary to assess the role of the national bourgeoisies in the national liberation movements and to define the type of relations the Communists should establish with them. These questions were extensively discussed at the Second Comintern Congress held in July-August 1920.

Two opposite views emerged at the congress. Lenin was full of optimism concerning “national-revolutionary movements.” He felt that the national bourgeoisie in the colonial and semi-colonial areas were playing an objectively progressive role in their struggle against the imperialists and should be supported. Following independence, it was to be hoped that the internal socio-economic conditions would push the nationalists leftward in their efforts to deal with the legacy of imperialist domination. As Lenin argued, “with the help of the proletariat of the advanced countries, the backward countries can switch to the Soviet system and – following certain steps of development – to Communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage.”¹⁵²

The opposite group argued that the bourgeoisie in the colonial countries was essentially reactionary and would eventually find it necessary to ally themselves with their former enemies,

¹⁵¹ Kapur, p. 27.

¹⁵² Schoenberger, Reich, p. 3.

the imperialists, against the workers and peasants in their own countries. Consequently, the foremost objective must be to form communist parties in Asia which would organize the peasants and workers and lead them to revolution and to the establishment of Soviet republics.

Finally, after considerable debate, the congress sought to resolve the disagreement by approving both the theses. Nevertheless, as Kapur argues, during the early Soviet period Lenin's view of the national bourgeoisie became the basis of Soviet theory and practice.¹⁵³ After Lenin, as will be seen further, the Soviet leadership underwent several vacillations on the assessment of the role of national bourgeoisie. As Schoenberger and Rish assert, the question had really never been resolved and, depending on the position adopted at various points in time, had radically affected Soviet policy in the Middle East and elsewhere in the Third World.¹⁵⁴

As for Turkey, its special significance within the context of the early Soviet policies in the East should be emphasized at this point. Turkey was considered the most promising country in the Middle East in regard to its revolutionary potential. The Soviets were genuinely impressed by Ataturk's efforts to rid Turkey of Western control. Stalin wrote in 1920: "Turkey, the most politically developed country among the Muslim peoples, raised the banner of revolt and rallied around itself the peoples of the East against imperialism."¹⁵⁵ By the end of 1920 Soviet leadership became firmly convinced that Turkey was a real centre for revolutionary movements in the East and, therefore, was to be kept on the Soviet side at any cost.¹⁵⁶ Despite some

¹⁵³ Kapur, p. 42. It should be noted that there was yet another group in Comintern and in the Soviet Communist Party, which held views different from those of Lenin on the colonial question. This group was led by Sultan-Galiev. According to Sultan-Galiev, the weakest link was not the West, but the East, and the communist leadership had committed a great strategical mistake by placing the main emphasis on revolutionary activity in Europe. Sultan-Galiev was also of the view that the Eastern societies, because of their unique social, cultural and religious characteristics, required different revolutionary methods. He insisted on the national character of revolutions in the Eastern countries, which would be led by the bourgeoisie. Sultan-Galiev's views were rejected in the Soviet state and he himself became one of victims of Stalin's purges in 1937.

¹⁵⁴ Schoenberger, Reich, p. 3.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 4.

¹⁵⁶ Kapur, p. 103.

fluctuations in the evaluation of Kemalist policies, during the early Soviet period the overall policy of extending support to Turkey was the case on the Soviet side.¹⁵⁷

It will be interesting to describe here the Soviet presentation of the issue. According to Soviet view, during its early years the Soviet state served as the uniting center for the peoples of the East in opposition to the Western entente.¹⁵⁸ The establishment of friendly relations with Turkey had broad political and economic meaning as the first instance of relations between the Soviet state and the Eastern countries, which had entered the path of anti-imperialist struggle. These relations represented a completely new pattern in the history of diplomacy as a relationship between the first state of workers and peasants and a people that among the first rose to struggle for national independence under the influence of the ideas of the October Revolution.¹⁵⁹

As for the particular meaning of the Soviet-Turkish friendship in regard to their usefulness for Turkey and Russia, it put an end to the predatory politics of Sultans and Tsars and to the mutual distrust which existed in the Tsarist times between the two countries. This mutual distrust had been skilfully used by England, France and Germany in their struggle to turn the Ottoman Empire into their colony. Soviet Russia's friendship turned into the only guarantee of Turkish integrity and independence. The Soviet-Turkish Agreement on Friendship and Brotherhood strengthened Turkish statehood, its sovereignty and prestige in the international arena. Moreover,

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 142. As Schoenberger and Reich say, both sides benefitted from their friendship. Warm relations with the Soviet Union, which culminated in a 1925 treaty of friendship and non-aggression, helped the Turks diplomatically in their dealing with the West. On a more concrete level, the Soviets were able to provide a material aid to Turkey. Considering the Soviet Union's isolated and dangerously weak position in the world, an alliance with Turkey was greatly valuable for the Soviets. The 1925 Treaty of Friendship was of special importance to the Soviet Union as it followed upon the Treaty of Locarno which provided in essence for the reintegration of Germany into the Western camp and thus deprived Russia of an important ally in Europe. Cordial relations with Turkey also permitted the Soviet government to stabilize control of the Transcaucasus region. However, the community of interest between the Soviet Union and Turkey was not great. Beyond the shared struggle against foreign domination, there existed widely divergent concerns and aims arising from the fact that Atatürk was a nationalist and a westernizer, not a revolutionary. Beyond the 1925 treaty, Atatürk was preoccupied with internal affairs and refrained from any significant commitment (Schoenberger, Reich, p. 4).

¹⁵⁸ *SSSR i Turtsiia, 1917-1979* [The USSR and Turkey] (Moscow, 1981), p. 43.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 27.

Soviet Russia provided many-sided material aid, and moral and political support to the Turkish people without which destitute and ruined Turkey hardly could have defended its independence. Soviet authors emphasize that material aid to Turkey was provided at a time when the Soviet state itself was desperately in need of material sources and that the Soviet aid represented a generous and disinterested act on the Soviet part as it was not bound to any political obligations from the Turkish side.¹⁶⁰

The early Soviet-Turkish relations were also important as they served as the first instance for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It is stated by Soviet authors that in the practice of Soviet-Turkish relations were worked out many ways and methods of Soviet diplomacy which were later successfully applied in relations with the countries of the Third World. Moreover, it was exactly Soviet-Turkish relations that served later as the pattern in forming the system of economic cooperation between the USSR and developing countries. Credits given to Turkey in 1934 for its program of industrial construction were, in fact, the first Soviet credits given to a developing country, while textile factories in Kayseri and Nazilli were the first industrial complexes built with Soviet assistance in the territory of a foreign state.¹⁶¹

So it can be concluded that the Turkish movement for independence and the new-born Republic of Turkey were of great significance for the early Soviets in political and ideological terms, while the early Soviet-Turkish relations served as the first instance of Soviet foreign policy practices in the East and were the first field for working out Soviet methods in Eastern diplomacy.

How did the moments described above affect the development of Soviet Turkology?

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 36-38, 47.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., p. 283.

As far as can be judged from the available information, educational activities aimed at training in Turkish prevailed at this period. In particular, educational activities in Ukraine attract attention. In 1918, the Institute of Eastern Languages was founded in Kiev which some time later was reorganized as the Institute of the Near East consisting of two faculties, Consular and Commercial. In 1920, the Institute was reorganized as the Institute of Foreign Relations divided into two departments, Oriental and Anglo-Saxon. The departments consisted of two faculties, Consular and Foreign Trade. Turkish was taught by V. S. Shcherbina and T. G. Kezma. These two teachers prepared a textbook of the Turkish language in 1918.

Difficulties in the post-war era and frequent reorganizations hindered the normal development of Oriental studies in Kiev. In the end, the Institute of Foreign Relations was turned into the Technical Trade School, in which Oriental disciplines were moved back. But an Orientalist group was active. In 1924, this group turned to the Higher Seminar of Oriental Studies attached to the Technical Trade School. The activities of the Seminar were focused mainly on investigation of Soviet trade relations with the East.¹⁶²

Meanwhile, in contiguous to Turkey Armenia and Azerbaijan, training in the Eastern languages also began. In 1922, the Oriental Faculty was established at Azerbaijan State University¹⁶³ and in 1923 the teaching of Eastern languages and literatures was started at Erivan State University.¹⁶⁴ Information on whether Turkish was taught at these two universities was not available, but it can be supposed that it might be the case.

As for scholarly activities in Moscow and Leningrad, as far as can be judged from scanty information, the Tsarist tradition to conduct Turkological studies within the framework of

¹⁶² *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR (Azerbaijan, Armeniia, Gruzii, Ukraina)* [Oriental Centers in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine)] (Moscow, 1988), p. 91.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

Tiurkological and Near Eastern studies continued in the early Soviet era. Evidently, this was caused at this stage by a lack of specialists and various other obstacles. The Tiurkological Department was established in the Academy of Sciences in 1918. The All-Union Scientific Association of Oriental Studies (VNAV) established in 1922 had a section on the Near East. It can be supposed that at the Moscow Oriental Institute (the former Lazarev Institute) and at other institutions, relevant activities were conducted.

In scholarly activities in Turkology, Ukraine was again in the leading position. Much contribution to the development of Ukrainian Oriental studies in general and Turkological studies in particular was made by A. Ie. Krymskii, the eminent Ukrainian Orientalist. In February 1919, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was established. Krymskii occupied the post of secretary of the Academy from 1919 to 1928. At the same time, he headed the Philological department in the Academy, which included Tiurkological division as well. Krymskii's task was not easy since only three specialists on Oriental studies, Arabist T. G. Kezma, Iranist P. N. Loziev, and Tiurkolog T. I. Grunin, assisted him at that time. Another difficulty was related to the lack of necessary materials. Krymskii started to collect an Oriental library, the base of which his own personal library formed. He examined the library of Kiev University and made many useful discoveries. As he wrote to V. V. Bartold: "I was greatly surprised in view of the fact that in the library of Kiev University during ninety years of its existence a rather considerable collection of works on the East came to existence. There are complete sets of Oriental journals, all publications of European academies with their Oriental parts, European translations of historians and geographers (therefore, frequently accompanied with Oriental texts, for instance, Masudi), general works on Oriental literatures. In particular, the history of Turkey promises many pleasant surprises."¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, p. 95.

Along with materials found in the university's library, the former Religious Academy's sources and some private collections were brought to scholarly use. In 1919, in the Academy of Sciences' library was founded a separate department named "Orientalia."

The first years after the October Revolution were devoted mainly to organizational activities and scientific work was suspended for a while. Then a number of the works of Krymskii appeared, among which several were devoted to Turkey (see Appendix J).

The All-Ukrainian Scientific Center of Oriental Studies, headed by A. Ie. Krymskii, was established in 1925 in Kiev. When in 1926 the All-Ukrainian Academic Association of Oriental Studies (VUNAV) (as the Ukrainian branch of VNAV) was established in Kharkov, the Center in Kiev was turned into its branch. Another branch was founded in Odessa. Investigations carried on by VUNAV focused mainly on problems of contemporary life, in particular, the economic problems of the peoples of the East and had practical meaning for the development of trade relations of the USSR with Eastern countries. The Association consisted of two departments: Politicoeconomic (sections of the Economics and Politics of the Soviet and Foreign East; Law of the Countries of the East) and Historicoethnological (sections of History, Languages and Literature, Art, Archaeology). The Commission on Study of Ukrainian-Turkish Relations was established in 1928 as the result of an agreement with Turkish scholarly circles reached in the course of the journey of the Association's delegation to Turkey. In order to assist the activities of the Commission, the Leningrad Orientalists sent the Central Historical Archive of Ukraine copies of materials related to Ukrainian-Turkish relations.

VUNAV's staff numbered 193 actual members and 158 competitor ones in 1929. VUNAV held two congresses in 1927 and 1929 and published its journal *Skhidnii svit* [Eastern Light] (from the end of 1930 renamed as *Chervonii skhid* [Red East]) between 1927 and 1931 (17 issues in

all).¹⁶⁶ The journal was rather capacious (250-300 pages, some issues over 400 pages) and consisted of the following parts: 1) Economics, Politics, Law; 2) History, Ethnography, Literature; 3) Papers; 4) Bibliography; 5) Latest News about Oriental Studies. The geographical scope of the journal was wide, but articles on the Near and Middle East prevailed.¹⁶⁷

VUNAV was supported by monthly subsidies from the Odessa Branch of the Russian Chamber of Eastern Commerce, which issued its bulletin *Torgovlia Ukrainy s Vostokom* [Ukrainian Trade with the East]. VUNAV carried the investigation of those economic issues in which the Chamber was interested. Many works of VUNAV's members on political and economic issues were written based on the materials of the Chamber.

The teaching of Eastern languages was one of the main directions of VUNAV's activities. Three-year courses were established in 1925 in Kiev (Arabic, Persian, Turkish) and in 1926 in Kharkov (Japanese, Persian, Turkish). On the basis of these courses in May 1930 a three-year Ukrainian Evening School of Oriental Studies and Eastern Languages was established in Kharkov. This school had the status of a high educational institution and prepared specialists of the following specialities: economists with particular specialization on the countries of the East and workers in cultural and educational fields (teachers, translators, workers of the press and others). Along with Turkish and Persian, English, French, and optionally Arabic, Uzbek, Turkmen, and Tadjik were taught. In order to provide teachers with corresponding materials VUNAV's members prepared several textbooks on Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Japanese languages. Among them two textbooks on the Turkish language¹⁶⁸ must be mentioned here.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ There is the bibliography of this journal in Ukrainian: R. S. Livshits and Kh. S. Nadel, comp., *Sistemachnii pokazhchik do zhurnalu "Skhidnii svit" – Chervonii Skhid (1927-1931)* (Kharkov, 1964).

¹⁶⁷ *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, p. 92.

¹⁶⁸ *Prakticheskii uchebnik turetskogo iazyka* (Kharkov, 1928); T. I. Grunin, *Turetskii iazyk. Elementarnaia grammatika i novyi alfavit* (Kharkov, 1930).

¹⁶⁹ *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, pp. 93-94.

Aside from VUNAV, some other Oriental institutions functioned in Kharkov. In 1927 the Department of Foreign Relations was established at the Kharkov Institute of National Economy where Turkish was taught. In 1930 the Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Orientology was founded with the following divisions: Politics and Economics, Law, History, Linguistics and Literature, and Material Culture.¹⁷⁰

As for the content of scholarly studies in that period, according to Vucinich, the main efforts of the Soviet Orientalists of this period were directed at discrediting Islam, encouraging national liberation movements, exposing colonialism and imperialism, and rewriting the history of the Middle Eastern peoples in accordance with Marxist-Leninist ideas.¹⁷¹

So it can be concluded that in the early years of the Soviet rule, Turkology developed mainly in accordance to the practical needs of the Soviet state and it found its expression in the fact that training in Turkish was at the fore, while educational and scholarly activities related to Turkology became established in the Soviet republics contiguous to Turkey. In particular, Turkological activities in Ukraine received well development. It should be pointed out that they had an apparent inclination to economic issues in keeping with the practical interests of the Soviet state.

The Period of the “More Orderly and Restricted Development” (The 1930-40s)

In the late 1920s, a new turn in Oriental studies occurred characterized with organizational changes in Oriental studies resulted in the liquidation of some institutions and the concentration of the management over Oriental studies in the hands of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 93.

¹⁷¹ Vucinich, p. 178.

and with the beginning of a more militant and politicized discourse. It should be underlined that these changes coincided with Stalin's establishment in power.

In the Sixth Comintern Congress held in 1928 under Stalin, new "theses on the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies" were adopted which were marked with a shift in the perception of the role of the national bourgeoisie in the national liberation movement (the national bourgeoisie came to be frowned upon as "reformist"). The Soviet Orientalists, who were expected now to denounce the same national movements which had hitherto been considered communism's main allies, were criticized for their "apolitical approach and pseudo-Marxist stand." In 1928, the Central Committee of the Communist Party expressed dissatisfaction with the work of VNAV. As a result, VNAV was dissolved and replaced by the new Association of Marxist Orientalists (which in its turn was brought to a sudden end in 1937).¹⁷²

In 1930 it was decided that Oriental studies no longer required separate academic, governmental, and party institutions. The Asiatic Museum, the Collegium of Orientalists, the Institute of Buddhist Culture and the Turkological Department were merged in 1930 into a single Institute of Oriental Studies (IVAN) of the Academy of Sciences, with headquarters in Leningrad. Afterwards, most of the basic research in Oriental studies was conducted at the Institute of Oriental Studies, in certain other institutes of the Academy of the USSR and in the academies of other republics.¹⁷³ As Eran argues, "the decision to establish IVAN was well within the trend toward harnessing the USSR Academy of Sciences to the service of the Soviet government and its practical needs . . . the obvious intention was to convert the Institute into a body for policy-oriented

¹⁷² Sahai-Achuthan, pp. 325-326.

¹⁷³ Vucinich, p. 178.

research projects.” Though, according to Eran, in the beginning the scholars at IVAN did not show an inclination to become “politically oriented scholars.”¹⁷⁴

To start with, IVAN had the following geographic divisions: Caucasian, Arabic countries, Jewish-Turkish, Iranian, Indo-Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian, and Japanese-Korean. By 1937 it had added two more divisions, Modern Indian and Ancient East.¹⁷⁵ Scholarly activities obtained a planned character in IVAN, with the focus on the following subjects: modern and recent history, the national liberation movement, and the economic problems of Eastern countries. From 1930 to 1934, the number of its staff increased from 18 to 47. In 1940, the number of scholars was 110.¹⁷⁶

Vucinich argues that Soviet interwar research was low in both quality and quantity. The Institute of Oriental Studies passed through a series of crises and was purged and reorganized. Official interference with scholarship, shifts in government and party tactics, the Stalin personality cult and the purges in the 1930s, controversies over historical interpretations, all of these seriously impeded Oriental studies in general and Middle Eastern studies in particular.¹⁷⁷

Turkological studies underwent some dislocations in that period. With the liquidation of the All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientology (VNAV) in 1930, its Ukrainian branch (VUNAV) was also disbanded.¹⁷⁸ As a result, Oriental studies (and Turkological studies as their part) in Ukraine received a serious blow and since that time have not recovered the previous scope. However, Oriental studies continued to be conducted in Armenia and Georgia and even achieved some development there during the 1930s. In 1936, the Sub-faculty of Eastern Languages was established at Tbilisi State University and the Department of Oriental Studies was

¹⁷⁴ Eran, 48-49. Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 327.

¹⁷⁵ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 327.

¹⁷⁶ *Vostokovedy Moskvyy i Sankt-Peterburga: Osnovnye napravleniia sovremennykh issledovaniy. Vostokovednye nauchnye tsentry. Personalii* [Orientalists of Moscow and St. Petersburg: Major Directions of Contemporary Researches. Oriental Scientific Centers. Personalities.] (Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia RAN, 2000), p. 76.

¹⁷⁷ Vucinich, p. 178.

¹⁷⁸ *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, p. 94.

established in the Institute of Linguistics, History and Material Culture of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR.¹⁷⁹ The Department of Oriental Studies was established in the Philological Faculty of Erivan University in 1940.¹⁸⁰ Though no information was available on whether Turkological studies were conducted in these centers at that time, it can be supposed that it might well have been the case, taking into consideration these republics' proximity to Turkey and the long historical contacts between the Turks and the peoples of the area. Moreover, in view of the fact that in the following period serious work on Turkey was conducted in those republics, it can be assumed that, obviously, this work was to be based on a certain base created in the previous stage.

Leningrad became the center of Turkological studies at that time, for a Turkish Cabinet was created within the Institute of Oriental Studies.¹⁸¹ A group of Turkologists united in this cabinet numbered nine, the majority of whom were young: A. A. Alimov,¹⁸² Kh. M. Tsovikian, Kh. I. Muratov,¹⁸³ A. Ie. Mochanov,¹⁸⁴ A. N. Kononov, A. D. Novichev,¹⁸⁵ T. P. Cherman, A. S.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁸¹ A special essay is devoted to activities of this group: A. D. Zheltiakov, "Izuchenie istorii Turtsii" [Studying History of Turkey], in *Aziatskii muzei – Leningradskoe otdelenie instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR* [Asiatic Museum – The Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences] (Moscow, 1972), pp. 428-434.

¹⁸² Alimov elaborated and organized the first in IVAN and Leningrad University course of Turkish general history on the basis of Marxist doctrine. In 1934 he published a sketch of Turkish history from the 1860s to the 1930s: A. A. Alimov, "Turtsiia," in *Ocherki iz istorii Vostoka v epokhu imperializma* [Essays on History of the East in the Era of Imperialism] (Moscow, 1934), pp. 3-92. After a year, Alimov's special study on the Young Turks Revolution was published: A. A. Alimov, "Revoliutsiia 1908 goda v Turtsii" [The 1908 Revolution in Turkey], in *Probuzhdenie Azii. 1905 god i revoliutsii na Vostoke* [The Awakening of Asia. The Year of 1905 and Revolutions in the East] (Moscow, 1935), pp. 1-93.

¹⁸³ Alimov's pupils, Tsovikian and Muratov, studied the history of Turkey in the imperialist era, paying especial attention to people movements in the last quarter of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century. Mastering Turkish as well as European languages (Tsoviakan knew Armenian as well), they analyzed a great amount of archival materials. Muratov wrote a chapter on the Ottoman Empire from 1870 to 1917 in the first Soviet textbook on the modern history of colonial and dependent countries designed for higher educational institutions: *Novaia istoriia kolonial'nykh i zavisimykh stran* [Modern History of Colonial and Dependent Countries] (Moscow, 1940), pp. 421-452. In 1937, Tsovikian completed his dissertation entitled "The Young Turks Revolution and National Question," from which only a small part was published: Kh. M. Tsovikian, "Vliianie russkoi revoliutsii 1905 g. na revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Turtsii" [The Impact of the 1905 Revolution on Revolutionary Movement in Turkey], *SB*, 1945, Vol. III, pp. 15-35. After the death of these three scholars (Alimov died before the war, Muratov died

Tveretina,¹⁸⁶ and A. A. Adzhian.¹⁸⁷ It should be underlined that for the first time in Russian Oriental studies, all of the specialists on Turkey were united within the framework of a separate group.

Comparing the number of Turkologists who worked in Leningrad in the pre-Second World War period to the overall number of scholars there in 1940 (9 to 110) and taking into consideration the fact that these 110 scholars were divided among 10 divisions, some of which had united specialists of several countries or peoples (the Turkish Cabinet itself existed within the Jewish-Turkish division), it can be concluded that in the pre-war period Turkology in Leningrad was represented by a comparatively large group.

As for the development of Turkological studies in Moscow, the activities of V. A. Gordlevskii should be distinguished. Gordlevskii, who began to teach Turkish and the history of Turkish literature in 1907 at the Lazarev Institute, continued to work at the same institute after the Revolution. The Lazarev Institute was reorganized as the Moscow Oriental Institute in 1921 with the introduction of socioeconomic disciplines. Gordlevskii was a professor at that institute

during the war and Tsovikian died from starvation in the course of the siege of Leningrad), studies on the history of constitutional movement in Turkey and the Young Turks Revolution were suspended for 15 years.

¹⁸⁴ Mochanov published in 1929 an essay on the struggle between Tsarist Russia and the Ottoman Empire for Crimea: A. Ie. Mochanov, *Bor'ba tsarskoi Rossii i Turtsii za obladanie Krymskim khanstvom* [The Struggle between Tsarist Russia and Turkey for the Possession of Crimean Khanate] (Simferopol, 1929). He completed in 1939 his dissertation on Patron Khalil's revolt in Istanbul in 1730, but, unfortunately, the author's death precluded this study from publication.

¹⁸⁵ Novichev, a specialist on the economy and history of Turkey, worked in the Turkish Cabinet since 1932. During the 1930s, along with a number of articles on Turkey's industry, transport, countryside, agrarian system, Novichev published two big monographies on Turkey's economics from the Tanzimat reforms to the First World War: *Ekonomika Turtsii v period pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Turkish Economics During the First World War] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1935) and *Ocherki ekonomiki Turtsii do mirovoi voiny* [Essays on Turkish Economics until the World War] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1937). These works represented the first attempt to create generalizing works based on Marxist doctrine. In his following works, Novichev gave much attention to the examination of Turkey's politics: *Turtsiia. Politiko-ekonomicheskii ocherk* [Turkey. An Politicoeconomic Essay] (Tbilisi, 1941), *Turtsiia. Gosudartstvennyi stroi, ekonomika, etnografiia* [Turkey. State System, Economics, Ethnography] (Tbilisi, 1942) and *Agrarnoe zakonodatel'stvo sovremennoi Turtsii* [Agrarian Legislation of Contemporary Turkey] (Tbilisi, 1942).

¹⁸⁶ In 1939 Tveretina completed her dissertation that was published after the war: *Vosstanie Kara-Iazydzhi-Deli Khasana v Turtsii (1599-1603)* [Kara-Iazydzhi-Deli Khasan Revolt in Turkey] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1946).

¹⁸⁷ Adzhian defended in 1936 his dissertation on handicrafts in Istanbul in the first half of the 17th century, written on the base of critical analysis of travel accounts of Evliia Chelebi.

from 1918 to 1948. Besides his scholarly and educational activities at the Moscow Oriental Institute, which he conducted until his death in 1956, Gordlevskii also taught at Moscow University and the Military Academy.¹⁸⁸ Gordlevskii was the first investigator of Russian-Turkish literary relations¹⁸⁹ and produced several works on Turkish language,¹⁹⁰ ethnography,¹⁹¹ literature,¹⁹² and history.¹⁹³

With the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941-1942, Soviet Oriental studies were disrupted. The Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad was evacuated to Tashkent, but only some of its staff members went there. Others went to Moscow, and still others were drawn into government, military, or party service. Those who went to Moscow organized the Moscow Group of IVAN, which kept Moscow as its base even after the Institute moved back to Leningrad.¹⁹⁴ The Moscow Group which, according to Sahai-Achuthan, was formed by “politically oriented scholars” was accorded official status and established as a branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies in 1943, coinciding with the Kremlin preparations for the allied summit conference at

¹⁸⁸ *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* (A Translation of the Third Edition), vol. 7 (New York: MacMillan, Inc.; London: Collier MacMillan Publishers, 1975), p. 283.

¹⁸⁹ His works on this issue: *Tolstoi in Turkey* (Moscow, 1911); *Chekhov in Turkey* (Moscow, 1944); *Pushkin in Turkey* (Moscow, 1961) (*Azerbaijan Sovet Entsiklopediasy*, vol. 2 (Baku, 1979), p. 207).

¹⁹⁰ *Grammatika turetskogo iazyka* [Grammar of the Turkish Language] (Moscow, 1928). Gordlevskii also edited the first Turkish-Russian dictionary in the Soviet time (Moscow, 1931).

¹⁹¹ Several articles published from 1927 to 1934 (*Türk Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 17 (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1969), p. 438).

¹⁹² *Ocherki po novoi osmanskoii literature* [Essays on Modern Ottoman Literature] (Moscow, 1909-1912).

¹⁹³ *Iz zhizni tsekhov v Turtsii* [From the Life of the Turkish Guilds] (Moscow, 1927); *Vnutrennee sostoianie Turtsii vo vtoroi polovine XVI veka* [The Internal Conditions of Turkey in the Second Half of the 16th Century] (Moscow, 1940); *Gosudarstvo sel'dzhukidov Maloi Azii* [The Seljuk State in Minor Asia] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941). Gordlevskii's selected works were published in three volumes. The first volume contained historical works, the second studies on the Turkish language and literature, and the third the writings on Turkish culture and society (V. A. Gordlevskii, *Izbrannye sochineniia* [Selected Works] 3 vols. (Moscow, 1960-62).

¹⁹⁴ Vucinich, p. 179.

Teheran.¹⁹⁵ The Moscow Branch was joined in sufficient numbers by colleagues who had spent the war in Tashkent so that there were now more Orientalists in Moscow than in Leningrad.¹⁹⁶

According to Vucinich, in the war period the priorities of Oriental studies were affected as military and political interests dictated that primary attention be focused on Japan, China, and the Pacific Basin.¹⁹⁷ In contrast, Sahai-Achuthan argues that in the period following its creation (after 1943), the Moscow group “continued to focus on the study of Iran, Turkey, and India.”¹⁹⁸ In view of the lack of sufficient information, we are not in position to decide which opinion is more valid.

During the war, some other Oriental institutions were established at Moscow University: the Oriental Department in the Philological Faculty with the sub-faculties of Tiurkological and Iranian philology in 1943, and the Department of History of the Eastern Countries in Historical Faculty in 1944, with the following sub-faculties: History of the Countries of the Near East, History of the Countries of the Middle East, and History of the Countries of the Far East.¹⁹⁹ There was a significant development in Georgia as well: in 1945 the Faculty of Oriental Studies was established at Tbilisi University with following sub-faculties: Semitology, Tiurkology, Persian philology, and Armenian studies.²⁰⁰ It can be supposed that Turkology profited from these developments.

It can be summarized that during the period under consideration, Soviet Oriental studies obtained a more orderly and concentrated character²⁰¹ and became more closely affiliated with foreign-policy making affairs.²⁰² The war caused a certain amount of damage to Oriental studies,

¹⁹⁵ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 328.

¹⁹⁶ Vucinich, p. 179.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 179.

¹⁹⁸ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 328.

¹⁹⁹ www.iaas.msu.ru

²⁰⁰ *Vostokovednye tsenry v SSSR*, p. 73.

²⁰¹ One Western scholar describes this process in Oriental studies as ‘steadyding.’ O. Edmund Clubb, “Soviet Oriental Studies and the Asian Revolution,” *Pacific Affairs*, 31, no. 4 (December, 1958), p. 381.

²⁰² According to Fred Halliday, in the Lenin and Stalin periods, foreign policy was determined by a triangle of institutions: the Foreign Ministry, the International Relations Department of the Central Committee of the

but they did not come to a complete halt. Moreover, some significant developments occurred during the war as a result of which the center of Oriental studies moved to Moscow, closer to the Kremlin. As for Turkological studies, it can be said that they achieved comparatively good degree of development at that time and, what is the most important moment, became established as a separate unit (the Turkish Cabinet) within the Institute of Oriental Studies (IVAN), the major Soviet Oriental institution since 1930.

It should be pointed out that since the late 1930s, Soviet-Turkish relations gradually deteriorated and became hostile after the Second World War.²⁰³ Tension lasted until the mid-1960s. This phase in Soviet-Turkish relations was marked with the Soviets' discontent with Turkey's approachment to the West.

It is interesting to note how Soviet authors explained the background of this shift in Turkish foreign policy. According to the Soviet view, Turkey withdrew from the tradition of the good neighborly relations of the 1920-30s and took the "pro-imperialist and anti-Soviet" position in the international arena mainly because of social changes in its state system. Turkish foreign policy was determined in fact by the domestic politics of the Turkish government which corresponded to the interests of the ruling classes (the national bourgeoisie and closely related to them, the big landowners). The strengthening of the national bourgeoisie's political and economic positions inside the country resulted in the strengthening of its role in the sphere of foreign trade as well. With the assistance of the state, the national bourgeoisie became more closely affiliated with the compradore elements in both economic and sociopolitical respects.

Communist Party, and the Communist International. The place of the Communist International, dissolved in 1943, was taken by a new component of the triangle, several advisory institutions concerned with international relations. Halliday considers The Institute of Oriental Studies (IVAN) among these institutions. Fred Halliday, "Current Soviet Policy and the Middle East: A Report," *MERIP Reports*, no. 111, Rapid Deployment and Nuclear War (January, 1983), p. 20.

²⁰³ About peculiarities of the relationship between Turkey, the USA and the USSR in the immediate after-war period, see Melvyn P. Leffler, "Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952," *The Journal of American History*, 71, no. 4 (March, 1985), pp. 807-825.

Another moment that contributed to the affiliation of Turkish circles with foreign capital was the fact that during the 1930s, Turkey settled a number of controversial political, territorial and economic issues with the Western countries and, therefore, the Western countries relaxed their pressure on Turkey. Soviet authors pointed out that Turkey's drawing closer to the West was influenced also by Turkish anxiety in regard to the growing threat from Italy. As a result of combined influence of these factors, the Turkish national bourgeoisie "slid to collaboration with imperialism, damage to the national interest of their country."²⁰⁴

With the deterioration of Soviet-Turkish relations, an anti-Turkish propaganda emerged. This can be also traced in the contents of works written on Turkey in the late 1940s. For instance, N. Muratov's *Turtsiia v tiskakh vnutrennei i vneshnei reaktsii* [Turkey in the Grip of Domestic and Foreign Reaction] (Moscow, 1949) and I. Vasiliev's *O turetskom "neitralitete" vo vtoroi mirovoi voine* [On Turkish "Neutrality" during the Second World War] (Moscow, 1951) represent two examples of the anti-Turkish polemic of the late Stalin years.

It should be noted that this negative attitude towards Turkey coincided with the general negative stand of the Soviet leadership in regard to the "national bourgeoisie" of the Eastern countries during this period. Until the early 1950s, the Soviet government persisted in regarding the "bourgeois" governments of the Middle East as reactionary and as the "lackeys of imperialism." The Soviet press and radio fulminated against past and present "bourgeois nationalist" leaders such as Atatürk, Gandhi, and Nehru.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁴ SSSR i Turtsiia, p. 121.

²⁰⁵ G. E. Wheeler, "Russia and the Middle East," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 35, no. 3 (July, 1959), p. 299.

The Period of the “Fundamental Restructuring” (1950-1961)

The beginning of the post-Second World War era was marked by several momentous developments in the East such as the establishment of Communist rule in China, the movements of de-colonization and the emergence of the so-called “Third World.” Soviet Eastern policies and, consequently, Oriental studies became influenced in fundamental manner by these developments which posed urgent practical as well as theoretical problems for the Soviet state.

The opposition between socialist and capitalist systems (the Cold War) constituted a general background for developments in Soviet policies in that era. Meanwhile, as one Western scholar asserts, the maintenance of the leadership of the world Communist movement in the face of competition from China assumed only slightly lower priority than the ideological struggle with the West. Both competitions had economic as well as military, political, and ideological aspects and entailed the expansion of Soviet influence which moved from the Soviet borders outwards and even overseas.²⁰⁶

It should be underlined with regard to Soviet concerns with the Near East in this context, that the region assumed more critical importance for the Soviets at that time. As one Western scholar argues, the Middle East was a key battleground on which the superpowers played out their Cold War game.²⁰⁷ The most compelling Soviet interest in the Mediterranean/Gulf area involved the United States’ strategic threat deployed in the region. Turkey was of especial importance to the Soviet Union in this context as a NATO state on its border, also controlling the vitally strategic

²⁰⁶ Galia Golan, *Soviet Policies in the Middle East: From World War II to Gorbachev* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 2.

²⁰⁷ Talal Nizameddin, *Russia and the Middle East: Towards a New Foreign Policy* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999), p. 4.

Straits. Another focus of the Soviet concern in that region was the Arab Middle East, because of the importance of Persian Gulf oil to Western countries.²⁰⁸

By the early 1950s, the Soviet Union had begun to undertake broader involvement in world affairs, particularly those of the Third World, including the Middle East. Economic, technical, and military assistance programs were initiated, and changes were introduced to communist doctrine to justify the developing currents of Soviet policy.²⁰⁹ As time went on, Soviet ideological pronouncements became increasingly differentiated, moving from simplistic models of ‘two camps’ to realizations of the potential for creating a ‘zone of peace embracing socialist and non-socialist countries’ and to perceptions of the existence of ‘multistructural’ countries.²¹⁰

As for Oriental studies, they went through a series of reorganizations during the 1950s, which resulted in the end in the establishment of a centralized and tightly organized structure that started to carry out investigations in a broad and planned manner. It should be pointed out that developments in Oriental studies throughout the period under consideration were closely followed and directed by the political leadership. According to the Soviet state’s practical needs and ideological concerns, Oriental studies of this period became focused mainly on the problems of contemporary times and, in particular, socioeconomic issues. Especially during the 1960s, important theoretical debates took place. As Western scholars argue, since the 1950s the Soviets became more realistic and pragmatic in their approach to the East and the Soviet Oriental scholarship became more objective and creative in its analysis.²¹¹

²⁰⁸ R. D. McLaurin, *The Middle East in Soviet Policy* (Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975), pp. 143-145.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144.

²¹⁰ Hannes Adomeit, “Soviet Policy in the Middle East: Problems of Analysis,” *Soviet Studies*, 27, no. 2 (April, 1975), p. 304.

²¹¹ As early as in 1966, one Western scholar wrote that, “it is clear that Russian scholars are abandoning their uncritical generalizations, increasingly conscious of the complexity of the local situations in the third world.” Stephen Clarkson’s entitled review in *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 32, no. 1 (February, 1966), p. 110. Another scholar noted in 1968 a “shift in Soviet Asian studies from a narrowly conceived

Let us now trace the developments step by step.²¹²

After the Second World War, the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad remained principally responsible for research and publications on the East.²¹³ It continued its tradition of scholarship in non-political terms.²¹⁴ Meanwhile, a fundamental change was under way in the international position of the Soviet state, which coincided with some significant developments in the Eastern countries.

The plans for reorganizing IVAN began in the mid-1940s and took place along with three important developments in the East, the independence and partition of India in 1947, the creation of Israel in 1948, and the formation of the People's Republic of China in 1949.²¹⁵ As one Western scholar argues, the withering of colonial power, the upsurge of Asian nationalism, and the spectacular victory of the Chinese Communists brought a return, in Soviet thinking, to the great revolutionary expectations of the early 1920s.²¹⁶ Colonialism and the national liberation movement came to the fore in debates in Soviet historical and political circles during the immediate post-war

ideological basis to a more pragmatic and tolerant approach." Elibazeth Kridl Valkenier, "Recent Trends in Soviet Research on the Developing Countries," *World Politics*, 20, no. 4 (July, 1968), p. 644.

²¹² As noted in the introduction, Western authors became interested in Soviet Oriental studies especially after the changes experienced after the Second World War. In particular, in the late 1950s and during the 1960s we observe an explosion in publications dealing with Soviet Eastern policies and Oriental studies. Simultaneously, the bulk of Soviet publications describing the general development of Soviet Oriental studies appeared in those years, mainly as a result of the directives of the state. Consequently, we have a considerable amount of detailed data about developments in the 1950-60s. However, it is not the case in regard to the 1970s and 1980s. As the tide of intense interest in developing Oriental studies subsided in the Soviet state and the process of reorganization in these studies obtained its final settlement, less attention began to be given to tracing the general developments in Oriental studies. Nisha Sahai-Achuthan complains that for the period beyond the early 1970s, the source material on Soviet Oriental studies is not "as integrated as it was for the preceding period" and she had to reconstruct the development of Indology during this period through an analysis of articles scattered in Soviet journals. Sahai-Achuthan complains moreover that the descriptions she found are far from clear (Sahai-Achuthan, pp. 333-334). Perhaps, as a result of this scarcity of general descriptions, in the post-Soviet Russian sources, too, the late Soviet era is elucidated insufficiently and, for the most part, superficially. So I was not able in the thesis to create as comprehensive description as I wished of developments beyond the 1970s.

²¹³ Vucinich, p. 179.

²¹⁴ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 328.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 328.

²¹⁶ Clubb, p. 381.

years.²¹⁷ The need for accurate knowledge of contemporary Eastern affairs became manifestly urgent.

Soviet Oriental studies did not correspond to this need because of two significant shortcomings. The first was the insufficient number of specialists on modern Asia. On the eve of the reorganization, only thirty-six Orientalists were affiliated with the Moscow Branch of IVAN, and of these, half were graduate students and doctoral candidates. The second shortcoming was the content of Soviet Oriental studies, which were still “steaded in traditions of research in philology and pre-modern history” and as such was “ill-suited to satisfy the intelligence needs of an emergent global power.”²¹⁸ During the late 1940s the Institute in Leningrad was often criticized for neglecting contemporary issues.²¹⁹

In 1950, by a decree of the presidium of the Academy of Sciences, IVAN was reorganized, merged with the Pacific Institute and transferred from Leningrad to Moscow. The following divisions were established: China; Mongolia and Korea; Japan; South East Asia; India and Afghanistan; Iran; Turkey and Arab Countries; and the Soviet East. Functionally, IVAN was divided into three scientific councils: Historical, Economic, and Philosophical.²²⁰ Moreover, the Institute’s research program was reassessed and focused. The main emphasis came to be on social and historical topics. The new tasks outlined for IVAN consisted of studying problems of contemporary social, economic, political, cultural, and ideological development of the East (among them the national liberation movement, agrarian reform, and the workers’ movements in Asia and North Africa); the crisis of the colonial system; the development of new literary and state

²¹⁷ Vucinich, p. 179.

²¹⁸ Richard Remnek, *Soviet Policy towards India: The Role of Soviet Scholars in the Formulation of Soviet Foreign Policy* (New Delhi: Oxford and IBH, 1975), p. 109 (Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 328).

²¹⁹ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 328.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 341.

languages.²²¹ In keeping with the new orientation in Oriental studies, IVAN came to be affiliated with the department of history and philosophy of the Academy of Sciences, instead of the literature and language department.²²² Some time later, a separate Institute of Philology was established, IVAN was directed to collaborate with its sister organization in respect to linguistic problems, and also to carry a close working relationships with the Institutes of Ethnography, History and Economics.²²³

Since 1950, IVAN became the coordinating body for Oriental studies in the Soviet Union. In Leningrad, the Sector of Oriental Manuscripts was preserved which in 1956 was reorganized as the Leningrad Branch of IVAN. Afterwards, the Leningrad Branch dealt predominantly with ancient and medieval history, whereas the Moscow Institute became concentrated on contemporary times.²²⁴

How was Turkology affected by these developments?

