



MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

„The Museum Politics of the AKP Government: Panorama 1453 History Museum“

Verfasserin

Sevinc Kula

Angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2015

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 066 824

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Masterstudium Politikwissenschaft

Betreuerin / Betreuer: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Birgit Sauer

Abstract

Gegenstand der vorliegenden Masterarbeit ist die Neuformulierung der wechselnden Ideologie der Türkischen Republik, beginnend mit der AKP (die Partei für Gerechtigkeit und Aufschwung) Regierung im Jahre 2002. Die Hypothese lautet, dass die Türkische Republik sich eher an der konservatorischen und neo-Ottoman ideologischen Politik gewandt hat und nicht an der strengen Kemalist Ideologie, die auf den Türkischen Nationalismus mit dem modernistischen Diskurs basierte. Um die angenommene Hypothese zu bestätigen, wird die Museum Politik des Staates analysiert. Der Hypothese entsprechend wurde das Panorama 1453 Historisches Museum zur Fallstudie gewählt, das in der Zeit der AKP-Regierung gegründet wurde. Mittels der Diskursanalyse und der Beschreibung von den Ausstellungsräumen im Museum wird die Hypothese bestätigt.

Die folgenden Forschungsfragen werden unter Betracht gezogen um die Forschungshypothese zu bestätigen: Wie wurde die Politik von Museen während der AKP Regierung geändert? Wie kann die Gründung vom Panorama 1453 Historisches Museum die Ideologie der AKP Regierung widerspiegeln? Wie verstärkt dieses Museum die Identität der AKP Regierung?

Im Zentrum des Forschungsüberblicks sind die wissenschaftlichen Studien über Museen. Historische und theoretische Entwicklung von diesen Studien wird auch umfangreich analysiert. Der historische Teil fängt mit der Museumsgeschichte in der Zeit des Osmanischen Reichs an und läuft mit der Entwicklung des Museums in der Zeit der Türkischen Republik weiter. Zuletzt wird die Zeit der AKP Regierung im Hinblick auf die Museum Politik eingeschätzt. Als Schlussfolgerung von den theoretischen und historischen Beschreibungen wird die Gründung des Panoramas 1453 Historisches analysiert. Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen, dass das Museum die Kulturpolitik der AKP Regierung repräsentiert und zur ihrer Auswirkung wird. Die vorliegende MA-Arbeit zielt sich darauf die wechselnde Kulturpolitik der Türkischen Republik am Beispiel des Panoramas 1453 Historisches Museum zu zeigen.

Abstract

This thesis focuses on the reformulation of the changing ideology of the Turkish Republic, starting with the rule of AKP (Justice and Development Party) Government since 2002. The argument is that since the Turkish Republic embraced on conservatist and neo-Ottoman ideological policies in the cultural area rather than strict Kemalist ideology, which is based on Turkish nationalism with modernist discourse. In order to prove the argument, this thesis looks into museum politics of the state. Accordingly, the case study is the Panorama 1453 History Museum, which is founded in the governance of the AKP government. Through the method of discourse analysis and the museum space descriptions, the argument is being reinforced.

Research questions, aiming to unpack the arguments, are: how museum policies were changed during the rule of the AKP government, how can the establishment of Panorama 1453 History Museum show ideology of the AKP government and how does this museum reinforce the identity of the AKP government?

In the section of literature review my main focus is museum studies. The historical and theoretical developments of the museum studies are looked at extensively. The historical part starts with the museum history of the Ottoman Empire and continues with the museum development of the Turkish Republic. Lastly, the AKP Government era is evaluated in the field of museum politics. As a consequence of the theoretical and historical descriptions, the establishment process of Panorama 1453 History Museum is being revealed with the museum itself. In sum, the museum represents, and at the same time, is an outcome of the cultural policies of the AKP government. This thesis dedicates itself to illustrate the changing cultural policies of Turkey through the Panorama 1453 History Museum.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

2. Method

3. The Literature Review

3.1. The Idea of Museums

3.2 Back in the Time: The Historical Development of Museum Institutions

3.3 Power Relations in Museums

3.4. The Meaning of Exhibited Objects: From Tangible to Intangible

3.5. The Functions of Museums

3.5.1 Museums as Memory Sites

3.5.2. Museums as City Locations

3.5.3. The Visitor Aspect of Museums

4. The Context

4.1. The Introduction to the Museum Development in Turkey

4.2. The Ottoman Era

4.3. The Changing Museum Ideology of the Turkish republic

4.3.1. The Cultural Policies of Turkish Republic 1923-1950

4.3.2. The Museum Projects of the Turkish Republic

4.3.3. Museum Policies in the Light of Changing State Ideology of the Turkish Republic

4.3.3 The Introduction of Neoliberalism: 1950-2001

4.3.1. The AKP Government and Museum Policies

4.3.2. The Museum Projects of the Young Turkish Republic

4.3.3. The Development of the Museum Structure of Turkish Republic

4.3.5. The Introduction of Neoliberalism: 1950-2001

4.3.6. Privatization Process of the Museums in Turkey

4.4. The AKP Government and Museum Policies

4.5. Integration Process into European Union

4.6. The New Turkey Discourse

4.7. The signs of the cultural integration into the European Union: the European Capital of Culture in 2010

4.8. The Revival of Neo-Ottomanism

5. The Case: Panorama 1453 History Museum

5.1. The City of Conquerors: Istanbul

5.2. The Conquest Museum: Panorma 1453 History Museum

5.3. The Continuous Conquest

5.4. The Founders of the Museum: The Speeches of Governors

5.5. Evaluating the AKP Government with Panorama 1453 History Museum

6. Conclusion

7. Bibliography

The Museum Politics of the AKP Government: Panorama 1453 History Museum

1. Introduction

The journey of establishing museums in the Turkish Republic is rooted in the modernization stages of the late Ottoman period lasted between 1839 and 1922. The implementation of the modernization policy directions and the Westernization model escalated in the young Turkish Republic. Since the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, museums are constructed as spaces to reflect the official state ideology and consequently educate the public in accordance with this ideology. The young Turkish Republic gave a considerable importance to the cultural establishments, including museums, as the extensions of the realms of the state. Museums are seen to be the sites to exhibit the national history and its contemporary modifications. (Greenhalgh 2006, 84) Correspondingly, museum officers, employed by the state, reconfigure the historical materials and the facts in accordance with the aim and target of the state. Therefore, the museum sector and its activities are substantial showcases for displaying the cultural policies of Turkish Republic.

In this thesis, museums are not solely taken as showcases of various cultural and ethnical objects and materials but also spaces where nationality, history, national identities, ethnicities and ideologies of the state are reproduced and reconsidered. (Bennett 1995) Relatedly, the museum visitors constitute inseparable parts of the reproduction of the state discourses because the knowledge production is an inevitable result of the interaction between objects and subjects in the museum space. Museum visitors are active agents of the knowledge production through connecting objects with themselves and filtering in this reception. Museum audiences can identify themselves

with the concrete and abstract materials of the museums. The selected museum objects and their visual presentation become parts of their identity construction besides their intellectual development.

On the other hand, cultural policies involve both the advancement in culture and the limitation on the presentation of the history, certain cultural values and activities decided by the sponsors, which are basically states, private sector and private art investors. The exhibitions are formed in accordance with the contemporary political and economic situations. (Bennett 1995) Thus, comprehending the meaning of the museum exhibitions is essential to track the changing state policies and economic approaches of the Turkish Republic.

The institutions of the nation states provide the formation of political, economic and social structures and the maintenance of the national ideology, history and culture. The changes in the governments echo on the institutional structures. Especially, the institutions in the politicized states are subjected to *“the repeated transformations”*. (Chalmers 1997, 24) Chalmers proposes that the authoritarian states in Latin America are incapable of institutionalize the state structures. Therefore, the institutions are not fixed and on the top of them they change in accordance with the political circumstances. (Chalmers, 1997) National state museums locate present while display the past and give clues about the future since the state museums showcase the state identity. Even though the aim is exhibiting the past, the present conditions of collecting, storing, selecting, and exhibiting alter the content and the target of the exhibitions. In sum, in the case of national museums, the centralized or federalized state control decides upon the activities stated above. Thus, museums are critical institutions to analyze the changing ideological tendencies of governments because of the centralized state control over museums. Besides, its influence on the identity formation frames the individual identities of the museum audiences, particularly the citizens.

Apart from newly flourishing privately founded culture and art activities in Turkey, such as Biennials, contemporary art museums and music, theater and movie festivals, cultural matters are mainly managed, controlled and regulated by the Ministry of

Culture and Tourism. The state regulation over the cultural activities shapes the aim and the target of the culture since the state ideology involves in cultural practices both explicitly and implicitly. There are 188 museums in Turkey managed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.¹ Out of these museums “Panorama 1453 History Museum”, established in the era of the AKP government, constitutes the point of departure in this thesis in analyzing the changing museum policies of Turkey.

Through looking into museum politics and policy directions, the aim is to find out how Turkish government carves out the identity construction of the museum visitors. How do the museum policies change with the governance of the AKP government? What are the policy directions in the museum management? How can the museum politics of the the AKP government be seen in the foundation of Panorama 1453 History Museum? How do this museum reinforce the identity of the AKP government? In the line with these questions, the argument is that Museum policies, that implemented after 2002, are the reflections of the AKP government ideological line in addition to recreate and reproduce an Turkish-Ottoman identity, under the name of neo-Ottomanism from the beginning of their rule in 2002. Neo-Ottoman identity appears as a reaction to the modernization discourse of the Turkish Republic, advocating the regeneration of the Ottoman values instead of Western values. Promoting the so-called Ottoman life style and values over Western way of life indicates a rejection of the ideology of the Turkish Republic, established in 1923. The AKP government takes policy initiatives in the direction of this policy in various spheres of the state, ranging from foreign relations to cultural policies.²

¹ T.C. K lt r ve Turizm Bakanlıđı K lt r Varlıkları ve M zeler Genel M d rl đ  (Turkish Republic The Ministry of Culture and Tourism) Available from: <http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/TR,43253/bakanligimiza-bagli-muzeler.html> (Accessed on 04th September 2014)

² Davutođlu, Ahmet (2001) *Strategik Derinlik, Turkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*. (Strategic Depth, Turkey's International Position) Istanbul, Kure Yayınları.