During the Second World War, the work of the Turkish Cabinet in Leningrad was disrupted. Some of the Turkologists died during the war. Among the post-war activities of the Cabinet, only T. P. Cherman's dissertation on the 1945 agrarian reform in Turkey, defended in 1947, can be mentioned. Cherman also started to work on a compilation of Turkey's bibliography. After the 1950 reorganization, Novichev went to Daghestan and Tveretina to Moscow. As one Soviet Turkologist says, favorable conditions in Leningrad for renewing studies on Turkey appeared only after the 1956 reorganization when the Tiurko-Mongolian Cabinet was

²²¹ *Vostokovedy Moskv i Sankt-Peterburga*, p. 77.

²²² Sahai-Achuthan, p. 328.

²²³ Clubb, p. 382.

²²⁴ *Vostokovedy Moskv i Sankt-Peterburga*, 221. In the end of the 1950s the staff of the Leningrad Branch numbered 56, among them 3 doctors and 31 candidates. In the beginning of the 1980s the staff in Leningrad increased to 111, among them 24 doctors and 72 candidates.

created. In 1958 the following specialists were carrying on investigations on Turkey: A. N. Kononov,²²⁵ T. P. Cherman,²²⁶ A. K. Sverchevskaia, Iu. A. Petrosian,²²⁷ and A. D. Zheltiakov.²²⁸

In the Moscow IVAN, with the 1950 reorganization the Sector of Turkey and Arab Countries was created under the head of V. A. Gordlevskii. As Vucinich says, the research on Turkey and the Arab countries was assigned to a single sector because of a shortage of Middle East experts, especially economists.²²⁹

For several years following the reorganization of IVAN, academic production declined. This slack was caused partly because difficulties in transferring library funds from Leningrad to Moscow.²³⁰ According to Eran, the relative inactivity of the reorganized IVAN could also be attributed to the change in the Kremlin's strategy toward the East. Disillusionment with the forces of nationalism in Asia had led Stalin to abandon a short-lived propitious stand toward "national bourgeoisie" in the Eastern countries and reenter the pre-war dogma requiring a Communist leadership in the national liberation movement. "Since Soviet opportunities in Asia had not expanded . . . the reorganized IVAN was left practically unemployed."²³¹

²²⁵ Kononov concentrated mainly on Tiurkological linguistic issues and produced several works about some peculiarities of the Turkish grammar. He also headed the work on describing and studying Turkic manuscripts. As a result, an annotated catalogue of Turkic-languages manuscripts related to the history of the peoples of the USSR, Arabic countries, Iran, and Turkey was prepared: L. V. Dmitrieva, A. M. Muginov, S. N. Muratov, *Opisanie tiurkskikh rukopisei Instituta narodov Azii, t. I, Istoriiia* [Description of Turkic Manuscripts of the Institute of Peoples of Asia. Vol. 1, History] (Moscow, 1965).

²²⁶ Cherman in common with A. K. Sverchevskaia prepared two bibliographical studies on Turkey: A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)* (Moscow, 1959); the same authors, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)* (Moscow, 1961).

²²⁷ Petrosian completed in 1956 his dissertation on the Young Ottomans: Iu. A. Petrosian, "*Novye osmany*" i bor'ba za konstitutsiiu 1876 g. v Turtsii ["Young Ottomans" and the Struggle for the 1876 Constitution in Turkey] (Moscow, 1958). After this, Petrosian in common with Tveretinova prepared for publication an unique Turkish manuscript representing the most complete historical account about the Ottoman state until 1520: Khusein, *Bada'i ul-veka'i*, Vol. I-II (Moscow, 1961).

²²⁸ Zheltiakov prepared with Petrosian a book on history of education in Turkey: A. D. Zheltiakov, Iu. A. Petrosian, *Istoriiia prosveshcheniia v Turtsii (konets XVIII – nachalo XX veka)* [History of Education in Turkey (the End of the 18th Century – the Beginning of the 20th Century)] (Moscow, 1965).

²²⁹ Vucinich, p. 179.

²³⁰ Remnek, pp. 106-107 (Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 329).

²³¹ Eran, p. 58 (Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 329).

However, this situation did not last long. The decisions of the 19th Communist Party Congress of October 1952 led to new measures to improve IVAN's work. Early in 1953, the Institute received a program of revised work tasks, among which were the following: the production of general works "unmasking the colonial policy of imperialism" and of "scientific-popular" literature portraying the liberation struggles of colonial peoples and the successes of Asian people's democracies, the elucidation of the crisis in the colonial system, and a struggle against "lying falsifications of bourgeois Orientalists." One item called, significantly, for enlisting the cooperation of the various Soviet Republics in the preparation of cadres of Orientalists.²³²

According to Vucinich, the result of new program was a "series of hastily compiled works cloaked in Marxist-Leninist garb, which had as their purpose the promotion of Soviet state interests."²³³

In 1953, after Stalin's death, the Institute was given a new organization. This time it was divided into only three regional divisions: the Far East, the Near and Middle East,²³⁴ and India and the Countries of South East Asia. As Sahai-Achuthan argues, this move was apparently aimed at tightening the structure and functioning of IVAN.²³⁵

According to Wheeler, in the early 1950s, events in the Middle East began to work in the Soviet's favor and a new and positive policy in that region became necessary on the Soviet part in order to exploit the situation.²³⁶ The new positive tendency in Soviet policy caused by the

²³² Clubb, p. 382.

²³³ Vucinich, p. 180.

²³⁴ I. S. Braginskii was appointed as the head instead of Gordlevskii who was 77-year-old at that time. According to Sahai-Achuthan, Braginskii was a politically oriented scholar who was among vocal critics of the Leningrad IVAN non-political stand.

²³⁵ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 341.

²³⁶ Wheeler, p. 300. Wheeler listed these events as follows: "British influence suffered a severe setback in Persia; Anglo-American differences became more pronounced; Western insistence on defence began to alienate the Arab

opportunities in Near and Middle Eastern affairs immediately found its expression in the change in Soviet stance toward Turkey. The first Soviet attempt to establish friendly relations with Turkey was made as early as May 1953, that is, shortly after Stalin's death. On May 30, 1953 the Soviet government assured Turkey that it had no territorial pretensions to Turkey and had reconsidered its previous stand about the Straits. However, the Turkish government made a cold response to this move and Soviet-Turkish relations remained be unimproved until the mid-1960s. Nevertheless, throughout this interval the Soviets kept making attempts to improve their relations with Turkey.²³⁷

Meanwhile, the Soviet state began to pay increased attention to Near and Middle Eastern studies and Turkological studies within this context. The year 1954 brought a significant advance in this respect. Apart from the Department of the Near and Middle East at IVAN in Moscow, two Oriental centers focused exclusively on the Near East were created in 1954 in two Caucasian republics: the Department of History of the Countries of the Foreign East in the Institute of History of Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences and the Group on Studying the History and Economics of the Countries of the Near and Middle East at the Institution of History of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. The Department in Azerbaijan dealt exclusively with Iran and Turkey, as its task was formulated as studying the actual problems of the history of these two countries.²³⁸ The Group in Armenia was devoted to studying the history and economics of Iran, Turkey and the Arab countries.²³⁹

1955 marked a decisive shift in Soviet policies toward the Third World. According to Wheeler, it is probable that even before Stalin's death the Soviet leadership had realized that

states more and more; finally, in the middle of 1954, British forces began their withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone.”

²³⁷ *SSSR i Turtsiia*, pp. 195-196.

²³⁸ *Vostokovednye tsentry*, p. 10.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

“between the two poles of imperialism and anti-imperialism there was a pacifist neutral zone which was neither capitalist nor socialist and which was ideally suited for Soviet manoeuvre and eventual appropriation.” Official visits to India, Burma, and the Middle East in 1955 were the first signs that an epoch-making decision had been taken in the Kremlin.²⁴⁰

This change immediately found its expression in the development of Oriental studies. Shortly after the Bandung Conference (April 1955) in which the representatives of twenty-nine Asian and African countries met, the authoritative Soviet journal *Kommunist* asserted that the growing importance of Asian and African countries demanded the expansion of Oriental studies. The article emphasized that it was especially important to study the crisis of colonialism in its various aspects, and to portray the nature and motivating forces of contemporary Asian revolutions. More study was needed, it said, of Southeast Asia and Africa especially.²⁴¹

Meanwhile, the Soviet stand toward the “national bourgeoisie” experienced a fundamental change. Through an article in *Kommunist* (May, 1955), historians were told that they had made mistakes in denying a progressive role to the national bourgeoisie, in exaggerating the role of the working class in anti-imperialist movements. The national bourgeoisie came to be looked upon as an ally of the workers because its struggle against imperialism coincided with popular aspirations. The focus was thus shifted from the internal class struggle to the united “anti-imperialist struggle.” Soviet historians were asked to do a more meticulous investigation of national liberation movements. In regard to the Middle East, the specialists were expected to discredit Western historiography on that region, to hold the Western powers primarily responsible for the backwardness of the Middle Eastern countries, and to show that the Soviet Union, unlike

²⁴⁰ Wheeler, p. 300.

²⁴¹ Clubb, pp. 382-383.

the Western powers, was the genuine friend of the Middle Eastern peoples, always ready to aid them in their struggle for national independence.²⁴²

In August 1955, the Institute of Oriental Studies was reorganized once more, this time into twelve sectors, combining the geographical and subject divisions. One section was devoted to Middle Eastern studies.²⁴³ In 1955, a regular journal of Soviet Oriental studies *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* [Soviet Orientology] appeared.²⁴⁴

The 20th Communist Party Congress, held in February 1956, confirmed the new Soviet policy toward the Third World. At the Congress, Khrushchev enunciated the “zone of peace” concept of alliance with the emerging Afro-Asian non-aligned nations and denounced the theses adopted at the 6th Congress of Comintern on the role of the national bourgeoisie.²⁴⁵ According to Wheeler, the Soviet leadership had decided by that time that the countries of the Third World could be brought most conveniently under Soviet influence not by internal subversion organized among the ruling class and among the proletariat where it existed, or by resorting to armed force, but by courting the favour of the “national bourgeoisie,” whom they at last recognized as the real rulers of these countries. At the same time, the local Communist parties, so long the outposts of Soviet influence, were now to play a different role: they were no longer to plague the national bourgeoisie with threats to its vested interests, but were to join with all other parties supposed to be fighting for nationalism against Western imperialism.²⁴⁶

²⁴² Vucinich, pp. 180-181.

²⁴³ Ibid., p. 181.

²⁴⁴ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 329. The journal of the same name was published earlier in Leningrad, but appeared irregularly. The first issue appeared in 1940 and the second in 1941. The journal was suspended after the German invasion. By 1947, four numbers had appeared. Between 1959 and 1961, the journal was called *Problemy vostokovedeniia* [Problems of Orientology] and in 1961 it got its present name *Narody Azii i Afriki* [Peoples of Asia and Africa]. In 1957, *Sovremennyi Vostok* [Contemporary East] was also started which in 1961 got its present name *Aziia i Afrika segodniia* [Asia and Africa Today].

²⁴⁵ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 331.

²⁴⁶ Wheeler, p. 300.

Soviet publications of the period reflected the massive shift from hostility to friendship toward Asian “bourgeois nationalism.” An article in *Kommunist* in December 1956 explained that some Soviet Orientalists in the past had assumed mistakenly that the winning of political independence by Asian countries actually still left them in colonial status; this was erroneous and represented an under-estimation of the potential of Asian national revolutions. The winning of political independence was in fact the starting point for a continuation of the anti-imperialist struggle in the economic sphere.²⁴⁷

Meanwhile, the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow came under the fire of heavy criticism. In his speech to the 20th Congress, Mikoian remarked that “while all of the East has been awakened, IVAN was still asleep.” IVAN was criticized particularly for “its overemphasis of some areas and underemphasis of others regardless of current policy priorities and requirements.”²⁴⁸ Many works published by IVAN were said to be of inferior quality, to lack originality, and to contain mistaken interpretations of the national liberation movement and the role of the bourgeoisie. The Institute was asked to improve its staff and to publish more and faster.²⁴⁹

To meet the criticism, the Institute drafted a five-year plan (1956-60) for studies based on the Eastern policy of the government. The plan stressed contemporary social, economic, and political problems, called for the publication of a long list of historical, literary, linguistic, economic, and other studies, as well as for the publication of manuscripts and documents on the Oriental world. The Institute also planned to stimulate study on the impact of the October Revolution on Asian countries and to assess the effect on these countries of Soviet economic aid.

²⁴⁷ Clubb, p. 383.

²⁴⁸ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 331.

²⁴⁹ Vucinich, p. 182.

In September 1956, the Institute of Oriental Studies was reorganized again into six departments subdivided into sectors. The establishment of special departments for the Arab East and for Africa were significant innovations. According to Sahai-Achuthan, the 1956 reorganization of IVAN points to the importance attached to Africa and India as the leaders of the nonaligned bloc of Afro-Asian nations by the new Soviet leadership.²⁵⁰ The department of the Near and Middle East was made up of three sectors, Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan. But despite all the changes and the greatly expanded research and publications, the official criticism of the Institute continued. The complaints remained the same: insufficient publications, mistaken interpretations, and inadequate criticism of bourgeois historiography. The Institute was ordered to do better and to coordinate its work with other research centers.²⁵¹

1956 was a prolific year in regard to Oriental studies. The following institutions were established in this year: The Institute of the Eastern Languages at Moscow University, which offered instruction in the modern languages, as well as interdisciplinary training in area programs,²⁵² The Institute of Sinology²⁵³ and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO) in the Academy of Sciences that dealt exclusively with contemporary problems, one of its sections being concerned with “liberated and dependent countries.”²⁵⁴

The centralization and intensification of Oriental studies in Moscow was accompanied by the dispersal of Soviet Oriental studies toward the border Soviet areas contiguous to the Eastern

²⁵⁰ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 331.

²⁵¹ Vucinich, pp. 182-183.

²⁵² Walkenier, p. 644. The Institute was established by merging Oriental departments in Historical and Philological faculties and consisted of historicophilological and special faculties with the following sub-faculties: Arabic Philology, Tiurkological Philology (headed by V. M. Nasilov), Chinese Philology, Indian Philology, Iranian Philology, Languages and Literatures of the Southeast Asia, Languages and Literatures of the Far East, History of China, History of the Countries of the Far East and Southeast Asia, History of India, History of the Countries of the Near and Middle East (headed by N. A. Smirnov, the director of the institute), Economics and Economic Geography of the Countries of the Foreign East. The Institute was renamed as the Institute of Asian and African Countries (ISAA) in 1972 (www.iaas.msu.ru).

²⁵³ Clubb, p. 383.

²⁵⁴ Walkenier, p. 644.

countries. Since the mid-1950s a significant advance became observable in Oriental studies conducted by the Soviet republics and provinces in Central Asia, Caucasia and the Far East. These developments had significant political implications as well. IVAN Director Gafurov remarked in 1957 about these developments that “the Soviet Republics of Central Asia and Transcaspia have become the real lighthouse of Communism in the East.”²⁵⁵ According to Clubb, Oriental studies in Tashkent (the capital of the Uzbek SSR) became especially important in this political context, for the Orientalists there were themselves mostly Asians related, often enough, to the minorities in the neighboring Middle Eastern countries. As Clubb says, “Tashkent became a cultural center where Asians see the Soviet Union in its Asian guise.”²⁵⁶

The First All-Union Conference of Orientalists was held in Tashkent in June 1957, with 250 Orientalists participating from the republics of the Soviet Union along with guest scholars from China, Mongolia, Korea, and Vietnam.²⁵⁷ As Clubb says, the Conference had a “distinctly political Asian atmosphere.”²⁵⁸

The close affiliation of Oriental studies with Soviet foreign policy affairs also found vivid expression in the fact that the Soviet state employed Orientalists as diplomats in the Eastern countries. As one Western scholar remarked in 1958, “the chief Soviet diplomats in Asia generally are trained and experienced men, and their missions are strongly staffed with officers who both know the country and its people and speak the language fluently.” This scholar

²⁵⁵ Clubb, p. 387. Clubb notes that Gafurov’s remark recalls Stalin’s observation of 1923: “Turkestan is the most important Soviet Republic from the standpoint of revolutionizing the East . . . The task is to transform Turkestan into a model republic, into an advanced post for revolutionizing the East.”

²⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 387.

²⁵⁷ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 330.

²⁵⁸ Clubb, p. 387.

distinguished the Middle East in particular, saying that “outstanding Soviet experts head some of the USSR’s key diplomatic missions – in Cairo, Damascus, Teheran, and Ankara.”²⁵⁹

Another development which had a political and ideological background was the entrance of Soviet Oriental studies for the first time to the international arena in the 1950s and the establishment of relations with international scholarship. During the 1950s Soviet scholars participated in a range of international conferences.²⁶⁰ While Soviet authors justified this development by “the necessity of broadening scholarly ties with progressive Orientalists of other countries,”²⁶¹ Western scholars commented on this move as the Soviets’ effort to put their weight on international Orientology and impose their superiority in Oriental studies.²⁶²

During the 1950s the number of Soviet Orientalists increased sharply. According to Sahai-Achuthan, in the regional division, specialists on China and India were at the top.²⁶³ As for Turkological studies, it can be stated that in the context of overall growth in Oriental studies during the 1950s they obtained a still more advanced character and, for the most part, this advance occurred in the Caucasian republics. Oriental activities became centralized in the late 1950s in three Caucasian republics and the following centers appeared on the base of merging various Oriental groups and institutions: The Institute of the Near and Middle East in the

²⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 389.

²⁶⁰ Soviet scholars participated in the International Congress of Orientalists, for the first time, at the 1954 meeting in Cambridge. This was followed by participation in a gathering of East Asian specialists in Leipzig in 1955. In 1956 Soviet, Mongolian and Chinese Mongolists met at Ulan Bator, capital of the Mongolian People’s Republic, to arrange for preparation of a basic Marxist history of the Mongolian people. Soviet scholars participated at the International Conference of Young Sinologues at Marburg in 1957. In the 24th Congress of Orientalists convened at Munich in 1957, a 20-man Soviet delegation was present. In October 1957, Orientalist from the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia convened in Warsaw to consider the problems of study of Arabic, Iranian, Turkish and other Eastern sources for the purpose of clarification of the history of Eastern and Central Europe (Clubb, p. 386).

²⁶¹ Quoted from *Kommunist* (December 1956) (Clubb, p. 386).

²⁶² Wheeler wrote: “It seems probable that the Soviet Union intends to make a bid for leadership in the international field of Oriental scholarship and therefore considers it necessary to examine the merits and defects of the achievements of other competitors” (G. Wheeler’s entitled review in *Soviet Studies*, 7, no. 3 (January, 1956), pp. 296-298).

²⁶³ Sahai-Achuthan, pp. 330-331.

Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences and the Sector of Orientalist Studies in the Armenian Academy of Sciences in 1958²⁶⁴ and The Institute of Oriental Studies in the Georgian Academy of Sciences in 1960.²⁶⁵

The Institute in Azerbaijan was divided into four departments: Arab countries, Iran, Turkey, and Textual Studies and the Publication of Sources.²⁶⁶ The Sector in Armenia consisted in the beginning of three groups: Arab countries, Iran, and Turkey. In 1959 the Group of Kurdology was added.²⁶⁷ As for the Institute in Georgia, information about its structure at the time of its establishment was not available, however, in view of the fact that in the following period Tiurkological and Near Eastern divisions existed in this institute, it can be estimated that Turkological studies have been conducted there from the beginning.

In 1961, the Institute of Oriental Studies²⁶⁸ in Moscow was restructured yet again. Combining information provided by Vucinich and Sahai-Achuthan, it can be concluded that the Department of the Near and Middle East was reorganized by excluding Pakistan (which was placed with India) and subdivided into two sectors: economy and contemporary problems, and history. The Leningrad Branch was also reorganized into three sectors, one of which was in charge of research on the Near and Middle East. This reorganization introduced research groups involved with specific problems, the first group being formed to investigate workers' movements.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁴ *Vostokovednye tsenry*, pp. 10, 50.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

²⁶⁶ Clubb, p. 387.

²⁶⁷ *Vostokovednye tsenry*, p. 51.

²⁶⁸ In 1960 the name of the Institute of Oriental Studies was changed to the Institute of the Peoples of Asia, as a special Institute of Africa was established in 1959. IVAN retained its new name until 1970, when its earlier name was restored.

²⁶⁹ Vucinich, p. 184.

It seems that the 1961 reorganization was the last ripple in the great wave of restructuring initiated in 1950. Soviet as well as Western sources do not indicate in the period following the early 1960s another serious attempt for reorganization.

In summary, by the early 1960s, Soviet Oriental studies settled their final form and from that time on proceeded within a centralized and firmly established structure with the primary center in Moscow and some other centers in the peripheries, mainly in those that were contiguous to the Eastern countries. Investigations began to be conducted in a broad, many-sided and planned manner and became focused mainly on problems of contemporary political, economic and social development.

On evaluating Turkological studies within the context of the restructuring during the 1950s, it can be stated that they were greatly and positively affected by these developments. Along with a department in the Moscow IVAN, several other institutions dealing exclusively with Near Eastern affairs were established in which Turkology obtained the opportunity to develop. Based on bibliographical data it can be asserted that the output of work on Turkey has increased greatly since the early 1950s. The Soviet leadership's and, consequently, scholarship's interest in the detailed studying of the peculiarities of contemporary socioeconomic and political development of the Eastern countries found their immediate reflection in Turkological studies. The first serious works on Turkey's contemporary realities appeared as early as in the mid-1950s (see Appendix K). The appearance of two bibliographical reference books on Turkey in 1959 and 1961 were significant events as well, indicating the good state of Turkological studies (See Bibliographical Information about Soviet Turkology). In general, it can be asserted that for Turkology, a quick response to the state's demands and to the major trends of research was characteristic, which can be supposed to be conditioned, on the one hand, by the state's constant interest in developing Near Eastern studies and by the well-developed state of Turkology, on the other. The fact that

Turkey occupied a particular place among developing countries and, consequently, in the Soviet analysis can be considered as another important factor that contributed to such a state of affairs (the last moment will be considered in detail in Chapter III).

The Period of the “Organized Growth” of the Late Soviet Era

Judging from the available information, Soviet Oriental studies did not experience any abrupt structural reorganization during this period and developed within the established structure, which underwent from time to time some additional improvements. What is to be stressed about this period is that it was distinguished by growing sophistication in the Orientalist analysis. This trend started with a series of important theoretical debates that took place in the second half of the 1960s. They are worth considering here at some length, for they form the necessary ground for the second chapter of this thesis.

It should be indicated at first that after Khrushchev’s ouster in 1964, the new Soviet leadership began to show more cautious style in its policies toward the Third World and, as Sahai-Achuthan argues, this in turn conditioned the Soviet academic analysis. Soviet scholars began to conduct a fresh inquiry, testing the efficacy of such theoretical formulations as the “national liberation movement,” and the “non-capitalist path of development.” Most scholars agreed that the “revolutionary democrats” failed to bring about radical transformations and the non-capitalist path was not easy, at the same time the role of the national bourgeoisie was also reassessed.²⁷⁰

Based on Walkenier’s notes, it can be asserted that at the same time practical questions of economic development came to predominate over the earlier preoccupation with social classes

²⁷⁰ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 333.

and their political role. Walkenier evidenced this by referring to the organization of the section on newly independent states in the Institute of World Economy, which was divided into five groups dealing with socioeconomic problems, industrialization, agriculture, foreign economic relations, planning and no longer included such divisions as on the worker-peasant alliance or the role of the national bourgeoisie. Moreover, Walkenier said that a similar trend was observed in the refurbished teaching of modern Asian and African history, a compulsory course for all university graduates in history. The new syllabus was worked out as a result of public discussion initiated by *Narody Azii i Afriki* (Peoples of Asia and Africa) in June 1965 and was arranged by countries and not by problems, i. e. it was concerned more with the historical development of Asia and Africa than with “the influence of the October Revolution on the oppressed nations of the East.”²⁷¹

Theoretical debates of the mid-1960s occurred mainly within the framework of several conferences held under the auspices of the institutes and their journals. The first conference on socialism, capitalism, and the underdeveloped countries²⁷² was organized in early 1964 by the editorial board of *Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia* [World Economy and International Relations], the monthly journal of the Institute of World Economy. Since then other conferences, notably those on industrialization and on the food problem in the developing countries have indicated manifest departures from traditional interpretations.²⁷³

²⁷¹ Valkenier, p. 645. As Valkenier conveys, Professor G. V. Efimov of Leningrad University, under whose guidance the revised syllabus was prepared, advocated in the public discussion that teachers occupy themselves more with facts and scientific objectivity than with sweeping generalizations, as only a thorough knowledge of events would lead to an understanding of key problems.

²⁷² An abridged translation of materials of this conference was published as a special issue of the *Mizan Newsletter*, 6 (November 1964). *Mizan Newsletter*, the periodical of the Central Asian Research Centre in London, was published between 1959 and 1970 and reviewed the development of Soviet and Chinese relations with Asian and African countries. It also surveyed social, political and cultural developments in Soviet Central Asia.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 646. Valkenier notes that a new spirit was present in Soviet academic polemics which differed markedly from earlier exchanges that did not go beyond vague references to “mistaken views” held by “some authors.” As Valkenier puts it, “now there is outspoken, detailed criticism of attempts to impose preconceived patterns; individual

It will be useful to give a concise outline here of some shifts in theoretical level that occurred as a result of the debates.

To begin with the question of industrialization, until the 1960s Soviet economists tended to stress the fundamental differences between capitalist and socialist industrialization. In general, the former was pictured as based on light and processing industries and aimed at keeping the new countries economically dependent, while the latter was said to involve heavy industry and aimed at economic liberation from the West. The conference on industrialization, convened in 1967 by the Institute of World Economy, indicated a significant departure from the traditional view. At the conference, industrialization was discussed primarily as a factor in economic growth and not as a means of economic liberation. There was a dispassionate consideration of different growth models, the classical English and the American and German experiences, in addition to the Soviet pattern. There were suggestions that the developments of countries like Turkey, Brazil, and Pakistan be studied thoroughly for still other models. In other words, it was implicitly acknowledged that there were also non-socialist methods of development.²⁷⁴

In another departure, the conference stressed what was economically feasible rather than what was politically desirable. Creating an infrastructure and fostering light industry were no longer viewed as abandoning the goal of industrial expansion, but as essential steps in a complex process. Regional cooperation and integration were advocated in preference to autarkic development. Many economists opposed the policy of creating import-replacing industries on grounds of economic inefficiency. A highly critical assessment of the economic progress achieved thus far was made and various problems were indicated such as inflationary trends, slow rates of growth, low productivity and others. One economist even questioned whether it had been

writers are taken to task for specific opinions, and erroneous assertions are confronted with facts, regardless of what the official policies may happen to be" (Valkenier, p. 646).

²⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 648.

right to regard industrialization as the key to development.²⁷⁵ Many economists drew attention to the importance of agriculture. Since then a trend appeared away from the earlier conviction that in order to modernize and develop a nation must favor industry while ignoring agriculture.²⁷⁶

Until the 1960s the search for revolutionary potentials and radical solutions tended to predominate in the Soviet analysis of the agrarian situation in the developing countries. Agrarian specialists stressed the inadequacy of partial measures and argued that the needs of the masses, as well as many other problems, would be best taken care of by a general distribution to landless peasants and those with medium-size holdings. In contrast to this view, a 1964 conference on the agrarian problem agreed that the partial reforms had benefited the peasants. Moreover, there was even discussion of the need to alter the classic Marxist-Leninist position on the land question in the East so as to permit the gradual limitation of capitalist relations in preparing the ground for a socialist transformation of the countryside. After the conference, Valkenier says, many books appeared giving detailed descriptions of land reforms in various countries without reference to the ideal, Marxist solution.²⁷⁷

Farm productivity and the role of agriculture in the overall process of economic development also came under discussion. At a conference on the food problem in the developing countries, held by IVAN in June 1966, specialists cautioned against the hasty introduction of anti-capitalist measures. Cooperatives and state farms were advised to set up only when adequate machinery and trained personnel were available to assure their success. As this was not yet possible in most new states, the emphasis was to be on increasing output on individual peasant

²⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 648-649.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 651.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 649.

farms. It is notable, Valkenier argues, that favoring the small producer was justified in economic and not in political terms.²⁷⁸

In regard to planning a less rigorous approach emerged. While in 1965 it was held that the goal of planning should be to broaden the public sector because only state ownership assured effective organization and management and that the presence of private local and foreign capital created the most serious obstacles to planning, since then even the cases in which the aim of planning was to aid the private sector have become accepted as positive factors in development. A serious interest in mixed economy appeared. At the 1967 conference on industrialization it was argued that the existence of a mixed economy in the new states must be accepted and such planning devised as would control and utilize the private sector. Besides, Soviet specialists became more concerned with the economic results than with the extent of state interference.²⁷⁹

Another significant novelty was that approach to the West's economic presence in developing countries showed changes. Many specialist were no longer exclusively concerned with the negative aspects of this presence. The problem was no longer how the liberated countries should act about liquidating all dependence on the West, but rather how they can best take advantage of the relationship. At the conference on the role of private investment in former colonies, held by IVAN in 1964, though insisting in the traditional manner that the West exported capital in order to fight the national liberation movement, not to foster economic development, it was admitted that, at this stage, the complete elimination of foreign capital from developing countries would be harmful to their economic development.²⁸⁰

Work on social structure had also moved away from the mechanical application of conventional Marxist generalizations. The trend was away from the assignment of definite

²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 650.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 651-652.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 653.

political behavior to “peasants,” “workers,” and “national” and “compradore” bourgeoisie and toward detailed studies of the actual social composition of a country. Books in which the unique and the novel aspects of class formation in the third world were investigated appeared.²⁸¹

As Valkenier herself concludes, since the mid-1960s the developing countries came to be studied by Soviet scholars within the context of their own specific requirements and possibilities than according to preconceived dogmatic theories. While some conservative scholars continue to recognize the possibility of only two political systems and treat the developing countries as in the process of transition from precapitalist forms to socialist ones, rather numerous others tend to regard developments in the Third World not as emanations of either capitalism or socialism, but as peculiar local mixtures of their own.²⁸²

In the 1970s, Soviet Orientalists’ interest in elaborating theoretical issues took an institutional shape with the introduction of so-called “functional” departments (in addition to the regional ones) to the structure of IVAN. According to Sahai-Achuthan, these departments were highly innovative in a theoretical sense.²⁸³ In 1971 the Department on General Problems of the Sociopolitical Development of Asian and North African Countries was created, which turned with time into one of the leading departments with numerous staff and many branches. The following sectors existed within the Department: Social Problems, Political Problems, Methodological Problems, Ideology, Ethnonational Problems, Workers’ and Communist Movements, and Agrarian and Peasantry Problems. A group studying the Eastern armies also existed. The Department produced series of important collective works dealing with the general

²⁸¹ Ibid., p. 656.

²⁸² Ibid., p. 659.

²⁸³ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 334.

theoretical problems of the Eastern world (see Appendix B).²⁸⁴ Along with the Department on General Problems, there was a Department on Problems of International Relations.²⁸⁵

According to Eran, during the Brezhnev era, IVAN, in addition to policy research, also undertook work in non-political scholarly fields and to this extent “regained some of its historical character.”²⁸⁶ In 1983, IVAN had 28 departments and over 300 researchers. It had also 110 postgraduate students, ninety percent of whom were from Central Asian republics.²⁸⁷ Considerable research was conducted also by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), which focused its research on specific issues and problems unlike IVAN where the focus was on regional specialization; IMEMO also took the lead in adopting innovative methodology and formulating somewhat controversial theoretical concepts.²⁸⁸ In general, concerning the Third World, discussions became much freer and more sophisticated.²⁸⁹

To give an overall picture of Oriental studies in the late Soviet era, they were conducted not only under the auspices of IVAN, but in number of other institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, in special government and party institutes and agencies, and in several Academies of Sciences of Soviet Republics. Besides these, several institutions of higher learning offer courses on the Eastern peoples, sponsor conferences, and publish the research efforts of their staffs. The best programs on the Middle East were to be found in the universities of Baku, Erivan, Leningrad, Moscow, Tashkent, and Tbilisi. The largest and the most prestigious of these centers were the

²⁸⁴ *Vostokovedy Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga*, p. 6.

²⁸⁵ *Vostokovedy Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga*, p. 12.

²⁸⁶ Eran, p. 234 (Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 335).

²⁸⁷ Halliday, p. 20.

²⁸⁸ Sahai-Achuthan, p. 336.

²⁸⁹ Jerry Hough, “The Evolution of the Soviet World View,” *World Politics*, (July, 1980), pp. 528-529 (Quoted from Sahai-Achuthan, p. 337).

Institute of Oriental Languages at Moscow State University and the Oriental Faculty at Leningrad State University.²⁹⁰

It is interesting to cite here Halliday's observation about Soviet Orientalists' conditions in the early 1980s, for it indicates clearly the importance attached by the Soviet state to Oriental studies in relation to its concerns with foreign policy-making. As Halliday says, "they [advisory institutions among which Halliday considers also Orientalist institutions] appear to be well-funded, with hundreds of researchers in the larger centers, access to foreign materials, some latitude in off-the-record discussion, and permission for members to travel abroad."²⁹¹

As for Turkological studies, some short remarks should be made first about the peculiarities of Soviet-Turkish relations during the period under consideration. From 1964 on, a period of diplomatic thaw developed between Turkey and the Soviet Union that lasted until about 1980. The Soviet economic aid program to Turkey, beginning in 1963, grew rapidly and soon made Turkey one of the world's major recipients of Soviet aid. The Soviet-Turkish link was reinforced also in connection with the Cyprus crisis in 1974.²⁹² From the mid-1960s, scholarly relations between the Soviet Union and Turkey were reestablished and during the 1970s four two-year programs of cultural and scholarly exchange were agreed upon and realized.²⁹³ It can be supposed that these factors affected Soviet Turkological studies positively, in particular, by creating more opportunities for access to the Turkish sources.

During the 1970s and the 1980s, Turkological studies at IVAN were conducted by the Turkish Sector of the Department of the Near and Middle East as well as some other departments

²⁹⁰ Vucinich, pp. 184-185.

²⁹¹ Halliday, p. 20.

²⁹² For more information see: Aaron S. Klieman, *Soviet Russia and the Middle East* (Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970); Olav Fagelund Knudsen, "Did Accommodation Work? Two Soviet Neighbors 1964-88," *Journal of Peace Research*, 29, no. 1 (February, 1992), pp. 53-69.

²⁹³ *SSSR i Turtsiia*, p. 278.

dealing with general problems.²⁹⁴ Turkological studies continued also in Caucasian republics and started to be conducted again in Ukraine. Since the mid-1960s Oriental studies in Ukraine made progress, as a center on Near and Middle Eastern studies was established there. Perhaps, it will be correct to evaluate this advance within the context of Soviet-Turkish rapprochement and to suppose that it was related to some degree to the renewal of relations with Turkey. The Department of History of the Countries of the Near and Middle East was established at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of Ukrainian SSR in 1964.²⁹⁵ In regard to the history of Turkey, the main subjects of investigation were Ukrain-Ottoman and Russian-Ottoman relations as well as the Balkan question.²⁹⁶ In 1970, the department was renamed as the Department of History of the Countries of the Foreign East and became concentrated on work over the following subjects: “The participation of Ukraine in the Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations of the USSR with Foreign Countries of the East,” “The Development of Oriental Studies in Ukraine,” “Development of Liberated Countries and the Strengthening of Their Cooperation with Socialist Countries.” In 1978 the department was reorganized as the Institute of Social and Economic Problems of Foreign Countries. Afterwards, the Institute focused its investigation mainly on two issues: “Socioeconomic Changes in Developing Countries under the Conditions of the Struggle against Neo-Colonialism” and “Laws and Peculiarities of the Contemporary Stage of Socioeconomic and Political Development of Liberated Countries (the Region of the Near and Middle East).”²⁹⁷

During the late Soviet era, three Caucasian republics obtained their respective fields of specialization in Oriental studies. While all of them focused in geographical terms on Caucasia

²⁹⁴ *Vostokovedy Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga*, p. 44.

²⁹⁵ *Vostokovednye tsentry*, p. 102.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

and the Near and Middle East as contiguous to the Caucasia area and conducted investigations on a broad range of issues, Azerbaijan Orientalology became especially advanced in philological and textual studies, on the publication of manuscripts and on Islamic studies. As for Turkological studies in Azerbaijan, especially the problems of modern and recent history, economics, sociopolitical development, ideology, education and literature were investigated (see Appendix F). In 1988, the Institute consisted of the following departments: History of Medieval East, History of Iran, History of Turkey, History of Arabian Countries, Economics, Iranian Philology, Turkish Philology, Arabic Philology, Ideological Problems, and Studying and Publishing Eastern Manuscripts.²⁹⁸

Georgian Oriental studies, similar to those conducted in Azerbaijan, became particularly advanced in philological and especially linguistic studies. This specialization found its expression also in the fact that the history of the countries of the Near and Middle East and their relations with Transcaucasia were investigated in close relation to philological studies and the textological examination of primary sources. In regard to Turkey especially the Turkish language, problems of medieval and modern history and some subjects in recent history (in particular, agrarian development) were elaborated (see Appendix H). In 1988 the Institute consisted of the following departments: Languages of the Ancient East, Semitology, Tiurkology, Persian Philology, Indo-Iranian Languages, Byzantology, Medieval History of the Countries of the Near East, Modern and Recent History of the Countries of the Near East, Information, Laboratory of General Phonetics and Typology of the Eastern Languages.²⁹⁹

As for Armenian Oriental studies, while conducting investigations in the range of fields (history, economics, philology, ethnography, and others) and became specialized in Kurdology,

²⁹⁸ *Vostokovednye tsentry*, p. 10.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

in regard to Turkology it became especially advanced in historical research. In particular, the medieval and modern history of the Ottoman Empire, the history of the Republic of Turkey, the national question, and the domestic politics of the Turkish ruling classes were elaborated (see Appendix D). In 1971 the sector was reorganized as the Institute of Oriental Studies. After the reorganization three new departments were added: the Ancient East (1971), Caucasian and Byzantine Studies (1978), and Eastern Sources (1983).³⁰⁰

In conclusion, Turkology benefited from the organized growth of Soviet Oriental studies during the late Soviet era. Turkological studies became firmly established within the framework of Near and Middle Eastern studies and started to be conducted on a large scale not only in the centers such as Moscow and Leningrad but also in peripheries of the Soviet state, contiguous to Turkey (the Caucasian republics and Ukraine).

³⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 51-52. As Soviet authors argue, the dispersed character of the Armenian people and the existence of Armenian diaspora in many Eastern countries give an important peculiarity to Armenian Oriental studies as Armenian diasporas have access to first-hand materials about those countries they inhabit. At different times in Egypt, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, and other countries numerous Armenian newspapers, journals, annuals and other literature were published or are still being published (it is said that the overall number of Armenian periodicals throughout the world is about three thousand). As a result, Armenian scholarship has at its disposal an enormous amount of sources for Oriental studies (*Vostokovednye tsenry*, pp. 49-50). It is interesting to describe here the Soviet view of Armenian history as well. Explaining reasons for the dispersed location of Armenian scholarly centers, Soviet authors say that “Natural course of Armenia’s spiritual culture was many times violently interrupted by devastating invasions of foreigners and especially since the establishment of the cruel Ottoman yoke. The atmosphere created and hard life conditions forced the best Armenian minds to leave the country in search of more favourable conditions for their activities.” It is stated that “Especially favourable conditions for the development of Armenian scholarship were created when Eastern Armenia joined Russia in the beginning of the 19th century. Due to this event a considerable part of Armenian population was rescued from Turkish and Persian yoke and entered all-Russian democratic-cultural sphere” (*Vostokovednye tsenry*, p. 48). It is interesting also to note here that V. V. Barthold had highly appreciated the contribution of Armenian and Georgian scholars to Russian Orientalology of the pre-revolutionary era, saying that “Russian scholarship owes scholars of Armenian and Georgian origins the dissemination in Russia scientific views worked out by Armenian and Georgian circles as well as the later correction of these views on the basis of methods of European science” (Barthold, p. 291). As for the events of 1915, it is stated by Soviet authors that “The genocide of Armenians undertaken by the Young Turks’ government in 1915 was the national tragedy that left a deep sign in the national memory and Armenian historical discipline. In particular, the Armenian intelligentsia focused its attention on the Ottoman Empire, later on Turkey, trying to go deep into the questions of domestic and among them national politics of Turkish ruling circles, to understand the double-faced politics of the great imperialistic countries, and to comprehend the catastrophe that happened” (*Vostokovednye tsenry*, p. 49).

Bibliographical Information about Soviet Turkology

Soviet publications on contemporary Turkey were compiled in two bibliographies published in 1959 and 1982.³⁰¹

The first bibliography lists 3,262 references to scholarly and popular works (books, chapters of books, journal articles, brochures, dissertations, articles from various collections and periodicals, translations of Turkish and Western European authors' works) published from 1917 to 1958. They were compiled from catalogues of V. I. Lenin State Library, Fundamental Library of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Moscow and the Library of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Leningrad. Besides that *The Bibliography of the Orient*,³⁰² *Books Annals*, *Journal Articles Annals* and *Reviews Annals* were used as the source of information. Not only works devoted especially to Turkey, but also those treating other subjects but including certain information about Turkey, were covered. It was noted by the authors that the bibliography did not pretended to absolute comprehensiveness. The references are grouped thematically as follows:

Table 3

Thematical Division of Works on Turkey by Soviet Authors (1917-1958)

| SUBJECTS | REFERENCES |
|----------|------------|
|----------|------------|

³⁰¹ A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)* (Moscow, 1959); by the same authors, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1975)* (Moscow, 1982).