2. Method

Since its foundation, the Turkish Republic advocates a unified Turkish identity through its constitution and state institutions by claiming that all people living in Turkey are Turkish³. This means the assimilation of other ethnicities, like Kurdish, Armenian and Assyrians. Constitutionally recognized non-Muslim minorities, including Greeks, Jews and Armenians, are reconfigured as Turks in the upper identity in terms of the Turkish Constitution. Even though, neo-Ottomanism has an inclusive discourse, through which it aim to connect the ex-Ottoman Empire lands and nations. (Yegen 1996) However, the Turkish identity appears as an upper identity over all identities and being glorified thorough the political discourses. Namely, The place of identities, like Greek, Armenian and Kurdish, are excluded from the official history and the state structures. The compulsory religion education and national defense classes at schools exemplify few of the tools of the deification of the Islamic Turkish identity. The changing identity politics since the foundation of the republic are the reproduction of the “*Turkishness*” through neo-ottoman identity.

Since 2001, with the leadership of the AKP government, the cultural activities increasingly cover a lager place in the agenda of the government. Hosting the ‘Istanbul 2010: European Capital of Culture’⁴ contributed to the acceleration of the state sponsored cultural activities namely opening up of new museums, exhibitions and theater halls. Congruently, focusing on state museums is relevant to look into ideological changes in the governance of the state, since in the light of Foucault

³ In the article 66 in the constitution of the Turkish Republic valid since 1982, it is stateted that „Everyone bound to the Turkish state through the bond of citizenship is a Turk”. (Türk Devletine vatandaşlık bağı ile bağlı olan herkes Türktür.) So each and every Turkish citizen is counted as a Turk in ethnicity. The article excludes the etnicities, namely Kurdish, Armenian and Greek, other than Turkish one in the context of citizenship.

⁴ For more information: <http://istanbul2010.org/european-capital-culture/> (Accessed on 4th September 2014).

discourse analysis; institutions are the forms of power (Foucault 1982). Besides, the control of the state over the citizens is not solely through armed forces, hegemony over culture is a form of controlling the public and maintaining the state ideology and legitimacy. (Gramsci 1971) In the light of the analyses of Foucault and Gramsci, museums are feasible institutions to unpack policy directions of the states. In the literature review section, the museum related theories would be unpacked.

Nation states impose their power not only through armed forces, violence and punishments but also “*by constituting the desirable citizens as autonomous, rational, and efficient subjects.*” (Altan Olcay 2012, 138) In the modern national states, obedient and passive citizens are obtained by the cooperation and variation of the institutions, namely schools, prisons and museums. According to Duncan, “*to control a museum means preciously to control the representation of a community and its highest values and truths.*” (Duncan 1995, 8) Museums are the control mechanisms of the states. In that sense, analyzing museum policies illustrates the ideological policies and changes in these policies.

AKP government initiated the establishment of the Panorama 1453 History Museum and that is why the driving force in establishing the museum space and the museum itself are going to be methodological tools in analyzing the political ideology and the policy directions of the AKP government. In this thesis, Museums, among other state institutions, are the points of departure in observing the ideological reflections of the Turkish State. Panorama 1453 History Museum is reconfigured as a public space, which displays a historical moment, marked the history.

A scene of the conquest of Istanbul by the Ottomans in 1453 is the theme of the museum. The scene does not depict the conquest only. The story of the museum, the people involved in its establishment and socio-economical besides political conditions, they all involve in the aim of the Panorama 1453 History Museum.

In order to answer the research questions, the literature about the museum theory is going to be reviewed. The review starts with the idea of the museum institutions to

define the museums. The museum institutions are going to be analyzed in terms of power relations, the abstract meanings and their functions. In the case of the functions, museums are taken as memory sites, city locations and visitors vision. Following to theory part, the analysis on historical development of museums in Turkey is going to be focused. In doing so, the Ottoman era, the early Turkish Republic periods and the AKP government periods are going to be explored. The certain momentous political developments like the European Union integration process, the entitlement of European Capital of Culture: İstanbul and the emergence of the New Turkey discourse. After looking into the museum policies in the context of Turkey, the Panorama 1453 History Museum is going to be analyzed through the observations, the statements of the officers and the news on the media. The conclusion part aims to sum up the thesis in the light of the research questions and the argument.

This thesis sticks on the museum concept, developed as an extension of the nation state and analyses the Panoramic 1453 from that approach solely. Congruently, the concepts of national identity, culture and history are going to be explored in relation with the museum institutions.

3. The Literature Review

3.1. The idea of Museums

Museum institutions have evolving and dynamic characters because of their adaptability to the changing conditions of the certain periods and across countries. Because of the diversity of the museums, to build a consensus on their definitions is considerably hard. Many centralized museum institutions, like International Council of Museum (ICOM), The Museums Association in the United Kingdom and the American Alliance of Museums outlines the museums in various ways.⁵ ICOM, established in 1946, is an international organization of museum professionals. ICOM defines museums as:

“A non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.”⁶

In the light of this definition, museums are responsible for the progress of the society by transferring the history with the aim of education, study and enjoyment. (American Alliance of Museums 2000) Being a non-profit institution and accessibility to public are

⁵ The museum definition The Museums Association in the United Kingdom: “Museums enable people to explore collections for inspiration, learning and enjoyment. They are institutions that collect, safeguard and make accessible artefacts and specimens, which they hold in trust for society.” (Museums Association 2008) Available from: <http://www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=15717> . The definition of American Alliance of Museums : “Museums make their unique contribution to the public by collecting, preserving and interpreting the things of this world... Although diverse in their missions, they have in common their nonprofit form of organization and a commitment of service to the public. Their collections and/or the objects they borrow or fabricate are the basis for research, exhibits, and programs that invite public participation.” (American Alliance of Museums, 2000) Available from <http://www.aamus.org/resources/ethics-standards-and-best-practices/code-of-ethics> .

⁶ ICOM, *International Council of Museums*, Available from: <http://archives.icom.museum/definition.html> (Accessed 30th April 2014).

the crucial components of the museums because of planning the social development rather than economic profit. Thus, the museums undertake the duty of social and intellectual development.

The museum definition of ICOM encapsulates the functions and the goals of the museums extensively, however the influence and the significance of the political power and the state policies remain missing in the definition. Museums are considered as cultural capitals of the countries and since the culture and national identity are highly intertwined into each other, national museums are the spaces where the policy directions of the states can be followed. Besides, museums can be spaces of power relations and identity construction as much as spaces for education, study and enjoyment. (Bennett 1988, 73) On the other hand, the definition also excludes the private investments and the presence of the private sector in the establishment and maintenance of the museums. That's why, approaching national museums as a point of departure says lot about the political power and the ideological inclinations of the state governors.

3.2. Back in the Time: The Historical Development of Museum Institutions

Museums are public spaces, subjected to the elaborated scrutiny of the scholarly work. Initially, museum institutions originated in the West back in the late 19th century. The origin of the 'Museum' word comes from "*Muse*" with the association of ancient Roman and Greek civilizations. Literally it means "*goddesses who preside over the arts and sciences.*"⁷ Greek and Roman civilizations inspired emergence of the Enlightenment period in the Western Europe. The Enlightenment ideas, namely improving the societies well being and taking the example of the antiquity, prepared grounds for the establishment of museums. The collections and curiosity of aristocrats gave rise to collecting and the gathering the artistic objects and historical artifacts.

In the beginning, museums were delineated to exhibit the '*collections has been a product of 'Renaissance humanism, eighteenth-century enlightenment and nineteenth-*

⁷ Oxford dictionaries. Oxford University Press. (Online) Available from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/muse> (Accessed on 09th September 2014).

century democracy'. (Manual for Museum Managers, 2005, 2) The curiosity and the aesthetics of the Enlightenment period aimed to establish an ideal society. Museums met this demand considerably. Cultivating the public by sharing the art, history and science was one of the goals of the Enlightenment values. In addition to the Enlightenment period roots of museums, the Western Europe originated core ingredients, namely culture, history, identity make museums inherently western institutions.

The aristocrat classes were the sole possessors of the artistic pieces such as paintings and sculptures since owning the art was the symbol of the wealth. The decline in the power of aristocracy and nobility together with the rise of the social responsibility brought about the opening up the private collections under the names of museums. Sharing the private collections prepared a ground for setting up the national identity in the newly founded public areas in addition to legitimize the imperial and national powers. In addition to cultivate the common people, museums were the great public spaces to glorify the unique history and the art of a nation. Museums are able to frame the national identity via archeological roots and private collections and therefore generate the national heritage. (Lyons 2002, 116)

The history of the ancient Greek and Roman eras were idealized and taken as the origins of the Renaissance Europe aimed to prove the origin connection of those eras with the industrialized and developed West. The archeological remnants of those civilizations were displayed in the Western Museums as the roots of the Western civilizations. On the other hand, the private collections became national heritage and they were exhibited in the public spaces for the public good as a result of the Renaissance idea of the equality.

The evolution of the museums resulted in representing the present rather than reaching the ideal society. *'Along with economic independence, and greater wealth, came an emphasis on the importance of a life in the present rather than the contemplative ideal of earlier times'* (Hooper-Greenhill 1988, 70) Predominantly, nation states operate museums as the showcases of their present conditions and adapt them to their changing

political and economic alterations. Duncan inscribes the museums into ceremonial structures of the past, by fulfilling its declared purposes as a museum, museum buildings also carry out broad sometimes less obvious political and ideological tasks. (Duncan 1991, 90)

The art movements, started in the 19th century and the emergence of the monetary value of the art pieces generated the competition across countries and museums, which ended up in art economy and cultural capital. The global network of the art sector strengthened the complex relations of the involving agents. In the beginning, the industrial revolution emerged as an indispensable continuation of the Enlightenment period and the urbanization flowingly. Alongside the rapid urbanization, the public spaces emerged. The increasing importance of the public spaces, such as parks, theaters, concert halls and museums drew the attention of the governments to museums since museums constitute sites for education and imposing the official national ideology in addition to be sites for entertainment.

In addition to the disposition of private collections, museums were used as tools in claiming the colonial superiority in addition to reproduce the colonial discourse. The exhibitions in museums were official sites for displaying the exotic objects obtained with the Western imperialism and colonialism. "*These objects can tell the history of their status as trophies of imperial conquest.*" (Karp, 1991, 16) The very beginning of the museums was rooted in the idea of posing power by exhibiting the high culture and the superiority over other ethnicities and countries. In the light of being Western originated institutions, museums focus on the western originated nation state concepts like history, identity and culture.

The first public museum, the British Museum, was established in 1789 in England. Even though, in the beginning, the admission to the museums was selective, in a short time governments realized the substantial influence of museums over the public opinion and education. Particularly, the influence of the French Revolution in 1789 changed the society and the societal practices substantially and consequently the mentality of the

museums as well. Nation states transformed the idea of museums as an extension of public institutions, exhibiting the national culture and identity.

The equality notion emerged with the French revolution brought about new public institutions, including public museums. As Duncan exemplifies, the opening up the Louvre Museum in 1793 was the one of the first initiatives in sharing the aristocratic properties with the public. (Duncan 1995, 21) The creation of a public space in the palace of the king indicates the sense of equality between the public and the aristocracy. The notion of equality, ignited in the French Revolution of 1789, resulted into creating and expanding public spaces shared by aristocrats and the public. The possessions of the aristocrats were counted as national heritage and the visual face of the national culture. Therefore in the process of the formation of the national identity and national history, general public found spaces to identify themselves with the possessions of the aristocracy and counted as equals with the elites.

Having the freedom of accessing to the exclusive aristocratic treasures was regarded as a *“symbolic attempt to generate a ‘public’ - a self-identifying collectivity in which members would have equal rights, a sense of loyalty to one another, and freedom from previous tyrannies and exclusions.* (Macdonald 2003, 1) Macdonald points out that sharing the exclusive treasures with the public audience was an opportunity for *“‘culturing’ the public: for bringing ‘culture’, in the sense of ‘high culture’, to the masses and, more importantly, for attempting to constitute a public.”* (Macdonald 2003, 2) As a result of the aim of the exhibit the national culture and identity, the concept of history museums emerged in addition to other types of museums, like science and technology museums. Therefore, museums were established as the state institutions to exhibit the national culture.

The modernist and universal values of the museums encountered with reactions starting from 1960s. The critics aroused towards the museum establishments because of their dogmatic and idealized exhibitions and displaying the museum administrations choices as the ultimate truths. Duncan claims, that *“To control a museum means precisely to control the representation of a community and its highest values and truths.”* (Duncan

2005, 8) Selected museum pieces in accordance with the intentions of the museum managers covered the rest of the past. As a result of the subjective selection, museums started to lose their legitimacy, especially when multi-culturalism, plurality and differences prevail social, political and economic agendas both locally and globally. The critics to modernism change the museum concept substantially and move its functions beyond the collecting, selecting, storing, categorizing and exhibiting. The museum visitor becomes the active and integral part of the narration of the museum contents. Museums evolved into interactive cultural sites hosting the panels and workshops besides sole exhibitions.

In a traditional sense, the museum visitors are taken as passive audiences and museums are considered as spaces for education. Museums had become sites for both education and entertainment where the public and the state can encounter each other. Thus, museums serve as *non-coercive tools* (Gramsci 2011) for educating and imposing the ideology of the state. After the abolishment of the empires, nation states used the museums to build and reinforce the national identity, history and the culture. As Bennett states, “*Museums, galleries, and, exhibitions played a pivotal role in the formation of the modern state and are fundamental to its conception as, among other things, a set of educative and civilizing agencies.*”(Bennett 1988, 66) In the name of civilizing the masses, nation states impose their ideologies through their non-coercive institutions like museums.

Adorno and Horkheimer coined the term “*culture industry*”, and referred to the Enlightenment as ‘*mass deception*’ (Adorno and Horkheimer 2006, 41). They wished to make it quite explicit that they believed that the products of mass culture did not emanate from the people themselves. The products were part of a culture, which was administered by a central hegemonic authority; very rarely has the culture industry offered consumers the potential for self-realization and development. Almost without exception, the culture industry has served the needs of central authority through the legitimization of its ideology. Adorno and Horkheimer (2006) considered both the culture industry and the advertising industry as contributing to an homogenization of form, and eventually the whole of society, as they conspired to ‘*merge technically as well as*

economically. In both cases the same thing can be seen in innumerable places, and the mechanical repetition of the same culture product has come to be the same as that of the propaganda slogan' (Adorno and Horkheimer cited by Walsh 2002, 64) The culture industry is a state device to control and manipulate the masses.

As a part of the culture industry, the state museums are the control spaces of governments over the citizens. Thus, the government intervention into arts, science, history, ethnography, archeology and culture has become legitimate through museums. The variation in themes of the museums led the definition of the museums quite broad. With the introduction of the exhibition of the modern art with modern exhibition techniques made the exhibited objects intangible. Therefore, the museums have become the spaces where are always changing and transforming themselves instead of exhibited the objects in a fixed way.

The origins the museum establishments reveal the affinity with the colonialism. (Bennett 2004, 2) Exhibiting the exotic pieces from the colonials was a ground for claiming the superiority over others. The British Museum was the outcome of the colonial empires dominance and it helps to the reproduction of the race and social relations by implying the identity differences. (Bennett 2005, 19)

The formation and the emergence of the nation states after the French Revolution of 1789 changed the contents profoundly and museums focused more on exposing the nations' history and at the same time reproducing the national history, identity and culture through exhibited objects. Museums are used as the sources and materials for the history narrating process of the nations. Consequently, museums contributed to the identity construction of a nation. Nation states, defined as "*imagined communities*"⁸ (Anderson 1991), handle and operate museums as means of educating the citizens and at the same time constructing the national identity. In a similar vein, museums are "*effective political instruments*" since they can be used "*to control, confirm or*

⁸ "Imagined communities" is a concept developed by Benedict Anderson in his book, named "Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread on nationalism" in 1991. In this book, Anderson defines nation as "*an imagined political community and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign*" (Anderson 1991, 6)

challenge ideas and beliefs.”(Benediktsson 2004, 9) Individuals identify themselves with the exhibited objects and connect their ancestors with the history narratives of these selected and ordered exhibited materials. Therefore, these history narrations evolve and change their directions in accordance with the economic, social and political circumstances.

The ratifications in state structures directly affect the aim and the administration of the state museums. Even though, they display the past basically, they are not exempted from the outer influences. Museums are long lasting, fixed and well establishment institutions. The unchanged image of them shifts in time by keeping the unchangeable image because of the subjectivity of the history. Accordingly, identity of the nation shifts with the waves of the political circumstances. *“Our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as 'one people', with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history.”* (Hall 1990, 223) As a result, history does not remain stable. On the contrary, it has a dynamic and changing nature, affecting by the surrounding conditions.

The alterations in political, social, cultural and economic circumstances, the state museums have to adapt themselves to the changes happening both in the museum technology. Even though, it would be almost impossible to change the general permanent exhibitions with the temporary exhibitions and the order of the exhibited objects can be changed. Besides, the invention of various art materials like photographs, movies and graphics led to the reconfiguration of the museums. *“In addition, changes in the perceptions on the purposes of the museum within the society and more specifically in relation to the public, changes in its symbolic role in relation to the history or the future of a nation or society are main reasons why museums tend to modify their character.”* (Konstantios, Konstantios and Tsombanoglou 2005, 8) Due to the changing approaches to the art production in the twentieth century, the concept of to museums had also subjected to the change. The modern and postmodern museums are developing interactive museum methods between the objects and audiences. They require active participation of the visitors to the exhibition process. In this line,

museums have become spaces for workshops, creative activities, conferences and panels. Even the contemporary museums can be seen a huge split from the conventional museums; they are still the spaces for the power displays. The spread of the private museums reproduces the power relations. The privately founded museums are administered and managed in direction of the interests of the founders and sponsors who maintain the museum. The implementation of the neoliberal policies turns museums into market-oriented spaces. Therefore, the museums cannot appear as critical spaces to power, since their existence are highly depended on the powerful agents. Along similar line, Wittcomb states, *"contemporary museum trends have historical precedents rather than being a radical break with the past practices."* (Wittcomb 2003, 165) In this sense, museums are trapped in between ideological and market concerns.