³⁰² The first and sole volume was published in 1928.

| | |
|--|-----|
| V. I. Lenin about Turkey. | 86 |
| Soviet statesmen about Turkey. ³⁰³ | 58 |
| General works. | 35 |
| Physical and economic geography. | 36 |
| Population. Ethnography. | 27 |
| Travel accounts. | 37 |
| Economics. | |
| General works. | 200 |
| Agrarian question. Peasant conditions and peasant movement. | 54 |
| Industry. Handicrafts. | 45 |
| Foreign trade. | 116 |
| Finances. | 51 |
| Transport and communication. | 26 |
| Economic relations between the USSR and Turkey. | 160 |
| History. | |
| Turkey in the Middle Ages (the end of the thirteenth century – the first half of the seventeenth century). | 43 |
| Turkey in modern time (the second half of the seventeenth century – 1917) | 73 |
| Balkan peoples' conditions. National liberation movement. | 59 |

³⁰³ The works and speeches of S. M. Kirov, M. Litvinov, G. K. Ordzhanikidze, I. V. Stalin, M. V. Frunze, N. S. Khrushchev, and G. V. Chicherin are listed.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Balkan wars. | |
| The Young Turks revolution. | 28 |
| Turkey and the First World War. | 76 |
| Turkey in recent times (1917-1958). | 636 |
| The Straits (History of the question; its role in international relations). | 42 |
| Russia and Turkey. | 111 |
| Russian-Turkish Wars. General works. | 59 |
| Russian-Turkish Wars until 1768. | 15 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1768-1774. | 29 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1787-1791. | 11 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1806-1812. | 11 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1828-1829. | 7 |
| Crimean War of 1853-1856. | 49 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1877-1878. | 23 |
| The USSR and Turkey. | 169 |
| National question. | 47 |
| Worker class' conditions. Trade union movement. | 67 |
| Conditions of women, children and youth. | 23 |
| Political system. Legislation. | 24 |
| Military forces. | 66 |
| Political parties. | |
| Communist party. | 18 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Bourgeois parties. | 15 |
| Philology. | |
| Language. Writing system. | 92 |
| Grammars. Textbooks. | 23 |
| Dictionaries. Conversational books. | 18 |
| Literature. | 66 |
| Translations of Turkish writers' works. ³⁰⁴ | 239 |
| Education. Press. | 22 |
| Art. | 29 |
| Cultural and scholarly relations. | 18 |
| Reference books. Encyclopedias. Statistical collections. | 66 |
| Total. | 3,262 |

Before examining data provided by the bibliography, it should be noted at first that the appearance of a reference book on Turkey represented an important event in development of Soviet Turkology, signifying, on the one hand, that a considerable work on Turkey was done until 1958 so that the need to systematize and classify it emerged. On the other hand, this development was a sign of the Soviet state's close attention to the state of Turkological studies and its desire to comprehend the scope of achievements in this field. It is significant that the bibliography was compiled and published in the midst of busy re-organization activities in Soviet Oriental studies.

³⁰⁴ Aziz Nesin, Melih Cevdet Anday, Nazım Hikmet, Oktay Rıfat, Omer Seyfeddin, Orhan Veli, Orhan Kemal, Orhan Hancerlioğlu, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, Sebahattin Ali, Sadri Ertem, Suad Derviş, Fahri Erdinç and others.

In 1961, two years later, the same compilers produced another reference book on Turkey (analyzed in the chapter on Tsarist Turkology), covering this time achievements of the pre-Soviet period.³⁰⁵ So we see that in the most intense phase of restructuring in Oriental studies, two reference books on Turkey, covering the overall development of Turkology from its early stage until the end of the 1950s, were produced quickly. To our opinion, this fact can be considered as an evidence for the good state of Soviet Turkology at that time, especially in view of the fact that the bibliographies on Turkey were the first works to appear among similar studies on other countries of the Near and Middle East which were produced some time later. For instance, a bibliography on Afghanistan appeared in 1962 and two bibliographies on Iran were published in 1967.³⁰⁶ A bibliography on India, a country of great significance for the Soviets especially since its independence in 1947, was produced only in 1965.³⁰⁷

Even taking into consideration the fact that a part of the bibliography covers popular and translated works, it can be asserted that a considerable amount of scholarly studies on Turkey was created from 1917 to 1958. On examining the thematical scope, we see that, compared with the Tsarist period, the same accent on history and economics continued. Similar to Tsarist times and even to a greater degree Soviet authors paid their primary attention to problems of recent history and contemporary development. In contrast with Tsarist period, social issues came to the fore in Soviet writings on contemporary topics.

The primary subjects of interest in the Tsarist period such as geographical descriptions, travel accounts, studies of military forces faded in significance in Soviet times, while religious

³⁰⁵ A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)* (Moscow, 1961).

³⁰⁶ T. I. Kukhtin, *Bibliografiia Afganistana, literatura na russskom iazyke* [Bibliography of Afghanistan, Literature in Russian Language] (Moscow, 1962); *Bibliografiia Irana* (Moscow, 1967); N. A. Kuznetsova, *Bibliografiia Irana, literatura na russskom iazyke* (Moscow, 1967) (Vucinich, p. 252).

³⁰⁷ *Bibliografiia Indii* (Moscow, 1965). This bibliography covered the period from the eighteenth century to 1961 and included over 9,000 references (Sahai-Achuthan, p. 331).

issues disappeared altogether.³⁰⁸ Philological studies continued to develop but, similar to Tsarist times, did not form the bulk of investigations on Turkey. Translating Turkish writers and compiling various reference books and statistical collections about Turkey showed great advances in the Soviet era. There was some work on cultural and other issues (not overwhelmingly numerous, similar to Tsarist times).

The second bibliography was compiled by the same authors and published in 1982. Actually, it was the second - improved and significantly supplemented - edition of the first bibliography. Like the first edition, it covers scholarly and popular works, including books, chapters of books, journal articles, brochures, dissertations, articles from various collections and periodicals, translations of Turkish and Western European authors' works. In addition, certain amount of newspaper articles (only literary translations) were also included. Not only works devoted especially to Turkey, but also those treating other subjects but including certain information about Turkey are covered. Those works dealing with a range of different issues are listed under the rubric to which the greater part of a work is related.

The references are grouped thematically as follows:

Table 4

Thematical Division of the Works on Turkey by Soviet Authors (1917-1975)

| SUBJECTS | REFERENCES |
|----------|------------|
|----------|------------|

³⁰⁸ Actually, religious issues continued to be studied, as it is evidenced by references to works created prior to 1959 in the later bibliography. But, evidently, works on religious issues have been considered by the compilers as irrelevant and unworthy stuff at that time so they were not included to the first bibliography. This attitude can be related to atheistic character of the Soviet state and secular character of the Turkish state. However, this attitude changed after 1959 and the rubric "Religion" reappeared in the second bibliography.

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Founders of Marxism-Leninism and Soviet Statesmen about Turkey | |
| K. Marx and F. Engels. | 16 |
| K. Marx. | 125 |
| F. Engels. | 67 |
| Correspondence between K. Marx and F. Engels. | 56 |
| Chronological extracts. | 7 |
| V. I. Lenin. | 140 |
| Soviet statesmen about Turkey. ³⁰⁹ | 61 |
| Soviet authors about the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism on Turkey | 94 |
| Statements about V. I. Lenin in Turkey. Turkish statesmen and public figures about V. I. Lenin. | 7 |
| General Works and Reference Literature | |
| General works. | 52 |
| Reference books (Encyclopedias, annuals). | 77 |
| History of Turkological Studies in Russia and the USSR | |
| General works. | 23 |
| Turkological studies in Russia. | 48 |
| Turkological studies in the USSR. | 153 |
| Turkological studies in other countries. | 3 |

³⁰⁹ The works and speeches of L. I. Brezhnev, V. V. Vorovskii, S. M. Kirov, A. N. Kosygin, M. Litvinov, G. K. Ordzhaniidze, M. V. Frunze, and G. V. Chicherin are listed.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Russian and Soviet scholars. | |
| General works. | 5 |
| Personalia. ³¹⁰ | 227 |
| Travel Accounts. Essays on Turkey. Soviet Artists' Stories about Turkey. | 108 |
| Geography | |
| Physical geography. | |
| General works. | 27 |
| Geology. Seismicity. Relief. | 10 |
| Mineral resources. | 58 |
| Flora and fauna. | 5 |
| Economic geography. | 26 |
| Population. Ethnography. | 90 |
| Political System | |
| General works. Legislation. Meclis. | 56 |
| Political parties. | |
| Communist, socialist and workers' parties. | 62 |
| Mustafa Subhi | 13 |
| Bourgeois parties. | 33 |
| Military forces. | 103 |

³¹⁰ The following scholars are listed: Sh. S. Ailiarov, G. M. Arasly, M. O. Auezov, N. A. Baskakov, I. N. Berezin, A. K. Borovkov, A. M. Valuiskii, V. A. Gordlevskii, B. M. Dantsig, S. S. Dzhikiia, N. K. Dmitriev, A. Kazem-Bek, N. F. Katanov, M. A. Kerimov, A. N. Kononov, A. Ie. Krymskii, Ie. F. Ludshuveit, D. A. Magazanik, S. S. Maizel, S. Ie. Malov, A. Ie. Martyntsev, P. M. Melioranskii, A. F. Miller, M. S. Mikhailov, P. P. Moiseev, A. D. Novichev, M. P. Pavlovich, V. V. Radlov, A. N. Samoilovich, V. D. Smirnov, A. S. Tveritina, P. A. Chikhachev, A. M. Shamsutdinov, M. Sh. Shiraliev.

| | |
|---|-----|
| History | |
| General works. | 20 |
| Turkey in the Middle Ages (the end of the thirteenth century - the first half of the seventeenth century) | |
| Sources and materials. | 73 |
| General works. | 129 |
| Turkey in modern time (the second half of the seventeenth century – 1918) | |
| Sources and documents. | 37 |
| General works. | 228 |
| The impact of the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907 on revolutionary movement in Turkey. The Young Turk Revolution (1908-1911). | 78 |
| Turkey on the eve and during the First World War. | 140 |
| Balkan peoples' conditions. National liberation movements in Balkans. | 162 |
| Russia and Turkey. | |
| Sources and documents on Russian-Turkish relations. | 34 |
| General works. | 191 |
| Russian-Turkish wars. | |
| General works. | 23 |
| Russian-Turkish wars until 1768. | 71 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1768-1774. | 37 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Russian-Turkish War of 1787-1791. | 32 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1806-1812. | 28 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1828-1829. | 20 |
| Crimean War of 1853-1856. | 61 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1877-1878. | 37 |
| Military operations between Russia and Turkey in 1914-1918. | 39 |
| Balkan countries in Russian-Turkish relations. | 153 |
| Economic relations between Russia and Turkey. | 15 |
| Turkey in recent times (1917-1975). | |
| Sources and documents. | 27 |
| General works. | 12 |
| The Great October Socialist Revolution's impact on Turkish national liberation struggle. | 62 |
| Turkish national liberation struggle (1918-1923). Establishment of the Republic of Turkey. | 388 |
| Turkey from the establishment of the Republic to the Second World War (1923-1939). | 189 |
| Turkey during the Second World War (1939-1945). | 74 |
| Turkey after the Second World War (1945-1975). | 372 |
| The 1960 coup. The military's role in political life of the country. | 39 |
| Working masses' conditions. Workers' and trade-union | 204 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| movement. | |
| Turkish women's conditions. Women's movement. | 26 |
| Conditions of children and youth. Youth movement. | 25 |
| National minorities' conditions. National question. | 48 |
| Cyprus problem. | 76 |
| Turkey's participation in NATO and CENTO. | 97 |
| Turkish statesmen and politicians. | |
| Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. | 8 |
| Others. | 23 |
| The USSR and Turkey. | |
| Documents and materials. | 73 |
| General works. | 21 |
| Soviet-Turkish relations during Turkish national liberation struggle (1918-1923). | 144 |
| Soviet-Turkish relations from the establishment of the Republic to the end of the Second World War (1923-1945). | 42 |
| Soviet-Turkish relations after the Second World War (1945-1975). | 75 |
| Scholarly and cultural relations. | |
| General works. | 18 |
| Scholarly relations. | 36 |
| Cultural relations. | 14 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Sport relations. | 9 |
| The Straits (Their role in international relations). | 54 |
| Auxiliary historical disciplines. | |
| Historiography. | 151 |
| Numismatics. Epigraphy. Calendars. | 28 |
| Economics | |
| Economic legislation. | 68 |
| Turkish economics from the establishment of the republic to the Second World War (1923-1939). | 145 |
| Fiscal monopolies. | 83 |
| Turkish economics during and after the Second World War (1939-1975). | 153 |
| State sector's role in Turkish economics. | 36 |
| Agrarian question and agrarian relations. Peasantry conditions. Peasant movement. | 90 |
| Agriculture. | 213 |
| Grain. | 46 |
| Tobacco. | 60 |
| Cotton. | 49 |
| Industry. | |
| General works. | 73 |
| Power engineering. Construction of hydroelectric power stations. | 41 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Extractive industry. | 82 |
| Manufacturing industry. | |
| Food industry. | 94 |
| Textile and carpet industry. | 75 |
| Building materials industry. | 46 |
| Oil and chemical industries. | 68 |
| Metallurgical industry. | 32 |
| Machine-building. Electrical engineering. Atomic power engineering. | 44 |
| Timber industry. Cellulose and paper industry. | 35 |
| Leather industry. Shoe industry. | 12 |
| Foreign trade. | |
| General works. | 168 |
| Contract and customs policies. | 61 |
| Import. | 109 |
| Export. | 170 |
| Commodity markets. | 118 |
| Turkey and foreign capital. | 146 |
| Foreign capital's struggle for Turkish oil. | 38 |
| Economic relations between Turkey and capitalist countries. | |
| Turkey and England. | 84 |
| Turkey and Germany (until 1945). | 74 |
| Turkey and FRG. | 74 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Regional economic cooperation between Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. | 34 |
| Turkey and Italy. | 43 |
| Turkey and USA. | 163 |
| Turkey and France. | 41 |
| Turkey and Japan. | 59 |
| Turkey and other countries. | 275 |
| Finances. | |
| General works. | 118 |
| Budget. | 88 |
| Taxes and tax system. | 46 |
| Foreign debt. | 34 |
| Banks. | 113 |
| Financial exchange. Credit. Insurance. | 10 |
| Transport and communications. | |
| General works. | 13 |
| Automobile transport. Roads. | 27 |
| Railways. | 120 |
| Merchant marine. Ports. | 68 |
| Public transportation. | 9 |
| Post. Telegraph. Telephone. | 20 |
| Economic relations between the USSR and Turkey. | |
| From the establishment of the republic to the Second World | 331 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| War (1923-1939). | |
| During and after the Second World War (1939-1975). | 70 |
| Trade contracts, agreements, and conventions. | 23 |
| Economic relations between Turkey and socialist countries. | 53 |
| Culture and Science | |
| Ideology in contemporary Turkey. | 28 |
| Dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas. | 7 |
| Religion. | 94 |
| Development of sciences in Turkey. | 12 |
| Linguistics. | |
| Language. Writing system. | |
| General works. | 332 |
| Grammars. Textbooks. | 29 |
| Dictionaries. Conversational books. | 38 |
| Literature. | |
| General works. | 11 |
| Medieval literature (The thirteenth century – the first half of the seventeenth century). | 68 |
| Translations from medieval authors. Literature on the authors. ³¹¹ | 114 |
| Literature in modern and recent times (The second half of | 170 |

³¹¹ The following authors are listed: Aşık Paşa, Celaleddin Rumi, Mihri Hatun, Ömer Nefi, Ruhi Bağdadi, Şeyhi (Yusuf Sinaneddin).

| | |
|---|------|
| the seventeenth century – the twentieth century). | |
| Poetry. | |
| Collected verses. | 4 |
| Translations of individual verses. Literature about the poets. ³¹² | 1863 |
| Prose. | |
| Collected stories. | 7 |
| Translations of individual works. Literature about the writers. ³¹³ | 1340 |
| Dramaturgy. | |
| Translations of dramaturgical works. Literature about the dramaturges. ³¹⁴ | 37 |
| Folklore. | |
| General works. | 24 |
| Translations. | |
| Tales, popular stories, folk songs. | 23 |
| Proverbs and sayings. | 11 |
| Russian-Turkish literary relations. | 37 |
| Turkish writers' statements. Interviews and talks with the writers. | 27 |

³¹² 93 Turkish poets in total are listed. The most numerous translations were made from and literature created about Nazım Hikmet (833), Fazıl Hüşhü Dağlarca (194), Orhan Veli Kanık (144), Oktay Rifat (106), Tefvik Fikret (104), Melih Cevdet Anday (98), Nevzat Üstün (52), and Rıfat Ilgaz (47).

³¹³ 77 Turkish writers in total are listed. The most numerous translations were made from and literature created about Aziz Nesin (325), Sabahattin Ali (107), Sait Faik Abasıyanık (93), Orhan Kemal (91), Ömer Seyfeddin (79), Fahri Erdinç (69), Nazım Hikmet (67), Reşad Nuri Güntekin (39), and Haldun Taner (37).

³¹⁴ 5 Turkish dramaturgists are listed: Aziz Nesin, Vasıf Öngören, Cengiz Tuncer, Nazım Hikmet, and Fehmi Cevat Başkurt.

| | |
|--|--------|
| Art. | |
| General works. | 8 |
| Turkish art in the Middle Ages and modern time. | 35 |
| Contemporary Turkish art. | 21 |
| Exhibitions of Turkish art. Guidebooks of museums and exhibitions. Catalogues. | 29 |
| Architecture. Historical monuments. | 14 |
| Music. | 10 |
| Theater. | 26 |
| Cinema. | 9 |
| Education. | 67 |
| Writing system's reform. | 19 |
| History of printing. Press. | 34 |
| Public health. | 12 |
| Total. | 14,600 |

Comparing the two bibliographies, we can indicate some important shifts from 1958 to 1975. First of all, a sudden growth in the amount of literature on Turkey is obviously the case: while the first bibliography contains 3,262 references, this number increases in the second bibliography to 14,600. Several reasons for this growth can be indicated. To some extent, it was connected to the fact that in the second bibliography the authors achieved more comprehensiveness, covering sources unused in the first edition. For instance, it is stated in introduction that the part entitled "Economics" was significantly enlarged in the second edition

due to materials taken from *Torgovyi biulleten'* (Trade Bulletin), the journal of Soviet Trade Agency in Istanbul published during the 1920s. Besides that the content of the second bibliography was enlarged by introducing some new rubrics such as "History of Turkological studies in Russia and the USSR," "Public Health" and some others. But, undoubtedly, the growth in the amount of literature covered by the second bibliography was related mainly to the increased output by Soviet Turkologists after the 1950s. This advance in Soviet Turkology should be considered in relation to overall development of Soviet Oriental studies. The Soviet state's close attention to the Eastern affairs and its effort to advance Oriental studies, the emergence of specialized Orientalist journals and other factors that called forth increased academic publication on Oriental issues seem to have favored increased work on Turkey, too.

As to shifts in the content of the work on Turkey, it can be observed that, in general, thematical priorities did not experience any striking change from 1958 to 1975 and the same emphasis on history and economics continued. But it is observable that after the 1950s, comparing with the previous period, economics came more to the fore than history, whereas in the field of history recent events obtained obvious priority. Furthermore, judging even from the composition of the second bibliography - which list the works in a much more specified and detailed manner than the first bibliography - within fifteen years all fields of Turkological studies became much more elaborated. In particular, advance showed by cultural studies attracts attention in this context. The compilers even felt the need to collect references related to cultural issues under a separate rubric entitled "Culture and Science."³¹⁵ We see that especially linguistic

³¹⁵ Though this rubric is the largest one in the bibliography (it contains 4,560 references, while "Economics" covers 4,345 and "History" 3,943), this overwhelming quantity does not mean overwhelming character of cultural studies, for this amount stems simply from covering numerous references to translated verses and pieces of prose and dramaturgy listed item by item. For example, each translated Turkish verse is referred separately and the whole list of verses includes about 1,500 references many of which refer to one book. Similarly, there are about 1,000 references to translated pieces of prose which are listed separately though many of them are grouped in one book. In

and literary studies advanced within this field. Attention paid by Soviet scholars to literary translation continued and a considerable amount of Turkish literature was translated. Significantly, religion reappeared among areas of investigation.³¹⁶

Special mention should be made here of a bibliography of Turkey compiled by a Georgian Turkologist.³¹⁷ This bibliography is limited to Georgian works on Turkey's history and is interesting as representing the Georgian branch of Soviet Turkology.³¹⁸ It contains 1,961 references to books, journal and newspaper articles published from 1852 to 1967. The compiler made use of 8 bibliographies, 48 periodicals and collections, and 34 newspapers. Original works as well as translations are covered. As the compiler states, references to newspaper articles by special correspondents in Turkey deserve a special attention as representing an original material of unique value.

The compiler groups the references thematically as follows:

Table 5

Thematical Division of the Works on Turkey by Georgian Authors (1852-1967)

| SUBJECTS | REFERENCES |
|----------|------------|
|----------|------------|

other words, the amount of references does not correspond to the amount of books (In the first bibliography, to the contrary, literary works were listed by books not by separate items).

³¹⁶ More precisely, studies of religious issues became to be evaluated as worthing consideration. Though there were not any references related to religion in the first bibliography, references on religion in the second bibliography includes some amount of works created prior to the 1950s. In other words, absence of references in the first bibliography did not mean that there was no work on religion after 1917. But, evidently, this work was considered by the compilers at that time as unimportant and irrelevant. This attitude was changed later. Judging from references in the second bibliography which covers not only works devoted to Turkey but also a range of general works on Islam, study of religious issues advanced especially since the end of the 1950s. Changed attitude toward study of religious issues can be evaluated as a sign of more objective and less militant stand obtained by Soviet scholars in late Soviet era and the more attention they started to pay to cultural issues. As to religion in Turkey, interest in this subject was, evidently, related to the increased role religion started to play in this country after the Atatürk period.

³¹⁷ N. I. Bostashvili, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (istoriia)* (Tbilisi, 1971).

³¹⁸ Unfortunately, we could not find similar works produced by Turkologists in other Soviet republics. So we are not in position to make comparisons.

| | |
|--|-------|
| K. Marx and F. Engels on Turkey. | 27 |
| V. I. Lenin on Turkey. | 86 |
| Soviet statesmen ³¹⁹ on Turkey. | 38 |
| Travel accounts. | 40 |
| Turkey's economic conditions. Worker and peasant movement. | 53 |
| Turkey in the Middle Ages (the end of the thirteenth century - the first half of the seventeenth century). | 24 |
| Turkey in modern times (The second half of the seventeenth century – 1917). | 232 |
| Turkey and the First World War. The Caucasian front. | 279 |
| Balkan peoples' conditions. National liberation movement. The Balkan wars. | 148 |
| Turkey in recent times (1917-1967). | 233 |
| The USSR and Turkey. | 51 |
| Georgia and Turkey. | 331 |
| Russia and Turkey. | 23 |
| Russian-Turkish War of 1877-1878. | 218 |
| The question of the Straits. | 38 |
| National question. | 140 |
| Total. | 1,961 |

³¹⁹ The works and speeches of M. Litvinov, G. K. Ordzhani­kidze, and I. V. Stalin are listed.

As can be observed, the Georgian branch of Soviet Turkology was concerned primarily with issues having relation to Georgian history. It is evidenced by the multitude of works on such subjects as the national question, Georgian-Turkish relations, the Caucasian front in the First World War and so on. At the same time, a certain amount of works on Turkey's history and contemporary sociopolitical and economic development and on Russian/Soviet-Turkish relations was produced.

As far as we can judge from the three bibliographies examined above, the following conclusions can be drawn about the development of Soviet Turkology from 1917 to 1975. First of all, we see that in terms of academic production Soviet Turkology showed steady growth and this growth obtained a particularly fast character from the 1950s: from 1958 to 1975 the output of Soviet Turkologists increased to a striking degree and all fields of Turkological studies became much more elaborated. As for the content of Turkological studies, Soviet Turkology showed evident continuation with Tsarist times, as it preserved the same focus on contemporary issues and was engaged mainly in studying economics and recent history. At the same time, some accents shifted and some new fields of investigation appeared. For example, economic and social issues obtained priority and many more literary translations and reference books were produced, compared with in Tsarist period. Ideology appeared among the topics of investigation.

To sum up, first, the obvious continuation can be stated between Tsarist and Soviet Turkological studies in regard to their priorities in investigation, and second, it should be accepted that during the Soviet period Russian Turkological studies showed undeniable growth in terms of academic production and became much more elaborated.

CHAPTER III

SOME ASPECTS OF THE SOVIET ANALYSIS OF TURKEY

Along with creating a historical account of Turkological studies in the Soviet Union, I have also aimed at giving some descriptive information about the content of these studies. This task had to be seriously limited in view of the fact that Turkological studies cover a number of fields and to deal with all of them in this study is beyond possibility. The focus here is on the Republican period of Turkey and on the field of social studies as congenial to my own area of interest. Within this field, again, only certain themes had to be necessarily determined. The choice here was directed by the peculiarities of the Soviets' perception of Turkey. As a country considered within the framework of the Third World, Turkey represented for the Soviets a case in elaborating the theoretical problem of the so-called "national liberation movement", i. e. the socioeconomic and political evolution of former colonies and semicolonies conceived primarily in the context of their relationship with the so-called "world capitalist system." Due to the peculiarities of its historical development, Turkey had some special qualities in this context that offered Soviet scholars a somewhat different and rich material for advancing their theoretical analysis. To quote from one Soviet source:

The specificity of Turkey's social development consists in the fact that Turkey de jure never had lost its national sovereignty, though, in fact, since the second half of the nineteenth century it was turned by Western powers into their semicolony. What is more, Turkey, unlike the overwhelming majority of Asian and African countries, accomplished its anti-imperialist national liberation revolution and won political independence in the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism immediately after the October Revolution. As a result, Turkey had the opportunity to start the struggle for economic independence long before other colonial and dependent countries and, thus, it has a longer experience in capitalist development.³²⁰

³²⁰ *Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik)* [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)] (Moscow, 1975), p. 56.

Judging from the passage, the following two focuses of Soviet interest in regard to Turkey can be pointed out: the specificity of the Turkish national liberation revolution and the specificity of the Turkish experience in capitalism. In particular, the latter was of great concern and value for the Soviets because, as another Soviet source has indicated, in the course of the Republican period Turkey had tried practically all models and strategies of socioeconomic development that could be observed in developing countries.³²¹ As evidenced by the bibliographical information about Soviet Turkology, the most numerous literature was created exactly on the two subjects mentioned above. Quite naturally, the focus in this chapter came to be on these issues. I started with the description of the Turkish National Struggle and proceeded with the section on the Turkish experience in capitalism. Description of the Soviet scholarship's conclusions was made based on two Soviet monographs which are considered to be representative.

I did not attempt a theoretical assessment of the Soviet analysis on the consideration that it is beyond the scope of this thesis. The only comment that I would like to make here is that, it seems that the Soviet scholars' emphasis on social issues resulted in the creation of a more detailed, comprehensive and more realistic analysis of the Turkish realities than could be provided by any other kind of analysis, which does not take into consideration social issues. At the same time, the Soviets' shortcomings related to ideological restrictions should be indicated, for example, their conviction of the ultimately pernicious character of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist way of development.

³²¹ *Kapitalizm v Turtsii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe razvitie v 50-80-e gg.* [Capitalism in Turkey: Socioeconomic Development in the 1950s-1980s] (Moscow, 1987), p. 4.

The Turkish National Liberation Revolution

This section is based on a single individual monograph.³²² Judging from the bibliographical data, it can be asserted that this monograph was the most comprehensive one created during the Soviet period on the topic. Moreover, after the publication of his monograph A. M. Shamsutdinov was accepted by the Soviet scholarship as the primary specialist on the Turkish National Struggle. This is evidenced by the fact that in almost all collective works on Turkish history prepared after 1966 the chapter devoted to the Turkish National Struggle was written by him. It is observable that the Soviet view of the subject, as it was established in 1966 by Shamsutdinov, did not undergo afterward any serious reassessment. As indicated in the previous chapter of the thesis, developments in Turkey in the period of the National Struggle were of considerable political, strategical and ideological significance for the Bolsheviki. On examining Shamsutdinov's work we can see that, as time went on and the events of those years became history, the ideological moment came to the fore in the Soviet analysis: the Turkish National Struggle came to be described and given importance in the 1960s as one of the first national liberation revolutions in the East that had occurred under the impact of the October Revolution.

In examining the content of Shamsutdinov's work, emphasis was given to catching the essence of his comments, while trying to avoid describing factual information. In other words, the aim was to relate the structure of the analysis, not its factual content. Therefore, the description came to be of its own kind – somewhat incoherent and fragmented – as it dealt with only themes

³²² A. M. Shamsutdinov, *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'naiia bor'ba v Turtsii. 1918-1923 gg.* [The National Liberation Struggle in Turkey] (Moscow: Nauka, 1966), 358 p.

and conclusions. Naturally, those parts of Shamsutdinov's book that are predominantly theoretical were described in more detail than others that offer mostly factual material.

To begin with, Shamsutdinov's periodization of the history of the Turkish National Struggle should be given: as he argues, three phases can be distinguished. The first (from the end of October 1918 to the end of 1920) is characterized by the strong uplift of the anti-imperialist movement and the people's active participation in it. During the period, the anti-imperialist armed struggle was conducted almost solely by partisans. The selfless and heroic struggle of the masses made it possible for the national bourgeoisie to establish a new government in Ankara in opposition to the Sultan's government. The second phase (from the end of 1920 to October 1922) witnessed the strengthening of the new government, the creation of a regular army and the beginning of the war for independence by means of the regular army. Soviet-Turkish friendship was established in that phase and served as reliable support for Turkey. At the same time, the new government's domestic and foreign policies came to be influenced to a greater degree by reactionary forces. The Turkish authorities violated the people's democratic rights (the prohibition of the Turkish Communist Party, the liquidation of the "Green Army," the liquidation of partisan groups and trials over Communists). In foreign policy the tendency to rapprochement with the imperialist powers and the strengthening of the aggressive stand in regard to Caucasia became observable. However, revolutionary principles of the struggle for independence ultimately prevailed. As a result, the victory over occupying forces was achieved. The final phase of the national liberation revolution (from October 1922 to July 1923) covers, for the most part, developments related to the Lausanne Conference.³²³

Shamsutdinov examines the subject, dividing it into the following parts:

I. Ruin of the Ottoman Empire.

³²³ Ibid., pp. 335-336.

- II. Beginning of the national liberation movement.
- III. Masses are the main force of the national liberation revolution.
- IV. Soviet-Turkish relations in 1920-1922.
- V. War for independence. Ankara government's conditions inside and outside the country.
- VI. The Lausanne Conference.

Chapter I is precluded by an Introduction that gives a detailed description of the Ottoman Empire's conditions on the eve of the fall. I have decided to give a rather wide place to this description because it includes important comments that characterize the Soviet view of the Ottoman Empire's conditions at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The Ottoman Empire on the Eve of the Fall

Shamsutdinov states that toward the end of the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire became in fact a semicolony of the Western powers, which colonized it by means of loans, concessions, banks, non-equivalent foreign trade and the regime of Capitulations. The Western countries aimed at turning the empire into a market for their products and at adapting the Turkish rural economy to supplying them raw materials. Absolute domination of foreign capital was one the most important causes of the economic and cultural backwardness of the Ottoman Empire, as the foreigners were trying to preserve the existing feudal relationships and maintain the foundations of the Sultan's feudal regime. In their efforts to colonize the country, the foreigners were actively assisted by the Ottoman authorities. The relationship between the two forces (the "imperialist enslavers" and the "bloody Sultan's regime") is described in the following words: 'The policy of plunder pursued by the imperialists leaned on the Sultan's regime, which was a

zealous guard of the existent feudal and bureaucratic tyranny, guild system, internal custom obstacles and suppressed all possibilities for the development of native industry and trade.”³²⁴

The extreme backwardness of the countryside (it is stated that the majority of peasants was landless and suffered from heavy taxes and the tyranny of landowners, money-lenders, and local authorities) and heavy conditions of the non-Turkish nationalities (their situation is described as especially hard in comparison with that of Turks) are underlined. In regard to the minorities, it is stated that “The Sultan’s Turkey pursued the policy of the assimilation of non-Turkish people under its rule. Non-Turkish peoples were deprived of the very elementary human rights.”³²⁵

The Young Turk government’s activities are evaluated in a totally negative light. The Young Turks revolution itself is characterized as bourgeois³²⁶ and “made-from-the-top,” the 1908 constitution as “docked,” the party “Union and Progress” as representing solely the interests of the Turkish bourgeoisie and liberal landowners. An aggressive and adventurous stand in foreign affairs, the policy of violent assimilation and pressure toward non-Turkish nationalities, irresponsibility and neglect toward their own ordinary peoples are listed as the basic features of the Young Turks’ governmental activities.

As Shamsutdinov says, after coming to power, the Young Turks gave up their early promises and did not relieve the Empire’s peoples’ conditions. On the contrary, the state of the multi-national population of the Empire grew worse. The Young Turks, basing their actions in the beginning on the doctrine of Osmanism, then (after the Balkan wars) on Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism, continued the policy of violent assimilation of non-Turkish peoples. In foreign affairs the doctrine of Pan-Turkism served for the policy of invasion, as the Young Turks wanted

³²⁴ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 4.

³²⁶ According to the Soviet formulation, the bourgeoisie is the social class that owns the means of producing wealth and exploits the working class. Due to this emphasis on exploitation, the words “bourgeois” and “bourgeoisie” themselves had acquired in the Soviet scholarly language perceptible negative meanings.

to take under their domination all Turkic peoples from the Bosphorus to Altai. Pursuing aggressive aims, the Young Turks with the help of German specialists, started the reorganization of the army. Plans to seize new lands, in fact, were the main reason for the Ottoman Empire's participation in the war on the side of Germany. The following words of Enver-Pasha said at a meeting of the central committee of Union and Progress on October 12, 1914, are cited as an argument for the Young Turks' desire to take part in the war with aggressive aims in mind: "Germany agrees to our winning back Egypt, Caucasia and even Iran... This way, undoubtedly, we can open the way to Turan and realize the union of Turkic people." Shamsutdinov notes that Enver-Pasha's supporters were in the minority, but they concentrated in their hands all of the power. It is argued that the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress saw Germany as the Ottoman Empire's protector against the Entente, whereas the German imperialists encouraged in every way the adventurism of the Young Turks in order to oust the other countries from the economic and political life of the Ottoman Empire and establish their own control.³²⁷

The secret agreement between imperialist countries (among them Tsarist Russia) on the partition of the Ottoman Empire is commented on by Shamsutdinov as "a rude action of colonial violence over the people of the Ottoman Empire." The hypocrisy of the British statesmen toward Arabs is underlined. It is stated that the scramble over the Ottoman Empire was a part of the general struggle between the imperialist countries aiming at repartition of the world and played a great role in unleashing the First World War.³²⁸

The attack on Russia that Turkey undertook at the end of October, 1914 Shamsutdinov evaluates as a treacherous one. "Enver-Pasha, the chief initiator and inspirer of the campaign

³²⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 7.

against Russia, considered that the conquest of Caucasia would force Iran to join the anti-Russian coalition and would create the ground for an uprising of Muslim peoples in Russia.”³²⁹

The dependence on Germany that Turkey obtained during the war is stressed and Lenin’s words, said in January of 1917, are quoted: “Germany *today* has turned Turkey into *both* its financial and military vassal!” Shamsutdinov says that German imperialism had turned Turkey into its actual colony: the Turkish army and navy were completely under German domination and German capital had totally enslaved the Turkish economy. Germany had also established its control over the political life of the country.³³⁰

Special attention is given to the Young Turks’ policies toward the non-Turkish nationalities. The repression of the Arabs in the course of the requisition of camels and foodstuffs is described (it is said that thousands of Arabs were executed and sent to concentration camps, and that massacres and plunders of peaceful population were organized). “Nevertheless, the Arabs did not lost their determination in the struggle against the hateful Turkish yoke.”³³¹

Plans for seizing new lands and the desire to remove a convenient excuse for foreign countries to interfere with the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire are indicated as the main reasons for the eviction of the Armenian population of western Armenia. It is stated that many Armenians were killed during massacres and plunders organized by the government.³³²

Shamsutdinov gives much attention to the description of the terrible situation of the Ottoman population and economy destroyed and exhausted by the war. The negative role the Young Turk government played in this situation is emphasized. As Shamsutdinov puts it, the

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 7.

³³⁰ Ibid., p. 8.

³³¹ Ibid., p. 5.

³³² One Soviet source estimates Armenian losses as 1,500,000: Iu. A. Bagirov, *Iz istorii sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii v 1920-22 gg. (Po materialam Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR)* [On History of Soviet-Turkish Relations in 1920-1922. By materials of Azerbaijan SSR](Baku: Izd-vo akademii nauk Azerbaijan SSR, 1965), p. 11.

government, taking advantage of the war, plundered the population. Foodstuff were taken away at insignificant prices; horses, camels, oxes were requisitioned. The rural economy, the foundation of the Ottoman economy, was ruined. The government requisitioned all grain, even that stored up for sowing. A considerable amount of this foodstuff was sent to Germany and Austro-Hungary, whereas the Ottoman population suffered from epidemic diseases caused by famine and insanitary conditions. Over 2.5 million perished in Asia Minor during the war. In order to cover military expenses, the government, along with issuing paper money, resorted to such unpopular measures as increasing taxes and introducing new taxes, decreasing the salaries of civil servants, abolishing benefits to soldier's families, and requisitioning the properties of Armenians and Greeks.³³³

Shamsutdinov touches also upon developments in industry and trade experienced during the war and summarizes changes as follows: some industrial branches suffered great losses, while some others, especially those serving military needs, obtained stimulus for growth. The most significant novelty was that new enterprises were built not in port cities, which were vulnerable to attacks, but in Central Anatolia. The cessation of imports also contributed to the growth of native industry. Both foreign and domestic trade passed into the hands of quickly growing Turkish national bourgeoisie and landowners, who were making huge profits by speculating on military supply.³³⁴

The changes that different social groups underwent during the war are analyzed in detail. It is stated that the war conditions favored the enrichment of the Turkish bourgeoisie. In particular, exporters of grain, wool, cotton, leather, fruits and importers of sugar, coffee, textile articles, kerosine made huge profits. Buyers and suppliers of foodstuff and forage for the army, as well as

³³³ Shamsutdinov, pp. 8-9.

³³⁴ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

owners of enterprises working for military needs became excessively rich. Being under governmental protection, landowners and wealthy peasants prospered. Almost all of the output of ordinary peasants was requisitioned by the authorities, whereas landowners and wealthy peasants supplied the government only a small part of their harvest. Landowners and wealthy peasants were released from military obligations, had favourable terms in paying taxes, and enjoyed governmental subsidies and credits from Agricultural Bank. Landowners' farms did not suffer during the war, whereas peasants' farms were totally ruined. The peasants experienced mass destitution. The main forms of plundering the Turkish peasants experienced were: heavy taxes; compulsory requisitions of agricultural products and cattle; labour duty; and enslavement by landowners, wealthy peasants, money-lenders, officials and agents of foreign capital.

During the war, the process of differentiation in the countryside intensified. More and more peasants became landless and turned into farm labourers or lumpenproletariats. The conditions of workers and craftsmen also worsened. Real wages in all industrial branches decreased several times during the war, while the prices of consumer goods increased persistently. The working day was officially lengthened to fourteen hours; rest days and holidays were abolished. The workers of the enterprises serving the needs of the army were put under martial law. The employment of women and children was widely used, and what is more, their work was paid two times less than that of men. Unskilled workers were employed for a plate of soup and a piece of bread. Petty civil servants and the employees of commercial organizations could not get their salaries for several months and were compelled to go to money-lenders. One Soviet trade representative in Istanbul wrote in 1919: "A terrible destitution is striking everywhere. Turkey never could boast of prosperity, but today it is rapidly rolling towards a total economic crash."³³⁵

³³⁵ Ibid., pp. 10-12.