The administration of the museums pursues the power interests for the maintenance of the exhibitions. These power sources are either governments or capital. Even though contemporary museums host the critical approaches, the extend of the criticism is limited to the borders of the sponsor. At this point, the significance of the decision makers and the curators of the museums increase substantially. According to Karp *"From one point of view, the most powerful agents in the construction of identity appear to be neither the producers of objects nor the audience but the exhibition makers themselves, who have the power to mediate along parties who will not come into face-to-face contact."* (Karp 1991, 15) The museum makers pose the power of affecting the perceptions of the audience since the selection, order and the exhibition decisions are taken by the museum managers, especially in the state museums. In the contemporary museums, curators have the substantial power to decide and finalize the exhibitions, however any conflict with the sponsors is not in the point of question. (Alexander 1996)

3.3. Power Relations in Museums

The museums appear as spaces where power relations are mediated. These power agents can consist of the state officers, sponsors, multi national companies or individual art investors. All of these agents have the power to influence the order of the exhibitions and consequently the aim of the exhibitions as well. Each selected object and their order

could change the content of the exhibition and also knowledge produced as a result of the exhibition. In other words, *"museums can pull together publics and their knowledge of culture, history, nature, or technology in ways that artfully mediate the power of those governing the people and their things."* (Luke 2002, 221)

The modernity and the theoretical background of the modern museum establishments
Museums are the extensions of the institutional development of the modern Western nation states. (Macdonald 2003, 2) The increasing power and realm of nation states brought about the systematic control over the people both physical and mental ways. The control over the past through systematic accumulation and the eventual display of these objects resulted in the emergence of the museums. Accordingly, Foucault claims that:

"The idea of accumulating everything, of establishing a sort of general archive, the will to enclose in one place all times, all epochs, all forms, all tastes, the idea of constituting a place of all times that is itself outside of time and inaccessible to its ravages, the project of organizing in this way a sort of perpetual and indefinite accumulation of time in an immobile place, this whole idea belongs to our modernity. The museum and the library are heterotopias that are proper to western culture of the nineteenth century." (Foucault 1984, 7)

Apart from the rise of the modern state, industrialism the structural economic changes and the emergence of the new social classes, like bourgeoisie and proletariat, resulted in the needs other than survival in the industrial era. *"The processes of modernization, industrialization, urbanization and empire- building brought a vast new populace into increased contact with the developing political, economic and cultural networks which were a part of modernity."* (Walsh 2002, 22) As a result of the social state services, like health and education, the needs of common people were not restricted to the survival. They accumulated time and capital to nurture their minds and tastes.

Museums are also parts of the modern economic system in addition to be consequences of them. The economic systems of the nations are the combination of the various

factors. Accordingly, Pierre Bourdieu (1983) distinguishes the capital into economic, social and cultural. The convertibility of the goods into money determines the capital, which should not be minimized to the exchange of the goods. However, the misrecognized capital source of art economy underestimates the reproduction and the sustainability of the world of art. Through, equating the capital with power, the cultural capital is obtained unconsciously in accordance with *“the period, the society, and the social class.”* (Bourdieu 1983) Otherwise, it would be impossible to maintain the capital in terms of material economic capital. The capital power of bourgeoisie diversifies in the high culture and art sector with their sophistication of tastes and education. The establishment of the museums constitutes an extension of the cultural capital of the bourgeoisie class of the Western Europe. Institutionalization of the cultural capital appears as a result of the cultural capital and institutionalization brings about the emergence of the authority in the art sector and the production of the power groups. As a consequence museums can be considered as tools to recognize and control the capital.

The historical facts and truths are determined by the history narrators and depended on the historical perspective of the education institutions, including schools and media. Above all, the control of the history and the presentation of the past events are in the hands of the state and in its elaborate institutions. Museums, symbols of conservation, order and presentation, take great part in the re-narration of the past and consequently of the present. Museums are instruments to broadcast the past, present and the future through the filters of the museum managers. In the case of the national public museums, the aim is the reproduction of the social knowledge in the favor of the official state ideology. Besides the ideological concerns, museums develop and reshape the aesthetic perceptions of the public by exposing the aesthetics of the filtered past.

Museums reveal the so-called secrets of the past by presenting them publicly at the same time the exhibited objects are displayed to the public after the selection of the museum officers. Museums suggest that everything is identifiable but at the same time they identify the facts selectively. As a result of this, museum administration selects and orders historical facts subjectively. Foucault looks into knowledge with the relation of

object and subject in the context of the museum. In the words of him, museum „appears in his ambiguous position as an object of knowledge and as a subject that knows; enslaved sovereign, observed spectator“ (Foucault 1970, 312). The relation between object and subject is redefined in the context of the museum space. The exhibited object and subject produce the knowledge collectively as a result of the interaction.

Tony Bennett, following the footsteps of Foucault, defines museums as the accumulation of “a complex of disciplinary and power relations” (Bennett 1988, 73) by relating its birth to the organization of “the unruly populace through technologies of discipline, surveillance, and spectacle”. (Goldstein 2005, 29) The concepts of that Foucault purport, “carceral archipelago” and “governmentality”, constitutes points of departure in the museum institutions through the exhibitionary concept of Bennett. Besides, the Gramsci’s theory of power forms a base for the Bennett’s theoretical approach. The exhibitionary complex put emphasis on the power concepts of Foucault and Gramsci.’s thoughts of educative tools of the modern national state. Tony Bennett explains the exhibitionary complex as following:

“The space of representation constituted in the relations between the disciplinary knowledges deployed within the exhibitionary complex thus permitted the construction of a temporally organized order of things and peoples. Moreover, that order was a totalizing one, metonymically encompassing all things and all peoples in their interactions through time. And an order which organized the implied public - the white citizenries of the imperialist powers - into a unity, representationally effacing divisions within the body politic in constructing a 'we' conceived as the realization, and therefore just beneficiaries, of the processes of evolution and identified as a unity in opposition to the primitive otherness of conquered peoples. (Bennett 1988, 92)

The power focuses can shape the world vision and identities of their subjects. In the case of state power, the cultural institutions control the citizens’ thoughts and acts. The exhibitory complex depicts the museums as control apparatus. Carceral archipego,

literally means prison on islands, refers to the state control and discipline over the societies. (Foucault 1975) Through the prison analogy, Foucault questions the change in the dominance of power over the bodies. In the case of prisons, prisoners subject to the discipline and in the modern times the tools of the discipline and punishment shifted to the schools, religious locations or museums.

Prisons symbolize the spaces under the strict control with the thick walls, gates, guards and cameras. In the modern world, the boundaries of prisons extended to the cities in other words to urban spaces. The state institutions provide the strict control over the citizens. Especially the fear of security legitimizes the state control over people. On another level, museology, as a part of social sciences, is a control tool of the authorities since the history is reproduced under the roofs of the museums.

Bennett approaches the museum institution by explaining the relationship of object and subjects and its eventual knowledge production. The visitors' position to the object situates them as the objects of the knowledge. As a result of the visitors' visit a visit interaction with objects, visitors become inseparable parts of knowledge production along side with exhibited objects. Through an interdisciplinary interaction, namely archeology, history, anthropology and politics, the audiences are becoming the object of the knowledge production since knowledge is a product of the interaction of the museum visitor and exhibited objects. The museum shapes the visitors *"in a relation of both subject and object to the knowledge it organizes."* (Bennett 1988, 22) Therefore, audience is located in the focus in broadcasting the aim of the exhibition. Following this, Bennett propounds that museums are the direct consequences of the institutionalization of the private collections. The institutionalization meant for opening up the noble doors to the masses. In a wider public space, the messages, the life styles and perceptions of the power were conveyed in a proper way. (Bennett 1988, 74)

In addition to carceral archi-epoche, Foucault analyzes the governmental power to demonstrate the state influence on the daily lives and control the masses. Governmental power operates with elaborate programs and various tools to manipulate the citizens. The tools of government are in fact in Foucault terminology are the instruments of

governments, which occur in “*a range of multiform tactics*” (Foucault 1978, 95). The instruments of the governments do not only emerge as military and state offices. The cultural instruments of the states, like museums, are among the control tools. In a similar vein, Gramsci’s non-coercive power delineates the control and manipulation instruments of the state. Non-coercive power is applied through culture and education and imposed in the public spaces. The operation of non-coercive power is legitimized through culture and education. That’s why; cultural and educational institutions are means of the power exercise of the state, aiming to shape the perceptions, knowledge and aesthetic tastes of the masses. *“its seriated public spaces, surveyed and controlled, where knowledge is offered for passive consumption, are emblematic of the museum as one of the apparatuses that created ‘docile bodies’ through disciplinary technologies.”* (Hooper-Greenhill 1992, 192)

3.4. The Meaning of Exhibited Objects: From Tangible to Intangible

The museums emerged to exhibit the objects carrying the historical, scientific and cultural meanings. In Foucault terms, all the surrounding of the object can be named as “*the discourse of the object*”. (Foucault 1972, 140.) Surrounding encompasses not only the present tense, but also the history of the objects with the subjective interpretation, the reflection on the media and the future expectations account for the discursive formations of the objects. Thus “*the object*” exists as a deep-rooted concept. Museums take advantage from the persistence of the object both materially and ideologically. For this purpose, “*museums convert the primary goods into a lasting cultural good through collection, classification, conservation, and exhibition.*” (Starn 2005, 80) The objects become carrier of the abstract meanings as a result of the processes of the museum administrators. The abstract meanings of the exhibited objects are conveyed to the visitors through the exhibition space.

Affecting the personal interpretations and perceptions, coming together with the experiences, knowledge and the sensations of the audiences are the primary targets of the exhibitions. Marking the individual memories in addition to affect the collective ones are the desired aims of the exhibitions. The museum displays aim to influence and to change these personal interpretations and perceptions through exhibited objects.

Therefore, the exhibited material moves way beyond its materiality and visibility and becomes an intangible notion.

Dematerialization processes of the materials in other words putting abstract meanings on the objects come out as consequences of the social, political, cultural and economic conditions of the exhibitions countries. The time periods and the locations of the exhibitions contribute to the abstraction process of the material considerably. On this account, the museums do not only conserve the objects, *“they endow them with cultural coherence and value.”* (Starn 2005, 82) However, even though objects represents meanings beyond their material existences, the way they ordered and the decision makers of this orders constitute the core elements of the exhibitions. Curators and museum managers creates spaces to express themselves through objects. That’ s why, the power over the museum order both influences the abstraction process of the exhibited objects and the perceptions of the museum visitors.

Museums are inscribed in to cultures of the societies, in other words in nations. In addition to narrating the history, museums had to capability rewriting and renaming the history by selecting the exhibited objects. Selecting some symbolic objects comes along together with the ignoring the rest. *“Museums are adept at dealing with objects. Objects are accessioned, numbered, measured, catalogued, stored, preserved, conserved, exhibited, repatriated and de-accessioned. While museum curators and professionals fully understand that each object tells a larger story, it is the object itself that is fetishised.”*(Kurin 2004, 7) The selection and order processes of the museums are highly politicized. *“The museum’s reordering of things needs to be seen as an event that was simultaneously epistemic and governmental.”* (Bennett 1995, 33) For that reason, the museums should be reconfigured in terms of the political conditions, which maintain them.

Museums are the centers of the knowledge and history accumulation and they pose the power to attract the public to this accumulation. Museums do not solely reflect the history, culture and identity; in contrast museums are active, determinative and definitive parts of them by result of reproducing the history, culture and identity.

Especially, state museums are the sites of exhibition of culture, history, identity and ethnicity by conserving and sustaining them. They connect the past and the present and consequently offer a ground for the future vision. The way of representation, selection and ordering the objects demonstrate the intention and the aim of the museums. Therefore, the power and the authority over museums do not simply decide on administration but also on the past, present and the future. Museums pose the power of converting the items into abstract values and changing the collective memories of the masses through the abstraction.

3.5. The Functions of Museums

The national state museums have multi-functions besides being sites for reproducing the memory about certain events and forgetting the rest. They are spaces for educating, culturing and entertaining the public. They operate primarily with education purposes in addition to the other public institutions of the nation states, namely schools and media. The aim of educating, culturing and entertaining is achieved by being specialized in collecting, documenting, conserving, interpreting, exhibiting and serving. Vergo delineates the existence of the museums by classifying them “*acquiring safeguard, conserving and displaying objects, artefacts and works of art of various kinds.*” (Vergo 2006, 51) Even though their functions are stated clear-cut, they work beyond these functions. They are tools of broadcasting the official ideology. At the same time, they are sites for remembrance and memory. They visualize the history and at the same time contribute to the production of the everyday discourses of history, culture, identity and ideology.

The national states museums are perceived as the entertainment and cultural faces of the states. The state power functions “*within a regime of governmentality by giving art, nature, science, history, and technology a much more entertaining face.*” (Luke 2002, 223) In this sense, the state sponsored arts and culture are the direct reflections of the state ideology and mentality. As a part of cultural institutions, museums pose a great power in influencing the mindsets. They can change the perceptions of the public audience through exhibited objects and their order. Through the contact of the exhibited

objects, their order, the museum space and the audience, multiple meanings are produced. These meanings, in the end, join to the knowledge production. Bennett (1995) highlights the significance of the audience as the object of the knowledge since museums cannot produce any knowledge without an audience. He suggests, “*The museum constructs man in a relation of both subject and object to the knowledge it organizes. Its space of representation, constituted in the relations between the disciplines which organize the display of the frameworks of different types of museum, posits man as the object of the knowledge.*” (Bennett 1995, 7) The museums’ functions are not confined to the knowledge production. They have substantial influence on the formation of individual and collective memories.

The discipline of museology diversified and accelerated in accordance with the increasing numbers of museums across countries and cultures. In addition to anthropological and practical approaches, the theory of museums mainly advances with the cultural studies. Tony Bennett explores the museums as political and social institutions elaborately by highlighting them as “*exhibitory complex*”. (Bennett 1995)

3.5.1. Museums as Memory Sites

Memories of the societies take actively part in the creation national identity. Memories involve in the acts of remembering and relatedly to the forgetting. Both practices are crucial for the formation of an identity, suitable to the nationalistic discourse. Since the identity is inseparable from the history of a country, the memory practices are substantially significant in establishing a national identity. “*The ‘present’ cannot simply be reduced to a naturalised and privatised time embedded in everyday life or to a segment in the national-durational time of modern history that connects past and future in the moment. The present has its own politics of time and space that is overdetermined by what is called history, itself a geographical-temporal representation.*” (Ahiska 2003, 353)

Memory is primarily defined as “*the conservation and preservation of the past in the present*” (Moulard-Leonard 2008, 64). Memories are the integral parts of the self. The

individual and national identities are formed and defined after passing through the filters of the memories. Therefore, the conservation and the preservation are not functioning in the most efficient extend both individual memories and societal memories. Memories do not include the past and history exactly the same. They can be selective and manipulative about the facts of the history. *“Memory is what allows us to construe an image or narrative of the past and, by the same process, to develop an image and narrative of ourselves.”* (Assman 2008, 15) While individual memories are kept alive through photos, diaries ore videos, a memory of a nation is commemorated through the *“creation of monuments, museums, parades, rituals, street names, graffiti, and murals.”*(Meusburger et al. 2008, 7). The commemoration process is vital for preventing masses from collective amnesia. *“Because memory is unreliable, partial, allusive, fragmentary, and transient, it makes an easy target for political propaganda and manipulation.”* (Meusburger et al. 2008, 56). Through the selectiveness of the state, the past can be commemorated partially or not at all.

Museums endanger a site for the interaction of memory and national identity. Imagined events and objects of museum can contribute to the reshaping of the memory and reconstruction of the identities of the nations. Memory is not stable. On the contrary, it is continuous. The memory of a nation about certain periods and events can fade away.

The act of collective forgetting happens if the certain memories are not commemorated through institutional ceremonies. Individual attempts of remembering remain inadequate in the case of keeping alive the memory. *“In this sense all memorials are simultaneously about remembering and forgetting. The opportunity and ability to draw public attention to specific issues, persons, objects, historical events, or places and to divert it from others is one of the most fundamental instruments of state power.”* (Meusburger et al. 2008, 9) The state has the power and influence to change national topics and manipulate the public and the means of the information with its instruments, namely education, cultural institutions and media. Therefore, both individual and collective memories can be modified by external and internal influences, namely media, politicians and personal experiences.

Collective memories and identities can be subjected to the change with the tools and institutions of the nation states. Political powers reproduce the national identity through reconfigured memory, identity and history. Varutti (2010) outlines the manipulative power of the museums over the reproduction of the existing knowledge and the history. *“Museums are by vocation sites where collective ideas are formed, nurtured, validated, and at times also disrupted and contested.”* (Varutti 2010, 71) Accordingly, the devious control of museums over the individual and the collective memories of audiences are the extension of the state mechanisms namely schools, religious institutions and museums.

A collection, the core of the exhibitions, implies an act of remembering. Susan Crane reminds that *“being collected means being valued and remembered institutionally; being displayed means being incorporated into the extra-institutional memory of the museum visitors”* (Crane 2000, 2). The continuing narration of the history of a nation and national identity is a vital process for keeping national memory alive.

Memory consists of many layers. The multi-layer character of memory could be subjective, deceptive and changing in accordance with external factors. The same counts for the collective memory as well. The shifting character of memory leads states reproduce their national memory with its institutions via manipulative methods. Memory, in other words *“the past”* carves out a ground for the present and the future. Diana Drake Wilson suitably asserts that *“remembering is understood as not only the passive recall of representation of events gone by, but also a creative action instantiating the present and prefiguring the future”* (Wilson 2000, 116). A powerful and glorious past hides the instabilities of the present and creates a hope of turning back to the successes of the past. (Hall 1980) Namely turning back to old values, wealth and the well-being can be popular slogans of the governments. To seduce the masses by promising turning back to past is a popular strategy of the neo-conservatist governments.

In a museum space, audiences have the opportunity to identify themselves with the story of the exhibition through the objects taken out from the history and put in the

timeless spaces. *“By removing objects from their original context and locating them in an artificial, ad hoc environment, museums alter the perception of objects, their meanings, as well as the interrelations among objects, and between objects and persons”* (Bennett 2005, 4). De-contextualization of the displayed objects prepares a ground for new interpretations of the past and in the line with the reinterpreted and manipulated past, the narrations about the future and the present can be shaped with the directions of the decision makers. Therefore museum managers and decision makers of an exhibition space pose power whose realm influences the past, present and the future. Pierre Nora outlines memory as being *“everywhere establishing close ties between respect for the past – whether real or imaginary – and the sense of belonging, collective consciousness and individual self-awareness, memory and identity.”*(Nora 2002, 1)

3.5.2. Museums as City Locations

The national state museums are established and maintained by the centralized control mechanisms. The strict surveillance identifies museums with the state and therefore they are usually located in the symbolic and historical districts of the cities where the state indicates its power in sight. The locations of them are not chosen randomly. Since museums are regarded as ideological tools of the modern nation states, the locations of them are also an extension of the ideological purposes. The locations of museums and outer spaces of museums reinforce their influence on the museum visitors. The locations of the museums together with their architectural character should be taken into consideration as inseparable parts of the exhibited collection. *“They stood as embodiments, both material and symbolic, of a power to ‘show and tell’ which, in being deployed in a newly constituted open and public space, sought rhetorically to incorporate the people within the processes of the state.”* (Bennett 1995, 87) That is why the outer space and the architecture of museums are integral parts of the museum itself.

Museums are sites of obtaining knowledge in addition to comprehend and internalize the realities and images of the past. The museum visitors contact to the objects of the museums virtually and sensually. Pratt defines the museum spaces as “contact zones” as

"the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict." (Pratt 1992, 81) As the symbols of the unified state, museums appear as the interaction space of the masses. Each exhibition has a certain messages to deliver and the audience receives these messages in various ways in accordance with their background.