Throughout the country an extreme shortage of consumer goods and foodstuffs was sensed. Speculation thrived. In the big cities cards on bread, sugar, rice, meat, fats were introduced and semiofficial trade organizations aiming at fighting speculation were established. But these organization headed by high officials became themselves the breeding grounds of unbridled speculation. The heads of these organizations obtained huge capitals and became big dealers. Among state officials, including the Sultan himself, corruption and taking bribes were usual things. Talaat Pasha is said to have confessed in October 1918 that the government was not interested in fighting speculation, corruption and taking bribes, because the country could not lose the necessary persons while the war was going on. Shamsutdinov quotes one military report: “The economic situation is very hard and it is felt by everyone, except those enriched by the war and having close terms with the Committee of Union and Progress, which is making use of this difficult situation that enables it to make great amount of money.”³³⁶

A detailed picture of situation in the Turkish army is given. The army did not have necessary armaments, uniforms and foodstuffs. In provisioning service speculation thrived. In 1918 soldiers in the field received 75 gr. of bread per day. Meat, fats, sugar, coffee were not given altogether, though orders on those provisions were written out. Foodstuffs were brought to the front with delay and often were of bad quality. Shamsutdinov quotes from one French source: “The army suffered from devprivations harder in comparison with the peaceful population. In order to eat, the soldiers had to loot, and in order to dress they had to undress corpses.” The army suffered from epidemics of typhoid. The wounded and sick were deprived of medical aid. The death-rate came to over 60 men per day. The number of deserters was growing. The psychological state of the army was painful. One report received by the Central Board of the General Staff of the Russian Army is cited in which the situation in the Turkish army is described

³³⁶ Ibid., p. 12.

in the following words: “Discipline is slackened. Relations between the German and Turkish officers is getting worse, the latter are protesting against the assignments of Germans as commanders and declaring that they do not want to obey the culprits of the war. ... The Turkish officers have lodged a complaint to the Sultan, saying that the war, started for the defense of the Sultanate and Islam, in fact is being waged in the name of Pan-Germanism and that the Sultan ought to think of the answer to God about Muslims’ shed blood.”³³⁷

Shamsutdinov states in sum that the Young Turks in pair with the Germans brought the country to a complete economic, financial and military catastrophe, while all the hardships lay on the shoulders of the masses. The Turkish people started to show their indignation in the way of armed conflicts with the local authorities and landowners. The peasants flowed into guerilla groups created by deserters. Great peasant insurrections took place during 1915 in northern and southern Anatolia. Many representatives of other social groups (parliamentarians, army officers) also show discontent with the Young Turks’ policies. Many plots aiming at coup d’etat were organized in Istanbul during the war.

The attack to Caucasia Young Turks’ government undertook in February 1918 is evaluated by Shamsutdinov as a “criminal adventure against Soviet Russia,” the reasons for which were “fierce hatred toward the Bolsheviks, the fear because of socialist revolution’s success in Russia, and the desire to raise the shakened prestige of the Young Turks and avoid the explosion of the people’s indignation by means of a successful military operation.” It is said that Caucasian venture of the Young Turks was realized despite the will of Turkish people and aimed at seizing Caucasia, Iran and Central Asia. This venture speeded up the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the

³³⁷ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

war. After the defeat of the Ottoman Empire, the Young Turks' leaders fled to Germany, leaving their country to the mercy of fate.³³⁸

The Ruin of the Ottoman Empire

In this chapter, Turkey's internal and external conditions after the Mudros Armistice are analyzed with the main focus on the struggle between the Western powers over the partition of the Ottoman legacy. Much attention is given to the description of a peculiar position each Western power had established in the Ottoman Empire.

It is observable that the main point that concerned the Soviet historians in relation to Turkey's capitulation was the threat for Soviet Russia created by the terms of the Mudros Armistice. Shamsutdinov cites the Mudros treaty clause by clause, asserting that a number of the treaty's articles were interfering in internal affairs of Soviet Russia and that the treaty aimed both at enslaving Turkey and strengthening intervention in Southern Russia and Caucasia. Articles 11 and 15, foreseeing the occupation of Transcaucasia by British troops, are said to be the evident examples. Lenin's words are cited on the plans of Great Britain to establish its domination in Caucasia: "Now according to the treaty England has robbed Baku from the Turks in order to strangle us, depriving us of raw materials." It is indicated also that Article 24 giving the Allies the right to occupy Armenian provinces was dictated by the desire to seize military depots left there by the Russian army. Shamsutdinov mentions also an article which was not included in the final text of the treaty, saying that the wording of this article was "meaningful": "The Allies will use Constantinople as their naval base." As Shamsutdinov puts it, though this "anti-Soviet" article was exempted, the Allies in fact realized it, "bossing" the Black Sea for five years. It is

³³⁸ Ibid., p. 13.

stated that Istanbul since November 13, 1918 when it was occupied became “the base of the world reaction against Soviet Russia, the Hungarian Revolution, and national liberation struggle of the Turkish and Arab peoples.”³³⁹

As for Turkey’s situation after the armistice, the struggle between the imperialist countries over the partition of the Ottoman Empire’s legacy is described in vivid terms.³⁴⁰ It is stated that the Near East was one of the main knots of imperialist contradictions because of the competition over rich resources of oil and other raw materials. It is also indicated that the importance of this region had increased in connection with the struggle against Soviet Russia.³⁴¹ It is asserted that the mandate system over Turkey at establishing of which imperialist countries aimed was a “new form of colonial plunder.” As Shamsutdinov says, “since the masses of the East did not clearly comprehend the real nature of this system, the imperialists could cover with it their predatory politics.”³⁴²

The hostile attitude of the Soviet scholars toward the United States is clearly perceptible. Much attention is given by Shamsutdinov to revealing the imperialist aspirations of the United States in regard to Turkey, while the hypocrisy of its pretensions to be Turkey’s defender is stressed. It is said that the United States which “has made huge money on the war and enslaved economically a number of countries” showed great activity in the partition of the Ottoman Empire’s legacy. “The United States did not take part or, to be correct, missed secret agreements

³³⁹ Ibid., pp. 14-20.

³⁴⁰ The somewhat rude and ironic style of Soviet historical writing with its characteristic wording shows itself clearly in this part of the book. For example, it says that “The colonial appetites of the American imperialists surpassed the most agitated imagination. ... On hearing about the conclusions of the American commission concerning [American plans about] the mandates over Near Eastern countries, even such inveterate operators of imperialism as Lloyd George and Clemanceau were astonished” (p. 39).

³⁴¹ Ibid., p. 14. On this issue Shamsutdinov advises to see his article “Plany razdela sultanskoi Turtsii i ispol’zovaniia ieio v vooruzhennoi interventsii Antanty protiv Sovetskoi Rossii v 1918 – 1919 gg.” (Plans on the partition of Sultan’s Turkey and using it in the Entente’s armed intervention against Soviet Russia in 1918-1919), in *Turetskii sbornik* (The Turkish Collection) (Moscow, 1958).

³⁴² Ibid., p. 33.

on the partition of Turkey. Therefore, they can act more freely than their British and French rivals. American imperialists passed themselves off as ‘friends’ and ‘defenders’ of the peoples of the Near East, stating that they are against secret plans on Asiatic Turkey’s partition and are ‘disinterested’ in territorial acquisitions in the Near East. Covering themselves with such statements about ‘humane’ attitude toward the peoples of the Near East, in fact the United States pursued the same imperialistic predatory aims as British, French, and Italian imperialists.”³⁴³

It order to illustrate the United States’ real aims in regard to Turkey, much place is devoted to description of American political and economic activities in the Ottoman Empire. It is emphasized that American penetration of Turkey started long before the war and began with missionary and educational activities.³⁴⁴ Though the Americans had failed to invest considerable capital in Turkey before the First World War, many American industrial and trade companies here competed as successfully as other foreign companies.³⁴⁵ It is stated that after the First World War Americans became dominant in Turkish foreign trade.³⁴⁶

The peculiarities of other Western countries’ position in Turkish economics and politics are examined, too. The dominance of the British imperialists is emphasized. It is said that the British, who were interested in the raw materials of the Near and Middle East, especially in oil and cotton, had become full masters of the Near East toward the end of the war and were not inclined to reckon with the secret agreements reached earlier. It is stressed that after the armistice Turkey became totally subordinated to British political will. As for France, it is stated that the French had

³⁴³ Ibid., pp. 27-28.

³⁴⁴ It is said that to the end of the world war, 675 American schools, 7 hospitals, several orphanages and religious institutions were active in Turkey.

³⁴⁵ It is said that American trade companies were investigating the Turkish market carefully and every year organized exhibitions of American sample goods. Some statistics showing the steady growth of American commercial activities in Turkey are given. It is stated that from 1900 to 1913 American imports increased 40 times (from 136,000 dollars to 5,066,000 dollars) and exports increased 2.5 times (from 2,517,000 to 6,066,000 dollars). American imports reached 62 million dollars in 1919 and 82 million dollars in 1920.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

the most important financial institutions of the Ottoman Empire in their hands, predominated over Turkish culture, science and literature, and had close relations with Turkish ruling circles. But France had weakened during the war and was in no position to compete with England. Moreover, it was concerned primarily with strengthening its position in Europe. The weakest among the imperialist powers was Italy. Italian economic as well as political weight in Turkey was insignificant. Besides that, Italian territorial claims ran counter to that of the Greeks.³⁴⁷

The Turkish ruling classes' conduct during the period of occupation received a very negative evaluation as harmful to the masses and treacherous for the homeland. The Sultan and his government had become "the obedient servants" of the British and French imperialists. The Turkish ruling circles and a part of the Turkish intelligentsia took part in propaganda campaigns organized by the United States, England and France on the issue of the mandate over Turkey. High officials, high circles of clergy, military-feudal bureaucracy, and compradore circles of Turkish bourgeoisie connected to British and French capital sought consent with England at the expense of the national interests of Turkey. The words of Churchill are quoted that "Turks said after the armistice: 'We ought to be punished, but let England, our old friend, punish us.'" ³⁴⁸

Shamsutdinov states that the Turkish reactionaries aimed at maintaining the feudal-monarchical system, while trying to achieve this aim at the expense of Soviet Russia: they were ready to assist Western powers in the struggle against the Bolsheviks. Akhmet İzzet Pasha's interview with European journalists is quoted: "It is my firm belief that with our army we can play in Asia a useful role for Europe. We have all that is necessary to serve as a barrier against Russian invasion." It is stressed that the British desire to use Turkish forces against Soviet Russia coincided with the aspirations of the Turkish reactionaries at seizing lands in Caucasia. The

³⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 14; 16; 21; 31-32.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

words of Rauf Bey are quoted in the case. In March 1918, in the course of a conversation with Khatisov, the Dashnak leader, Rauf Bey underlined the advantage of an alliance with England in the struggle against Bolsheviks in Caucasia: “An alliance between Turkey and England would ensured to Turkey restoring the borders of 1876 in Caucasia.”³⁴⁹

Shamsutdinov gives attention to activities of *Hürriyet ve İtilaf*, the party “representing interests of feudal and compradore circles,” that came to power when its leader Damad Ferit Pasha was appointed as the head of government. Shamsutdinov says somewhat inconsistently that “in spite of its weakness and unpopularity among the masses of the population, the party managed to establish its local organizations in all of the main centers of the country.” It is stated that various organizations created by the party, such as The Society of England’s Friends or several Pan-Islamist organizations, were subsidized and directed by British agents, while serving as centers of anti-Soviet propaganda not only in Turkey, but also in Caucasia, Crimea, Central Asia, and Afghanistan. It is said that The Society of British Friends were in favor of British mandate on Turkey, arguing that this would ensure peace among the different ethnic groups competing each other, whereas in fact British agents deliberately tried to aggravate relations between the different ethnic groups in Turkey, encouraging the activities of various ethnic organizations, arousing hostility and provoking bloody collisions between the Turks and Armenians, the Turks and Greeks, and the Kurds and Armenians. British occupants were assisted on that issue by Turkish feudal-bourgeois chauvinist organizations.³⁵⁰

Negotiations on Turkey’s partition conducted in the course of the Paris Conference are stated to be “one of the most shameful events of the war.”³⁵¹ Lenin’s words are quoted that

³⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 22; 23.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

³⁵¹ Ibid., p. 34.

“Turkey was parted alive.”³⁵² The Greek memorandum, sent to the peace conference on 30 January 1919, is said to having contained “much fantastic fabrications and rude attacks on Turkey,” while not reflecting the true aspirations of the Greek people.³⁵³

The Beginning of the National Liberation Movement

This chapter covers the period from the end of 1917 to April 23, 1920, the date of opening of the Great National Assembly of Turkey. The chapter opens with a sub-chapter on the October Revolution’s impact on the Turkish national liberation movement. Persistent emphasis on the connection between the October Revolution and national liberation movements in the East has been a traditional feature of the Soviet scholarship. The following sentences from the sub-chapter reflect the standard view the Soviet historical discipline has taken about the issue: “The Great October Socialist Revolution opened the new era of liberation wars in colonies and dependent countries. The revolution woke up the peoples of the East and raised them to the struggle against the foreign enslavers. . . . Without the victory of the Great October Revolution and the establishment of the united revolutionary front between the Western proletariat and the suppressed peoples of the East headed by Soviet Russia, the successful struggle of the Eastern peoples would be impeded.”³⁵⁴ Concerning Turkey, it is said that “October’s ideas of liberation and the repulse to foreign invaders and the White Army by the peoples of Russia inspired the Turkish working masses to the struggle against inner and external enemies. At the end of 1917

³⁵² Ibid., p. 42.

³⁵³ Ibid., p. 33.

³⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 43-44.

and during 1918, the peasant movement [in Turkey] became much stronger and broader, and obtained a strongly marked political quality.”³⁵⁵

It is stated that revolutionary ideas penetrated to Turkey by the following channels: contacts between the population of eastern Anatolia and Russian soldiers; the sojourn of Turkish soldiers in Transcaucasia, especially in revolutionary Baku; the influence of Turkish prisoners of war returned from Russia; the influence of emigrant Turkish intellectuals, Turkish students studying in European universities, and Turkish workers who had worked in German and Austrian factories during the war.³⁵⁶ The role of propaganda conducted by Turkish communists and their newspaper *Yeni Dünya* headed by Mustafa Suphi that was published in Russia since February 1918 and had circulation in Turkey is stressed.³⁵⁷ It is mentioned that Turkish left socialists were present at congresses of the Communist organizations of the peoples of the East held in Moscow. A conference held by Turkish left socialists in Kazan in 1918 is described in which a paper under the title “On the Importance of the Great October Revolution for the World Revolutionary Movement and on the Attitude of Turkish Left Socialists toward RSFSR” was read. The conference decided to support the Russian Federation in every possible way in its struggle against external and internal enemies and to organize from Turks prisoners in Russia military units for the defence of the October Revolution’s achievements. Later, at the First Congress of Comintern, Mustafa Suphi reported that thousands of Turks were defending the Soviet state at various fronts in Russia.³⁵⁸

Shamsutdinov asserts that developments in revolutionary Russia were of political and psychological significance for Turkey. First, due to the publication by the Bolsheviks of the

³⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 47.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 48-49.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 49.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 50.

secret agreements of the Tsarist government, Turkey had become aware of predatory plans of the Western powers. Second, Soviet Russia had served as an example and inspired Turkish people to the struggle against its enslavers. The appeal of the Soviet government “Toward All Working Muslims of Russia and the East” (December 3, 1917) is said to be of great importance to the Turkish people as well as to the all oppressed Muslim world, as it call them to be masters of their countries and their destinies. Apart from serving as a model, Soviet Russia had rendered real political and economic support for Turkey by renouncing the economic, financial and juridical privileges Tsarist Russia had received from the Ottoman Empire on the base of unequal agreements. In doing so, the Soviet state had been the first country in the world that had recognized not only the political but also the economic independence of Turkey. Shamsutdinov writes that as a result of the victory of the October Revolution, the international situation of Turkey had changed radically. He quotes from Turkish newspaper *Hakimiyeti Milliye*: “Turkey between imperialist West and Greece, on the one hand, and imperialist Tsarist Russia, on the other hand, would be like between a hammer and an anvil.”³⁵⁹

In the following sub-chapter, titled “Emergence of an Anti-Imperialist Movement and Its Driving Forces” Shamsutdinov characterizes the prerequisites of the Turkish national liberation movement, the peculiarities of its development, and the arrangement of class forces within it.

Shamsutdinov points out that the movement began in Anatolia where a compact Turkish population lived, referring to Marx, who pointed out that Asian Turkey was the true center of the Ottoman Empire. Prerequisites of the movement appeared in the course the First World War and in the beginning it took the form of mass desertion and had an anti-war character. Along with the soldiers, Turkish officers also had been overcome with anti-German feelings. Their way of responding to the state of affairs was the establishment of a secret organization aimed at a coup.

³⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 45-47.

In cities, discontent took the form of anti-government demonstrations, while in the countryside the peasantry showed their protest in the form of riots directed at landowners, wealthy peasants, tax-collectors, and local authorities. The highest form of people's discontent with the politics of war and the "impudent domination" of the German imperialists over the political and economic life of the country was a partisan movement directed at the German imperialists as well as the Young Turks, their agents. It is stressed that in the partisan movement, representatives of various nationalities participated.³⁶⁰

In the beginning, the liberation movement developed in the form of the self-defence of separate regions against the aggression of the Entente. Later, the movement obtained a general national character. The peasantry that formed nine-tenths of the population was the main driving force of the struggle. Turkish peasants also bore the financial and economic burden of the war for independence. Their struggle against foreign invaders was at the same time the struggle for land and for the liquidation of feudal exploitation. However, because of the leadership of the bourgeoisie, the anti-imperialist movement did not come to merge with the agrarian movement.³⁶¹

As for the role other social forces played in the movement, the following paragraphs from Shamsutdinov's monograph are worth full quotation:

Peasant movement in Turkey was not headed by the working class. Being not numerous (approximately 150 thousand), the working class was concentrated in three main industrial centers of the country: in Istanbul, where according to the 1915 census around 55% of the proletariat was concentrated, in Izmir (22%), and in Kilikia (about 15%). Even taking into consideration the fact that during the First World War this proportion slightly changed due to certain increase in number of factories of manufacturing and military industries, in any case, more than 70% of Turkish workers were in regions occupied by the forces of the Entente and Greece. The rest of the workers were dispersed throughout Anatolia in small factories. Moreover, the working class was poorly organized, politically inexperienced, and had not yet at that time its own party (the

³⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 54-56.

³⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 58-59.

Communist Party of Turkey took shape only during the anti-imperialist struggle and was established in September 1920). For these reasons Turkish workers failed to establish close relations with the peasant's spontaneous anti-imperialist movement and to head it. Nevertheless, Turkish workers actively participated in the national liberation revolution.³⁶²

The liberation movement of the Turkish people was headed by national merchant bourgeoisie, which turned into the revolutionary force of the war for independence. The bourgeoisie consisted mostly of small and middle tradesmen occupied mainly with domestic trade. During the First World War, the national bourgeoisie grew in number and strengthened its positions. The abolition of the Capitulations and lack of competition from capitalists of Western Europe (except Germans) favored these changes.

Unlike the non-Turkish compradore big bourgeoisie, which was the agent of foreign capital, the national merchant bourgeoisie was interested in maintaining state independence and the territorial integrity of Turkey. It aspired also to strengthen its economic and political positions and prevent a new monopolistic dominance of foreign capital in the country. In spite of its economic weakness, the Turkish national bourgeoisie played an active role in the political life of its country and had the experience of legal and illegal struggle against the despotic regime of Sultan Abdul-Khamit II. It had experienced staff among the military as well as civil officials, the majority of whom had obtained their secondary and higher educations in Europe.

Patriotic Turkish intelligentsia, especially officers, headed by Mustafa Kemal, played the leading role in organizing and carrying out the national liberation revolution.

The Turkish industrial bourgeoisie was scarcely in existence at that time. Not numerous in number, its representatives sided with the merchant bourgeoisie, taking active part in the struggle for independence. Along with the national bourgeoisie, liberal landowners the majority of whom had established contacts with the merchant bourgeoisie, joined the anti-imperialist struggle because the liquidation of the Turkish state and the partition of the country would create for them a real threat of losing their lands.

Becoming the leader of the people's movement, the Turkish national bourgeoisie narrowed its political goals. In spite of the active participation of the working masses, the movement failed to go beyond the framework of a bourgeois liberation movement. The movement developed under the banner of the nationalism of an oppressed nation and as such it had democratic content directed at liquidating imperialist oppression and achieving independence.³⁶³

In the following sub-chapter, titled "Establishment of Bourgeois Patriotic Organizations.

Erzerum and Sivas Congresses of the Societies for Protecting the Rights" the detailed examination of the bourgeoisie's role in the liberation movement is given. Characterizing the development of the bourgeois patriotic movement, Shamsutdinov leans almost solely on Turkish

³⁶² Bagirov specified the contribution of Turkish workers to the liberation movement, saying that they organized strikes in their factories, sent weapons and ammunition to Anatolia, and that many of the workers voluntarily joined partisan groups. Bagirov, p. 18.

³⁶³ Shamsutdinov, pp. 60-61.

sources. It can be discerned that on many points the Turkish and Soviet stands are similar. For example, it is the case considering the evaluations of Western powers' aspirations about Turkey, the conduct of the Sultan's governments, and Mustafa Kemal's deeds.³⁶⁴ The differences between Turkish and Soviet evaluations are determined by the Soviets' focus on social issues.

Shamsutdinov writes that while the people's armed struggle against the occupying forces was unfolding in the country, the bourgeois organizations too began little by little to join this struggle. They appeared independently of each other in various parts of the country. In the beginning of their activities, the majority of the bourgeois organizations were under the influence of pacifist illusions and held a false believe in the possibility of a "fear" peace based on the Wilson program. Therefore, their activities, instead of organizing an armed struggle against the occupying forces, were directed at organizing meetings, gatherings, and the publication of political pamphlets in order to propagate Turkey's independence and integrity. But the disappointment with the Western powers and the unfolding of a spontaneous struggle against the occupiers gradually led the bourgeoisie to participation in the people's anti-imperialist movement.³⁶⁵

Shamsutdinov emphasizes that at both Erzerum and Sivas congresses only the representatives of the propertied classes (big landowners, merchants, sheikhs, mullakhs, small and middle tradesmen, officers, bureaucrats, doctors, journalists, lawyers, teachers) were present.

³⁶⁴ Soviet scholars highly appreciated the personality of Atatürk, emphasizing his patriotism, foresight, soberness, and political and organizational skills. Shamsutdinov gives Mustafa Kemal's detailed biography, full of approving comments. It is mentioned that though Mustafa Kemal was a member of the Young Turk party, later he left it as he disagreed with them on the army's role in the political life of the country. It is also stressed that Mustafa Kemal was against German dominance in the country and army, being convinced that Germany aimed to turn the Ottoman Empire into its colony. The collision between Mustafa Kemal and Enver Pasha is mentioned. Mustafa Kemal's activities as the organizer and ideologue of the liberation movement are described with approval. Mustafa Kemal's remarks on various issues are cited frequently throughout Shamsutdinov's work. In short, it can be stated that almost all moments in Mustafa Kemal's activities received positive evaluation from Soviet scholars. It is notable that even on those occasions when the leadership of the Turkish national liberation movement comes under heavy criticism, Atatürk's personality escapes direct attacks.

³⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 61-65.

The narrowness of the social base determined the bourgeois-nationalist and moderate character of the decisions adopted by the congresses.³⁶⁶

According to Shamsutdinov, the discussion about the American mandate at the Sivas congress revealed the serious contradictions between the small, middle, and big merchant bourgeoisie in Turkey. In relation to this issue an examination of various strata of the bourgeoisie is given. It is said that the Turkish big merchant bourgeoisie consisted mainly of compradores which along with Turkish feudals served as the agents of foreign capital in enslaving the peoples of the Ottoman Empire by imperialist countries. Non-Turkish compradores had for a long time economic relations with British and French capitalists, whereas Turkish compradores were mainly connected to German capital. In spite of being the dominant nationality, Turkish compradores were weaker than non-Turkish compradores which held in their hands the monopoly in external and domestic trade. However, in the course of the First World War the correlation of forces changed in the favor of Turkish compradores. As the result of the policy of discrimination conducted by Young Turks' government toward national minorities, non-Turkish compradores were forced out of their positions. Taking advantage of the situation, the Turkish compradores became enriched during the First World War due to trade with Germany and Austro-Hungary and at the expense of the inhuman plunder of the working masses. Then the victory won by the Entente changed again the conditions of the competing compradore groups. After Turkey's capitulation the non-Turkish compradores under the protection of the Entente began to regain their previous positions in Turkey. Their existence became still more connected to British and French dominance in the Near East.³⁶⁷

³⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 86.

³⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 76-77.

It is stated that the interests of both the non-Turkish and Turkish compradore bourgeoisie were incompatible with the goals of the Turkish people's national liberation movement. The Turkish compradores related to British and French capital were in favor of the British or French mandate over Turkey, while those related to German capital favored the American mandate. Some high officials, officers, and intelligentsia were for the American mandate, too. They saw it as the least evil and the best means for preventing Turkey's partition. They did not believe in the success of the struggle against the occupiers. Moreover, they feared their own people. In fact, the activities of the American supporters were leading to subordinating the people's movement to the predatory plans of the United States in the Near East.³⁶⁸

In the end, the idea of an American mandate was rejected by the Sivas congress. The representatives of the Turkish national bourgeoisie and liberal Anatolian landowners, who were interested in maintaining the Turkish state, did not agree with the supporters of American mandate which represented the interests of the Istanbul big merchant bourgeoisie. The unfolding movement of the Turkish people for independence was the decisive factor in the determination of the country's fate. The Turkish national bourgeoisie became convinced that a strong base for the achievement of the independence had emerged.³⁶⁹

Actually, at the Sivas Congress the programme of anti-imperialist national liberation revolution (which later was named the Kemalist revolution) was worked out. In spite of the Sultan's evident treachery, the congress did not set the task of establishing a revolutionary government, limiting itself only with the demand of replacing the Damad Ferit Pasha's government with a new one. Nevertheless, the slogans advanced at the congress, "national

³⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 78.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 83.

sovereignty” and “full independence,” determined the progressive character of the national movement and became its basic demands.³⁷⁰

The chauvinist stand toward the national minorities showed at both congresses is underlined as a serious negative moment. It is said that, “the Turkish nationalists demonstrated their unwillingness to give the national minorities the right to independent existence and development of their economics, culture, language, literature, as if it could damage Turkey’s sovereignty or break the social balance in the country.” It is asserted that because of this moment Sivas congress’ political activities came to be directed not at establishing brotherly solidarity between Turkey’s oppressed nationalities and their joint struggle against imperialist oppressors, but at aggravating the struggle between various nationalities that was advantageous for the imperialists. By their stand toward the national minorities, the congress’ participants demonstrated their adherence to the national politics of the Young Turks. Actually, this situation was conditioned by the fact that the majority of the participants were former active members of the Young Turks party and were incapable of solving correctly this matter. Meanwhile, the matter was of paramount significance for the destiny of multi-national Turkey and, in particular, for the successful realization of the struggle for independence.³⁷¹

In the following sub-chapter, titled “Convocation and Dispersal of the Parliament in Istanbul. The Opening of the Great National Assembly of Turkey,” the process of the transition of political power to the Kemalists is described. It is stated that the process was under way throughout Anatolia during the autumn of 1919, as in almost all regions outside of occupied territories committees of the Society for Protecting Rights were created which began to control the activities of the local governmental institutions. In view of this situation, the Sultan and the

³⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 85-86.

³⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 84-85.

Allied powers decided to establish contacts with the Kemalists and a new government of Ali Riza Pasha was created which, acting as if it was sympathetic with the national movement, had to, in fact, seek its liquidation. On agreement with the Kemalists, the Parliament was convoked in Istanbul the majority of deputies of which were made up of supporters of the national movement. However, those deputies immediately became ordinary servants of the Sultan, as they agreed to collaborate with the occupying forces. Nevertheless, the “National Vow” accepted by the Parliament was of great significance as it became the program of the struggle for independence. At the same time, it was a rather limited program, for it did not include social and economic demands, did not aim at democratizing the state system and at granting equality of rights to national minorities. This situation stemmed from the bourgeois character of the Kemalist movement and the narrowness of its social base.³⁷²

The National Vow alarmed the Western powers. Dissatisfied in their hopes to liquidate the national movement by the hands of the Sultan’s government, they decided to strangle it by armed force. The following occupation of Istanbul caused a fundamental division within the national forces: the supporters of Turkish independence moved to Anatolia, which became the base of the anti-imperialist movement, while Istanbul became the center of the reactionary forces. The situation accelerated the transition of political power to the national bourgeoisie, who had hesitated to acquire it so far. In view of its political and economic weakness and dependence on feudal land-owning, the bourgeoisie came to be closely allied with the land-owners. This alliance determined the essence of the new political power in Turkey in which the bourgeois and land-owning elements came to be dominant. Defending their class interests, the bourgeoisie and landowners denied the working masses access to the new governmental institutions. Similar to previous governments, the Great National Assembly of Turkey did not reflect the class structure

³⁷² Ibid., pp. 89-93.

of the population and became the supreme political organ of the propertied classes. The fact that at that time the Turkish workers and peasants had not yet created their own class organizations and were in no position to put forward their political and economic demands contributed to such a situation.³⁷³

The absence of representatives of the working masses in the supreme political organ of revolutionary Turkey negatively affected not only the policies of the Kemalists, who showed inconsistency and hesitance in their relations with imperialist countries and the Sultan's circles, but also the program of the struggle for independence, which did not go beyond bourgeois nationalist demands.³⁷⁴ The Turkish nationalist bourgeoisie, like the bourgeoisies of other colonial countries, was of an ambivalent nature. On the one hand, it struggled for independence, against colonialism and imperialistic enslavement; on the other hand, its fight aimed at establishing its political and economic dominance in the country. According to the Kemalists, the national liberation movement had to unfold under the banner of nationalism that was allegedly the only condition of the existence of the Turkish nation and Turkish state. It was argued that within Turkish society contradictions did not exist and a "national unity" was the case. Based on this assumption, the Turkish bourgeoisie aspired to use nationalism not only for liberating the country and creating a sovereign bourgeois nation-state, but also for keeping the masses in political and spiritual servitude.³⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the principles of the new state system were progressive in comparison with the previous feudal-monarchical regime and had positive effect on the further development of Turkey.³⁷⁶

³⁷³ Ibid., pp. 95-106.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 109.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 106-107.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 111.

The Masses are the Main Force of the National Liberation Revolution

This chapter deals with developments in 1919-1920. The role the ordinary people played in the armed struggle against the occupation forces during that period, the interaction between the people and the bourgeois leadership of the revolution in this context and the reaction the bourgeois leadership showed toward the developments in political life of the population throughout the period are analyzed in detail. Shamsutdinov's main conclusion is that the Turkish national liberation movement, in fact, owed its success to the heroic efforts of the ordinary peoples, while the bourgeois leadership was always on guard so that not to lose its control over the situation and to prevent the masses from advancing radical social demands.

The first sub-chapter, titled "Turkish Partisans' Struggle against the Occupiers and the Sultan's Reaction in 1919-1920" traces the events of the period with the emphasis on the success achieved by the partisan movement and on the interaction between the Kemalists and the partisan forces. Shamsutdinov says that the struggle against the occupation forces was started by the people's spontaneous armed opposition. The basis of the Anatolian partisan forces was made up from groups created in the course of the First World War against the Germans and Young Turks. New groups were added to them now. Turkish Communists and Turkish prisoners of war that returned from Russia to Turkey played important role in the creation of new partisan groups. During 1919-1920 the burden of the struggle against the occupying forces and the Sultan's reaction fell to the partisans, as the Ottoman regular army disintegrated after the capitulation and its demoralized remains were incapable of armed opposition. Though the Kemalists considered the partisans as an anarchical force threatful to the state, they were forced to lean on them, for the partisans were the only force capable of action at that time. However, the Kemalists failed in the beginning to take the partisan movement under complete control, because the masses were full of

hatred toward the military, which had put the country into the catastrophe during the First World War and, therefore, were not inclined to obey the officers sent by the Kemalists. Nevertheless, the Kemalists succeeded, at least, in attaching their officers to many of the partisan groups as military advisers.³⁷⁷

In the following sections, the political activities of various strata of the population during 1920 and the reaction of the bourgeois leadership of the national liberation movement to those activities are examined. As Shamsutdinov argues, in 1920 within the national forces united so far in an anti-imperialist movement, the class conflicts became more apparent. The failure of the Kemalists to take the partisan movement under control showed that the division between the various social forces began and the strengthening of the independent movement of the working masses was under way. The emergence of the two currents was quite natural, as the social forces behind them had different objectives. The Kemalist movement, as a bourgeois liberation movement, aimed at achieving political and economic independence within the capitalist system, while workers and peasants, apart from their country's independence, also sought social liberation.³⁷⁸

Shamsutdinov proceeds then to describe the political organizations of the peasantry (the so-called "Green Army") and workers (the Communist Party of Turkey). He states that the decisive role the masses played in the anti-imperialist movement was the prerequisite for the creation of their revolutionary organizations. Concerning the "Green Army," Shamsutdinov says that it was established in a critical time when the Kemalists had no ability to create a regular army because of the people's refusal to serve in it and there existed an urgent need to unite the partisan forces in

³⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 112-122.

³⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 135-136.

order to give coherence to their activities.³⁷⁹ In view of the weakness of the working class and its inability to lead a peasant movement, the “Green Army” was led by petty-bourgeois revolutionaries.³⁸⁰ Shamsutdinov then considers the Green Army’s program in detail, stating that the two opposite outlooks – socialist and nationalist – interacted in it and, though being inconsistent in defending the interests of working masses, it included several positive moments, such as the demands of agrarian and other reforms, the democratization of the state system, the alliance with the Red Army and others. Leaning on Islam, ignoring the leading role of the working class, giving priority to the Turkish nationality are pointed out as shortcomings of the program reflecting its petty-bourgeois nature.³⁸¹

The program of “People’s Group,” a faction in the parliament formed from supporters of the Green Army, is also examined in detail, stressing that the principles of the state system advanced by the group strikingly differed from that of Mustafa Kemal.³⁸² Shamsutdinov says that the Kemalists decided to liquidate the organization, having become alarmed by the Green Army’s influence over the partisans and the soldiers of the regular forces and with the success of the People’s Group in the parliament (a member of that group was appointed Minister of Domestic Affairs).³⁸³

The following sub-chapters, titled “Establishment of the Communist Party of Turkey and Its First Congress” and “Prohibition of the Communist Party and Liquidation of Partisan Groups” traces in detail the vicissitudes of the Turkish Communist movement during the National Struggle. In the beginning short remarks on the history of the dissemination of socialist ideas in Turkey are made. It is stated that Turkey’s semi-colonial condition, the preservation of old feudal

³⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 140.

³⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 138.

³⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 141-144.

³⁸² Ibid., pp. 144-145.

³⁸³ Ibid., pp. 147-148.

institutions, the dominance of Islam, bourgeois nationalist movements among various peoples of Turkey, and the downtroddenness and illiteracy of the working masses prevented the crystalization of socialist ideas.³⁸⁴ Shamsutdinov proceeds then to account for the emergence of Communist groups in Istanbul and various places in Anatolia from 1918 to 1920, stressing that Turkish prisoners of war returning from Russia played a great role in this process.

The distinguished role played by Mustafa Subhi in the Turkish Communist movement is emphasized and his detailed biography is given.³⁸⁵ It is stressed that the Russian period had a profound impact on him. Much place is given then to the description of the first congress of the Turkish Communist Party and its decisions. As Shamsutdinov asserts, the creation of the Communist Party was one the greatest political events in Turkish history, which evidenced that the Turkish proletariat had become a political force in the country. The Congress' decision to support the national liberation movement is said to be of great importance for the Turkish revolutionary movement, as the Communist Party aimed at uniting in the anti-imperialist struggle not only workers and peasants but all patriotic forces of the country. Due to its revolutionary program that included the demands of radical agrarian, social and other reforms, the Communist Party's popularity among the masses started to grow. The Communists played an important role in the struggle for independence, as they took part in organizing partisan groups and conducted propaganda among the people calling them to the struggle against the occupying forces.³⁸⁶

The Kemalists showed an openly hostile attitude toward the Communist activities and fought them by means of various provocative methods. In October 1920, a government-sponsored false Communist party was created to confuse the growing Communist movement. As Shamsutdinov puts it, this party aspired to "obscure the consciousness of working masses with

³⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 150-151.

³⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 155-158.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 158-165.

the ideology of Islam and Pan-Turkism.”³⁸⁷ After this project’s failure, Turkish authorities applied to open terror toward the Communists. Mustafa Subhi and his comrades were brutally killed on their way to the homeland on the invitation of the Great National Assembly of Turkey. This act was just one among the range of others aimed at the destruction of the growing democratic movement in the country. The interests of the bourgeois leadership of the national liberation movement differed in a fundamental way from that of the people.³⁸⁸ The Kemalists’ attack on the democratic forces became easier in view of the fact that toward the end of 1920, the Ankara government strengthened its political position, created a regular army and strengthened the existing organizations of the police and gendarmerie.³⁸⁹ The partisan forces were taken under control as they were reformed and included in the regular army and those that resisted reform were physically liquidated.³⁹⁰

Soviet-Turkish Relations, 1920-1922

In this part, the history of the establishment of Soviet-Turkish relations is related, focusing mainly on diplomatic developments. Long citations from diplomatic correspondence and speeches both of Soviet and Turkish statesmen are in abundance. The account is animated with passages from the memoirs of Soviet diplomats that worked in Turkey or visited it at that time.³⁹¹ The essence of the chapter can be summarized as follows: the establishment of Soviet-Turkish friendship was of paramount significance for the Turkish anti-imperialist struggle. Soviet Russia

³⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 166.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 173.

³⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 166.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 167-171.

³⁹¹ The memoirs of M. I. Frunze, who visited Turkey at the end of 1921 as the Ukrainian extraordinary ambassador and signed with the Ankara government the Ukrainian-Turkish Treaty on Friendship, and those of S. I. Aralov, the plenipotentiary of RSFSR in Turkey in 1922, are used.

provided the security of Turkey's northeastern border and rendered it significant material, political, and spiritual support. The Treaty of friendship with Soviet Russia strengthened Turkey's statehood and sovereignty. Soviet Russia's support was one of the most important factors in Turkey's ultimate victory over the occupying forces. The Turkish people felt sincere gratitude to Soviet Russia for its help which was rendered without being bound to any political obligations.

As to the vicissitudes of the process of establishing Soviet-Turkish relations, the Soviet side invariably showed a well-disposed attitude, gave constant attention to the national interests of Turkey and was always guided by the Leninist principles of supporting peoples struggling for their independence. All hindrances and misunderstandings were caused by the Turkish side which sometimes was influenced by reactionary forces hostile to Soviet Russia. The imperialist powers were in constant effort to upset Soviet-Turkish friendly relations to prevent two peoples who struggled against the same enemy from uniting and to use Turkey in their struggle against Soviet Russia. Nevertheless, Soviet Russia and Kemalist Turkey managed to keep mutual understanding. The Soviet-Turkish Treaty on Friendship was of great political significance not only for Turkey, but also for Soviet Russia, as it struck a decisive blow to the Entente's anti-Soviet plans.

Peculiar attention is given to the Armenian issue in the context of Soviet-Turkish relations (it considered in a separate sub-chapter titled "The Dashnak-Turkish War"³⁹²). It is stated that the Soviet government, taking on itself the responsibility of the mediator in solving the territorial argument between Turkey and Armenia, aimed at a just decision to put an end to the imperialists' century-long interference in the internal affairs of the two countries. But both sides were insisting on unreal territorial claims, while the Entente powers were doing their best to unleash a war between the Turks and the Armenians. The Entente's true objective was to force Turkish troops

³⁹² Ibid., pp. 181-191.

to collide with the Red Army and to turn Caucasia into an arena of an anti-Soviet war. As military operations began, the belligerents refused Soviet mediation, because the Kemalists hoped for the quick crash of Dashnak Armenia and Dashnaks in their turn hoped for help from the Entente. But the help did not come and, in fact, the Dashnaks' venture condemned the Armenian people to a tragedy. The atrocities carried out by the Turkish troops toward the peaceful Armenian population roused the Soviet public's indignation. Numerous appeal by the Soviet government to stop the war and accept Soviet mediation were declined. Only the establishment of Soviet rule in Armenia saved the Armenian people from foreign enslavement and Dashnak oppression. Meanwhile, ordinary Turkish soldiers sympathized with Soviet Armenia and the Red Army. But, despite the will of the Turkish people, Turkish military commanders continued their old policy toward Soviet Armenia. Even after the conclusion of Soviet-Turkish Treaty on Friendship, the commanders of Turkish Eastern Army (in particular, Kazım Karabekir is depicted in negative terms and his conduct in the case is defined as "rowdyism") refused to leave the territory of Soviet Armenia. Nevertheless, in spite of all counteractions and intrigues of the enemies of Soviet-Turkish friendship and difficulties experienced in the course of solving border problems between Turkey, Armenia and Georgia, Soviet-Turkish friendly relations became established and strengthened every day. In the words of one Soviet statesman, the "general political line of close friendship in Russian-Turkish relations could be combined with discord on certain special questions."³⁹³

³⁹³ Ibid., p. 209.

War for Independence. The Ankara Government's Conditions Inside and Outside the Country

In this chapter Shamsutdinov deals with developments in Turkey from the Sevres Treaty to the Lausanne Conference (1920-1922) and furthers the social analysis he started in the second chapter of the book, as he assesses here the role the various strata of Turkish society played in the war for independence and gives detailed description of the changes that took place during the period under consideration in the conditions of those strata.

Shamsutdinov begins the chapter with comments on the Sevres Treaty and the London Conference. He describes the Sevres Treaty as “enslaving” and “disgraceful to the country in the highest degree.”³⁹⁴ According to the author, the “predatory conditions of the Sevres Treaty aroused wide-spread indignation among the Turkish people and caused a new wave of the liberation movement. Even those strata of the population that did not actively participate in the struggle for independence up until that part were overcome by common anger.”³⁹⁵ Furthermore, Shamsutdinov asserts that the Sevres Treaty had a strongly marked anti-Soviet direction, as the turning of Istanbul and the Straits into the Entente's navy base and free access of warships to the Black Sea created great opportunities for the continuation of anti-Soviet intervention in Caucasia and Southern Russia.³⁹⁶

It is stated that the Sevres Treaty, by fixing juridically British dominance in the Near East and in the Straits and dissatisfying the other powers, served to worsen imperialist contradictions. The rivalry between the Entente powers and their heavy financial conditions were the reasons for their decision to revise the Sevres Treaty. At the same time, the desire to prevent rapprochement between the Soviets and Turks and upset the Moscow Conference played great roles in this

³⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 227.

³⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 230.

³⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 230.

decision. During the London Conference, the Entente powers tried to draw Kemalist Turkey into an anti-Soviet coalition, but failed in their efforts.³⁹⁷ The only result of the London Conference was the Greek attack on Turkey.³⁹⁸

Meanwhile, the Kemalists succeeded in rallying the people for an organized struggle against the occupying forces and creating a regular army. With the creation of such an army, the Turkish national liberation movement entered a new phase in the war for liberation that marked one of the most important events in world history.³⁹⁹ Shamsutdinov describes the Turkish army's condition before the Sakarya battle, giving the primary attention to measures taken by the military in order to provide the army with necessary materials.⁴⁰⁰ Shamsutdinov stresses that the requisitions put a heavy burden on the population. However, it was a necessary step, because without the material base provided by the people the victory would have been unthinkable.⁴⁰¹ Shamsutdinov then describes the Sakarya battle in vivid terms as the heroic effort of the Turkish people. As he puts it: "A battle not seen before in Turkish history occurred from August 23 to September 13 along a front that extended to 100 kilometers. In the course of these days successes intermitted with failures and attacks with retreats, but all the time the Turks had in mind that they could not give the enemy a single inch of their land. . . . The people's enormous effort brought about the brilliant victory of the Turkish army."⁴⁰²

The following sub-chapter, titled "The Domestic Politics of the Ankara Government and the Internal Conditions of Anatolia in 1920-1922," is devoted to a detailed description of the economic and social situation in Anatolia in the period under consideration. The overall

³⁹⁷ Ibid., pp. 231-238.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 241.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 231.

⁴⁰⁰ He examines in detail how the requisitions were conducted and what materials were taken from the population.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 245-246.

⁴⁰² Ibid., pp. 246-247.

economic devastation is accounted, applying to some statistical data. Then the conditions of separate branches are examined, stating that, along with the degradation of agriculture, Anatolia's weak industry went into complete decline. While the remains of industry in the occupied territories worked for the Entente powers, those in inner Anatolia served the needs of the Turkish army. The government's efforts to revive certain industrial branches failed, as propertied people preferred to trade, not to produce.⁴⁰³ Shamsutdinov gives special attention to the activities of American monopolies in Turkey, saying that they, taking advantage of the war situation during 1921-1922, unfolded their trading network throughout Anatolia, penetrating into its most remote places. A number of economic fields became the targets of the Americans: they were buying up stocks of tobacco, trying to monopolize the oil and kerosine markets, monopolized internal communications, began to sell automobiles by installments, and created a widespread network of stores selling consumer goods and agricultural machines. American trade undermined the native economy. As a representative of the Ukrainian embassy wrote, "In Ankara complaints were frequent that American bitter but cheap meal was forcing out Turkish first quality wheaten meal, undermining the native meal industry."⁴⁰⁴

Then Shamsutdinov proceeds to describe the financial state of the Turkish state, stating that military expenses made up the greatest part of the state budget, while taxes were the primary source of income. The taxes were numerous, moreover, their rate grew during the war years and heavy requisitions were added to the existent taxes. The population was exhausted and the taxes could only be collected by severe measures. Like in the years of the First World War, all burden of taxes lay on the working masses, in particular, the Anatolian peasantry. Especially the middle and poor peasants suffered. Before the First World War, middle farms possessed 5-10 hectares of

⁴⁰³ Ibid., pp. 248-250.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 250.

land and 30-50 head of cattle in average. Those of them that possessed little land rented it from land-owners or rich peasants. In the mass, middle peasants did not exploit the work of another. The richest of them sometimes used hired labor and lended insignificant amount of money. Because of heavy taxes and requisitions many middle farms descended to the state of the poor. Before the war, a part of the poor peasants possessed 3-5 hectars of land, a couple of oxen and several head of sheep or goat. The rest were landless and rented land from land-owners and rich peasants. During the war, poor peasants became deprived of their land and cattle. Many of them turned to hired labor, some started to conduct a beggarly existence.⁴⁰⁵

At this point Shamsutdinov introduces the heavy criticism of the Kemalist government, saying that the Kemalists liked to speak and write of the peasantry as the true masters of Turkey, while doing nothing so that this became true. The peasantry continued to suffer from heavy economic and political pressure from land-owners, rich peasants, governmental and clerical authorities, and lived in constant poverty. The Kemalists had no intention to liquidate the big feudal land-owning or to carry out agrarian reform. In Eastern Anatolia still existed places in which peasants were in the condition of serfs and could not move without the permission of their feudal owners. The new government did nothing to improve the peasantry's conditions apart from giving general promises. Shamsutdinov cites a passage from Ethem Izzet saying that it accurately defines the Turkish ruling classes' policies toward peasants: "Nobody liked the peasant: neither pasha, nor land-owner, nor imam, nor buyer, nor collector of taxes, nor gendarme, nor sheikh. All of them were shouting at him unanimously: blockhead. As the war began, two things were demanded of him, as was the case all times – money and soldiers."⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 251-253.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 254-255.

Shamsutdinov states that rich peasants were central figures in the countryside and that the Kemalists carried out their policies toward the peasantry through rich peasants. In average, rich farms possessed 10-20 hectares of land and several hundreds head of cattle, many owned mills, forges, creameries, etc. Some rich peasants cultivated their lands themselves, using hired labor. Others rented their lands to poorer peasants. Many rich peasants were occupied with trade, money-lending, transportation or led producers' and credit cooperatives, carried out local administrative duties. Rich peasants were, in fact, the countryside's bourgeoisie. They were interested in the country's independence and bore the material burden of the war.⁴⁰⁷

Little changed in big land-owners' conditions during the war years, as land-owning rights continued to be considered sacred in Turkey. Big land-owners were made up of two groups. The first includes aristocrats who possessed several thousands hectares of land, about 200 villages, and thousands of heads of cattle. The high clergy and leaders of big nomadic tribes too were within this group. Aristocratic feudal lords had always been the supporters of the feudal state and had served as high officials and military authorities. In Kemalist Turkey too they preserved their strong position and continued to occupy high posts in the state and the military. They actively supported the old feudal methods of exploitation and opposed any changes in agrarian relations. Moreover, they were connected with foreign capital and served as the agents of imperialism in their country. During the war for independence they struggled in tandem with the occupying powers against their own peoples.

The second group of big land-owners was formed from representatives of the capital collected by trade and money-lending and from those bureaucrats that succeeded in seizing big lands. This group emerged as a result of buying up lands from the state and ruined land-owners, seizing the lands of poor and middle peasants taken from them for non-payment, and buying up

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 255.

the lands of deported Armenians and Greeks. This group of the so-called “liberal” land-owners, though being within the national front, all along the struggle for independence pushed Turkey to the collusion with the Entente. Representatives of this group actively opposed the democratic movement and the republican form of government. They had strong positions in the provinces and, along with petty and middle land-owners, exerted serious influence on domestic and foreign politics of the new government which was trying to create conditions for capitalist development. Only the threat of Turkey’s partition forced this group to take part in the people’s struggle against the occupiers and to bear the material expenses of the war.⁴⁰⁸

The workers’ class existed under extremely difficult conditions during the war years. It was not numerous. Moreover, the workers were purely organized, nevertheless, they actively participated in the struggle for liberation. Railroadmen, miners, port workers, tobacco workers, typesetters, textile workers, and metal workers were considered to be the most organized groups. The total number of workers did not exceed 120-150,000 and what is more, most of them were in occupied territories. There were a great deal of women and children among the workers. The number of women and children increased, as qualified workers were mobilized for military service in 1921. the workday lasted twelve to sixteen hours. Wages were extremely low. For instance, tobacco workers in Samsun were paid sixty kuruş per day, while a pound of bread was six kuruş. Wages of nine to sixteen-year-old children did not exceed ten to twelve kuruş and that of qualified workers did not exceed one lira. Railroadmen and workers of military factories were paid somewhat better – three lira. Typesetters were paid two lira. However, there were few qualified Turkish workers. Unskilled workers earned thirty kuruş per day. Five percent of wages went to the health fund and about twelve percent were paid as various direct taxes (income tax, military and travelling taxes). Delay in payment was frequently the case and the workers were

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 255-256.

compelled to go to money-lenders and profiteers. The workers' conditions in occupied territories were still worse. The huge influx of refugees from Bolshevik Russia had an immediate effect on wages, which dropped enormously. Payment per day to heavy workers and dock workers dropped from 2.5 lira to twenty kuruş and 1.5 cups of bean soup, while the workday lasted fourteen hours. Craftsmen also suffered. Most of them were mobilized and worked at military factories. Many branches of handicrafts degraded. Craftsmen used primitive tools. Nevertheless, their products successfully replaced European goods in native markets.

Poverty pushed the workers to struggle for their rights. In 1921, the first trade unions emerged. Railroadmen's trade union united about 5,000 members, that of miners – 7,000 textile workers' trade union consisted of about 12,000 and that of metal workers – 1,000. Their main objectives were an eight-hour workday, increased wages and active participation in the struggle against the occupiers. The trade-union movement strengthened after the September 1921 amnesty when the leaders of the Turkish Communist Party were released. In 1922, the trade unions united in a single body of the Union of Turkish Workers. The success achieved by the trade union movement alarmed the government. In the beginning of 1922, a draft Labor Law was proposed to the parliament. The basic objective of the law was to turn the trade unions into the appendage of the state machine, prevent the growth of class struggle and create the illusion of harmony between interests of the various classes of the Turkish society.⁴⁰⁹

The workers of Istanbul struggled under difficult circumstances. The occupying forces and the Sultan's gendarmes were arresting revolutionary workers without any reason and shooting them without judicial inquiry. Despite the terror, the workers' movement grew and strikes were frequent. Trade unions in Istanbul, in particular, the trade union of the dock workers rendered

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 257-259.

great assistance to the struggle against the Entente forces, transferring to Anatolia weapons, ammunition, medical supplies, and means of communication.⁴¹⁰

Shamsutdinov states that the heavy economic conditions caused wide-spread discontent among the working masses by the politics of the new government. Along with the strengthened workers' movement, the peasantry started to show dissatisfaction. The number of deserters grew, armed bands appeared that were attacking food storehouses and trade caravans. Instead of taking measures to improve the people's conditions, the government applied to repressions.⁴¹¹

Shamsutdinov underlines the role of the Turkish Communists in the growth of the workers' movement and accounts in detail the decisions of the 1922 Congress of the Communist Party held illegally in view of the government's ban. The congress pointed out that the reactionary forces became more active within the country and that the Kemalists, afraid of the people's activity, sought to solve the internal crisis by liquidating the anti-imperialist movement. The congress paid great attention to the peasantry question. The communists' weakness in the countryside was indicated as the party's serious shortcoming. It was decided to work among the peasants in order to draw them into the revolutionary struggle and to establish the union of workers and peasants. An agrarian program calculated for the war period was accepted. It includes the following demands: abolition of "asar," a double tax for uncultivated lands, giving lands to agrarian workers from deserted estates, etc. The communists' tasks related to trade-union movement and to the work among the youth were discussed as well. As Shamsutdinov argues, the congress showed that, despite repressions, the Turkish Communist Party grew and developed and that the Turkish workers and peasants started to comprehend their class interests.⁴¹²

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 260-261.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., p. 261.

⁴¹² Ibid., pp. 261-264.

After the congress, the Communist Party began wide propaganda activities. In accordance with the congress' decisions, the first conference of Kilikia's workers was held in October 1922. Alarmed with the strengthening of the Communist movement, the Turkish government arranged a shameful trial of the leaders of the Communist Party and the trade-unions. They were charged with high treason and the Communist Party was outlawed. Barbarity toward Communists undermined the new government's authority among the Turkish masses and caused widespread protests in the progressive circles of all countries.⁴¹³

As Shamsutdinov argues, the repression was a part of the national bourgeoisie's efforts to strengthen its positions. The Turkish national bourgeoisie, while struggling against the occupying forces, tried at the same time to ensure its power. The renewed state machine created in the course of liberation struggle was to serve its interests. The series of legislative acts adopted during 1920-1921⁴¹⁴ aimed at adapting the old state machine to a new regime that was replacing the semi-feudal one. The transition from feudalism to capitalism in Turkey lasted longer and was more difficult than in other countries. The semi-colonial conditions, the dominance of foreign capital, the foreign powers' constant interference with internal affairs, the preservation of the despotic Sultan's regime created serious hindrances to economic and cultural progress. The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 failed to establish a capitalist system, while creating certain prerequisites for capitalist development. In the course of the national liberation struggle, the basis for the new bourgeois system was worked out, which was fixed by the 1921 Constitutional Law. The constitution proclaimed the basic principle of capitalism – private property and the

⁴¹³ Ibid., pp. 287-288.

⁴¹⁴ Law on High Treason of April 29, 1920; Law on Organization of Gendarmerie and Police of June 7, 1920; Laws on Military Service of June 9 and November 3, 1920; Law on Invalidity of All Agreements Made by the Ottoman Government since March 16, 1920; Law on National Pact of July 18, 1920; Law on Fighting Desertion and Establishment of Trials of Independence of September 11, 1920; Law on Liquidation of Partisan Forces of December 28, 1920; Constitutional Law of January 20, 1921 and others.

inviolability of citizens' personality and capital – as the sacred law of the new Turkey (in the Sultan's Turkey, private property was not ensured by law). The constitution established the principle of national sovereignty and unity of powers. Though, by definition, supreme power belonged to the “nation,” national sovereignty did not mean the sovereignty of all of the nation, as the working masses were prevented from participating in government. Therefore, the proclaimed liberties of personality, the press, speech and gathering as well as widely used terms such as “nation” and “the people” served to cover the bourgeoisie's dictatorship.⁴¹⁵

Shamsutdinov points out that the 1921 Constitution did not change the form of government. As he says, it was caused by the Kemalists' fear at that time that the liquidation of the Sultanate could threaten the national front's unity.⁴¹⁶ Shamsutdinov then traces how after the Turkish victory over the Greek army the situation changed and in the context of the intensified struggle between the Kemalists and their political oppositon the former decided to liquidate the Sultanate that became a dangerous center around which the reactionary forces started to unite. According to Shamsutdinov, the liquidation of the Sultanate was one of the greatest achievements of the Turkish national liberation revolution. This act was directed against the forces of internal reaction which served as the agents of imperialism and were hindering the creation of an independent Turkish nation-state. The liquidation of the Sultanate put an end to the existance of the puppet Sultan government. Meanwhile, the Caliphate was preserved though the spiritual rule of the Caliph over the Muslims of the world had already turned into a fiction in view of the fact that nation-states had been created in the Muslim East. Preservation of the Caliphate was the provisional concession to feudal and clerical circles.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 266-267.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., p. 268.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 284-287.

The last sub-chapter deals with details of the decisive struggle against the Greek intervention and its consequences. It is stressed that though the Greek had a technical advantage, the Turkish army, inspired by the idea of the homeland's liberation, excelled the Greek army in spiritual and political respects. The Turkish soldiers constantly felt their own people's support. Moreover, the sympathies of Eastern peoples and progressive circles of the Western European and Balkan states were on their side. The Greek side lacked such psychological support. The predatory war the Greeks were conducting in Anatolia was unpopular even among the Greek public. The growth of anti-war moods and desertion, the plundering of the peaceful population negatively affected the Greek soldiers' performance. Moreover, they were fighting in an alien country with unknown conditions. All these moments contributed to the Turkish victory. After the Alashehir battle, the Greek army became completely demoralized and turned into fleeing mobs. As one Soviet source described: "There are no longer any intact units. Crowds of exhausted, worn-out, hungry, and, for the most part, unarmed peoples are flowing to Smyrna. Officers swamped with the wave of runaways have no ability to soothe the terrible situation."⁴¹⁸

Shamsutdinov states that the Turkish victory was met with joy throughout the world, while it caused serious anxiety and trouble among the Entente states and brought about the so-called "Near Eastern Crisis" in Europe that meant the failure of the Entente's, in particular, Britain's politics in Turkey. Greece's defeat was, in fact, England's defeat. The British imperialists were particularly alarmed by the probable impact of the Turkish victory on the peoples of their colonies. In Greece itself the defeat brought about a coup. The indignant Greek people, who had experienced numerous losses and sufferings because of the Turkish venture, overthrew their king and the government.⁴¹⁹

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 271-276.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 277-280.

Shamsutdinov argues that after the Greek defeat the Turkish army was able to make a sudden attack toward the Dardanelles to trap the British navy in the Marmara Sea and the Bosphorus. But the Turkish leaders showed hesitation and the moment was missed. After September 28 when the British received reinforcements, a diplomatic solution became inevitable. The Mudanya Armistice was, in fact, a compromise between Turkey and the Entente, as Turkey agreed to the Entente powers' staying in Istanbul and the Straits. The presence of foreign powers in Turkish territory negatively affected the course of negotiations at Lausanne.⁴²⁰

The Lausanne Conference

The subject is considered from the perceptible Russian perspective: the interaction between Soviet Russia and the Entente powers before and during the negotiations, the Soviets' demands advanced before and during the conference, and the meaning of the conference and its final decisions to Soviet Russia are given close attention. The Turkish side is said to have been inconsistent and yielding at some important points. The overall meaning of the Lausanne Conference for Turkey is assessed rather objectively, pointing out the positive and negative moments for the Turkish side.

The chapter begins with the section titled "The Struggle for Peace in the Near East" in which the Soviets' efforts to participate in the conference is described. This description is precluded by account of the efforts Soviet Russia undertook during the Turkish National Struggle in order to persuade the Entente powers to stop the bloodshed in Turkey (Soviet suggestion to invite Turkey to the Genoa Conference, numerous notes to the Entente powers, etc.). It is stated that Soviet Russia was the only great power that consistently strived for the liquidation of the war

⁴²⁰ Ibid., pp. 283-284.

in Turkey. Participation in the Lausanne Conference was the Soviets' legitimate right, for Soviet Russia, being the main Black Sea country, was interested to a greater degree than any other country in establishing lasting peace in the Near East and in a fair solution to the Straits problem. The Soviets' participation with equal rights was of paramount significance not only for establishing lasting peace, but also for meeting the legitimate demands of the Turkish side and restoring Turkey's absolute sovereignty. Meanwhile, the Allied powers were trying to preserve the semi-colonial dependence of Turkey, liquidate the Soviet-Turkish friendship and establish such a regime in the Straits in order to use them to anti-Soviet purposes. Therefore, the Entente did its best to prevent Soviet Russia from participating in the conference. As one Soviet newspaper put the reasons for such behavior: "Contemporary Russia is too alien a thing to European politicians, they feel too uneasy with the direct manner and frankness with which Russia puts questions, and, at last, Russia's demands are too inconvenient, as they run counter to the interests of the world lords." It is stated that the Soviets' firm stand broke through the Entente's diplomatic boycott and Russia participated in the conference, though only in solving the Straits problem. It is pointed out that the Turkish government, sadly, did not support the Soviets in their effort to obtain the right to equal participation.⁴²¹

The course of negotiations is described dividing it into two periods. It is stated that the first period was characterized by tense struggle between the Allied powers themselves, between them and Turkey, and between the Allied powers and Soviet Russia. The different priorities of the Entente states in accordance with the peculiar role each them had played in the Ottoman Empire are pointed out: it is indicated that France was interested primarily in the financial question, while England was more engaged with military-strategic considerations. It is stated that England, which had played the major role in the enslavement of Turkey, became, in fact, the conductor of the

⁴²¹ Ibid., pp. 289-295.

conference. G. V. Chicherin, the head of Soviet delegation, wrote: “England tried, first of all, to take from Turkey what it itself needed. Then it left France to scramble in further negotiations, sometimes skilfully intensifying discord and sometimes turning into a peacemaker between France and Turkey.” As to the conduct of the Turkish side, it is stated that the Turks defended their national interests with great decision and persistence, while being invariably supported in their efforts by the Soviet delegation, which was consistently unmasking the predatory politics of the Entente powers and demanding the recognition of the Turkish people’s right to absolute political and economic independence. In order to achieve their plans, the Entente powers applied widely to means of threats, blackmail and ultimatums, leaning on the occupation forces that remained in Istanbul and the Straits. The Turkish internal reactionary forces were acting in favor of the Entente, too: the feudal, clerical and compradore opposition in the Turkish parliament were pushing Turkey to collusion with the imperialist powers.⁴²²

Shamsutdinov treats the questions considered in the course of negotiations separately and in detail. Considering the question of the Capitulations, he stresses that Soviet Russia, unlike the capitalist states, considered the regime of Capitulations as incompatible with national sovereignty and, therefore, was the first to give up the privileges given to Tsarist Russia by the Ottoman Empire.⁴²³ Within the issue of territorial discussions much attention is given by Shamsutdinov to the Mosul problem. It is stated that British-Turkish discord on the subject was influenced seriously by the rivalry between the imperialist powers over Mosul oil. In fact, the Mosul question had turned into the problem of Near Eastern oil, though this was not openly accepted by the conference. Shamsutdinov argues that imperialist rivalry over Mosul oil was not properly used by the Turkish delegation to its favor. The final exception of the Mosul question from the

⁴²² Ibid., pp. 297-300.

⁴²³ Ibid., p. 316.

conference program served British interests and strengthened Britain's position not only in the conference, but also in the Near East in general.⁴²⁴

The greatest attention is given by Shamsutdinov to the question of the Straits. He underlines that the Straits were of paramount importance for the economic life and for security of Soviet Russia. "Naturally, the Soviet government, which firmly condemned the predatory policies of Russian Tsarism in the Near East and annuled all agreements of the Tsarist government on passing Istanbul to Russia, at the same time, could not allow such a solution of the Straits problem that would threaten its security." The content of the three programs (Soviet, Turkish and the Entente's) are described in detail, stating that the Soviet program differed in a fundamental way from that of the Entente powers. The Soviets' solution corresponded to Turkish national interests and to the security interests of the Black Sea countries, and aimed, in the end, at establishing lasting peace in the Near East, while the Entente's program aimed at using the Straits for aggressive objectives and as such was directed against Soviet Russia; it threatened the security and independence of Turkey and other Black Sea countries as well.

The Turkish delegation, wanting concessions on financial issues, from the very beginning showed inclination to yield on the Straits issue. Therefore, the major argument on the question occurred between the Entente and Soviet Russia. The Soviet delegation revealed step by step the aggressive plans of the Entente states in the Near East. A Soviet memorandum on the Eastern Question announced in the conference played a great role in these efforts and impressed the European public very much. The Entente powers, feeling uneasy, hurried to finish the discussion. By means of threats, they forced Turkey to agree with their solution. As a result of the inconsistent and yielding stance of the Turkish delegation, an agreement that only slightly differed from the conditions of the Sevres Treaty was concluded on the Straits question. The

⁴²⁴ Ibid., pp. 302-303.

Turkish concession on the issue violated the Soviet-Turkish Treaty on Friendship. It was, ultimately, a malicious deal between Turkey and imperialism realized at the expense of the interests of the Soviet republics and of Turkey itself. It originated from the very nature of the Kemalist bourgeois revolution and ambivalent role of the national bourgeoisies of the East.⁴²⁵

Shamsutdinov states that the numerous discord brought the conference at last to a deadlock and the negotiations were interrupted for a while. They started again after a series of preliminary negotiations and mutual concessions. Unlike the first period, the second one was characterized by a mutual desire to reach agreement as soon as possible. The Entente powers replaced the method of threats and ultimatums by the tactic of peaceful persuasion. The Soviet government was not informed about the renewal of the negotiations, for the Entente powers feared the Soviets' influence on the Turks and the world public. When V. V. Vorovskii, the Soviet delegate, arrived at last at Lausanne, he was assassinated by the intelligence services of the Entente powers. The convention on the Straits signed by the Conference was not ratified by the Soviet government.⁴²⁶

Shamsutdinov concludes the chapter by remarks on the meaning of the Lausanne Conference and the Lausanne Treaty for Turkey. He states that the Lausanne Conference was the final and the most important phase of the Turkish national liberation struggle. As one Soviet statesman wrote about it: "The Lausanne Conference was, in fact, a world event of paramount gauge, the first diplomatic battle of the rebellious East with the decaying power of united world oligarchies, the first manifestation of the ability of rebellious Eastern peoples to defend against the united front of world capital their basic achievements and to turn down agreements containing economic enslavement." The greatest achievement of Turkey at Lausanne was the juridical recognition by great powers of its statehood, sovereignty and independence. The most important

⁴²⁵ Ibid., pp. 303-312.

⁴²⁶ Ibid., pp. 319-324.

negative moments were as follows: Turkey did not succeed in liquidating its dependence on foreign capital, first of all, in liberating itself from state debt, the heavy legacy of the Sultan regime. The Convention on the Straits violated Turkish sovereignty. Turkey was forced to make concessions as it was weakened by long struggle. At the same time, they originated from the bourgeois character of the liberation revolution. The Kemalists feared the further development of the anti-imperialist movement, the strengthening of the class struggle and division of class forces. Therefore, they limited the revolution's tasks to liberating the country from foreign intervention, liquidating the semi-feudal Sultan's regime and carrying out some reforms directed against the remains of the medieval system.

Nevertheless, the Lausanne Treaty was a great victory over the imperialist powers. It meant the beginning of the liquidation of the Versailles system. It inspired the oppressed peoples of the East to determined struggle against imperialism. The Soviet peoples as well as progressive circles throughout the world welcomed the Lausanne Treaty that opened before Turkey the way of peaceful revival after years of suffering and hardship. Shortly after the treaty, the Turkish state that arosed in the fire of revolutionary struggle from the ruins of the Sultan's monarchy proclaimed itself the Republic.⁴²⁷

Results of the Turkish National Liberation Revolution

In conclusion, Shamsutdinov sums up the results of the Turkish National Struggle as follows: the main result of the Turkish national liberation revolution was the achievement of independence and the creation a sovereign nation-state. At the same time, the revolution put an end to the medieval foundations of the Sultan's regime and opened the way to a national revival

⁴²⁷ Ibid., pp. 323-326.

and the spiritual development of the Turkish people. In view of its bourgeois character, the revolution did not bring about fundamental changes in the socioeconomic life and did not provided democratic rights to the people. Agrarian, workers' and national questions remained unsolved, and the financial and economic dependence on the imperialist powers was preserved. In sum, the Turkish national liberation revolution showed the characteristic features of a bourgeois revolution as was described by Lenin: "It is advantageous to the bourgeoisie not to liquidate all of the remains of old times, but to preserve some of them, i. e. not to go to the end, not to be determined and ruthless."⁴²⁸

Capitalism in Turkey: The Turkish Model of Socioeconomic Development

The previous chapter discussed how Soviet Oriental studies became focused on contemporary socioeconomic issues from the 1950s and that in this context Turkological studies too experienced this shift. As the bibliographical data shows, a considerable amount of work on the socioeconomic development of the Republic of Turkey was produced especially during the late Soviet era. Soviet Turkologists have dealt with various aspects of Turkish economics and social life. In view of the wide scope of covered issues, I have decided to focus here only on that section of Soviet analysis that is concerned with explaining the overall course of Turkish socioeconomic development and its general particularities. In order to do it, I chose for description a collective work on capitalism in Turkey produced by specialists of the Turkish Sector of the Department on the Near and Middle East in IVAN,⁴²⁹ that was, according to the

⁴²⁸ Ibid., pp. 336-337.

⁴²⁹ *Kapitalizm v Turtsii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe razvitie v 50-80-e gg.* [Capitalism in Turkey: Socioeconomic Development in the 1950s-1980s] (Moscow: Nauka, 1987), 360 p. It was prepared by N. G. Kireev, R. P. Kornienko, P. P. Moiseev, G. I. Starchenkov, and Ie. I. Urazova.

authors themselves, “the first complex monograph on Turkish economics in Turkological literature.”⁴³⁰

Obviously, economic analysis differs from historical account significantly. To convey it properly, an appropriate approach and a competent hand are needed. In view of my inexperience in the field of economics, I have decided to limit the discussion here listing topics covered by the monograph (so that to give an impression about the areas of the Soviet scholars’ interests) and by relating some general conclusions made by the Soviet authors themselves, without going much into the details of the content.

The monograph is divided to the following parts:

- I. The general characteristics of socioeconomic development. The chapter deals with the process of pre-capitalist structures’ transformation, the dynamics of social production and reproduction at different stages of the national economic history, the principles underlying the Turkish state’s economic policy, the peculiarities of state capitalism, and the place of Turkey in the world capitalist economy.
- II. The evolution of agrarian structures. The shifts in the economic and social structure of the countryside during the Republican period are analyzed.
- III. The sphere of industrial production. The following issues are dealt with: the industrial policies of the Turkish ruling classes, the evolution of capitalist relations in industry, the concentration and centralization of private capital, the positions of foreign capital, the rates of growth in production in the 1980s etc.
- IV. The development of the service industry. The basic trends in the development of the services are examined; the analysis draws on such economic indicators as the share

⁴³⁰ Ibid., p. 3.

of the services in the GNP and the national income, in the employment of economically active population, and in the gross investment.

- V. Accumulation and its financial sources in Turkey. This chapter deals with the issues of mobilization and the use of domestic and external financial sources, Turkey's credit and banking system, the mechanism of taxation and its role in the accumulation of capital, and certain aspects of currency accumulation.
- VI. Shifts in the social structure of Turkish society. The role and place of pre-capitalist and capitalist structures in Turkish society are analyzed.
- VII. Aggravation of class conflicts. The growth of class antagonisms between the exploiters and exploited, i. e. between labor and capital, between the Turkish people and international imperialism, and between different groups of the bourgeoisie (national and proimperialistic, big and middle, monopolist and non-monopolist) are analyzed.

I have decided to focus in the description only on the general conclusions of the Soviet economists about Turkey. To begin with, the introductory statements of the monograph should be related.

The Introductory Remarks⁴³¹

The authors state that they seek to investigate in the example of Turkey problems of "peripheral" capitalism, its common and specific features, possibilities and limits of capitalist transformation. It is said that the authors were guided in their analysis by the following three

⁴³¹ Ibid., pp. 3-8.

conceptions worked out by the Soviet scholarship in regard to specificities of developing countries:

First, the combination of several different socioeconomic forms in one country.⁴³² It is stated that in Turkey the combination of pre-capitalist relationships with national capitalism (in its private and state forms) and foreign capital is the case with the preponderance of capitalist relations.

Second, the dependent type of development within the framework of the world capitalist system. This concept considers developing countries of capitalist orientation to be elements of the world capitalist system, having, however, such a specificity of development that puts them either under one-sided dependence on the centers of the world capitalism or create an asymmetrical interdependence between a developing country and capitalist centers.

And third, the dualism of the socioeconomic structure, i. e. the combination of traditional and contemporary economic sectors based on different forms of industrial relations: pre-capitalist and capitalist. It is considered that these different sectors are interpenetrable and walls between them are gradually disappearing.

The authors state that Turkey, according to general opinion, is a developing country which has numerous peculiarities due to the specificity of its historical development. First, Turkey is one of those countries the number of which not numerous that escaped direct colonial enslavement and preserved formal political independence though, in fact, they were under semi-colonial conditions for several decades.

Second, already in the 1920s, soon after the October Revolution, Turkey managed, with Soviet Russia's spiritual and material support, to restore its full political sovereignty and started

⁴³² In the Russian language a single word is used for this concept – *mnogoukladnost* – that could be translated roughly as “many-socioeconomic-formness.”

the struggle for economic liberation earlier than a number of other colonial and dependent countries of Asia and Africa that achieved their political independence only in the second or third phases of capitalism's general crisis. Third, for sixty years of the republican development,⁴³³ Turkey tried nearly all models and strategies of socioeconomic development characteristic to liberated countries: the attempt at the mechanical adoption of the experience of highly industrialized Western countries (the economic liberalism of the 1920s); active interference of the bourgeois state with the system of industrial relationships (politics and practice of state capitalism in an underdeveloped country – 1930-40s); transition from the principle of leaning on internal sources to the strategy of the active use of external sources (in the form of American economic help and loan capital from other Western countries) in order to accelerate economic growth (the economic liberalism of the 1950s); the strategy of “catching up” development on the base of import substituting industrialization (the so-called planned economy of the 1960-70s); the course on turning the “closed” economy into an “open” one by means of improved quality of native production – export oriented industrialization (the “free market economy based on competition” that has been conducted since the beginning of the 1980s).

The authors state that they have based the analysis of Turkish realities on the following ideas:

a) Although the initial push for capitalist development came from outside (in the Sultan period), as a whole, Turkish capitalism is a product of the internal evolution of pre-capitalist structures during the Republican period.

b) The transformation of traditional structures has all the way been impeded by considerable amount of feudal remains that were not liquidated by the Turkish ruling circles by means of radical reforms.

⁴³³ The monograph was published in 1987.

c) The constant influence of external factors on the course of socioeconomic development is the case. This influence is not exerted directly but shows itself in indirect ways in the course of interaction between the national economy and the world capitalist economy.

d) Capitalism as an economic formation goes through three phases of development: early, mature, and final. Like other developing countries, Turkey, in fact, has missed the mature phase, as early capitalism in Turkey was followed by its final – monopolistic – form.

It is stated that the greatest success in socioeconomic development of Turkey occurred in the 1960-70s, when an important structural shift occurred and Turkey turned from a backward agrarian country into an agrarian-industrial one with middle level of development. Its many indices nearly caught those of “new industrial countries.” However, since the end of the 1970s, because of some internal and, in particular, external factors of destabilization Turkey entered a period of acute political and socioeconomic crisis. The attempt of the ruling circles to overcome the situation led in the political field to the 1980 military coup and in the economic field to the so-called Package of Measures on Economic Stabilization. These measures represented in the theoretical sense an obvious transition from liberal bourgeois theories to conservative conceptions that reduced the state sector’s role only to creating the basis of an industrial and social infrastructure.

The authors then mention discussions conducted by Soviet scholars about the Turkish experience in capitalism and point out several controversial issues. As they state, Soviet Turkologists – economists and sociologists – have constantly discussed the level of development achieved by Turkey and the proportion of traditional and contemporary sectors in the Turkish economy. The authors argue that it was agreed in the 1980s that Turkey is a capitalist country with a middle level of development, but the question of the correlation of traditional and contemporary forces in the Turkish economy is still unresolved. The argument over the latter

problem stems from different interpretations of the role of small production. Whereas some scholars argue that the field of small production constantly transforms and thus way capitalist relations grow within the traditional sector; others are inclined to see small production as the “bastion” of the traditional way of life. The authors note that this disagreement was reflected in the monograph and that different interpretations were mentioned.

The question of whether Turkish capitalism already has passed to the monopolist phase or not has also been the subject of lively dispute. The authors say that they themselves are of opinion that monopolies do not totally dominate the Turkish economy and politics as some scholars argue. It is stated further that the possibilities and limits of the capitalist transformation in liberated countries have been the subject of still more intense discussions. According to the authors, the principle of uneven development in capitalism formulated by V. I. Lenin should be the point of departure in this discussion. It can be asserted, based on this principle, that it is possible for a developing country to become firmly established in the capitalist form of economy, but it would not mean the liquidation of the country’s dependent position in the world capitalist system. Therefore, in the case of the 1980 economic program in Turkey, they conclude that this program will certainly advance capitalism, but would not solve the major problems of national development.

Chapter I of the monograph gives an outline of the socioeconomic development of the Republican Turkey. I have decided to convey its content in detail as it forms the foundation of the monograph, giving the most important characteristics of Turkish socioeconomic development and tracing them in historical perspective. The order of sub-chapters in which the chapter is divided was followed in the description.

The General Characteristics of Socioeconomic Development of Turkey

I. Peculiarities and Contradictions of the Transformation of Pre-capitalist Structures⁴³⁴

The first sub-chapter gives the overall history of the Turkish economy. It is stated that the first signs of capitalist development began to appear from the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The reforms of the 1840-60s (the Tanzimat era) accelerated the process. Early capitalist elements in the Ottoman Empire were rather the consequence of external impact than the result of internal processes. When the Sultan's Turkey was turned into a sem-colony of the imperialist states, it meant in practice that its economy became subordinated to laws of the capitalist market, but it was a deformed capitalist development, because by means of economic and non-economic methods (the Capitulations, inequal agreements) value proportions were distorted. The ultimate result was the deformation of national development and the appearance of such a capitalism that was entirely subordinated to the will of the external market and received the impulses for development from outside. With the achievement of political independence, internal factors of economic development began to predominate over external ones. However, the objective of independent national development put forward by the Turkish ruling classes was not ever fully realized and certain features of the "secondary," dependent form of evolution were still present in the 1980s. As the authors put it: "The contemporary Turkish economy is a part of the world capitalist economy, a link of its reproductive mechanism. It is liberated from imperialist exploitation by means of non-economic methods and as such is an autonomous economy. At the same time, it is a part of subordinated, dependent "periphery" of the world capitalism which is being exploited by methods of neo-colonialism, i. e. basing primarily on economic laws."

⁴³⁴ Ibid., pp. 9-18.

Along with the “peripheral” quality, the Turkish socioeconomic system is distinguished by its “incompleteness,” as the process of transformation of pre-capitalist structures (especially, in the countryside) is still unfinished. Consequently, Turkish society combines different forms of economies. In the early Republican years, various economic forms existed autonomously, i. e. separately, without having stable interrelations, while pre-capitalist forms prevailed over others. As time went on and capitalist forms became dominant, economic disunity decreased due to the gradual disappearance of pre-capitalist forms. While the “many-formness” of the early Republican years referred to such a condition in which none of the existent economic forms were central, the presence of many economic forms in contemporary Turkey has a different meaning. In fact, the “many-formness” of the contemporary Turkish economy in many respects resembles that of developed countries, differing from them only in a quantitative respect rather than in a qualitative one. At the same time, quantitative particularities turn out to have a qualitative significance.

In sixty years of the Republican development, the Turkish economy went through the following stages:

The first stage (1923-1932) covers the first decade of independent development. In this period, the ruling circles of the young Republic chose the strategy of economic liberalism, i.e. they decided to lean on reactionary forces. In practice, it meant that Atatürk and his supporters undertook an attempt – that was doomed to failure from the very beginning – to apply the Western theories of economic growth mechanically, without any modifications to a newly liberated country. The Kemalists’ decision was preconditioned by the range of objective and subjective factors. The point was that the Kemalists were convinced that Turkey could overcome its economic backwardness by means of establishing capitalist methods of production in their Western variant. In the circumstances of the 1920s when the world capitalism enjoyed a partial

stabilization they could not think of another possibility; the socialist undertaking in neighboring Soviet Russia was alien to them in class terms and, therefore, incomprehensible. Meanwhile, they, naturally, were not fully aware of the specificities of the socioeconomic development of liberated countries, as they were among the first to experience it and were in no position to make use of others' experiences. The Kemalists were forced to seek solutions only by their own efforts and were exposed to errors. The attempt to revive economically a poverty-stricken semi-feudal country by means of free enterprise was one of those errors.

The second stage (from 1932 to 1939, but for convenience is considered to last to 1945). In this stage, because of the range of internal (the failure of private enterprise to liquidate economic disunity and provide economic revival, the realizing of erroneousness of uncritical borrowing of the Western experience) and external factors (the world economic crisis of 1929-1933, the first successes of Soviet Russia in socialist development) the conservative line was abandoned and the new course to enlarging the economic functions of the state and to achieving economic independence with the leading role of the state enterprise was proclaimed. It was a really original solution for the 1930s and deserves being called as the "Turkish model of economic development."

Foreign private enterprise became stagnant at that time: foreign firms were deprived of their previous privileges and their activities were put under Turkish jurisdiction. At the same time, the first attempt was undertaken to use Soviet experience in planning, which had some positive effect. Although during the Second World War the sphere of etatist measures seemingly became still more enlarged, very soon the state's regulation degenerated to the system of military-bureaucratic regulation and the redistribution of surplus value in favor of big businessmen by means of price mechanism, bank credits etc. Therefore, the war years should be considered as a period of transition from "democratic" capitalism to conservative form of development.

The third stage started immediately after the Second World War and finished, according to common view, with the 1960 coup. In the post-war period, with the initiative of big capital that was undergoing the process of consolidation, the Turkish ruling circles withdrew from the Kemalist ideas of protectionism in the economy, and from the course of peaceful coexistence in foreign affairs. They actively joined the imperialist policies of the Cold War and took the course of “liberalization” in the economy that is unlimited development of private enterprise, both native and foreign. The politics of economic “liberalism” leaning on reactionary land-owners, military and civil bureaucracy; close alliance with the world imperialist reaction against the forces of democracy and socialism in the international arena referred to a preponderance of conservative tendencies at all levels of economic and sociopolitical life.