The knowledge production of the museum between the exhibited objects and the visitors start with the surrounding and the environment of the museum, including the city, district and the architectural design of the museum. If museums are regarded as contact zones, they host "an ongoing historical, political, moral *relationship*-a power-charged set of exchanges, of push and pull." (Clifford 1997, 192). Even though museums host to the exchanges, it does not mean necessarily on equal grounds. In the traditional sense, museum managers, administration and curators decide on the exhibited objects and their order. Thus, the museum staff primarily directs the knowledge production and then the readily prepared objects and environment are represented to the audience for the presentation. The audience perceives the objects with the filters of their past and sight. Therefore, the interaction of objects and subjects is collated with the past experiences and the background of the audience which is mainly shaped by the media, the education and the family heritage. In sum the culture of the society and their societal conditions of the museum visitors influence the knowledge production explicitly.

3.5.3. The Visitor Aspect of Museums

Museums are spaces of the interaction of the objects and the subjects in order to produce knowledge and sustain it. Whereas, subjects are the museum visitors, objects are the exhibited materials, including historical remnants, natural formations, photographs and movies. Museums managers and curators are in charge of choosing the

exhibited items and put them in a special order. After all of the collection, documentation, selection and order processes, the exhibition is formed and opened to the public. Even though, the selection is directed with a certain aim. As a consequence of the differentiating background, age and personal experiences of the audience, the ultimate message of the exhibitions is depending on the visitor.

Unified nation states aim to establish coherent masses in the name of citizens. In conjunction with this, the centralized education system aims to build a unified nation. The national state museums, as extra-curricular education spaces, are institutions to educate the citizens and expose them to the ideology of the state. *"In the museum, the viewer's perception of the object is often constructed through her/his acceptance of the naming/identification of the object by an 'authority'."* (Walsh 2002, 36) Although audience varies substantially, they are expected to produce the same knowledge through the exhibited objects because of the exposure of the certain order and selection. The outcome of this collective knowledge production affects the collective memory of the audience; in the case of national museums the aim is reshaping and reinforcing the collective memory of the nation.

In traditional museum approach, the audience is described as a receptive rather than reactionary. In the similar line, Hooper-Greenhill names the museum visitors as *"docile bodies"* which are created through disciplinary technologies as one of the consequences of the passive consumptions in the seriated, survey and controlled museum spaces. (Hooper-Greenhill 2003, 190.) Taking that into consideration, Bennett labels the museum visiting activity as *"a voluntary, self-regulating citizenry."* (Bennet 1995, 18) Thus, museum visitors are essential in the nation building process which accelerated with the French revolution in 1789. *"Museums act as sites of identity and citizenship construction, providing 'identity frames' through which visitors can reflect on and relate their own experiences to. On the other hand, visitors actively construct and produce their own understandings and meanings around nation and citizenship which in turn 'frame' their experience of the museum."* (Dodd et al. 2012, 12)

In sum, the collective memory, in other words history of a nation, is written and reproduced through the interaction of the objects and the subjects in the museums. In

public museums, the official ideological discourse is maintained with the administrative directives of the museum staff. *“A museum is a cultural institution where individual expectations and institutional, academic intentions interact, and the result is far from a one-way street.”* (Crane 1997, 46) On the other hand, private museums, financed by private corporates, constitute a legitimate basis for the private hands, which own the capital. Through the art donations, their public appearance is legitimized. Besides, they take part in the knowledge production. The empowerment of the private companies in the art sector indicates the weakening of the state in the knowledge production. In fact, the neoliberal adjustments in the art sector develop with the neoliberal institutionalization of the state. Even though the power is diversified among the agents of states and the conglomerates, the neoliberal ideological direction prevails the art world. As a result of the prevalence of the neoliberalism, the independent art producers and knowledge producers remain excluded from the art sector by not finding exhibitions spaces, even though the power entities are augmented.

4. The Context

4.1. Introduction to the Museum Development in Turkey

In order to outline these changes in the ideological directions of museum politics since the rule of the AKP government, this thesis will be following the chronological timeline of the museum politics. The *Tanzimat Decree* (1839) constitutes the departure point of this timeline. Accordingly, the opening up the Panorama 1453 History Museum in the year of 2009 would be the end of the deadline. In that sense, this chapter divides the history of the museums in there: the Ottoman Era, the Republican era and the last but not least the period of the AKP government.

Wendy Shaw (2011) divides the history of Museums in Turkey into four periods to analyze the national identity construction. These periods are “*the late Ottoman era (1839-1922); the early Republican era (1922-1960); the era between two eras of military rule (1961-1983) and the current era (1984- 2010)*” (Shaw 2011, 925). These time periods are not determined by chance. Each period is the direct result of the political, economic and the social changes in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. 1839 symbolizes the starting year of the first initiatives of modernization and westernizations within the Ottoman Empire. The year of 1922 indicates the abolishment of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the modern Turkish Republic. 1961 represents the year of the first military coup and the changes in the constitutional law and finally 1984 is the year of the beginning of the implementation of the neoliberal policies and an authoritarian constitution. In addition to Shaw’s classification the rule of the AKP had a marking point in the museum history of Turkey. Therefore the 5th period starts with the role of the AKP in 2002.

Since the mid nineteenth century, the Ottoman state initiated to modernize its state structure to keep up with the economic, military and social developments of the Western Europe and overcome the problems of the regression period. The modernization policies were mainly implemented in the formal state structures like military and education institutions. However to a larger extent, the Western model of modernization had great impact on the abstract structures of the Ottoman Empire as well. The western originated concepts like national identity, national culture, citizenship, equality and last but not least liberty influenced the Ottoman Empire elites

in the modernization process. The Western oriented young Ottomans marked the late Ottoman period as well as the early Turkish Republic.

The nations and ethnicities under the rule of Ottoman Empire were governed with “*millet system*”. (Icduygu et al 2008, 362) The system was based on ethnic and religious governance determined with the firm and unmixed boundaries. “*Under this system, the prominent non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire, its Greek-Orthodox, Armenian-Gregorian and Jewish communities, were granted communal autonomy in spiritual as well as secular areas, including their religious, educational, juridical and fiscal affairs.*” (Icduygu et al. 2008, 362) The Ottoman State, as Muslim hegemony, provided the security and autonomy to the non-Muslim powers, if they accepted the rule of the Ottoman Empire. Under the hegemony of the Ottoman State, the “millet system” was a strictly segregated system to sustain the multi-religious and multi-ethnic composition of the Empire.

The nationalist movements of the non-Muslim communities, namely Bulgarians and Greeks forced the Ottoman cadres to reconsider the “millet system”. The French Revolution had a huge impact on the minorities in the Ottoman Empire. The idea of the sovereign nation state, rather than being under the absolute rule of the Ottoman Empire, triggered the minorities like Greeks and Bulgarians to built their own nation state. These movements were extremely threatening for the integrity of the Ottoman lands. Therefore, establishing a common Ottoman culture and identity was seen as a consolidating element for the empire. In the aim of achieving a common culture, culture was institutionalized. As a consequence of this attempt, the Ottoman state embarked on the Western originated institutions: museums. Museums were cultural tools of constructing, reconstructing and reshaping the national identity in the Ottoman Empire and the tradition of this perception was enforced in the Turkish Republic. (Shaw 2007)

The enlightenment values, basis for the foundation of the museums in modern sense, were transformed firstly into the Ottoman Empire concept and then into the Turkish Republic respectively. The cultural transformations in the course of the West took place as results of the modernization and the westernization processes began in the late

Ottoman Empire period between 1828 and 1922 especially in Istanbul, in the capital of the Ottoman Empire. The Turkish Republic followed the same path in emphasizing unitary national identity, in other words Turkish identity, in the state institutions and in the public spaces. The national state museums constitute the public institutions where the state discourse can be followed.

In a similar vein, Turkish identity was incarnated through nationalist policy directions of the past governments, namely starting with Republican People's Party (RPP) and followed by Democrat Party (DP) in 1950s. Since the establishment of the republic in 1923, the Turkish republic glorified the Turkish identity through the constitution, public ceremonies, commemoration days, education institutions and media. Through the means of state, the history of Turkey has been narrated in the line with nationalistic discourse. In this context, museums are the sites of the memory and narration of the history over and over again. Museums provide a continuum in the exhibition of the permanent collections and at the same time continuously attract the visitors with the same collections. The museums emerge as means to convey the nationalistic discourses.

The establishment of the museum institutions started in the modernization period of the Ottoman Empire in the mid 19th century. Museums had become the sites of constructing an identity and history and at the same time the symbols of the Westernization. However, these two: the national identity and the westernization could not go together in the long run since they were perceived by the conservatives as the conflicting sides. The ideological changes in the late Republican era since 1970s are the reactions against westernization, consequently exhibits the struggle substantially. Namely, National View Movement (NVM) established as a reaction to the Westernization policies. According to NVM *"Turkey did not belong to the West historically, culturally and geographically, instead it shared its past, values and institutions with the Islamic world, a world that had to be mobilized to balance the power and pressure of the West."* (Dagi 2005, 5) Consequently the pro-westernization and anti-westernization led to the polarizations within the society.

After 2010, the cultural policies and museum policies shifted substantially. Hosting the Istanbul 2010: European Capital of Culture led Turkish policy makers to adapt global market conditions of culture and museum industries. At same time, the eager chase and intervention of the government rule of the AKP in the cultural activities and consequently museum policies resulted into substantial controlled change in the era of cultural policies, mostly reflecting the ideological directions.

4.2. The Ottoman Era

The Tanzimat period (The reform period), lasted from 1839 to 1876, consisted of the initiatives to modernize the Ottoman Empire by introducing the Western institutions and reform packages, including education, military and legal ratifications. This period witnessed the nationalist movements within the empire; consequently the Ottoman Empire developed reactionary action policies against these separations not only in militaristic terms but also in social and political ways. Namely the Reform Edict of 1856 aimed to enhance the religious freedoms.

The Ottomanism, aiming to unify the all layers (Muslims and non-Muslims) of Ottoman Empire society under the roof of Ottoman Empire, was one of the consequences of these changing state policies of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire adopted the Western concept of the unified nation state into its state structures. The strong centralized state was the basis of the Ottoman state. However, the centralization was not based on cultural and historical structures. The very Western concepts of citizenship and the national identity were advocated under the name of the Ottomanism. Although multi-ethnic and multi-religious composition of the Ottoman Empire, the state used the concept of *“one single citizenship as a common political identity in order to achieve equality and unity among all Ottoman subjects and supersede differences of faith, ethnicity, and language.”* (Karpas 2000, 6 in Çolak 2008, 145). As Colak defines Ottomanism as *“a political identification with the territorial fatherland.”* (Colak 2006, 590) As a result of Ottomanism, in 1839 the *“equality before the law of all subjects, whatever their religion”* (Zürcher 2010, 51) was declared in the name of the Sultan Abdülmecid.

In the light of these initiatives, this period witnessed the establishment of the centralized museum institutions. At the beginning, the museums of the Ottoman Empire were the spaces to glorify the military past and exhibiting the archeological remnants. The collection of the Ancient Weapons (*Mecma-i Asar-i Esliha*), opened in 1845 in Istanbul, and the Archeological Museum (*Mecma-i Asar-i Antika*), opened in 1846 again in Istanbul, were the pioneers in the museum history of the Ottoman Empire. “*The museum as an institution was a touchstone in the city, deemed indispensable to modern life given the winds of modernization and Westernization then blowing.*” (Ünsal 2009, 163) Even though, museums were established with the modernization movements, museums were also the spaces to exhibit the reaction against the Western European countries.

One of the important cultural policies of the Ottoman Empire was to fight against the smuggling of historical items. “*The Ottoman Empire attempted to use the archeological acquisitions to signify sovereignty over an empire that was, unlike contemporary European empires, slowly disintegrating.*” (Shaw 2003, 224) The regulations about the historical artifacts initiated *strict* controls over the trade and the smuggling. Accordingly, Asar’ı Atika Nizamnamesi (The Regulation of Antique Monuments) was decreed in 1884 to ban the smuggling of historical remnants and materials from Ottoman Empire’s lands abroad. Therefore, “*in the late Ottoman era the motivation in the construction of a single national discourse also was performed in the body of museal projects in the form of centralizing the pieces in the same space and controlling the mobility and private property rights regarding them.*”(Seçil 2005, 19) The economically weak situation of the Ottoman Empire makes its position to fight against smuggling the historical artifacts harder. Besides the economic obligations, namely capitulations, keep the Ottoman Empire’s economy even more depended on the Western powers especially since 1740.

The museum management of the Ottoman Empire was focusing on the selected specific pieces instead of all-inclusive strategy for including all the differences equally. The *encyclopedic museum* of the Western Europe was not taken as an example by Ottoman

Museums. The focus was “*on specific historical moments of its newly cataloged past.*”(Shaw 2003, 219) Additionally, the science museums were not on the agenda of the Ottoman administration. According to Shaw, “*the key to this difference lies in the absence of natural history collections, which, while part of the original plan for the museum, never developed as an epistemological core for the museum.*”(Shaw 2003, 219) The museum institutions were perceived as tools to integrate into the European culture.“ *Rather than relying on epistemologies in which an object functions as a symbol for an idea integral to its own culture, or a synechdocal relationship with an Enlightenment project towards universal knowledge.*”(Shaw 2011, 928) The interpretation of the late Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic was based on the knowledge coming from military and the archeology rather than science and industry museums. Therefore the first museums focused on showing selected military and archeological artifacts. Consequently, the absence of the science museums exhibits that the museum mentality of the Ottomans is based on the social development rather than scientific one.

4.3. Museum Policies in the Light of Changing State Ideology of the Turkish Republic

4.3.1. The Cultural Policies of Turkish Republic 1923-1950

The culture policies of the young Turkish Republic diverted considerably from its predecessors' rule, the Ottoman Empire. Even though the republic tried to loose the ties with the Ottoman Heritage, Turkey basically maintained the modernization and Westernization initiatives started during Ottoman rule. Turkey embraced on “*a comprehensive development encompassing all aspects of life including training citizens in the name of civilization project.*” (Katoglu 2009, 33) The driving forces of the cultural policies were nationalism and populism with the strong presence of state. In the 1924 constitution identified every Turkish citizen as a Turk regardless his or her religious and ethnic background. “*The concept of the Turkish nation inherently indicated the compact unity of Turkish-Muslim citizens, whereas non-Muslims remained at the periphery of this political definition.*” (Icduygu et al 2008, 365) The nation building process of Turkey was carried on through putting Turkish identity in the core of its definition. The policies to built the common culture; language and history reinforced the constitutionally defined Turkish identity.

Educating the citizens appeared as a national mobilization. Literacy campaigns, the compulsory primary education, establishing universities became evidences of the serious approach to the education project. Education was not limited to schools and literacy courses. The public spaces and institutions were designed to educate the citizens about history, culture and art of the newly established country. Turkish Historical Society (Türk Dil Kurumu) and Turkish Language Institute (Türk Tarih Kurumu) were established as the institutions to create the history and culture in 1932 and 1935 respectively. Through the researches of these institutions, the roots of Turks were traced back in the Greek and Latin civilizations. The purification of the language, get rid of Persian and Arabic words and producing new words. The Westernization trend and getting closer to the Western cultures aimed in this period. (Güngör 1996, 113) In the name of the Westernization, the public theaters and the state and opera institutions were

the backbones of establishing the national performance arts. To advance the art the talented young painters and musicians were sent to Europe to improve themselves artistically and contribute to the art scene of the countries. Corresponding to the civilization project, the museums, like the Ethnography Museum in Ankara, played a vital role in educating and displaying the culture and the history of the country.

The cultural policies of Atatürk period were shaped in accordance with creating national culture, identity and history. The early republic period witnessed to the attempts of civilization project including the modernization of the outfit, culture and education in order to educate the citizens in the accordance with the state ideology. Museums, the means of the national heritage promotion and preservation, were inscribed into the culture of the nation. *“The issues of establishing the national cultural heritage, the research on cultural archives, and the contemporary museum concepts were considered a priority during the reconstruction process in the country.”* (Atasoy 1983, 31) Consequently, museums policies had played vital roles in shaping and forming the national identity.

4.3.2. The Museum Projects of the Young Turkish Republic

Since the establishment of the new modern Turkish Republic, Turkey embraced heavily on the cultural policies in the name of civilization. The abolishment of the Ottoman Empire and followingly Turkish Republic gave away to the process of forming the modern Turkey image. First of all, Topkapi Palace in Istanbul and the Mevlevihane (Dervish Lodge) in Konya was confiscated by the state in 1924 and turned into public spaces. The transformations of these two very symbolic sites of the Ottoman Dynasty and the Islam into public sites of the republic signified the forgetting policies of the past. By the definition, these two places were the contradictory images of the young modern republic. When these two locations functioned only for touristic purposes, the public alienates itself from the spaces and only gazes as exotic locations. Because of banning these locations from their daily usages, various functional spaces of the past become touristic attractions and consequently these places were perceived as if they are out of their times and spaces. The separation of the daily life and the touristic attraction

abstract these touristic locations. (Urry & Larsen 2011) Both local and foreign Tourists gaze at them in an extraordinary way. In the cases of Topkapi Place and Mevlevihane, tourists see them as unusual locations and out of their daily lives. In this way, the identification of these locations with the self and the current times become impossible.

Alienation from the near past and imitating the West became the driving force of the young Turkish Republic. Besides reaching the same level with the Western State system and societal structures were the desired consequences in order to achieve the Western development model. That's why, the intense Westernization discourse prevailed all the political, social and economic layers of the state.

On the other hand, the Western oriented state structure approach remains insufficient in maintaining with the collaboration with the citizens. According to modernization discourse of the young republic, the citizens of the modern Turkish Republic must have seen themselves as integral parts of the Western culture and history. In order to become a part of Western world, Turkey began its own Westernization project. Namely, the sustainable Westernization could be provided with the established and strong ideology of the state. Cultural institutions were perceived as sites where the history, culture and identity of the Turkish nation can be constructed. Museums are the tools to channel the state ideology to the citizens. Accordingly, the museology was regarded as an integral part of this immense reconstruction of the country.

Since the establishment of the Turkish Republic, culture and cultural institutions are under the control of the centralized state administration. The "*Turkish historical thesis*" (Zürcher 2010, 191) formed the basis for the direction of the cultural development policies and culture promotion. This thesis was determining that Turks were the descendants of white inhabitants of Central Asia. "*The theory aimed to give Turks a sense of pride in their history and national identity, separate from the immediate past, that is to say Ottoman era.*" (Zürcher 2010, 191) The separation of the history from the Ottoman past and the Middle Eastern roots and Islam reinforced the approachment to the Western modernization, even though connecting the roots to being Turkish and the Central Asia is highly nationalistic act. (Zürcher 2010, 191)

The institutions stated above served this purposes to connect the young Turkish Republic with central Asia. To strengthen the connection, the civilizations, existed in Anatolia before the Ottoman Empire, were the main topics of history and archeological researches. These researches, centered in Anatolia, constituted a base for the national history narration. Through the findings of these institutions it was claimed that the Turks in Anatolia existed on Anatolia since the ancient times. Their historical narrations become official history. For instance, the Hittites were connected to the Turks in Anatolia. The first archeological museum opened in Ankara in 1923 was named as Hittites Museum, containing the archeological findings from Hittites dated back 2000 BC in Anatolia . As a consequence, the existence of the Turkish people was legitimated in Anatolia. Moreover, the Western model contributed to the estrangement process from the Ottoman, the Middle Eastern the Islamic roots. The republic designed to harmonize the Turkish historical thesis with the Westernization policies. The cultural policies of the early years of the republic were based on ignoring the Ottoman Past. At the same time this re-narration of the history turned Turkish state into creating discovering the ancients roots.