The fourth stage is the so-called period of planned development of the 1960-70s. After the 1960 coup and the adoption of the 1961 Constitution (that was more liberal than the previous one), under the influence of some internal (increased role of the state in the economy as a result of the adoption and realization of long-term programs of economic development; politics of industrialization) and external factors (the relaxation of international tension, Turkey’s giving up the course of one-sided orientation to the capitalist West) positive tendencies in development of national capitalism appeared again, as in the 1930s. “Democratic” capitalism made it possible for Turkey to realize a great leap forward. However, economic difficulties grew into a serious crisis in the end of the 1970s.

The fifth stage started with the so-called “Package of Urgent Measures” of January 1980 that represented the new strategy of capitalist modernization undertaken with the initiative of big neo-compradore capital in favor of its own interests. The new strategy meant turning again to utterly conservative aims and methods.

In sum, except for two periods (1932-39 and 1963-1979), capitalist development in Turkey was characterized by the preponderance of conservative, anti-democratic features and tendencies. In its turn, this particularity turned into one of the primary causes of political reaction that distinguished Turkey throughout nearly all of its development as a bourgeois republic.

After giving this outline of the stages of economic development in Turkey, the authors point out that the Turkish economy, like that of other liberated countries, is distinguished by “enclaveness:” capitalist relations unfolded, especially during the first four decades (1923-1962 – the period of “unplanned” development), not everywhere and in even fashion, but in the form of separate enclaves, for the most part, weakly connected with each other in technical and economic terms. The enclaveness of development prevented the unification of the economy and led to the regional unevenness of social evolution that has been one the most acute problems of Turkey.

Then the authors proceed to analyze shifts in the official economic strategies during the Republican period considering the official stand toward sources of accumulation and external factors. It is stated that from the victory of the national liberation revolution until the end of the Second World War, the Turkish ruling circles were on guard against foreign capital and strictly limited its entrance. The “autarkic model of development” practiced from 1926 to 1950 was based on the idea that Turkey, liberated from non-economic methods of exploitation, was able to manage without foreign loans. The 1930s were unique period in the economic history of Turkey when debts to foreign countries were decreasing steadily. The authors point out that the economic autarky of 1923-1945 was, largely, a result of a coincidence of circumstances rather than of the Turkish government’s purposeful course. The Kemalists were, in principle, not against using external sources, but wanted to impose on foreign capitals some restrictions so that maximum profit was guaranteed to the Turkish state. Foreign firms were not satisfied with these conditions and did not invest in the Turkish economy, whereas the system of providing to

developing countries loan capital from international organizations appeared only after the Second World War. As a result, Turkey was in no position to make use of foreign capital either in the form of enterprise or as loans. On the one hand, this situation put the Turkish economy into a Procrustean bed of limited internal sources, on the other hand, it made it possible for Turkey to minimize toward the mid-1940s its dependence on imperialist monopolies.

Meanwhile, it became obvious at that time that Turkey, practically, had exhausted its modest possibilities in mobilizing internal sources. There existed two ways out of the deadlock: to increase the scale of national production and, accordingly, incomes as the base of internal accumulation by means of socioeconomic reforms; to use external sources of accumulations. The Turkish ruling circles chose the second way: from the end of the 1940s and, in particular, after the coming to power of the Democrat Party, which represented the interests of big merchant-speculative capital and big landowners (these groups strengthened during the war) the new phase of economic development began. The economy became oriented to use external sources in every possible way, at first, in the form of American aid, then – loans from the International Consortium for Aid to Turkey and, in the end, since the mid-1970s – loans and credits provided from free capital market.

At the same time, the Turkish economy did not become open. On the contrary, the import substituting industrialization that began to be conducted with vigor especially after the transition to planned development (1963) was unthinkable without the protection of national production. Therefore, during the 1960-70s using external sources for accumulation was combined with protective measures. However, such a model of development, though absolutely necessary at a certain phase of social progress, started in the end to hinder economic development. Domestic demand was not able to provide constant high rates of growth when production costs were high and the competitive qualities of Turkish production were low. Protective measures and Turkish

lira's low rate, while providing protection for the industrial sector, at the same time hindered export and created structural disproportions in the system of production.

The authors indicate that the problem of national production's conformity to world standards is especially acute for Turkey. In 1980, Turkish big capital started by means of the Demirel government the new strategy of capitalist modernization (neo-conservative strategy copied from highly developed countries) aimed at changing the model of industrialization and thereby changing Turkey's place in the system of the international division of labor. In particular, this strategy proposed the application of the principles of the free market based on competition, giving the priority to export branches and decreasing the state's interference in the economy. As the authors state, this turn corresponded to the interests of the ruling classes the best.

The authors sum up that the most important features of Turkish capitalist development are as follows: first, Turkey is situated at the periphery of the world capitalist system, and, therefore, a certain dependency, the secondariness of its economic development is the case; second, conservative, non-democratic features have predominated the Turkish socioeconomic reality; third, Turkish society has a transitive character and, therefore, the combination of many different economic forms is the case; fourth, the formation of industrial production has been characterized by enclaveness and, consequently, by regional unevenness (regional disproportions in economic, social and cultural progress).

II. The Dynamics of Social Production and Reproduction⁴³⁵

The second sub-chapter deals with qualitative changes in Turkish economics during the Republican period, clarifying them by economic statistics and tables. Only some of the general conclusions will be conveyed here.

It is stated that the economic development of liberated countries aims at liquidating the disunity between the existent various economic forms. As a rule, in the course of economic integration industry outstrips other branches because the industrial sector promotes the creation of the technological basis for all other branches. Turkey is not an exception. Nearly at all stages of Turkish economic history the proportions between industrial sector and agriculture have been in favor of the former. As a matter of fact, the outstripping growth of industry is a progressive phenomenon that has testified the important structural shifts in the economy, as industrialization is the primary condition for achieving economic independence and liquidating backwardness. But, at the same time, certain proportions should be preserved between industry and other branches. Turkey has still to achieve an optimal structure of economy.

From 1923 to 1945 the Turkish ruling circles were of the conviction that the transformation of traditional structures into contemporary ones could be achieved by the mere acceleration of economic growth without carrying out socioeconomic reforms.⁴³⁶ However, economic realities little by little refuted the possibility of such an automatic development and forced the political superstructure to undertake some urgent reforms and to intervene in the economic life so that to accelerate capitalist evolution. The acute economic crisis at the end of the 1950s and the

⁴³⁵ Ibid., pp. 18-25.

⁴³⁶ It is stated that the Kemalist reforms did not much affect the countryside, which continued to vegetate in the conditions of economic and sociocultural backwardness, and the deprivation of civil rights and poverty.

beginning of the 1960s⁴³⁷ revealed an urgent need for the state's purposeful and long-term activities in the economy. The period of planned economy began. However, the planning in a bourgeois country represents only a certain type of economic policy and serves to deepen the existent social contrasts. In the Turkish experience in planning, too, the support of only certain strata of society and ignoring the interests of the working masses were the case.

Turkey serves as a perfect example of the principle of the uneven development of liberated countries with the capitalist form of economy. Until the 1960s, Turkey showed the same level of development as any other developing country, despite the fact that it achieved its political independence much earlier. Then, after the leap experienced in the 1960-70s, Turkey suddenly outstripped many Asian and especially African countries and became one of the most quickly developing countries. However, starting with the second half of the 1970s, many internal factors (political instability, the growth of military expenses, the acute shortage of fuel, the struggle within ruling circles) and the world economic crisis caused an abrupt slowing-down.

III. Objective Foundations of State Economic Policy⁴³⁸

In the third sub-chapter the evolution of the economic policies pursued by the Turkish ruling circles during the Republican period is traced.

It is stated that in countries of the Turkish type the historical task of the bourgeois reorganization of society necessarily was handled by the state. This situation was determined by

⁴³⁷ It is said that though Turkey was not exposed to the destructive effects of the war (on the contrary, the Turkish ruling classes became enriched due to supplying the belligerent countries with raw materials and exploiting the Turkish masses), nevertheless, during the war years the Turkish economy was brought to a total decline and the Turkish working masses – to serious destitution. The causes of this situation were as follows: the militarization of the economy, the disruption of foreign economic relations, anarchy in internal market as a result of the merchant and profiteer bourgeoisie's activities.

⁴³⁸ Ibid., pp. 25-44.

the traditional functions of the state in the Eastern world: keeping the army, controlling and directing social works. Throughout the Republican period, Turkish economic policy has been based on etatist conception. This conception has not been directed against private enterprise, on the contrary, it has supported the private sector in every possible way; the state interference in the economy from the very beginning has been determined, in fact, by the national private capital's weakness. During the Turkish National Struggle, when all economic measures were undertaken and financed by the Kemalist government, the foundations of the economic policies of Republican Turkey were established. Aiming at creating a bourgeois state in a backward feudal country, the Kemalists became necessarily engaged in activities directed at concentrating accumulations in the hands of the state and organizing the material base of Europeanization. The Law on the Liquidation of the Caliphate was, in fact, the first Kemalist act of nationalization, as by the law the properties owned by Sultan and his family were transferred to the "nation." The Kemalists' early measures represented, in fact, the measures of state capitalism though their forms carried inevitably a traditional or semitraditional character.⁴³⁹

The etatist measures of the 1920s were oriented mainly at spontaneous processes of accumulation of capital with the future perspective of transferring this capital to industrial construction and began to contradict the country's need for economic growth especially during the world economic crisis of 1929-1933. Industrialization appeared as an urgent need in this situation and the only possible base of the industrialization in such a country as Turkey was a strong state sector. The authors point out that the state in Turkey was represented by a military and civil bureaucracy, a complex social organism with striking particularities of its own kind. First, the Turkish bureaucracy was numerous and unusually influential and organized. What is

⁴³⁹ At this point, the authors indicate that the majority of Turkish historians themselves does not consider etatist measures of the 1920-30s within the framework of capitalism.

more, it leaned on traditions that did not experience any serious change even after Turkey's transition from the conditions of a vast empire to a relatively small republic. Second, the Turkish bureaucracy represented the interests both of the exploiter classes and petty bourgeoisie; moreover, it represented national interests too. Third, the Turkish bourgeoisie has traditionally had its own interests not only in the field of politics, but also in the economy. The struggle for these interests was one of the stimuli for preserving the dominant position of the bureaucracy's top within the complex structure of ruling forces.

Stating that the Turkish bureaucracy and its role in Turkish history deserves separate study, the authors point out that the 1920-30s witnessed a particular phenomenon: the Turkish bureaucracy took on the functions of capitalist entrepreneur in the most important spheres of economy: infrastructure, industry, banking and even to a certain degree agriculture and trade. During the 1930-40s the autonomy of the bureaucracy increased, as its economic base – the state sector – renewed and strengthened. During the war etatist policy ran to extremes and started to show an increasingly contradictory character. The state's interference in the economy greatly increased, while it did not prevent inflation, speculative enrichment of certain groups of private capital, etc. Etatism experienced a crisis that was paralleled with the changes in the structure of the ruling circles. Big Turkish bourgeoisie, which had accumulated considerable capital due to state capitalism (contracts for the state sector and the army), became experienced in technological and administrative spheres (again, due to the state sector) entered a new phase in its relations with the state in the field of economy. The big bourgeoisie aspired, first, to reorganize state companies according to its own interests; second, to seize those economic spheres that were controlled by the state sector and due to the development of internal market turned to profitable fields; third, to ensure state subsidies by means of the state capital's participation in mixed companies etc. These aspirations underlay the economic policies of the Democrat Party (1950-60). The politics of the

previous governments were severely criticized for “interfering capitalism, bureaucratization, monopolization.” However, despite all proclamations about adherence to private enterprise and the growth of big merchant-industrial capital, the sphere of state activities did not narrow. Like in the previous period, overall economic development was directed by the state, though nobody spoke of etatism anymore.

The 1960 coup did not bring any significant change to the ruling circles’ perception of the state’s role in economy. But the content of state capitalism, changed finding its reflection in the adoption of the new slogan “mixed economy.” It reflected the big bourgeoisie’s aspiration to limit the sphere of the state sector and establish the private sector as the state’s “legal partner.” The 1961 Constitution charged the state with the responsibility to “take measures so that to provide private enterprise secure activity in accordance with national economy’s needs and social objectives.” At the same time, the Constitution confirmed the continuation of the institute of etatism. Moreover, for the first time, the role of the state in economic life became elaborated in a number of constitutional articles. According to the authors, it meant that for the first time the new variant of capitalist industrialization – planned, based on big state property – became constitutionalized. During the 1960-70s the state sector became still more enlarged. While the state preserved its leading positions in the most important economic fields and the system of credit, the place and role of big private capital too were steadily growing, as state capitalism in Turkey aimed, at the same time, at stimulating the concentration and centralization of private capital and strengthening capitalist industrial relations.

Especially in the 1970s, big private capital achieved great success in establishing its political and ideological influence over Turkish society. Using its increased financial potentialities, tightening its cooperation with the top bureaucracy, leaning on the support of the international and national monopolies of the West, big capital kept in its orbit considerable parts

of the national bourgeoisie and petty producers. The theory of “mixed economy,” slogans on a united private sector, on protecting private property, and on social peace were widely exploited for ideological purposes. The fact that big capital was so well politically organized, its cooperation with the top bureaucracy and the high military, on the other hand, and the ideological disorientedness of the petty bourgeoisie, intelligentsia, and petty civil servants, the general disunity of democratic forces, on the other, made it possible for the big capital to freely use in its own interests almost all private as well as state sectors. In view of such a tendency, Turkish capitalism became oriented to the monopolist form of state capitalism. However, this form has not been fully realized, because the political power in Turkey represents not only the interests of big bourgeoisie and its monopolist top, but also that of the countryside bourgeoisie, land-owners, bureaucracy and other groups whose interests sometimes do not coincide with that of the monopolist capital.

Since 1980, the ruling circles started the revision of the existing system of interaction between state and private sectors. The new course aimed at the liberalization of all socioeconomic system of Turkish society and the gradual privatization of the state sector. However, the 1982 Constitution as well as a number of laws adopted in 1980-83 confirmed again the principle of the state’s interference in socioeconomic life. As the authors argue, Soviet scholars agreed that the leading role of the state sector was not decreasing, but was just being reorganized in accordance with the level and needs of the capitalist development. Moreover, some measures aimed at adapting economy to contemporary needs contributed to strengthening state capitalism. The authors conclude that, despite changing slogans and priorities, the state interference in socioeconomic development as well as the principle of planning have been the case throughout the Republican period.

IV. Turkey's Conditions within the World Capitalist Economy⁴⁴⁰

The fourth sub-chapter is devoted to the description of the place Turkey has within the world economy. It is stated that during the first decades of the Republican period certain prerequisites for the achievement of economic independence were created due to the politics of state capitalism and protectionism. The Turkish bourgeoisie was of conviction that full economic independence had to be achieved by overcoming backwardness and by industrialization. It was expected that, in consequence, the country's conditions in the world economy will change and Turkey will participate in the world economic affairs as an equal partner enjoying full rights.

However, Turkey's move toward the full economic independence was seriously impeded and slowed down by unfinished internal socioeconomic transformation, economic disproportions, insufficient accumulation. It was still more impeded by fundamental shifts in the system of relationships between imperialist centers and peripheries that occurred after the Second World War as a result of decolonization, on the other hand, and technological progress, on the other. Therefore, though Turkey's participation in the world division of labor grew and differentiated, the country's unequal position within the world capitalist economy continued and was being permanently reproduced. Under the circumstances of fastly unfolding scientific and technological progress, Turkey's lagging in technological terms became the main and, in many cases, unsurmountable obstacle for achieving the economic independence. Technological advance gave birth to objective processes which, under conditions of the world capitalist economy with its uneven character of development, led to the establishment of the new form of the capitalist center's dominance over peripheries – technological monopoly of imperialism. Along with other developing countries, Turkey turned into the subject of imperialist policies of neocolonialism,

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 44-54.

one component of which was “technological colonialism.” This transformation, which occurred during the last decades, can be considered in the three periods.

In the first period (from the end of the 1940s to the middle of the 1960s), despite the influx of the Western aid, Turkey did not experience yet structural changes in its external economic relations and the imperialist powers’ exploitation of Turkey still showed perceptible colonial features. Turkey continued to export its traditional goods – agricultural goods and minerals, while its foreign trade was limited to several countries. It is notable that the main partners of Turkey in foreign trade were the former colonial powers of the West Europe and the United States, whose expansion in Turkey unfolded during and after the Second World War. Dominant position of the leading imperialist powers in the Turkish market provided for them the possibility to influence not only price and credit policies, but also many aspects of internal economic and political life. Turkey’s entrance to NATO gave to imperialist powers still more opportunities for interference: in the 1950s foreign counsellors forced on the Turkish government a number of recommendations that contradicted with the country’s national interests and led to its intensified militarization; at the same time, the ground for extending the expansion of foreign private capital was created.

The second period (from the middle of the 1960s to the middle of the 1970s) witnessed Turkey’s transition to active industrialization and, on the base of it, changes in the economic structure. The task of industrialization necessitated serious shifts in foreign economic relations and strengthened the role of the external factor in the economic development. In this period Turkey increased economic relations with socialist countries, in particular, with the Soviet Union. Apart from trade relations, a number of industrial factories were constructed with the help of socialist countries. This way, the Western monopoly in equipment’s supply was shaken. Imperialism was forced to soften the terms of its help to Turkey to a certain degree (it turned out to be a temporary retreat). Leaning on economic and technical assistance provided by the Soviet

Union and other socialist countries, Turkey managed to improve for a while its position within the world capitalist economy. In particular, it succeeded in using a considerable part of the Western loans for national economic construction in accordance with five-year plans. Shifts in the character of the Western aid to Turkey during the 1960-70s was also conditioned by new developments in the process of reproduction within Western countries themselves. These developments was caused by technological advancement and they demanded that economies of developing countries (that is the periphery of the world capitalist economy) liquidate their agrarian character and become industrialized.

Meanwhile, industrial development of Turkey was accompanied with the establishment of foreign capital in the Turkish industry in the form of branches of transnational corporations. Their penetration of the Turkish economy signified the spreading of certain elements and phases of the process of reproduction of the whole corporation. The output of transnational corporations' branches in developing countries, while being final for these countries, has an intermediate character in the scale of the transnational corporations themselves. Imperialism realizes its technological dominance, as the branches of transnational corporations exist in the form of montage factories, "dirty" or out-of-date (in technological terms) industries. In this way, direct productive relations on the level of industrial factories were added to Turkey's trade and credit relations with the world capitalist economy. As one Soviet economist has stated: "while in earlier times former colonies were merely attached to metropolises as suppliers of agrarian goods and raw materials, today they occupy rather fixed position within the vertical integration of transnational corporations which tied up the production of finished product and raw materials in a single complex, subordinated to the objectives of the main corporation."

During the period under consideration, the export of manpower became a new component of Turkey's inclusion into the world capitalist economy. Workers abroad turned to a significant

source of foreign currency. At the same time, the workers' mass departure let the Turkish ruling circles to get a certain relief from internal social tension, as it partially solved the problem of employment.

The third period (began in the second half of the 1970s) is characterized, on the one hand, with the acceleration and widening of Turkey's integration to the world capitalist economy as its periphery, i. e. on the neocolonial base; on the other hand, the emergence of still more negative factors accompanying this development is the case. Like other developing countries of capitalist orientation that found themselves in the orbit of neocolonialism, Turkey became, in fact, absolutely unprotected from not only cyclic and structural crises that are shaking the world capitalist economy, but also from the old and new forms and methods of imperialist plunder. As the investigations of Soviet economists show, toward the end of the 1970s the new mechanism of exploiting developing countries took its final shape in the form of a coherent system of interrelated methods aiming at binding these countries to the centers of imperialism.

The impact of that mechanism on Turkey was made easier by a heavy economic crisis occurred in the second half of the 1970s that was caused mainly by the actions of the Western powers. Imperialist countries and international financial organizations took use of the crisis to force on Turkey their recommendations corresponding to the global plans of imperialism and the interests of transnational corporations. In order to prevent state bankruptcy, Turkey used enormous amount of the Western aid. As a payment for such an "understanding" showed by the West toward Turkey, it was forced to adopt the new economic program worked out by Western specialists. The most important objective of the program was to provide the quick transition from a "closed" economy to an "open" one. The task of complete reconstruction of activities both of the private and state sectors on the base of the principles of market economy was put forward to adapt the Turkish economy to conditions and demands of the world market. At the same time, the

Turkish economy is constantly encountering various forms of protectionism applied by the imperialist countries.

The beginning of the 1980s was marked with strengthening of Turkey's financial and economic dependence on the West. It does not contradict with the fact that, since the end of the 1970s, the weight of the Western countries in the Turkish commodity circulation reduced because of the increased share in it of the Near Eastern oil countries which supplied Turkey with oil in exchange to Turkish agricultural and industrial goods. The point is that this objective tendency of growing regional cooperation between developing countries was used by imperialism for its own purposes. In the case at hand, Turkey was used as a mediator of imperialist expansion in oil countries. As facts show, during the 1980s Turkey continued, on the one hand, to import in growing quantities Western capital and technologies; on the other hand, it increased its industrial export to neighboring developing countries (especially to Iran and Iraq), stimulating there the activities of Turkish civil engineers, exporting manpower etc.

Turkey's integration into the world capitalist economy was characterized not only by deepening its unequal conditions, but also with the growing asymmetrical interdependence between Turkey and the world capitalist system. Turkey preserves its significance for the West as the source of raw materials. Apart from this, Turkey's role as a selling market and as a field for capital investment is growing. Moreover, Turkey had strategic importance as the southern flank of NATO. Military aspect has had a constant and considerable effect on the whole system of economic relations between Turkey and the world capitalism. The following important point should be noted: despite the growing integration to and interaction with the world capitalist economy, the Turkish economy does not profit from it to an adequate degree. Moreover, not infrequently, the Turkish modernization was impeded within this framework. Turkey's growing participation in the world economy shows contradictory features: on the other hand, Turkey uses

external markets and export activities to accelerate its economic development and get the stable position in international division of labor; on the other hand, Turkey is forced to submit to neocolonial exploitation and various forms of discrimination.

Many branches of the Turkish economy suffer from their relations with the Western capital. Tracing the problems experienced by Turkey in this relation will help us to see the main methods and the scale of neocolonial exploitation.

Like other developing countries, Turkey has not adequate internal resources for extended reproduction based on the up-to-date industry. For the most part, the resources are imported. Not only the construction of industrial factories, but also their further functioning depend on supplies from abroad (equipment, spare parts and even raw materials and half-finished products). The economic crisis occurred in the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s showed how great is the scale of such a dependence on external supplies, as an abrupt decrease of industrial production was caused mainly by the stoppage of payments for imported goods.

After the Second World War, Turkish foreign trade became characterized by the chronic deficit caused mainly by constantly worsening trade conditions as a result of the imperialist politics of discrimination and monopolist price-making as well as of the non-equivalent exchange.

Another channel for pumping out the neocolonial tribute is payments Turkey makes for paying off its foreign debts. The fact that the weight of interest payments has been constantly increasing and that in the 1980 the interest payments exceeded the amount of debt payments is the most obvious manifestation of the strengthened imperialist exploitation. Yet another source of a constant decapitalization (loss of capital) is the export of foreign private capital's profits as a result of the favorable for them conditions created by the policies of liberalization. The "floating"

rate of Turkish lira that, in fact, legalized lira's permanent depreciation is favoring such a state of affairs.

The authors conclude that imperialist exploitation is the fate of all developing countries with capitalist orientation. Although developing countries are trying to oppose it (for instance, in the middle of the 1970s the movement of developing countries for the new international economic order appeared), imperialist powers persist in ignoring their right demands and even show the tendency to tightening the pressure over developing countries. On the contrary, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have actively assisted developing countries and are supporting their struggle for the restructuring of the world economic order.

Concluding Remarks⁴⁴¹

In conclusion of the monograph, the authors assert that it is wrong to take Western models as the only specimens of capitalist development and to consider other examples as anomalies. Moreover, while comparing different cases, it would be insufficiently to focus solely on quantitative economic indices. The particularities of social structures, state systems, cultural traditions etc. should be taken into consideration, too.

Concluding remarks about the Turkish case can be summarized as follows: the country has achieved an impressive success in capitalist development. Turkey of the 1980s is an agrarian-industrial country with a comparatively well-developed system of material and technical sources, manpower, and external relations. The Turkish industry provides all internal demand on consumer goods. The main agricultural branches of Turkey deal with such products with high selling qualities as cotton, sugar beet, tobacco, hazel-nut, citrus plants. 80 percent of arable lands

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 331-335.

are cultivated by tractors, 80 percent of villages are electrified. Turkey has such a system of trade, services, transportation, credit and insurance organizations, communications, radio, and television that makes possible the functioning of a capitalist internal market. A rather developed mechanism of the interaction with the world economy is established.

As for negative moments, the structure of national economy is not balanced, inadequate development of extracting industry, power engineering, machine-building, electronics is observable. Textile and food industry remain the leading branches. Technological lagging behind not only highly industrialized countries, but also some middle-developed ones is the case. Regional disproportions as a result of underdevelopment of the Eastern provinces caused serious difficulties. The growing unemployment is one of the most acute problems of Turkey. The process of pauperization of the working masses intensified in the beginning of the 1980s because of the economic crisis. The crystallization of conflicts between labor and capital, workers and bourgeoisie has taken place under the conditions of an authoritarian regime which periodically turns to an open military dictatorship. The last dictatorship, the most reactionary one, existed from 1980 to 1983. It realized the revision of labor relations and showed itself as a particular dictatorial form of the bourgeois rule in the periods of acute sociopolitical conflicts. The military dictatorship put into practice an extremely rigid (and, as a matter of fact, inevitable and necessary) modification of that form of capitalist development which the Turkish ruling classes chose after the victory of the national liberation movement. During the military regime of the 1980s, the ruling circles showed the ability to reconstruct in accordance with the requirements of capitalist development both the socioeconomic mechanism of making profit and the repressive apparatus (the military and police) that forces such a mechanism to function.

Thus, the Turkish experience in socioeconomic reorganization should be considered as an undeniable achievement of the ruling classes whose success was based on the strengthened

exploitation of the working masses. The main objective of the military coup was, in fact, to establish a repressive regime to make it easier to strengthen the exploitation and thereby to intensify capitalist development. The Turkish case serves as a confirmation of the Soviet scholarship's conclusion about capitalist development in the Eastern countries: "The inadequacy of capitalist evolution for achieving true independence and social progress of the peoples of the East becomes more and more manifest."

CONCLUSION

Among all of its Oriental neighbors, Turkey has been, perhaps, of the most special meaning for Russia throughout its history. As history shows, the destinies of the two peoples have been intermingled from the very beginning and this has manifested itself from time to time in a striking manner indeed. To begin with, the rise of Muscovy as a sovereign state was greatly affected by the fall of Constantinople (long-venerated by the Russians as *Tsargrad* – the King of Cities, the spiritual center of Orthodox believers) to the Ottoman Turks in 1453. In fact, it meant that the Byzantine civilization on which the rising Muscovy had leaned came to an abrupt end. As one Western historian puts it, “at the very moment when Moscow was launching its career as a sovereign state, its people lost their external spiritual anchor. The church of Rus, and therefore the potential Russian nation, had to work out its own destiny without further reference to the spiritual father in whose flock it had always previously sought its security. . . No wonder that over the following decades Muscovites gave vent to feelings of both apocalyptic doom and unprecedented exhilaration.”⁴⁴²

From the Petrian period on, strategic considerations that aimed at overcoming Russia’s landlocked position (the so-called “drive to warm seas” and the famous “Straits question”) came to determine the Russians’ relationships with the Ottoman Empire, along with the always present religious resentment that called to topple the crescent and restore the cross on the Cathedral of St. Sofia in Constantinople. For two and a half centuries the Ottoman Empire was Russia’s most constant preoccupation and its most frequent wartime enemy.⁴⁴³

⁴⁴² Hosking, p. 82.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., p. 193. Hosking’s further remarks about yet another aspect of the Russian-Turkish interrelation are interesting indeed: “[The Ottoman Empire] was also Russia’s alter ego. Like Russia, it was a multiethnic realm straddling the border between Islam and Christianity, and it included numerous subjects of both faiths. Like Russia,

With the establishment of the Soviet rule in Russia and the emergence of the Republic of Turkey, the situation changed in political and ideological terms. The new situation necessitated the reverse of centuries-old hostility and the establishment of friendly relations between the two new-born neighbor states: Soviet Russia and Kemalist Turkey. Each was alone in a hostile environment and in urgent need of the other's support. Both were opposed by the same enemy, the Western world. Moreover, Soviet Russia's interest in Turkey was based on ideological considerations, too: in the Bolsheviks' scheme of the world revolution, a great importance was given to insurgent Eastern peoples of which the Turkish people represented a perfect example. Kemalist Turkey that was among the first in the East to win a national liberation struggle against Western imperialist powers and, doing so, presented a model for other oppressed nations of the East, deserved unconditional support from Soviet Russia, "the leading light for the all oppressed of the world."

In the Cold War era, the friendship relations reversed, while Turkey remained of great significance for the Soviet Union, this time, in the context of the Cold War competition. As was stated in Chapter Two, the Middle East area became crucial to the assertion of the Soviets' global role and Turkey held strategic interests for the Soviet Union as a NATO state on its border. Beyond this, Turkey also fit into Soviet policies as a part of the Third World.

The post-Soviet era brought about significant changes in the Russians' perception of and attitudes toward Turkey. Actually, we observe a new rapprochement between the two countries today. The post-Soviet Russian authorities attribute a great importance to Turkey in the context of current international circumstances, indicating Turkey's strengthened geopolitical role in the

it was an autocracy with an ostensible religious mission which in practice observed toleration toward nonestablished faiths. It had a further, less obvious similarity with Russia: its supposedly leading people, the Turks, whose language was used for official documents, and by whose name the empire was often known, were in fact largely a subjugated peasant people whose culture and traditions were alien to the ruling elite."

region and its importance for Russia in economic terms. In the most recent comprehensive monograph on Turkey by Russian scholars, Turkey is characterized as “a great economic partner and influential rival of Russia in Eurasia.”⁴⁴⁴ At the same time, a new approach of Russian scholars toward Russian history in this context, namely, a reevaluation of Russia’s peculiarities of development based on comparing them to that of the Eastern world in general and Turkey in particular is the case. Russian scholars came to argue that developments of the Russian and Ottoman Empires showed obvious similarities. Moreover, it is accepted today by Russian scholars that the study of the Turkish experience in socioeconomic development is capable of offering useful insights for Russia in its post-Soviet development, as, in fact, Russia has come to be in the position of a developing country in the contemporary world.⁴⁴⁵

I undertook this historical excursus in order to show how intense Russia’s interrelations with Turkey have been and how firm a ground has underlay Russia’s interest in this country. The development of Russian studies on Turkey was greatly affected by the moments described above. It was stated in the Introduction that Turkology was established from the very beginning of Russian Oriental studies. As can be seen from the account created in this thesis, Russian Turkology throughout its history has been focused mainly on problems of contemporary development of Turkey. While traditional Russian Oriental studies on many other countries were based almost exclusively on philological investigations and studies of medieval history, this never was the case for Turkology. This interest in non-philological issues and contemporary times was determined by the acute significance Turkey presented for the Russian state in various

⁴⁴⁴ *Turtsiia mezhdru Evropei i Aziei. Itogi evropeizatsii na iskhode XX veka* (Turkey between Europe and Asia: The Results of Europeanization in the End of the 20th Century) (Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia RAN - Kraft+, 2001), p. 5.

⁴⁴⁵ *Musul'manskie strany u granits SNG (Afganistan, Pakistan, Iran i Turtsiia – sovremennoe sostoianie, istoriia i perspektivy)* (Muslim Countries by the Borders of CIS (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran and Turkey – Contemporary State, History and Perspectives) (Moscow: IVRAN-“Kraft+”, 2002), p. 288.

terms. For instance, Turkological studies in Tsarist Russia were focused on investigating those aspects of the Ottoman Empire that were of use from military, political and ideological points of view: geographical and demographical conditions, military forces, national question with the main focus on Balkan peoples and religion.

Soviet Turkology showed an apparent continuation with Tsarist times, as it was concentrated on non-philological investigations and contemporary times, too. We see that Turkology was among the well-developed branches of Soviet Oriental studies: it showed steady growth in terms of institutional establishment and academic production, while quickly responding to all shifts within the discipline determined by political and ideological motives of the Soviet state. It should be noted that Turkey's socioeconomic and political experience had a considerable theoretical importance for the Soviet scholarship, because this experience was conceived as a particular example of the national liberation movement in the East.

It seems to me that post-Soviet events imply exciting perspectives for further development of Russian Turkology.

In conclusion, Russian Turkology has a long and fascinating history of development, and a rich content. Actually, it offers an enormous field for investigation, which remains, for the most part, unstudied. At this point, the potentialities Russian Turkology offers for the study of both Turkish and Russian history should be pointed out. In regard to the latter, Shamsutdinov's monograph examined in this thesis can be referred to in the case: in many parts of his book Shamsutdinov is busily engaged, in fact, in describing Russian history. On considering such examples, one comprehends to what a degree the existence of the Turkish and Russian peoples has been intermingled and crossed with each other.

The objective of this thesis was to put together the existing fragmented pieces of information about the development of Russian Turkology and to give them certain coherence. In

consequence, a general outline of Russian Turkology appeared with the more elaborated part on the Soviet period. It is my hope that I have succeeded in pointing out the most important moments and in grasping the main tendencies of the development of Russian Turkology. It is also my hope that this thesis is capable of offering an introduction for further studies on the subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdel-Malek, Anouar. "Orientalism in Crisis," *Diogenes*, no. 44, 1963, pp. 103-140.

Adomeit, Hannes. "Soviet Policy in the Middle East: Problems of Analysis," *Soviet Studies*, 27, no. 2 (April, 1975), pp. 288-305.

Azerbaijan Sovet Entsiklopediasy, vol. 2. Baku, 1979.

Barnes, Joseph. "Soviet Sinology," *Pacific Affairs* 7, no. 3 (September 1934), pp. 331-333.

Barthold, V. V. *Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* [History of the Study of the Orient in Europe and Russia]. Leningrad, 1925.

Binder, Leonard. "Area Studies: A Critical Reassessment," in *The Study of the Middle East: Research and Scholarship in the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, edited by Leonard Binder. New York: John Wiley, 1976, pp. 1-27.

Biobibliograficheski slovar' otechestvennykh tiurkologov [Biobibliographical dictionary of native Tiurkologists]. Moscow: Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury, 1974.

Borozdin, N. I. "Inter-Racial Study in Asia: The Progress of Orientology in the USSR," *Pacific Affairs* 2, no. 6 (June, 1929), pp. 323-328.

Bostashvili, N. I. *Bibliografiia Turtsii (istoriia)*. Tbilisi, 1971.

Browe, Daniel R. and Edward J. Lazzerini, eds. *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Bulut, Yücel. *Orientalizmin Eleştirel Kısa Tarihi*. İstanbul: Yöneliş Yay., 2002.

Clubb, O. Edmund. "Soviet Oriental Studies and the Asian Revolution," *Pacific Affairs* 31, no. 4 (December, 1958), pp. 380-389.

Dantsig, B. M. *Blizhnii Vostok v russkoi nauke i literature* [The Near East in Russian Science and Literature]. Moscow, 1973.

Devlet, Nadir. "Çarlık Rusyası ve Sovyetler Birliği'nin Türk Tarihine Bakışı," *Avrasya Etüdleri* Cilt 2, Sayı 4 (1995/96), pp. 92-104.

Gabrieli, Francesco. "Apology for Orientalism," *Diogenes*, no. 50, Summer 1965, pp. 128-136.

Gibb, Hamilton A. R. *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*. Edited by Stanford J. Shaw and William R. Polk. Boston: Beacon Press, 1962.

Golan, Galia. *Soviet Policies in the Middle East: From World War II to Gorbachev*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia, vol. 5 (a translation of the third edition). New York: Macmillan, Inc.; London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1974.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia, vol. 7 (a translation of the third edition). New York: MacMillan, Inc.; London: Collier MacMillan Publishers, 1975.

Halliday, Fred. "Current Soviet Policy and the Middle East: A Report," *MERIP Reports*, no. 111, Rapid Deployment and Nuclear War (January, 1983), pp. 19-22.

Hauner, M. *What is Asia to Us? : Russia's Asian Heartland Yesterday and Today*. London; Sydney; Wellington: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Hosking, Geoffrey. *Russia and the Russians: A History*. London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 2001.

Kapitalizm v Turtsii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe razvitiie v 50-80-e gg. [Capitalism in Turkey: Socioeconomic Development in the 1950s-1980s]. Moscow, 1987.

Kapur, Harish. *Soviet Russia and Asia, 1917-1927: A Study of Soviet Policy Towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan*. Geneva: Mishael Joseph Limited, 1966.

Karskaia, L. N. *Annotirovannaia bibliografiia otechestvennykh rabot po arabistike, iranistike i tiurkologii. 1818-1917 gg.* [The Annotated Bibliography of the Native Works on Arabic, Persian and Turkic Studies]. Moscow, 2000.

Kennedy, Paul. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*. New York: Vintage Books, 1989.

Kireev, N. G. *Razvitiie kapitalizma v Turtsii: k kritike teorii "smeshannoi ekonomiki"* [Development of Capitalism in Turkey: The Critique of the Theory of "Mixed Economics"]. Moscow, 1982.

Klieman, Aaron S. *Soviet Russia and the Middle East*. Baltimor; London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970.

Knudsen, Olav Fagelund. "Did Accomodation Work? Two Soviet Neighbors 1964-88," *Journal of Peace Research*, 29, no. 1 (February, 1992), pp. 53-69.

Kononov, A. N. *Istoriia izucheniia tiurkskikh iazykov v Rossii* [History of the Study of Turkic Languages in Russia]. Leningrad: Nauka, 1972.

Krader, Lawrence. "Soviet Oriental Studies – 1940-1948," *Far Eastern Survey* 17, no. 14 (July 28, 1948), pp. 164-168.

Kramer, Martin. *Ivory Towers on Sand: The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*. Washington: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001.

Leffler, Melvyn P. "Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952," *The Journal of American History*, 71, no. 4 (March, 1985), pp. 807-825.

Lewis, Bernard. *Islam and the West*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Mazour, Anatole G. *The Writing of History in the Soviet Union*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1971.

Lockman, Zachary. *Contending Visions of the Middle East: The History and Politics of Orientalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

McLaurin, R. D. *The Middle East in Soviet Policy*. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975.

Nauchno-metodicheskaia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii" (Moskva, 29-31 maia 2000 g.): Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii [Scientific and Methodological Conference "Oriental Education in Universities of Russia" (Moscow, May of 29-31, 2000) : Theses of Papers and Reports]. Moscow, 2000.

Nizameddin, Talal. *Russia and the Middle East: Towards a New Foreign Policy*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Ray, Hemen. "Changing Soviet Views on Mahatma Gandhi," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 29, no. 1 (November, 1969), pp. 85-106.

Sahai-Achuthan, Nisha. "Soviet Indologists and the Institute of Oriental Studies: Works on Contemporary India in the Soviet Union," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 2 (February, 1983), pp. 323-343.

Schoenberger, Erica and Stephanie Reich, "Soviet Policy in the Middle East," *MERIP Reports*, no. 39 (July, 1975), 3-28.

Shamsutdinov, A. M. *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'naia bor'ba v Turtsii. 1918-1923 gg.* [The National Liberation Struggle in Turkey]. Moscow, 1966.

SSSR i Turtsiia, 1917-1979 [The USSR and Turkey]. Moscow, 1981.

Sverchevskaia, A. K. and T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*. Moscow, 1961.

Sverchevskaia, A. K. and T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)*. Moscow, 1959.

Sverchevskaia, A. K. and T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1975)*. Moscow, 1982.

Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik) [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)]. Moscow, 1975.

Turetskaia Respublika v 60-70e gody: voprosy obshchestvenno-politicheskogo razvitiia [The Republic of Turkey in the 1960-1970s: Problems of Sociopolitical Development]. Moscow, 1984.

Türk Ansiklopedisi, vol. 17. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1969.

Tveritina, A. S. “V. D. Smirnov – istorik Turtsii” [V. D. Smirnov – Historian of Turkey], *Sovetskaia tiurkologiya*, no. 4, 1971, pp. 105-114.

Valkenier, Elizabeth Kridl. “Recent Trends in Soviet Research on the Developing Countries,” *World Politics* 20, no. 4 (July, 1968), pp. 644-659.

Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR (Azerbaidjan, Armeniia, Gruzii, Ukraina) [Oriental Centers in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine)]. Moscow, 1988.

Vostokovedy Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga: Osnovnye napravleniia sovremennykh issledovani. *Vostokovednye nauchnye tsentry. Personalii.* [Orientalists of Moscow and St. Petersburg: Major Directions of Contemporary Research. Oriental Scientific Centers. Personalities.]. Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia RAN, 2000.

Vucinich, Wayne S. “Soviet Studies on the Middle East.” In *The Soviet Union and the Middle East: The Post-World War II Era*. Edited by Ivo J. Lederer and Wayne S. Vucinich. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1974, pp. 177-229.

Wheeler, G. E. “Russia and the Middle East,” *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 35, no. 3 (July, 1959), pp. 295-304.

Zheltiakov, A. D. “Izuchenie istorii Turtsii” [Studying History of Turkey], in *Aziatskii muzei – Leningradskoe otdelenie instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR* [Asiatic Museum – The Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences]. Moscow, 1972, pp. 428-434.

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENT OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AND TURKOLOGY IN SOVIET RUSSIA

- 1918 The Tiurkological Department was established in the Academy of Sciences.
- 1919 An Oriental division was created in the People's Commissariat of Education.
- 1921 The Collegium of Orientalists was founded in the Academy of Sciences. The former Lazarev Institute was reorganized as Moscow Oriental Institute.
- 1922 The All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientology (VNAV) was organized as a part of the People's Commissariat of Nationalities. VNAV had a section on the Near East.
- 1920s Several Tsarist Oriental institutions were reorganized as well as a number of new Soviet Oriental institutions were created.
- 1930 The All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientology (VNAV) was liquidated. The Institute of Oriental Studies (IVAN) of the Academy of Sciences was established in Leningrad on the base of merging the Asiatic Museum, the Collegium of Orientalists, the Institute of Buddhist Culture and the Tiurkological Department. IVAN had eight divisions: Caucasian, Arabian countries, Jewish-Turkish, Iranian, Indo-Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian, and Japanese-Korean. A Turkish Cabinet was created within the Jewish-Turkish division.
- 1937 Two more divisions were added to IVAN: Modern Indian and Ancient East.
- 1941 IVAN was partly evacuated to Moscow and Tashkent.

- 1943 Moscow group was established as a branch of IVAN. Oriental Department with a sub-faculty on Tiurkological philology was created in Philological Faculty of Moscow University.
- 1944 The Department of History of the Eastern Countries with a sub-faculty on history of the countries of the Near East was created in Historical Faculty of Moscow University.
- 1950 IVAN was reorganized and transferred from Leningrad to Moscow. The following divisions were established: China; Mongolia and Korea; Japan; South East Asia; India and Afghanistan; Iran; Turkey and Arab Countries; Soviet East. In Leningrad the Sector of Oriental Manuscripts was preserved.
- 1953 IVAN was given a new organization. This time it was divided into three regional divisions: the Far East, the Near and Middle East, and India and the countries of South East Asia.
- 1955 IVAN was reorganized once more, this time into twelve divisions. One division was devoted to the Near and Middle East. A regular journal of Soviet Oriental studies *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie* started.
- 1956 IVAN was reorganized again into six departments. The Department of the Near and Middle East was made up of three sections – Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan. The Sector of Oriental Manuscripts in Leningrad was reorganized as the Leningrad Branch of IVAN. The Tiurko-Mongolian Cabinet was created here. The Institute of the Eastern Languages was created at Moscow University. The Institute of Sinology and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO) were established in the Academy of Sciences.
- 1957 The First All-Union Conference of Orientalists was held in Tashkent.

- 1961 IVAN was restructured yet again. The Department of the Near and Middle East was reorganized by excluding Pakistan and being subdivided into two sectors: economy and contemporary problems, and history. The Leningrad Branch was also reorganized into three sectors, one of which was in charge of research on the Near and Middle East.
- 1964 The Conference on Socialism, Capitalism and the Underdeveloped Countries was organized by IMEMO. The Conference on the Agrarian Problem and the Conference on the Role of Private Investment in Former Colonies were held by IVAN.
- 1966 The Conference on the Food Problem in the Developing Countries was held by IVAN.
- 1967 The Conference on Industrialization was convened by IMEMO.
- 1971 The Department on General Problems of Sociopolitical Development of Asian and North African Countries was created in IVAN.

APPENDIX B

COLLECTIVE WORKS OF SOVIET ORIENTALISTS ON GENERAL PROBLEMS OF THE EAST

Novaia istoriia zarubezhnogo Vostoka [Modern History of the Foreign East], 2 vols. (Moscow, 1952).

Noveishaia istoriia stran zarubezhnogo Vostoka [Recent History of the Countries of the Foreign East], 4 vols. (Moscow, 1954-60).

Araby v bor'be za nezavisimost' [The Arabs in the Struggle for Independence] (Moscow, 1957).

Istoriia stran zarubezhnogo vostoka v srednie veka [Medieval History of the Countries of the Foreign East] (Moscow, 1957).

Narody Perednei Azii [Peoples of the Front Asia] (Moscow, 1957).

Velikii Oktiabr' i narody Vostoka. Sbornik. 1917-1957. [The Great October and the Peoples of the East. Collection.] (Moscow, 1957).

Peredneaziatskii etnograficheskii sbornik [Ethnographical Collection of the Asia Minor] (Moscow, 1958).

Ocherki po istorii arabskikh stran [Essays on History of Arab Countries] (Moscow, 1959).

Imperializm i bor'ba rabocheho klassa [Imperialism and the Struggle of the Working Class] (Moscow, 1960).

Lenin i Vostok [Lenin and the East] (Moscow, 1960).

Politika SshA na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke (SshA i strany SENTO) [USA's Policies in the Near and Middle East (USA and SENTO Countries)] (Moscow, 1960).

Agrarnye reformy v stranakh Vostoka [Agrarian Reforms in the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1961).

Politika SshA na Arabskom Vostoke [USA's Policies in Arab East] (Moscow, 1961).

Polozhenie rabocheho klassa i rabochee dvizhenie v stranakh Azii i Afriki. 1959-1961 [Conditions of the Working Class and the Workers' Movement in Asian and African Countries] (Moscow, 1961).

SSSR i strany Vostoka [USSR and the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1961).

Vzaimosviaz' literatur Vostoka i Zapada [The Interaction between Eastern and Western Literatures] (Moscow, 1961).

Blizhnii i Srednii Vostok [The Near and Middle East] (Moscow, 1962).

Ekonomicheskoe sotrudnichestvo Sovetskogo Soiuzs s ekonomicheski slaborazvitymi stranami [The Soviet Union's Economic Cooperation with Underdeveloped Countries] (Moscow, 1962).

Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v stranakh Vostoka [State Capitalism in the Countries of the East] (Moscow 1962).

Literatury drevnego Vostoka [Literatures of Ancient East] (Moscow, 1962).

O genezise kapitalizma v stranakh Vostoka (XV-XIX vv.). Materialy obsuzhdeniia [On Genesis of Capitalism in the Countries of the East (15th-19th Centuries). Materials of Discussion.] (Moscow, 1962).

Sessia po voprosam istorii i ekonomiki Afganistana, Irana i Turtsii. Tezisy dokladov [Session on Questions of History and Economics of Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey. Theses of Papers.] (Moscow, 1962).

Afrikanskii sbornik. Istoriia [African Collection. History], vol. 1 (Moscow, 1963).

Arabskie strany. Istoriia [Arab Countries. History] (Moscow, 1963).

Etnicheskie protsessy i sostav naseleniia v stranakh Perednei Azii [Ethnic Processes and Population Composition in the Countries of the Front Asia] (Moscow, 1963).

Iranskii sbornik [Iranian Collection] (Moscow, 1963).

Noveishaia istoriia stran zarubezhnoi Azii i Afriki [Recent History of the Countries of the Foreign Asia and Africa] (Leningrad, 1963).

Kolonializm vchera i segodnia [Colonialism Yesterday and Today] (Moscow, 1964).

Problemy teorii literatury i estetiki v stranakh Vostoka [Problems of the Theory of Literature and Aesthetics in the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1964).

Strany Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka [Countries of the Near and Middle East] (Moscow, 1964).

Politika Anglii na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke (1945-1965) [England's Policies in the Near and Middle East] (Moscow, 1965).

Politika Frantsii v Azii i Afrike (1945-1964) [France's Policies in Asia and Africa] (Moscow, 1965).

Rabochii klass i rabochee dvizhenie v stranakh Azii i Afriki [The Working Class and the Workers' Movement in Asian and African Countries] (Moscow, 1965).

Arabskie strany. Istoriiia. Ekonomika [Arab Countries. History. Economics] (Moscow, 1966).

Ideologiia sovremennogo natsional'nogo osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniia [Ideology of Contemporary National Liberation Movement] (Moscow, 1966).

Materialy diskussii ob obshchestvennykh formatsiakh na Vostoke (Aziatskii sposob proizvodstva) [Materials of the Discussion on Social Formations in the East (Asiatic Mode of Production)] (Moscow, 1966).

Obshchee i osobnoe v istoricheskom razvitii stran Vostoka [The General and the Peculiar in Historical Development of the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1966).

Problemy ekonomiki i istorii stran Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka [Problems of Economics and History of the Countries of the Near and Middle East] (Moscow, 1966).

Problemy realizma v literaturakh zarubezhnogo Vostoka [Problems of Realism in Literatures of the Foreign East] (Moscow, 1966).

Rabochii klass stran Azii i Afriki [The Working Class in Asian and African Countries] (Moscow, 1966).

SSSR i razvivaiushchiesia strany [USSR and Developing Countries] (Moscow, 1966).

Blizhnii i Srednii Vostok. Istoriiia, ekonomika [The Near and Middle East. History, Economics] (Moscow, 1967).

Klassy i klassovaia bor'ba v razvivaiushchikhsia stranakh [Classes and the Class Struggle in Developing Countries] (Moscow, 1967).

Mezhvuzovskaia nauchnaia konferentsiia po voprosam istorii stran Azii i Afriki v sovetskoj istoriografii (20-22 dekabria, 1966 g. Tezisy dokladov) [Scholarly Conference between Higher Educational Institutions on Questions of History of Asian and African countries in Soviet Historiography (December 20-22, 1966. Theses of Papers)] (Moscow, 1967).

Agrarnye otnosheniia v stranakh Vostoka [Agrarian Relationships in the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1968).

Istoriiia stran Azii i Afriki v srednie veka [Medieval History of Asian and African Countries] (Moscow, 1968).

Istoriografiia stran Vostoka [Historiography of the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1969).

Komintern i Vostok [Comintern and the East] (Moscow, 1969).

Novaia istoriia zarubezhnoi Azii i Afriki [Modern History of the Foreign Asia and Africa] (Leningrad, 1969).

Strany Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka [Countries of the Near and Middle East] (Moscow, 1969).

Istoriia stran zarubezhnoi Azii v srednie veka [Medieval History of Foreign Asian Countries] (Leningrad, 1970).

Krupnyi kapital i monopolii stran Azii [Big Capital and Monopolies in Asian Countries] (Moscow, 1970).

Lenin i natsional'no-osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie v stranakh Vostoka [Lenin and National Liberation Movement in the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1970).

Novaia istoriia zarubezhnogo Vostoka [Modern History of the Foreign East], 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1971).

Teorii ekonomicheskogo rosta razvivaiushchikhsia stran Azii [Theories of Economic Growth of Developing Countries of Asia] (Moscow, 1973).

Melkoe proizvodstvo goroda v Azii i Afrike [Small Production in Towns in Asia and Africa] (Moscow, 1974).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany: zakonomernosti, tendetsii, perspektivy [Developing Countries: Laws, Tendencies, Perspectives] (Moscow, 1974).

Zarubezhnyi Vostok i sovremennost' [The Foreign East and Contemporary Times], (Moscow, 1974) (the second enlarged and improved edition in three volumes was published in 1980).

Srednie sloi gorodskogo obshchestva v stranakh Vostoka [The Middle Stratum of Urban Society in Eastern Countries] (Moscow, 1975).

Analiz kontseptsii sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo razvitiia stran "tret'ego mira" [Analysis of Conceptions of Socioeconomic Development of the Countries of the "Third World."] (Moscow, 1976).

Inostrannyi kapital i inostrannoe predprinimatel'stvo v stranakh Azii i Severnoi Afriki [Foreign Capital and Foreign Enterprise in Asian and North-African Countries] (Moscow, 1977).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany: nakoplenie i ekonomicheskii rost [Developing Countries: Accumulation and Economic Growth] (Moscow, 1977).

Klassoobrazovanie na sovremennom Vostoke: problemy i tendentsii [Class Forming in the Contemporary East: Problems and Tendencies] (Moscow, 1978).

Mesto religii v ideino-politicheskoi bor'be razvivaiushchikhsia stran [The Place of Religion in the Ideologico-Political Struggle in Developing Countries] (Moscow, 1978).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany: problemy ekonomicheskogo razvitiia [Developing Countries: Problems of Economic Development] (Moscow, 1978).

Obshchestvo, elita i biurokратиia v razvivaiushchikhsia stranakh Vostoka [Society, Elites and Bureaucracy in Developing Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1979).

Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm i sotsial'naia evoliutsiia stran zarubezhnogo Vostoka [State Capitalism and Social Evolution of the Countries of the Foreign East] (Moscow, 1980).

Gosudartsvo i agrarnaia evoliutsiia v razvivaiushchikhsia stranakh Azii i Afriki [The State and Agrarian Evolution in Developing Countries of Asia and Africa] (Moscow, 1980).

Sotsialisticheskaia orientatsiia osvobodivshikhsia stran. Nekotorye voprosy teorii i praktiki [Socialist Orientation of the Liberated Countries. Some Questions of the Theory and Practice] (Moscow, 1982).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany: ekonomicheskii rost i sotsial'nyi progress [Developing Countries: Economic Growth and Social Progress] (Moscow, 1983).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany v sovremennom mire. Edinstvo i mnogoobrazie [Developing Countries in the Contemporary World. Unity and Variety] (Moscow, 1983).

Evoliutsiia vostochnykh obshchestv: sintez traditsionnogo i sovremennogo [Evolution of the Eastern Societies: Synthesis of Tradition and Modernity] (Moscow, 1984).

Nefabrichnyi proletariat i sotsial'naia evoliutsiia stran Zarubezhnogo Vostoka [Non-Factory Proletariat and Social Evolution in the Countries of the Foreign East] (Moscow, 1985).

Nizshie gorodskie sloi i sotsial'naia evoliutsiia stran Vostoka [The Lower Urban Stratum and Social Evolution of the Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1986).

Islam v sovremennoi politike stran Vostoka (konets 70-kh – nachalo 80-kh godov XXv.) [Islam in Contemporary Politics of Eastern Countries (the End of the 1970s – the Beginning of the 1980s)] (Moscow, 1986).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany v sovremennom mire: puti revoliutsionnogo protsessa [Developing Countries in the Contemporary World: Ways of the Revolutionary Process] (Moscow, 1986).

Kharakternye cherty i osobennosti razvitiia kapitalizma v osvobodivshikhsia stranakh Vostoka [Characteristic Features and the Peculiarities of Capitalism in Liberated Countries of the East] (Moscow, 1987).

Problemy razvitiia kommunisticheskogo dvizheniia v osvobodivshikhsia stranakh Azii i Severnoi Afriki [Problems of Development of Communist Movements in Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa] (Moscow, 1987).

Gorod v formatsionnom razvitii stran Vostoka [City in the Formational Development of the Eastern Countries] (Moscow, 1990).

APPENDIX C

DEVELOPMENT OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AND TURKOLOGY IN SOVIET ARMENIA

- 1920 Erivan University was founded.
- 1923 The teaching of Eastern languages and literatures began at Erivan State University.
- 1940 The Department of Oriental Studies in Philological Faculty of Erivan State University was established.
- 1943 The Academy of Sciences of Armenian SSR was established.
- 1954 All Orientalists were united in the structure of the Group on Studying History and Economics of the Countries of the Near and Middle East created in the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences.
- 1958 On the base of this group, the Sector of Orientalist Studies of Academy of Sciences of Armenian SSR was founded. The Sector consisted of three groups: of Arabian countries, Iran, and Turkey.
- 1959 The Group of Kurdology was added to the Sector of Orientalist Studies.
- 1971 The Sector was reorganized as the Institute of Oriental Studies with four departments: Arabian countries Iran, Turkey and Kurdology. Some later The Department of Ancien East was added.
- 1978 The Department of Caucasian and Byzantine Studies was added.
- 1983 The Department of Eastern Sources was added.

APPENDIX D

SOVIET ARMENIAN ORIENTALISTS' MAJOR PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO TURKEY

Collective Works on General Problems

Strany i narody Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka. V. Turtsiia [Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East. Vol. 5. Turkey], (Erivan, 1970).

Strany i narody Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka. X. Turtsiia [Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East. Vol. 10. Turkey], (Erivan, 1979).

Sovetskii opyt resheniia natsional'nogo voprosa i ego znachenie dlia narodov Azii i Afriki [Soviet Experience in Solving National Question and Its Significance for the Peoples of Asia and Africa] (Erivan, 1982).

Strany i narody Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka. XIII. Turtsiia [Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East. Vol. 13. Turkey], (Erivan, 1984).

Strany i narody Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka. XII. Turtsiia [Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East. Vol. 12. Turkey], (Erivan, 1985).

Individual Monographs

Ambarian, A. S. *Agrarnye otnosheniia v Zapadnoi Armenii (1856-1914)* [Agrarian Relations in Western Armenia] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1965).

Arzumanian, M. V. *Armenia. 1914-1917* (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1969).

Avanesov, S. S. *Polozhenie natsional'nykh men'shinstv v Turtsii* [National Minorities' Conditions in Turkey] (Erivan, 1963).

Avetian, A. S. *Germanskii imperialism na Blizhnem Vostoke* [German Imperialism in the Near East] (Moscow, 1966).

Bodzholian, M. T. *Reformy 30-kh gg. XIX v. v Osmanskoi imperii* [Reforms of the 1830s in the Ottoman Empire] (Erivan, 1984).

Danielian, R. S. *Prosveshchenie v Turtsii (1920-1960 gg.)* [Education in Turkey] (Erivan, 1971).

Indzhikian, O. G. *Burzhuziia Osmanskoi imperii* [Bourgeoisie in the Ottoman Empire] (Erivan, 1977).

Indzhikian, O. G. *Padenie Osmanskoi imperii* [The Fall of the Ottoman Empire] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1984).

Kirakosian, J. S. *Pervaia mirovaia voina i Zapadnaia Armenia* [The First World War and Western Armenia] (Erivan, 1965).

Kirakosian, J. S. *Mladoturki pered sudom istorii* [Young Turks before the Trial of History] (In Armenian), Vol. 1 (Erivan, 1982); Vol. 2 (Erivan, 1983).

Kondakchian, R. P. *Vtorzhenie zapadnogermanskikh monopolii v Turtsii* [Invasion of Western German Monopolies to Turkey] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1963).

Kondakchian, R. P. *Vnutrenniaia politika Turtsii v gody vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Domestic Politics in Turkey during the Second World War] (Erivan, 1978).

Kondakchian, R. P. *Turtsiia: vnutrenniaia politika i Islam* [Turkey: Domestic Politics and Islam] (Erivan, 1983).

Korkhmazian, R. S. *Turetsko-germanskije otnosheniia v gody vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Turkish-German Relations during the Second World War] (Erivan, 1977).

Nersisian, M. G. *Bor'ba armianskogo naroda protiv turetskogo despotizma (1850-1870 gg.)* [Armenian People's Struggle against Turkish Despotism] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1955).

Nersisian, M. G., ed. *Genotsid armian v Osmanskoi imperii* [Genocide of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire] (Erivan, 1982).

Oganesian, R. P. *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie armian i Karinskaia organizatsiia "Pashtpan Aireniats" (70-80-e gody XIX v.)* [Armenian National Liberation Movement and Karin Organization "Pashtpan Aireniats"] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1965).

Papazian, A. D., trans. and comment. *"Dzhikhan-Niuma" i "Fezleke" Kiatiba Chelebi kak istochnik po istorii Armenii (XVII v.)* [Kiatib Chelebi's "Dzhikhan-Niuma" and "Fezleke" as Sources on History of Armenia] (Erivan, 1973).

Saakian, R. G. *Antinauchnoe osveshchenie istorii sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii v sovremennoi turetskoi istoriografii* [Anti-scientific Elucidation of History of Soviet-Turkish Relations in Contemporary Turkish Historiography] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1964).

Saakian, R. G. *Turetsko-frantsuzskie otnosheniia i Kilikiia v 1919-1921 gg.* [Turkish-French Relations and Kilikia in 1919-1921] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1970).

Safrastian, A. Kh., ed. *Turetskie istochniki ob Armenii, arмянakh i drugikh narodakh Zakavkaz'ia* [Turkish Sources on Armenia, Armenians and Other Peoples of Transcaucasia], Vol. 1 (Erivan, 1961); Vol. 2 (Erivan, 1964); Vol. 3 (Erivan, 1967); Vol. 4 (Erivan, 1972).

Safrastian, A. Kh. and M. K. Zulalian, trans. and comment. *Osmanskіe zakony v Zapadnoi Armenii (svod zakonov XVI-XVII vv.)* [Ottoman Laws in Western Armenia (The System of Laws of the 16-17th Centuries)] (Erivan, 1964).

Safrastian, R. A. *Doktrina osmanizma v politicheskoi zhizni Osmanskoi imperii (50-70 gg. XIX v.)* [Doctrine of Ottomanism in Political Life of the Ottoman Empire (1850-1870s)] (Erivan, 1985).

Sarkisian, Ie. K. *Polozhenie trudiashchikhsia mass v sovremennoi Turtsii* [Working Masses' Conditions in Contemporary Turkey] (Erivan, 1955).

Sarkisian, Ie. K. *Agrarnaia politika osmanskogo pravitel'stva v Zapadnoi Armenii vo vtoroi polovine XIX v.* [Ottoman Government's Agrarian Policies in Western Armenia in the Second Half of the 19th Century] (Erivan, 1957).

Sarkisian, Ie. K. *Velikaia Oktiabr'skaia sotsialisticheskaia revoliutsiia i natsional'no-osvoboditel'naia bor'ba v Turtsii* [The Great October Socialist Revolution and the National Liberation Struggle in Turkey] (Erivan, 1958).

Sarkisian, Ie. K. *Ekspansionistskaia politika Osmanskoi imperii v Zakavkaz'ie* [Expansionist Politics of the Ottoman Empire in Transcaucasia] (Erivan, 1962).

Sarkisian, Ie. K. and R. G. Saakian. *Fal'sifikatsiia istorii arмянanskogo naroda novogo vremeni v turetskoi istoriografii* [Falsification of Modern History of Armenian People in Turkish Historiography] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1963).

Sarkisian, Ie. K. *Politika osmanskogo pravitel'stva v Zapadnoi Armenii* [Ottoman Government's Policies in Western Armenia] (Erivan, 1972).

Zulalian, M. K. *Dvizhenie dzhalaliev i polozhenie arмянanskogo naroda v Osmanskoi imperii* [Dzhalali Movement and Armenian People's Conditions in the Ottoman Empire] (In Armenian) (Erivan, 1966).

APPENDIX E

DEVELOPMENT OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AND TURKOLOGY IN SOVIET AZERBAIJAN

- 1922 The Oriental Faculty was established in Azerbaijan State University.
- 1926 The First All-Union Tiurkological Congress was held in Baku. In the congress Latin alphabet instead of Arabic for Turkic peoples of the USSR was accepted.
- 1935 The Azerbaijan branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR was founded.
- 1954 The Department of History of the Countries of the Foreign East in the Institute of History of the Academy was established. The main task of the department was to investigate actual problems of history of Iran and Turkey.
- 1958 The Institute of the Near and Middle East of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan SSR was established. The Institute became specialized in actual problems of history, economics, sociopolitical thought, philology of the peoples of the Near and Middle East as well as on studying and publishing manuscripts related to history and culture of the peoples of the East. In 1988 the Institute consisted of the following departments: History of Medieval East; History of Iran; History of Turkey; History of Arabian Countries; Economics; Iranian Philology; Turkish Philology; Arabic Philology; Ideological Problems; Studying and Publishing Eastern Manuscripts.

APPENDIX F

SOVIET AZERBAIJAN ORIENTALISTS' MAJOR PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO TURKEY

Collective Works on General Problems

Voprosy istorii Irana i Turtsii [Questions of History of Iran and Turkey] (Baku, 1966).

Velikii Oktiabr' i osvoboditel'naia bor'ba narodov Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka [The Great October and Liberation Struggle of the Peoples of the Near and Middle East] (Baku, 1967).

V. I. Lenin – velikii drug narodov Vostoka. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov. 1917-1924 [V. I. Lenin – the Great Friend of the Peoples of the East. Collection of documents and materials.], 2 vols. (Baku, 1967).

Voprosy turetskoi filologii [Questions of Turkish Philology] (Baku, 1971).

Voprosy turetskoi istorii [Questions of Turkish History] (Baku, 1972).

Voprosy ekonomicheskogo razvitiia Irana i Turtsii [Questions of Economic Development of Iran and Turkey] (Baku, 1978).

Voprosy turetskoi filologii, 2nd ed. (Baku, 1980).

Blizhnii i Srednii Vostok [The Near and Middle East] (Baku, 1986).

Iran i Turtsiia: voprosy istorii [Iran and Turkey: Problems of History] (Baku, 1986).

Voprosy ekonomicheskogo razvitiia Irana i Turtsii, 2nd ed. (Baku, 1987).

Individual Monographs

Abiev, A. M. *Zhizn' i tvorchestvo Omera Seifeddina* [Life and Works of Omer Seifeddin] (In Azerbaijan) (Baku, 1978).

Akhmedov, A. D. *Romany Reshada Nuri* [Reshad Nuri's Novels] (In Azerbaijan) (Baku, 1965).

Alibekov, I. V. *Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v Turtsii* [State Capitalism in Turkey] (Moscow, 1966).

Alibekov, I. V. and N. S. Tikhonov. "O regional'nom ekonomicheskom sotrudnichestve mezhdurusskoi, Iranom i Pakistanom" [On Regional Economic Collobaration between Turkey, Iran and Pakistan], *Izvestiia AN Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR. Serii ekonomiki*. 2 (1969).

Alibekov, I. V. "Gosudarstvennyi sektor v promyshlennosti Turtsii (stanovlenie i osnovnye tendentsii razvitiia)" [State Sector in Turkish Industry (Establishment and Major Tendencies of Development)], in *Voprosy ekonomicheskogo razvitiia Irana i Turtsii* (Baku, 1978).

Alibekov, I. V. "Etatizm v ekonomicheskoi politike i ideologii kemalizma" [Etatism in Kemalism's Economic Policies and Ideology] (In German), *Asien, Afrika, Lateinisch Amerika*, 5 (Berlin, 1979).

Alibekov, I. V. *Inostrannyi kapital v Turtsii (1960-nachalo 80-kh godov)* [Foreign Capital in Turkey (1960-The Beginning of the 1980s)] (Baku, 1987).

Aliev, G. Z. *Inostrannyi kapital v Turtsii* [Foreign Capital in Turkey] (Baku, 1962).

Aliev, G. Z. *Turtsiia v period pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Turkey During the First World War] (Baku, 1965).

Aliev, G. Z. *Turtsiia v period pravleniia mladoturok (1908-1918)* [Turkey Under the Young Turks' Rule] (Moscow, 1972).

Alieva, A. A. "Organizovannyi sel'skokhoziaistvennyi kredit v sovremennoi Turtsii" [Organized Agrarian Credit in Contemporary Turkey], in *Voprosy ekonomicheskogo razvitiia stran Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka* (Moscow, 1979).

Arasly, N. *Nizami i turetskaia literatura* [Nizami and Turkish Literature] (In Azerbaijan) (Baku, 1980).

Babaev, A. *Nazym Khikmet* (In Azerbaijan)(Baku, 1978).

Babaev, A. *Sotsial'nye motivy v sovremennoi turetskoi dramaturgii* [Social Motifs in Contemporary Turkish Dramaturgy] (Baku, 1982).

Bagirov, Iu. A. *Turtsiia na Lozanskoi konferentsii* [Turkey in Lausanne Conference] (Baku, 1954).

Bagirov, Iu. A. and Sh. Tagieva. *Vliianie Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii na natsional'noe dvizhenie v Irane i v Turtsii* [The October Revolution's Impact on National Movements in Iran and Turkey] (Baku, 1957).

Bagirov, Iu. A. *Iz istorii sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii v 1920-22 gg. (Po materialam Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR)* [From History of Soviet-Turkish Relations in 1920-1922 (Basing on Materials of Azerbaijan SSR)] (Baku, 1965).

Bizhe, A. R. *Sovetsko-turetskie ekonomicheskie otnosheniia (1923-1939gg.)* [Soviet-Turkish Economic Relations] (Baku, 1965).

Bizhe, A. R. “Turtsiia i ‘Obshchii rynok’” [Turkey and ‘Common Market’], *Izvestiia AN Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR. Serii ekonomiki.*, 4 (1976).

Bizhe, A. R. *Vneshnetorgovaia politika Turtsii (1920-1980 gg.)* [Turkish Foreign Trade Policy] (Baku, 1987).

Dadashev, T. P. *Prosveshchenie Turtsii v noveishee vremia (1923-1960)* [Education in Turkey in Recent Time] (Moscow, 1972).

Efendieva, N. Z. *Bor’ba turetskogo naroda protiv frantsuzskikh okkupantov na iuge Turtsii* [Turkish People’s Struggle against French Occupants in the South of Turkey] (Baku, 1966).

Gadzhiev, B. K. “Promyshlennaia politika Demokraticheskoi partii Turtsii” [Industrial Policy of Democratic Party of Turkey], *Izvestiia AN Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR. Serii obshchestvennykh nauk* 2 (1966).

Gadzhiev, B. K. *Ekonomicheskaia politika turetskogo pravitel’sтва posle gosudarstvennogo perevorota 1960 g.* [Economic Politics of the Turkish Government after the 1960 Coup]

Gasanova, E. Iu. “Novye veianiia v obshchestvennoi mysli Turtsii” [New Trends in Social Thought in Turkey], *Narody Azii i Afriki* 1 (1965).

Gasanova, E. Iu. *Ideologiiia burzhuaznogo natsionalizma v Turtsii v period mladoturok (1908-1914 gg.)* [Ideology of Bourgeois Nationalism in the Young Turks Period] (Baku, 1966).

Gasanova, E. Iu. “Iz istorii rasprostraneniia marksistskikh idei v Turtsii(kontsa XIX – nachala XX v.)” [From History of the Spread of Marxist Ideas in Turkey (The End of the 19th Century – The Beginning of the 20th Century)], in *Marksizm i strany Vostoka* (Moscow, 1970).

Gasanova, E. Iu. “Vliianie leninskikh idei na obshchestvenno-politicheskuiu mysl’ Turtsii” [The Impact of Lenin’s Ideas on Sociopolitical Thought in Turkey], in *Idei Lenina i demokraticheskaiia mysl’ narodov Vostoka* (Baku, 1970).

Gasanova, E. Iu. “K istorii proniknoveniia levnykh idei v Turtsiiu v poslednei chetverti XIX v.” [On History of the Penetration of Left Ideas to Turkey in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century], in *Problemy istorii Turtsii* (Moscow, 1978).

Gasanova, E. Iu. “Islam i printsip laitsizma v sovremennoi Turtsii” [Islam and the Principle of Laicism in Contemporary Turkey], in *Religiia i obshchestvennaia mysl’ stran Vostoka* (Moscow, 1984).

Guseinov, R. *Tevfik Fikret* (In Azerbaijan) (Baku, 1981).

Kuliev, R. I. “Rol’ gosudarstva v razvitii energeticheskoi promyshlennosti Turtsii” [The Role of the State in Development of Power Engineering Industry in Turkey], in *Ekonomicheskaia rol’ gosudarstva v kapitalisticheskikh, razvivaiushchikhsia i sotsialisticheskikh stranakh* (Moscow, 1973).

Kulieva-Kavkazly, Kh. *Karadzhaoglan* (In Azerbaijan) (Baku, 1985).

Kurbanov, T. A. *Ekonomicheskaiia politika pravitel'stva Partii spravedlivosti Turtsii* [Economic Policies of Justice Party of Turkey]

Orudzhev, M. G. *Iz istorii proniknoveniia germanskogo imperializma v Turtsii s kontsa XIX v. Po 1914 g.* [From History of German Imperialism's Penetration to Turkey since the End of the 19th Century until 1914] (Baku, 1971).

Rustamov, Iu. *Sovremennaia turetskaia burzhuaznaia sotsiologiiia* [Contemporary Turkish Bourgeois Sociology] (Baku, 1967).

Rustamov, Iu. *Islam i obshchestvennaia mysl' Turtsii* [Islam and Social Thought in Turkey] (Baku, 1980).

Shabanov, F. Sh. *Gosudarstvennyi stroi i pravovaia sistema Turtsii v period Tanzimata* [The State System and Legal System in Turkey in the Tanzimat Period] (Baku, 1967).

Shirinov, A. T. *Ekonomicheskaiia politika pravitel'stva Narodno-respublikanskoi partii Turtsii (1923-1939gg.)* [Economic Policies of People's Republican Party of Turkey]

Veliev, D. A. "O kharaktere raspredelitel'nykh otnoshenii v sovremennoi turetskoi derevne" [About Distributive Relations' Character in the Countryside in Contemporary Turkey], in *Blizhnii i Srednii Vostok* (Baku, 1986).

Zamanova, E. E. "Bor'ba dvukh khudozhestvennykh tendentsii v estetike sovremennoi Turtsii" [The Struggle between Two Art Tendencies in Aesthetics of Contemporary Turkey], *Uchenye zapiski AGU*, 3 (Baku, 1963).

Zamanova, E. E. "Idei sotsialisticheskoi literatury i iskusstva v Turtsii v 20 – 40-e gg." [The Ideas of Socialist Literature and Art in Turkey in the 1920-1940s], in *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie i sovremennaia ideologicheskaiia bor'ba* (Baku, 1973).

Zamanova, E. E. *Vliianie marksistsko-leninskoi estetiki na razvitie progressivnoi esteticheskoi mysli v sovremennoi Turtsii* [The Influence of Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics on Development of Progressive Aesthetical Thought in Contemporary Turkey] (Baku, 1987).

APPENDIX G

DEVELOPMENT OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AND TURKOLOGY IN SOVIET GEORGIA

- 1922 The Sub-faculty of Armenian Studies was founded in Tbilisi State University.
- 1936 The Sub-faculty of Eastern languages was added, and The Department of Oriental Studies was established in the Institute of Linguistics, History and Material Culture of the Georgian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- 1945 The Faculty of Oriental Studies in Tbilisi University was established with following sub-faculties: Semitology, Tiurkology, Iranian Philology, and Armenian Studies.
- 1950 The Sub-Faculty of History of the Eastern Countries was added.
- 1960 On the base of uniting all Oriental departments and groups, the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Georgian SSR was established. In 1988 The Institute consisted of the following departments: Languages of Ancient East, Semitology, Tiurkology, Persian Philology, Indo-Iranian Languages, Byzantology, Medieval History of the Countries of the Near East, Modern and Recent History of the Countries of the Near East, Information, Laboratory of General Phonetics and Typology of the Eastern Languages.

APPENDIX H

SOVIET GEORGIAN ORIENTALISTS' MAJOR PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO TURKEY

Collective Works on General Problems

Ocherki po istorii Blizhnego Vostoka [Essays on History of the Near East] (Tbilisi, 1957).

Oktiabr'skaia revoliutsiia i strany Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka [The October Revolution and the Countries of the Near and Middle East] (Tbilisi, 1967).

Ocherki po sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Blizhnego Vostoka [Essays on Socioeconomic History of the Near East] (Tbilisi, 1968).

Ocherki po istorii gorodov Blizhnego Vostoka [Essays on History of Cities of the Near East], Vol. 1 (Tbilisi, 1966); Vol. 2 (Tbilisi, 1970).

Individual Monographs

Abuladze, Ts. A., trans. and comment. "*Kniga zavoevaniia Tbilisi*" *Giurdzhizade* [Giurdzhizade's "Account of the Conquest of Tbilisi"] (Tbilisi, 1975).

Abuladze, Ts. A. and M. Kh. Svanidze. *Dzhaba-defter Childyrskogo vilaieta. 1699-1732 gg.* [Dzhaba-defter of Childyr Province] (Tbilisi, 1979).

Abuladze, Ts. A. *Turetskie istochniki po istorii Samtskhe-Saatabago 1-i chetverti XVI veka* [Turkish Sources on History of Samtskhe-Saatabago in the First Quarter of the 16th Century] (Tbilisi, 1983).

Alasaniia, G. G., trans. and comment. *Svedeniia Kiatiba Chelebi o Gruzii i Kavkaze* [Information Given by Kiatib Chelebi about Georgia and Caucasia] (Tbilisi, 1978).

Antelava, G. I. *Kratkii turetsko-russkii slovar' "novykh slov"* [A Short Turkish-Russian Dictionary of "New Words"] (Tbilisi, 1978).

Antelava, G. I. *Turetsko-russkii slovar' (neologizmy)* [Turkish-Russian Dictionary (Neologisms)] (Tbilisi, 1985).

Bostashvili, N. I. *Bibliografiia Turtsii (istoriia)* [Bibliography of Turkey (History)] (Tbilisi, 1971).

Chipashvili, G. S. *Velikii Oktiabr i narody Vostoka* [The Great October and the Peoples of the East] (Tbilisi, 1967).

Chipashvili, G. S. and Z. M. Sharashenidze. *V. I. Lenin o stranakh Vostoka* [V. I. Lenin about the Peoples of the East] (Tbilisi, 1974).

Dzhanashia, N. N. *Morfologiia turetskogo glagola* [Morphology of Turkish Verb] (Tbilisi, 1981).

Dzhikiia M. S. *Struktura slovoform turetskogo iazyka* [The Structure of Word Forms in the Turkish Language] (Tbilisi, 1984).

Dzhikiia, S. S., prepar. of the text, trans. and comment. *Prostrannyi reestr Giurdzhistsanskogo vilaieta* [Detailed List of Giurdzhistan Province], Vol. 1-3 (Tbilisi, 1947-1958).

Dzhikiia, S. S., compil. *Turetskaia khrestomatiia* [Turkish Reader] (Tbilisi, 1971).

Gabashvili, V. N. *Feodal'nyi stroi Gruzii XVI-XVIII vv.* [Feudal System in Georgia in the 16-18th Centuries] (Tbilisi, 1953).

Gabeskiriia, Sh. V. *Leksika proizvedenii Iunusa Emre* [Vocabulary of Iunus Emre's Works] (Tbilisi, 1983).

Gachechiladze, R. G. *Blizhnii Vostok (ekonomiko-geograficheskii obzor)* [The Near East (An Economico-geographical Survey)] (Tbilisi, 1977).

Gachechiladze, R. G. *Turtsiia* [Turkey] (Moskva, 1983).

Gigineishvili, O. I. *Pantiurkizm i vneshnaia politika Osmanskoi imperii* [Panturkism and Foreign Policy of the Ottoman Empire] (Tbilisi, 1963).

Gigineishvili, O. I. *Ocherki po istorii Turtsii* [Essays on History of Turkey] (Tbilisi, 1982).

Komakhidze, N. V. *Sel'skoe khozaistvo i polozhenie krest'ianstva Vostochnoi Turtsii posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Agriculture and Peasant Conditions in Eastern Turkey after the Second World War] (Tbilisi, 1965).

Komakhidze, N. V. *Problema preodoleniia sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi otstalosti Vostoka Turtsii (Dogu Sorunu) v programmnykh ustanovkakh burzuanzykh politicheskikh partii strany* [Problem of Overcoming Socioeconomic Backwardness of Turkey's East in Program Purposes of Bourgeois Political Parties] (Tbilisi, 1985).

Puturidze, G. V., trans. and comment. *"Kniga puteshestviia" Evlii Chelebi* [Evliia Chelebi's Travel Account], Vol. 1 (Tbilisi, 1971), Vol. 2 (Tbilisi, 1973).

Puturidze, G. V., F. M. Aliev, A. D. Zheltiakov, M. K. Zulalian, trans., and comment. *Evliia Chelebi. Kniga puteshestviia. 3* [Evliia Chelebi. Travel Account] (Moscow, 1983).

Shengeliia, N. N., trans. and comment. *Mustafa Naima. Svedeniia o Gruzii i Kavkaze* [Mustafa Naima. Information about Georgia and Caucasia] (Tbilisi, 1979).

Shengeliia, N. N. *Osmanskii dokumental'nye istochniki o krepostiakh Anakliia i Rukhi* [Ottoman Documentary Sources on Anakliia and Rukhi Fortresses] (Tbilisi, 1982).

Svanidze, M. Kh. *Iz istorii gruzino-turetskikh otnoshenii v XVI-XVII vv.* [From History of Georgian-Turkish Relations in the 16-17th Centuries] (Tbilisi, 1971).

APPENDIX I

DEVELOPMENT OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AND TURKOLOGY IN SOVIET UKRAINE

- 1918 The Institute of Eastern Languages was founded in Kiev which some later was reorganized as the Institute of the Near East consisting of two faculties – Consular and Commercial.
- 1919 The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was established in Kiev. In the Academy's library a separate department named "Orientalia" was founded.
- 1920 The Institute of the Near East was reorganized as the Institute of Foreign Relations divided to two departments – Oriental and Anglo-Saxon. The departments consisted of two faculties – Consular and Foreign Trade. Some later the Institute of Foreign Relations turned to the Technical Trade School, in which Oriental disciplines moved back.
- 1924 The Higher Seminar of Oriental Studies attached to the Technical Trade School was created. The activities of the Seminar was focused mainly on studying Soviet trade relations with the East.
- 1925 Three-year courses of Arabian, Persian, and Turkish were established in Kiev.
- 1926 Three-year courses of Persian, Turkish, and Japanese were established in Kharkov.
- 1926 The All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies (VUNAV) was established in Kharkov, with the branches in Kiev and Odessa. Investigations carried by VUNAV were focused mainly on problems of contemporary life, in particular, economic problems of the peoples of the East and had practical meaning for the development of trade relations of the USSR with Eastern countries. The Association consisted of two

departments: politicoeconomic (sections of economics and politics of the Soviet and foreign East; law of the countries of the East) and historicoethnological (sections of history, languages and literature, art, archaeology). VUNAV's staff numbered 193 actual members and 158 competitor ones in 1929. VUNAV held two congresses in 1927 and 1929 and published its journal *Skhidnii svit*[Eastern Light] (from the end of 1930 renamed as *Chervonii skhid* [Red East]) between 1927 and 1931 (17 issues in all). VUNAV was supported by monthly subsidies from the Odessa Branch of Russian Chamber of Eastern Commerce which issued its bulletin *Torgovlia Ukrainy s Vostokom* (Ukrainian trade with the East). VUNAV carried the investigation of those economic issues in which the Chamber was interested. Many works of VUNAV's members on political and economic issues were written basing on materials of the Chamber.

- 1927 The Department of Foreign Relations was established in The Institute of National Economy in Kharkov in which Turkish was taught.
- 1928 The Commission on Study of Ukrainian-Turkish Relations was established in VUNAV as the result of the agreement with Turkish scholarly circles reached in the course of the journey of VUNAV's delegation to Turkey. In order to assist the activities of the Commission, Leningrad Orientalists sent to the Central Historical Archive of Ukraine copies of materials related to Ukrainian-Turkish relations.
- 1930 Three-year Ukrainian Evening School of Oriental Studies and Eastern Languages was established in Kharkov. This school had the status of a high educational institution and prepared specialists of following specialities: economists with particular specialization on the countries of the East and workers in cultural and educational fields (teachers, translators, workers of the press and others). Along with Turkish and Persian, English, French, and optionally Arabian, Uzbek, Turkmen, and Tadjik languages were taught.

- 1930 The All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies (VUNAV) was liquidated.
- 1934 The capital of Ukraine was transferred from Kharkov to Kiev. It was followed by changes in the organization of higher education in Kharkov. Oriental studies continued to be carried in Kharkov State University, but they had not previous scope.
- 1941-1945 The Second World War caused a serious interruption in all scholarly activities in Ukraine. Oriental studies also suffered much since many specialists and the considerable part of library stocks were lost during the war.
- 1950s Oriental issues were present in historical faculties of higher educational institutions where the course “History of Colonial and Dependent Countries” was taught.
- 1964 The Department of History of the Countries of the Near and Middle East (in 1970 renamed as the Department of History of the Countries of Foreign East) was established in the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of Ukrainian SSR. The Department worked over the following subjects: “Participation of Ukraine in Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations of the USSR with Foreign Countries of the East,” “Development of Oriental Studies in Ukraine,” “Development of Liberated Countries and Strengthening Their Cooperation with Socialist Countries.”
- 1978 The Department of History of the Countries of Foreign East was reorganized as the Institute of Social and Economic Problems of Foreign Countries. The Institute focused its investigation mainly on two subjects: “Socioeconomic Changes in Developing Countries Under the Conditions of the Struggle Against Neo-Colonialism” and “Laws and Peculiarities of the Contemporary Stage of Socioeconomic and Political Development of Liberated Countries (The Region of the Near and Middle East).”

APPENDIX J

SOVIET UKRAINIAN ORIENTALISTS' MAJOR PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO TURKEY

Collective Works on General Problems

Ukraina i Blizhnii i Srednii Vostok [Ukraine and the Near and Middle East] (Kiev, 1968).

Ukrainskaia SSR v politicheskikh, ekonomicheskikh i kul'turnykh svyaziakh SSSR so stranami Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka v poslevoennyi period [Ukrainian SSR in Political, Economic and Cultural Relations of the USSR with the Countries of the Near and Middle East in the Post-War Period] (Kiev, 1968).

Pod vliianiem idei Velikogo Oktiabria [Under the Influence of Ideas of the Great October] (Kiev, 1969).

V bor'be za likvidatsiiu kolonializma. Vneshnopoliticheskaia bor'ba Sovetskogo Soiuz za okonchatelnuuu likvidatsiiu kolonializma i uchastie v nei Ukrainskoi SSR [In the Struggle for Liquidation of Colonialism. Foreign Policy Struggle of the Soviet Union for Complete Liquidation of Colonialism and Participation of the Ukrainian SSR in This Struggle] (Kiev, 1974).

Strany Vostoka. Istoriiia i sovremennost'. Sbornik statei [The Countries of the East. History and Contemporary State. Collection of Essays] (Kiev, 1974).

Razvivaiushchiesia strany Azii i Afriki v bor'be protiv neokolonializma [Developing Countries of Asia and Africa in the Struggle Against Neo-Colonialism] (Kiev, 1984).

Individual Monographs

Enolskii, Z. A. *Istoriiia stran zarubezhnogo Vostoka. Indiiia, Iran, Turtsiia (1870-1918)* [History of the Countries of the Foreign East. India, Iran, Turkey] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1965).

Enolskii, Z. A. *Izuchenie novoi istorii stran zarubezhnogo Vostoka i Afriki v shkole* [Studying of Modern History of the Countries of the Foreign East and Africa in School] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1968).

Enolskii, Z. A. and R. M. Brodskii. *Novaia istoriia stran Azii i Afriki (1870-1918)* [Modern History of the Countries of Asia and Africa] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1971).

Ganusets, A. I. *Gosudarstvennoe ustroistvo Turtsii v period respubliki* [State System of Turkey in the Republican Period] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1961).

Grunin, T. I. *Turetskii iazyk. Elementarnaia grammatika i novyi alfavit* [The Turkish Language. Elementary Grammar and New Alphabet] (In Ukrainian) (Kharkov, 1930).

Krymskii, A. Ie. *Istoriia Turechchini z 13 maliunkami, shcho ikh uziato pobilshe iz starodrukiv XVI – XVIII vv. Zvidki pochalasia Osmanska derzhava, iak vona zrostala rozvivalasia i iak dosiagla apogeiu svoei slavi i mogutnosti* [History of Turkey ...] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1924).

Krymskii, A. Ie. *Khodzha Nasreddin i iogo “Zharti”. Storinka z istorii turetskogo pismenstva XIV – XV vv., iak material dlia folkloristiv* [Khodzha Nasreddin and His “Jokes.” A Page From History of Turkish Literature in the 14-15th Centuries as a Material for Folklorists] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1926).

Krymskii, A. Ie. *Vstup do istorii Turechchini.. Vip. 3. Evropeiski dzherela XVI v.* [Introduction to History of Turkey. European Writings] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1926).

Krymskii, A. Ie. *Istoriia Turechchini ta ii pismenstva. Ch. 2. Vip. 2. Pismenstvo XIV- XV vv.* [History of Turkey and Its Literature] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1927).

Krymskii, A. Ie. *Z istorii turetskogo pismenstva XIV v. (Z privodu vidannia turetskogo tekstu poemi “Siukheil ve Nevbekhar” 1350-1378 rr., shcho opublikuvav I. Mordtman u 1925 r.)* [From History of Turkish Literature in the 14th Century (On the Occasion of Publication of Turkish Text of the Poem “Siukheil and Nevbekhar” Which Was Published by I. Mordtman in 1925)] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1927).

Krymskii, A. Ie. *Tiurki, ikh movi ta liiteraturi. 1. Tiurkski movi. Vip. 2.* [Turkic Peoples, Their Languages and Literatures. Turkic Languages.] (In Ukrainian) (Kiev, 1930).

APPENDIX K

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET WORKS ON TURKEY*

1918

Pavlovitch M. *Aziia i eio rol' v mirovoi voine* [Asia and Its Role in the World War] (St. Petersburg, 1918).

1920s

Pavlovich M. (Veltman M.) *Revoliutsionnaia Turtsiia. Velichie i padenie Ottomanskoi imperii (staraia Turtsiia). Turtsiia Enver-beia i Akhmed-Rizy. Turtsiia Kemalia. Kommunisticheskoe dvizhenie v Turtsii* [Revolutionary Turkey. The Grandeur and Fall of the Ottoman Empire (Old Turkey). Turkey of Enver Bey and Akhmet Riza. Turkey of Kemal. Communist Movement in Turkey.] (Moscow, 1921).

Iust K. *Anatoliiskaia pechat'* [The Anatolian Press] (Tiflis, 1922).

Arslan. *Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1923).

Gurko-Kriazhin V. A. *Istoriia revoliutsii v Turtsii* [History of the Revolution in Turkey] (Moscow, 1923).

Sokolovskii N. *Ocherki sovremennoi Turtsii* [Essays on Contemporary Turkey] (Tiflis, 1923).

Adamova Ie. A., ed. *Razdel Aziatskoi Turtsii: po sekretnym dokumentam byvshego ministerstva inostrannykh del* [Partition of Asian Turkey: According to Secret Documents of the Former Ministry of Foreign Affairs] (Moscow, 1924).

Lirau V. *Novaia Turtsiia, ee ekonomicheskoe sostoenie i vidy na budushchee* [New Turkey, Its Economic Situation and Plans for Future] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1924).

Adamova Ie. A., ed. *Konstantinopol' i prolivy: po sekretnym dokumentam byvshego ministerstva inostrannykh del* [Constantinople and the Straits: According to Secret Documents of the Former Ministry of Foreign Affairs], Vol. I-II (Moscow, 1925-1926).

Butaev I. *Natsional'naiia revoliutsia na Vostoke. Problema Turtsii* [National Revolution in the East. The Question of Turkey] (Moscow, 1925).

Gurko-Kriazhin V. A. *Blizhnii Vostok i derzhavy* [The Near East and Great Powers] (Moscow, 1925).

* Only books (individual monographs as well as collective works) and chapters of books and only works written in Russian are included.

Kasparova V. *Zhenshchiny Vostoka* [Women of the East] (Leningrad, 1925).

Kitaigorodskii P. *Ot kolonial'nogo rabstva k natsional'noi nezavisimosti. Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Perednei Azii i Severnoi Afrike* [From Colonial Slavery to National Independence. Revolutionary Movement in Anatolia and North Africa] (Moscow, 1925).

Pavlovich M., Gurko-Kriazhin V. *Turtsiia v bor'be za nezavisimost'* [Turkey in the Struggle for Independence] (Moscow, 1925).

Seifullina L. *V strane ukhodiashchego islama. Poezdka v Turtsiiu* [In the Country of Passing Islam. A Journey to Turkey] (Moscow, 1925).

Astakhov, G. *Ot sultanata k demokraticeskoi Turtsii. Ocherki iz istorii kemalizma* [From Sultanate to Democratic Turkey. Essays on History of Kemalism] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1926).

Mustafa Kemal-Pasha. *Vosmominaniia prezidenta Turetskoi Respubliki* [Memoirs of President of the Republic of Turkey] (Moscow, 1927).

Grankur K. *Taktika na Blizhnem Vostoke* [Tactics in the Near East] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1928).

Irاندوست, *Dvizhushchie sily kemalistkoi revolutsii* [The Driving Forces of Kemalist Revolution] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1928).

Melikov V. *Marna 1914 g. – Visla 1920 g. – Smirna 1922 g.* (Moscow, Leningrad, 1928).

Melnik A. *Respublikanskaia Turtsiia* [Republican Turkey] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1928).

Frunze M. V. *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works] Vol. I. (Moscow, 1929).

Melnik A. *Turtsiia, eio istoricheskoe proshloe i nastoiashchee* [Turkey, Its Historical Past and the Present] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1929).

Mustafa Kemal. *Put' novoi Turtsii* [The Way of New Turkey] vol. I-IV (Moscow, 1929-1934).

Shnurov A. *Turetskii proletariat* [Turkish Proletariat] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1929).

1930s

Dantsig B. *Ocherki po ekonomicheskoi geografii Turtsii* [Essays on Economic Geography of Turkey] (Moscow, 1930).

Pavlenko P. *Stambul i Turtsiia* [Istanbul and Turkey] (Moscow, 1930).

Zhukovskii P. M. *Zemel'cheskaia Turtsiia* [Peasant Turkey] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1933).

Alimov A. "Turtsiia", In *Ocherki po istorii Vostoka v epokhu imperializma* [Essays on History of the East in the Era of Imperialism] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1934).

Zavriev D. S. *Ekonomika sovremennoi Turtsii* [Economics of Contemporary Turkey] (Tbilisi, 1934).

Alimov A. A. "Revoliutsiia 1908 goda v Turtsii" [The Revolution of 1908 in Turkey], In *Probuzhdenie Azii. 1905 god i revoliutsiia na Vostoke* [Awakening of Asia. The Year of 1905 and Revolution in the East] (Leningrad, 1935).

Nikul'in L. *Stambul, Ankara, Izmir* (Moscow, 1935).

Novichev A. D. *Ekonomika Turtsii v period mirovoi voiny* [Turkish Economics During the World War] (Moscow- Leningrad, 1935).

Gabidullin H. Z. *Mladoturetskaia revoliutsiia: istoricheskie ocherki* [The Young Turks' Revolution: Historical Essays] (Moscow, 1936).

Zavriev D. S. *Vostochnaia Anatoliia: ekonomicheskie ocherki* [East Anatolia: Economic Essays] (Tbilisi, 1936).

Korsun N. G. *Sarykamyskaia operatsiia na Kavkazskom fronte mirovoi voiny v 1914-1915 gg.* [The Operation of Sarykamysk at the Caucasian Front of the First World War in 1914-1915] (Moscow, 1937).

Lorei G. *Operatsii germano-turetskikh morskikh sil v 1914-1918 gg.* [Operations of German-Turkish Naval Forces in 1914-1918] (Moscow, 1937).

Melnik A. *Turtsiia* (Moscow, 1937).

Kolenskovich A. *Dardanellskaia operatsiia* [The Dardanelles Operation] (Moscow, 1938).

Korsun N. G. *Erzerumskaia operatsiia na Kavkazskom fronte v 1915-1916 gg* [The Operation of Erzerum at the Caucasian Front in 1915-1916] (Moscow, 1938).

Korsun N. G. *Balkanskii Front mirovoi voiny 1914-1918 gg.* [The Balkan Front of the World War in 1914-1918] (Moscow, 1938).

1940s

Korsun N. G. *Greko-turetskaia voina 1919-1922 gg. Operativno-strategicheskii ocherk* [The Greek-Turkish War of 1919-1922. An Operational-Strategical Essay] (Moscow, 1940).

Korsun N. G. *Pervaia mirovaia voina na Kavkazskom fronte. Operativno-strategicheskii ocherk* [The First World War at the Caucasian Front. An Operational-Strategical Essay] (Moscow, 1946).

Smirnov N. A. *Rossia i Turtsiia v XVI-XVII vv.* [Russia and Turkey in the 16-17th Centuries], 2 vols. (Moscow, 1946).

Lemin I. M. *Vneshniaia politika Velikobritanii ot Versalia do Lokarno: 1919-1925* [Great Britain's Foreign Policy from Versailles to Locarno: 1919-1925] (Moscow, 1947).

Miller A. F. *Mustafa Pasha Bairaktar* (Moscow, 1947).

Sovetsko-turetskie otnosheniia. Sbornik dokumentov. T. 1 (1917-1926 gg.) [Soviet-Turkish Relations. The Collection of Documents. Vol. 1] (Moscow, 1947).

Zavriev D. S. *K noveishei istorii severo-vostochnykh vilaietov Turtsii* [Recent History of Northeast Provinces of Turkey] (Tbilisi, 1947).

Dranov B. A. *Chernomorskie prolivy. Mezhdunarodno-pravovoi rezhim* [The Straits. The International Legal Regime] (Moscow, 1948).

Miller A. F. *Ocherki noveishei istorii Turtsii* [Essays on Recent History of Turkey] (Moscow, Leningrad, 1948).

Dantsig B. *Turtsiia* (Moscow, 1949).

Muratov, N. *Turtsiia v tiskakh vnutrennei i vneshnei reaktsii* [Turkey in the Grip of Domestic and Foreign Reaction] (Moscow, 1949).

1950s

Vasiliev, I. *O turetskom "neitralitete" vo vtoroi mirovoi voine* [On Turkish "Neutrality" during the Second World War] (Moscow, 1951).

Kunina A. Ie. *Proval amerikanskikh planov zavoevaniia mirovogo gospodstva v 1919-1920 gg.* [The Failure of American Plans of World Domination in 1919-1920] (Moscow, 1954).

Ludshuweit Ie. F. *Turtsiia: ekonomiko-geograficheskii ocherk* [Turkey: An Economicogeographical Essay] (Moscow, 1955).

Dantsig B. *Ekonomika Turtsii* [Turkish Economics] (Moscow, 1956).

Kerimov M. A. *Gosudarstvennyi stroi Turtsii* [Turkey's State System] (Moscow, 1956).

Rozaliev Iu. N. *Ocherki polozheniia promyshlennogo proletariata Turtsii posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Essays on the State of Industrial Proletariat in Turkey after the Second World War] (Moscow, 1956).

Smirnov V. P. *Turtsiia: ekonomika i vneshniaia torgovlia* [Turkey: Economics and Foreign Trade] (Moscow, 1956).

Efendieva N. Z. *Osvoboditel'naia bor'ba turetskogo naroda protiv frantsuzskikh okkupantov na iuge Anatolii v 1919-1921 gg.* [The War of Liberation of Turkish People against French Invaders in the South of Anatolia in 1919-1921] (Baku, 1957).

Moizish L. *Operatsiia "Tsitseron"* [Operation "Cicerone"] (Moscow, 1957).

Miller A. F. "Burzhuzno-natsional'naia revoliutsiia v Turtsii" [The Bourgeois Nationalist Revolution in Turkey], In *Sovetskaia Rossiia i kapitalisticheskii mir v 1917-1923 gg.* [Soviet Russia and the Capitalist World in 1917-1923] (Moscow, 1957).

Miller A. F. *Piatidesiatiletie mladoturetskoi revoliutsii* [On the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Young Turks' Revolution] (Moscow, 1958).

Moiseev P. P., Rozaliev Iu. N. *K istorii sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii* [On History of Soviet-Turkish Relations] (Moscow, 1958).

Novichev A. D. *Istoriia rabocheho classa Turtsii* [History of Working Class of Turkey] (Leningrad, 1958).

Petrosian Iu. A. "Novye osmany" i bor'ba za konstitutsiiu 1876 g. v Turtsii ["Young Ottomans" and the Struggle for the 1876 Constitution in Turkey] (Moscow, 1958).

Sovremennaia Turtsiia [Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1958).

Turetskii sbornik. Istoriia, ekonomika, literatura, yazyk [The Turkish Collection. History, Economics, Literature, Language] (Moscow, 1958).

Turtsiia – aktivnyi uchastnik agressivnykh blokov [Turkey, the Active Participant of Aggressive Blocs] (Moscow, 1958).

Novichev A. D. *Krestianstvo Turtsii v noveisheie vremia* [Turkish Peasants in Recent Times] (Moscow, 1959).

1960s

Aralov S. I.⁴⁴⁶ *Vospominaniia sovetskogo diplomata* [Memoirs of the Soviet Diplomat] (Moscow, 1960).

Glebov A. *Liniia druzhby. Rasskazy o Turtsii* [The Line of Friendship. Stories about Turkey] (Moscow, 1960).

Gotlib V. V. *Tainaia diplomatiia vo vremia pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Secret Diplomacy During the First World War] (Moscow, 1960).

⁴⁴⁶ The plenipotentiary of RSFSR in Turkey in 1922-1923.

Kheifets A. N. *Lenin velikii drug narodov Vostoka* [Lenin, the Great Friend of Peoples of the East] (Moscow, 1960).

Lazarev M. S. *Krushenie turetskogo gospodstva na Arabskom Vostoke (1914-1918 gg.)* [The Downfall of Turkish Domination in the Arab East] (Moscow, 1960).

Moiseev P. P. *Agrarnye otnosheniia v sovremennoi Turtsii* [Agrarian Relations in Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1960).

Politika SShA na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke [The USA's Policies in the Near and Middle East] (Moscow, 1960).

Rozaliev Iu. N. "V. I. Lenin i Turtsiia" [V. I. Lenin and Turkey] In *Lenin i Vostok* [Lenin and the East] (Moscow, 1960).

Shpil'kova V. I. *Imperialisticheskaia politika SShA v otnoshenii Turtsii (1914-1920gg)* [Imperialistic Politics of USA toward Turkey] (Moscow, 1960).

Alekseev V. M. *Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1961).

Alekseev V. M., M. A. Kerimov. *Vneshniaia politika Turtsii* [Turkish Foreign Policy] (Moscow, 1961).

Kuznetsova S. I. *Ustanovlenie sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii (K 40-letiiu Moskovskogo dogovora mezhdu RSFSR i Turtsiei)* [On the Establishment of Soviet-Turkish Relations (On the Occasion of 40th Anniversary of Moscow Treaty between RSFSR and Turkey)] (Moscow, 1961).

Marunov Iu. V., Iu. V. Potemkin. *Arabo-turetskie otnosheniia na sovremennom etape. 1946-1960 gg.* [Arabian-Turkish Relations at Contemporary Stage] (Moscow, 1961).
Baziant's A. P. *Turtsiia* (Moscow, 1962).

Rozaliev Iu. N. *Osobennosti razvitiia kapitalizma v Turtsii (1923-1960 gg)* [The Peculiarities of Capitalist Development in Turkey] (Moscow, 1962).

Sarkisian Ie. K. *Ekspansionistskaia politika Osmanskoi imperii v Zakavkazie nakanune i v gody pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Expansionist Policy of Ottoman Empire in Transcaucasia on the Eve and During the First World War] (Erivan, 1962).

Shamsutdinov A. M. *Turetskaia Respublika. Kratkii ocherk istorii, 1923-1961* [The Republic of Turkey. A Short History] (Moscow, 1962).

Vdovichenko D. I. *Natsional'naiia burzhuaziia Turtsii* [Turkish National Bourgeoisie] (Moscow, 1962).

Gasratian M., Moiseiev P. *Turtsiia zhdiot peremen* [Turkey is Waiting for Changes] (Moscow, 1963).

- Problemy sovremennoi Turtsii* [Problems of Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1963).
- Kheifets A. N. *Sovetskaia Rossiia i sopredel'nye strany Vostoka v gody grazhdanskoi voiny (1918-1920)* [Soviet Russia and Contiguous Eastern Countries in the Years of the Civil War] (Moscow, 1964).
- Bagirov Iu. A. *Iz istorii sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii* [On History of Soviet-Turkish Relations] (Baku, 1965).
- Gasratian M. A. *Turtsiia v 1960-1963 godakh. Ocherk vnutrennei politiki* [Turkey in 1960-1963. An Essay on Domestic Policies] (Moscow, 1965).
- Ibragimov A. K. *Pechat' Turtsii* [Turkish Press] (Moscow, 1965).
- Kornienko, R. P. *Rabochee dvizhenie v Turtsii v 1918-1963 gg.* [Worker Movement in Turkey in 1918-1963] (Moscow, 1965).
- Miller Iu. A. *Iskusstvo Turtsii* [Turkish Art] (Leningrad, 1965).
- Moiseev P. P., Gasratian M. A. *Turtsiia: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskii ocherk* [Turkey: An Socioeconomic Essay] (Moscow, 1965).
- Novichev A. D. *Turtsiia. Kratkaia istoriia* [Turkey. A Short History] (Moscow, 1965).
- Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1965).
- Alibekov I. V. *Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v Turtsii* [State Capitalism in Turkey] (Moscow, 1966).
- Atatiurk Kemal. *Izbrannye rechi i vystuplenia* [Selected Speeches] (Moscow, 1966).
- Ludshuveit Ie. F. *Turtsiia v gody pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Turkey During the First World War] (Moscow, 1966).
- Miller A. F. *Chanakskii krizis i vopros o Prolivakh* [The Dardanelles Crisis and the Problem of the Straits] (Moscow, 1966).
- Rozaliev Iu. N. *Klassy i klassovaia bor'ba v Turtsii (burzhuaziia i proletariat)* [Classes and Class Struggle in Turkey (Bourgeoisie and Proletariat)] (Moscow, 1966).
- Shamsutdinov A. M. *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'naia bor'ba v Turtsii. 1918-1923 gg.* [The National Liberation Struggle in Turkey] (Moscow, 1966).
- Vdovichenko D. I. "Rabochii klass Turtsii i rabochee dvizhenie posle voennogo perevorota 27 maia 1960 g." [Working Class and Labor Movement in Turkey after the Military Coup of 27 May, 1960], In *Rabochii klass stran Azii i Afriki* [Working Class in Asiatic and African Countries] (Moscow, 1966).

Dantsig B. *Istoriia, ekonomika i geografiia Turtsii* [History, Economics and Geography of Turkey] (Moscow, 1967).

Kireev N. G. “Kontsentratsiia krupnogo chastnogo kapitala vo vneshnei torgovle Turtsii” [Concentration of Big Private Capital in Turkish Foreign Trade], In *Blizhnii i Srednii Vostok. Istoriia, ekonomika* [The Near and Middle East. History, Economics] (Moscow, 1967).

Vdovichenko D. I. *Bor'ba politicheskikh partii v Turtsii (1944-1965 gg.)* [The Struggle between Political Parties in Turkey] (Moscow, 1967).

Aizenshtein N. A. *Iz istorii turetskogo realizma. Zametki o turetskoi proze (70-e gody XIX v. – 30-e gody XXv.)* [From History of Turkish Realism. Notes on Turkish Prose (1870s – 1930s)] (Moscow, 1968).

Danilov V. I. *Srednie sloi v politicheskoi zhizni sovremennoi Turtsii* [Middle Stratum in Political Life of Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1968).

Khasanova R. Iu. “Ob Islamskom sotsializme v sovremennoi Turtsii” [About Islamist socialism in contemporary Turkey], In *Modernizatsiia islama* (Modernization of Islam) (Baku, 1968).

Kheifets A. N. *Sovetskaia diplomatiia i narody Vostoka. 1921-1927* [Soviet Diplomacy and the Peoples of the East] (Moscow, 1968).

Kireev N. G. *Natsional'nyi i inostrannyi kapital vo vneshnei torgovle Turtsii* [National and Foreign Capital in Turkish Foreign Trade] (Moscow, 1968).

Noveishaia istoriia Turtsii [Recent History of Turkey] (Moscow, 1968).

Srednie sloi v politicheskoi zhizni sovremennoi Turtsii [The Middle Stratum in Political Life of Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1968).

Eremeev D. E. *Iuryki (turetskie kochevniki i polukochevniki)* [Iuryks (Turkish Nomads and Seminomads)] (Moscow, 1969).

Kiamilev Kh. *U istokov sovremennoi turetskoi literatury* [Origins of Contemporary Turkish Literature] (Moscow, 1969).

Kipr [Cyprus] (Moscow, 1969).

Veselov V. T. *Transport sovremennoi Turtsii* [Transportation in Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1969).

1970s

Khasanova R. Iu. “Vliianie leninskikh idei na obshchestvenno-politicheskuiu mysl' Turtsii” [Impact of Lenin's Ideas on Turkish Sociopolitical Thought], In *Idei Lenina i demokraticheskaia mysl' narodov Vostoka* [Lenin's Ideas and Eastern Peoples' Democratic Thought] (Baku, 1970).

Moiseev P. P. *Agrarnyi stroi sovremennoi Turtsii* [Agrarian System of Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1970).

Danielian R. S. *Prosveshchenie v Turtsii (1923-1960gg.)* [Education in Turkey] (Erivan, 1971).

Üstün N. *Amerika i amerikantsy v Turtsii* [America and Americans in Turkey] (trans. from Turkish) (Moscow, 1971).

Aliiev G. Z. *Turtsiia v period pravleniia mladoturok (1908-1914)* [Turkey Under the Young Turks' Rule] (Moscow, 1972).

Dadashev T. P. *Prosveshchenie v Turtsii v noveishee vremia (1923-1960 gg.)* [Education in Turkey in Recent Times] (Moscow, 1972).

Kireev N. G. *Ankara* (Moscow, 1972).

Petrosian Iu. A. *Mladoturetskoe dvizhenie (vtoraia polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.* [Young Turks' Movement (The Second Half of the 19th Century – the Beginning of the 20th Century)] (Moscow, 1972).

Ataöv T. *SShA, NATO i Turtsiia* [USA, NATO and Turkey] (trans. from Turkish) (Moscow, 1973).

Komzin I. V. * *Ia veriu v mechtu* [I Believe in the Dream] (Moscow, 1973).

Petrosian Iu. A., A. P. Iusupov. *Izmir* (Moscow, 1973).

Polveka mirnogo sotrudnichestva. K piatidesiatiletiu dogovorov sovetskogo gosudarstva s Afganistanom, Iranom i Turtsiei [The Half Century of Peaceful Cooperation. On the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of Treaties between Soviet State and Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey] (Moscow, 1973).

Guseinov A. A. *Profsoiuzy v Turtsii (1960-1970)* [Trade Unions in Turkey] (Moscow, 1974).

Kireev N. G. "Nekotorye tendentsii razvitiia melkogo proizvodstva v obrabatyvaiushchei promyshlennosti Turtsii" [Some Tendencies in Development of Small Production in Manufacturing Industry of Turkey], In *Melkoe proizvodstvo goroda v Azii i Afrike* [Small Production in Towns in Asia and Africa] (Moscow, 1974).

Urazova Ie. I. *Turtsiia: problemy finansirovaniia ekonomicheskogo razvitiia* [Turkey: Financial Problems of Economic Development] (Moscow, 1974).

Danilov V. I. "Gorodskaiia melkaia burzhuaizii v Turtsii (nekotorye sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie problemy)" [Urban Petty Bourgeoisie in Turkey (Some Socioeconomic Problems)], In *Srednie sloi gorodskogo obshchestva v stranakh Vostoka* [Middle Strata of Urban Society in Eastern Countries] (Moscow, 1975).

* Manager of the Soviet building company which built the textile factories in Kaiseri and Nazilli.

Georgiian E. A. *Turetstskaia Respublika. Osnovnye instituty gosudarstvennogo stroia* [The Republic of Turkey. Basic Institutions of State System] (Moscow, 1975).

Starchenkov G. I. *Problemy zaniatosti i migratsii naseleniia Turtsii* [Problems of Engagement and Migration of Population in Turkey] (Moscow, 1975).

Turetstskaia Respublika (spravochnik) [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)] (Moscow, 1975).

Zhivkova L. *Anglo-turetskie otnosheniia 1933-1939 gg.* [English-Turkish Relations in 1933-1939] (Moscow, 1975).

Akhundov I. A. *Sovremennaia Turtsiia: bor'ba protiv imperializma* [Contemporary Turkey: The Struggle against Imperialism] (Baku, 1977).

Chernikov I. F. *V interesakh mira i dobrososedstva (o sovetsko-turetskikh otnosheniakh v 1935-1970 gg.)* [To the Interest of Peace and Good Neighbourhood (On Soviet-Turkish Relations in 1935-1970)] (Kiev, 1977).

Fish R. G. *Turetskie dnevniki. Vstrechi. Razmyshleniia* [Turkish Diaries. Meetings. Thoughts.] (Moscow, 1977).

Kireev N. G. "Inostrannyi kapital v Turtsii i kontsentratsiia krupnogo chastnogo kapitala v obrabatyvaiushchei promyshlennosti strany" [Foreign Capital in Turkey and Concentration of Big Private Capital in Manufacturing Industry of the Country], In *Inostrannyi kapital i inostrannoe predprinimatel'stvo v stranakh Azii i Severnoi Afriki* [Foreign Capital and Foreign Enterprise in Asian and North-African Countries] (Moscow, 1977).

Korkhmazian P. S. *Turetsko-germanskije otnosheniia v gody vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Turkish-German Relations During the Second World War] (Erivan, 1977).

Politika i ekonomika sovremennoi Turtsii [Politics and Economics of Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1977).

Kondakchian R. P. *Vnutreniaia politika Turtsii v gody vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Domestic Politics of Turkey in the Years of the Second World War] (Erivan, 1978).

Guseinov A. A. *Turetskoe kino: istoriia i sovremennye problemy* [Turkish Cinema: History and Contemporary Problems] (Moscow, 1978).

Problemy istorii Turtsii [Problems of Turkey's History] (Moscow, 1978).

Turtsiia: istoriia, ekonomika [Turkey: History, Economics] (Moscow, 1978).

Strany i narody Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka. X. Turtsiia [Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East. X. Turkey] (Erivan, 1979).

Vasiliev A. M. *Most cherez Bosfor* [The Bridge across the Bosphorus] (Moscow, 1979).

1980s

Rozaliev Iu. N. *Ekonomicheskaiia istoriia Turetskoi Respubliki* [Economic History of the Republic of Turkey] (Moscow, 1980).

Guseinov A. A. *Sredstva massovoi informatsii v obshchestvenno-politicheskoi zhizni Turtsii* [The Media in Sociopolitical Life of Turkey] (Moscow, 1981).

SSSR i Turtsiia. 1917-1979 [The USSR and Turkey] (Moscow, 1981).

Starchenkov G. I. *Trudovye resursy Turtsii. Demograficheskie, ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nyi aspekty* [Turkey's Labor Resources. Demographic, Economic and Social Aspects] (Moscow, 1981).

Kireev N. G. *Razvitie kapitalizma v Turtsii: k kritike teorii "smeshannoi ekonomiki"* [Development of Capitalism in Turkey: The Critique of the Theory of "Mixed Economics"] (Moscow, 1982).

Ekonomicheskoe razvitie sovremennoi Turtsii [Economic Development of Contemporary Turkey] (Moscow, 1983).

Gasratian M. A., Oreshkova S. F., Petrosian Iu. A. *Ocherki istorii Turtsii* [Essays on History of Turkey] (Moscow, 1983).

Sverchevskaia A. K. *Sovetsko-turetskie kultur'nye sviazi (1925-1981 gg.)* [Soviet-Turkish Cultural Relations] (Moscow, 1983).

Turetskaia Respublika v 60-70e gody: voprosy obshchestvenno-politicheskogo razvitiia [The Republic of Turkey in the 1960-1970s: Problems of Sociopolitical Development] (Moscow, 1984).

Turtsiia. Istoriia, ekonomika, politika [Turkey. History, Economics, Politics] (Moscow, 1984).

Danilov V. I. *Politicheskaiia bor'ba v Turtsii v 50-e – nachale 80-kh godov XX veka: politicheskie partii i armiiia* [Political Struggle in Turkey in the 1950s and the Beginning of 1980s: Political Parties and the Military] (Moscow, 1985).

Ivanova I. I. *Turetsko-arabskie otnosheniia i ikh mesto v sisteme mezhdunarodnykh sviazei na Blizhnem Vostoke: 1945-1983* [Turkish-Arabian Relations and Their Place in the System of International Relations in the Near East: 1945-1983] (Moscow, 1985).

Starchenkov G. I. "Nefabrichnyi proletariat Turtsii" [Non-Factory Proletariat in Turkey], In *Nefabrichnyi proletariat i sotsial'naia evoliutsiia stran Zarubezhnogo Vostoka* [Non-Factory Proletariat and Social Evolution in the Countries of the Foreign East] (Moscow, 1985).

Strany i narody Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka. 12. Turtsiia [Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East. 12. Turkey] (Erivan, 1985).

Miller A. F. *Turtsiia. Aktual'nye problemy novoi i noveishei istorii* [Turkey. Actual Problems of Modern and Recent History] (Moscow, 1986).

Kapitalizm v Turtsii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe razvitie v 50-80-e gg. [Capitalism in Turkey: Socioeconomic Development in the 1950s-1980s] (Moscow, 1987).

Kurdskoe dvizhenie v novoe i noveishee vremia [Kurdish Movement in Modern and Recent Times] (Moscow, 1987).

1990s

Gasratian M. A. *Kurdy Turtsii v noveishee vremia* [The Kurds of Turkey in Recent Times] (Erivan, 1990).

Starchenkov G. I. *Naselenie Turetskoi Respubliki: demograficheskoe-ekonomicheskii ocherk* [The population of the Republic of Turkey: A Demographic-economic Essay] (Moscow, 1990).

Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik) [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)] (Moscow, 1990).

Danilov V. I. *Turtsiia 80-kh: ot voennogo rezhima do "ogranichennoi demokratii"* [Turkey of the 1980s: from the Military Regime to "Restricted Democracy"] (Moscow, 1991).

Kireev N. G. *Istoriia etatizma v Turtsii* [History of Etatism in Turkey] (Moscow, 1991).

Turtsiia: novye tendentsii ekonomicheskogo razvitiia v 80-e gg. [Turkey: New Tendencies of Economic Development in the 1980s] (Moscow, 1991).

Potskhveriiia B. M. *Turtsiia mezhdum dvumia mirovymi voynami: ocherki vneshnei politiki* [Turkey between Two World Wars: Essays on Foreign Policy] (Moscow, 1992).

Fadeeva I. L. *Kontseptsii vlasti na Blizhnem Vostoke (srednevekovie i novoe vremia)* [The concept of Authority in the Near East (The Middle Ages and Modern Times)] (Moscow, 1993).

Zapadnaia Aziia: etnopoliticheskaia situatsiia [The Western Asia: Ethnopolitical Situation]. Edited by M. S. Lazarev (Moscow, 1993).

Urazova Ie. I. *Ekonomika Turtsii. Ot etatizma k rynku (Vnutrennie i vneshnie istochniki ekonomicheskogo rosta)* [Turkish Economics. From Etatism to Market (Internal and External Sources of Economic Growth)] (Moscow, 1993).

Kurdistan: na perekrestkakh istorii i politiki [Kurdistan: On the Crossroads of History and Politics] (Moscow, 1994).

Ivanova I. I., Ie. S. Melkumian, R. M. Mukimdžhanova. *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia v Iugo-Zapadnoi Azii (Turtsiia, Pakistan, gosudarstva Persidskogo Zaliva, konets 70-kh – nachalo 90-kh gg.)* [International Relations in the Southwest Asia (Turkey, Pakistan, the Countries around Persian Gulf, the End of 1970s – the Beginning of 1990s)] (Moscow, 1994).

Khazanov, A. M., I. Peev, eds. *Vostochnoe Sredizemnomorie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia v 80-e gody* [The Eastern Mediterranean Area. International Relations in the 1980s]. Edited by (Moscow, 1994).

Moiseev P. P. *Turetskaia Respublika: krestianstvo i sotsial'no-politicheskie protsessy v derevne* [The Republic of Turkey: Peasants and Sociopolitical Processes in the Countryside] (Moscow, 1994).

Maksimenko V. I., ed. *Zapadnaia Aziia, Tsentral'naia Aziia i Zakavkazie: integratsiia i konflikty* [Western Asia, Central Asia and Transcaucasia: Integration and Conflicts] (Moscow, 1995).

Sovremennyi Kurdistan. Problemy natsional'nogo dvizheniia [The Contemporary Kurdistan. Problems of Nationalist Movement] (Moscow, 1995).

Kazandžian Rem. *Bol'sheviki i Mladoturki. Novye dokumenty o rossiisko-turetskikh otnosheniakh (1920-1922 gg.)* [Bolsheviks and Young Turks. New Documents on Russian-Turkish Relations] (Moscow, 1996).

Belokrinitskii, V. Ia., I. L. Fadeeva, eds. *Osobennosti modernizatsii na musul'manskom Vostoke: opyt Turtsii, Irana, Afganistana, Pakistana* [The Peculiarities of Modernization in the Muslim East: The Experience of Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan] (Moscow, 1997).

Starchenkov G. I. *Trudovye migratsii mezhdru Vostokom i Zapadom. II polovina XX stoletiiia* [Labor Migration between the East and the West. The Second Half of the 20th Century] (Moscow, 1997).

Turtsiia: sovremennye problemy ekonomiki i politiki [Turkey: Contemporary Economic and Political Problems] (Moscow, 1997).

Danilov V. I., ed. *Evoliutsiia politicheskikh sistem na Vostoke (Iran, Pakistan, Turtsiia: traditsii i demokratizatsiia* [The Evolution of Political Systems in the East (Iran, Pakistan, Turkey: Traditions and Democratization] (Moscow, 1999).

Istoriia Kurdistana [History of Kurdistan] (Moscow, 1999).

Oreshkova S. F., Ulchenko N. Iu. *Rossiiia i Turtsiia (problemy formirovaniia granits)* [Russia and Turkey: The Problems of Formation of Borders] (Moscow, 1999).

Rossiiia i Chernomorskie proliivy [Russia and the Straits] (Moscow, 1999).

2000s

Blizhnii Vostok i Sovremennost' [The Near East and Contemporary Times], 9th Issue* (Moscow, 2000).

Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik) [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)] (Moscow, 2000).

Gasratian M. A. *Kurdskaiia problema v Turtsii (1986-1995)* [The Kurdish Problem in Turkey] (Moscow, 2001).

Turtsiia mezhdru Evropoi i Aziiei: itogi evropeizatsii na iskhode XX veka [Turkey between Europe and Asia: The Results of Europeanization in the End of the 20th Century] (Moscow, 2001).

Musul'manskie strany u granits SNG (Afganistan, Pakistan, Iran i Turtsiia – sovremennoe sostoianie, istoriia i perspektivy) [Muslim Countries by the Borders of CIS (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran and Turkey – Contemporary State, History and Perspectives)] (Moscow, 2002).

Ushakov A. *Fenomen Atatiurka: turetskii pravitel', tvorets i diktator* [The Phenomenon of Ataturk: Turkish Ruler, Creator and Dictator] (Moscow, 2002).

Koptevskii V. N. *Rossiia – Turtsiia: etapy torgovo-ekonomicheskogo sotrudnichestva* [Russia – Turkey: Stages of Commercial-Economic Cooperation] (Moscow, 2003).

Rossiisko-turetskie otnosheniia: istoriia, sovremennoe sostoianie i perspektivy [Russian-Turkish Relations: History, Contemporary State and Perspectives] (Moscow, 2003).

* The majority of articles is on Turkey.