4.3.3.The Development of the Museum Structure of Turkish Republic

In the early republic years, the museums were under the administration of the Ministry of Education. The duties of the Ministry of Education were being in charge of establishing new museums and providing the sources for the museums. The sources are ranging from museum staff to the selection of the exhibited objects. In the early Republic period, rather than exhibiting the past only, the contemporary objects, like traditional dresses of rural areas, found their places in the museums as well.

The first museum of the Turkish Republic, the Archeology Museum was established in Ankara in 1923. Following this, the Museum of Ethnography was built in 1927 in Ankara. In 1930, it was transformed into the Hittite Museum and flowingly in 1960 it was changed into the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations. In order to keep track on the

antiquities, in 1926, the central administration for the Antiquities and Museums was established as a part of the Ministry of Education. (Katoglu 2009, 48)

The state developed “Kemalist” ideology to sustain and legitimate its cultural policies. Kemalism claims the separation of the religion from the state. It suggests throwing off Islamic directions in the management of the official state matters. The Abolishment of the Caliphate in 1924 had brought about the fundamental changes in the institutional structure. The non-interference of the caliphate into the state matters gave rise to the secular policies in the early republic period. Even though, the secular policies were implemented keenly, conservatives condemned Kemalism as infidel. In order to eliminate the oppositional ideas, the state focused on creating and promoting one identity. First of all the management of education and culture was strictly centralized. The one common language in education and the standard education program aimed at creating unique Turkish identity. As being under the control of the Ministry of Education till 1971, the state’s perception on cultural matters and institutions were primarily focusing on educating the citizens for teaching the official Turkish history and culture. In that sense, the museums were showcases of the Turkish History of the Turkish Republic.

Kemalist state started up the ‘*Cultural Revolution*’ to gather every section of the society under one identity: the Turkish identity. Secularization of the state institutions was the first step. Following this, the secularization of the culture was adopted by the state. To achieve the secular culture, the state reclaimed the rise of the Turkishness and the remnants of the Ottoman Empire. “*The earliest official histories of the republic generally ignored the 600 year span of the Ottoman Empire, and reach back into a central Asian, Turkic past for a genealogy and ethnography to underwrite the new republic.*” (Aksan 2005/2006, 19) Through the emancipation from the Islamic identity and the Ottoman state structure, the secularization of the culture came into existence and the integration of the state ideology into the daily lives of the citizens was progressed.

In the Ottoman Empire, the state meant the Ottoman sultanate and dynasty. After the abolishment of the Empire, the dynasties' presence and properties were not legitimate anymore. The confiscated properties of the Ottoman dynasty converted into public spaces, mainly into museums since museums were the crucial tools of educating the citizens. In accordance with imposing the state ideology, the education policies were situated in the core of the secularization of the culture. The management of the cultural policies by the Minister of Education was not a coincidence in the early republic years. Namely, the change from the Arabic alphabet to the Latin one was one of the reinforcing acts of the Turkish nation-state under the administration of the Ministry of Education.

Cultural policies were administered in accordance with the predetermined Kemalist ideology, "*a secular experiment that marginalized Islam and Islamic groups*". (Dagi 2005, 4) The museums of the newly established republic were direct reflections of the Kemalism. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's presence, the first president of Turkey, marked the museum development strategy. Museum of Anatolian civilizations reserved a space on its website to the thought of Atatürk on museums. The section on the website 'Museums and Atatürk'⁹ explains extensively the main drives of the newly founded Republic. Atatürk states that the Turkish national culture is the main founding element of the republics' culture. Besides, he counts museums as the sites for exhibiting the Turkish culture. The Turkish culture constitutes the core of the exhibitions. The non-Turkish culture and the Ottoman culture were ignored and underestimated.

Under the administration of Hasan Ali Yucel, the first education minister, collecting the archeological remnants in Anatolia speeded up. The years between 1930s and 1950s

⁹ Atatürk states that 'The base of the Turkish Republic is culture. Republic was founded on rich Turkish culture.' By saying like this, Atatürk indicates the importance that he gave to the Turkish culture. He counted museums as places for the protection and the exhibition of the material Turkish culture." (Önder 1989) (The original text "Atatürk, Cumhuriyet'i kurduktan sonra: "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin temel kültürdür, Cumhuriyet, zengin Türk millî kültürünün üzerine kurulmuştur" diyerek Türk kültürüne verdiği önemi bir kere daha belirtmiş, müzeleri Türk kültürünün maddi varlıklarının korunduğu ve sergilendiği yerler olarsaymıştır.") Önder, Mehmet (1989) Müzeler ve Atatürk. (Museums and Atatürk) Atatürk Araştırma Dergisi, 16(6). Available from: <http://www.anadolumedeniyetlerimuzesi.gov.tr/TR,77766/muzeler-ve-ataturk.html>. (Accessed on 5th Many 2015).

witnessed a national mobilization to collect the archeological pieces since the findings in Anatolia were taken as vital for the formation of the national identity.

4.3.4. The Introduction of Neoliberalism: 1950-2001

In 1950s, the governance of the Democrat Party (DP), rightest political party, changed the approach to the cultural policies. DP was the first elected party of the Turkish Republic. The leadership of the Republican People's Party came into an end with the Democrat Party's victory. The DP government quitted the strict cultural development of the Republican People's party (CHP). Liberal policies implemented rather than strict government control.

After 1950s, the end of WW2 and getting closer to the United States, the capitalist liberal economy was introduced to Turkey. In other words, the economic development plans replaced the cultural progress plans. (Yaman 1998, 95) The cultural liberation meant the absence of the state control in the realm of the cultural sector. Besides, as a consequence of the immigration from rural the urban, the rapid urbanization brought about the new types of the cultural activities. Namely, art galleries emerged as platforms to host the exhibitions of the painters and sculptors sent by the State to receive the Western Education and brought the Western Art to the country.

The immigration movements brought the rural culture into urban areas, which created clash between two cultures. The immigrants were uneducated and poor people, whereas the urban dwellers were claiming themselves as a part of the Western high culture as a result of the cultural policies of the young republic. Therefore, urban citizens were seeing themselves superior to the rural immigrants. Consequently, the immigrants were discriminated by the urban residents. Additionally, only small percentage of them found permanent jobs. By not being included into the urban life, they built their lives in the outskirts of the cities and they developed their own mixed culture, the Arabesque culture. Even though, the arabesque is associated with a music genre, it actually is the reflection of the disappointment of the immigrants and their failure to integrate

themselves into city lives. In sum, the immigrants were not integrated in cultural and economic life or the city.

The emergence of the arabesque culture indicates the failure of the state in establishing a unified culture. The segregations in the society reveal a decrease in the republican values, namely equality. The unequal social developments brought about the new political formations as well. Until the immigration flows, the urban people did not know the living conditions of the villagers. The confrontation of urban people with rural ones created a tension rather than harmony. Liberalism started also to dominate the economic policies. The economic policies shifted to market oriented rather than state controlled. As a consequence, this tension resulted in the radical political formations. Ranging from the Islamic movement to the far-nationalistic political party formations.

In 1950s, Turkey witnessed the social and economic changes in addition to multi-party rule. In the realm of the cultural policies on the side of the culture the archeological researches were speeded up throughout Anatolia. Gathering the archeological artifacts and ruins brought about the opening up new archeological museums in different cities throughout Turkey, for instance in Izmir, in Erzurum and in Bursa.

Through local findings, the history writing process of the Turkish republic continued in those newly opened museums. The Hittites Museum, established in 1923 in Ankara, exhibited the archeological findings. In a short time, its name was changed into Ankara Archeological Museum where expanded its exhibited pieces to the various civilizations existed in Anatolia like Phrygians and Urartians. In 1967, the museum converted into the Anatolian Civilizations Museum. The Turkish history thesis was reinforced through the archeological pieces, found in Anatolia. Even though, the regions vary considerably depending on the geography and weather conditions, the uniformity of the state was visible both in the order of exhibitions and in the architectural design. The museum spaces were sites for reproduction of the state ideology, in this case Turkishness, through the same museum practices across different regions. The state employed the museums for the construction of the unified nation and unified national culture.

In the early years of the Turkish Republic, secularization was the driving force of the state structure and administration. However, till 1950s the westernization was associated with the elites of the country. The uneven development of the country affected the cultural formation of the young republic. As a consequence, the citizens were like to be divided into Western and Traditional in terms of their cultural values. In the year of 1963, 5 years development programs of the state were entered into force. The 1961 constitution entitled the state responsible from the social and economic development. In order to achieve this aim, the state founded the State Planning Organization, which outlined 5 years development plans. (Ünay 2006) These plans are crucial to understand the commitment in the area of cultural policies of the Turkish State. The goals of these 5 years development plans were very superficial and plain namely spreading the habit of reading books among the Turkish citizens were one of the aims of these cultural plans. However, the importance is to given to the improvement and the preservation of the Turkish culture through these 5 years of plans.

Till 1971, the cultural policies were under the administration of The Ministry of Education. In 1977, the title of the ministry had become The Ministry of National Education and Culture. In 1978, the Ministry of Culture was established and with the coup of 1980, this last ministry was converted into the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.¹⁰ So, till 1980s, the culture and cultural activities were officially connected to education purposes of the state.

The culture was seen as a civil service of the state. The separation of the culture and education mainly was the result of the accelerating archeological researches across Turkey. As a consequence of the archeological works in Anatolia, the need for opening up the new archeological museums emerged. Although these museums were established in various cities, like Konya, Izmir and Bursa, the selection, the content and the order of

¹⁰ The Ministry of Culture and Tourism was established with on 16.4.2003 with the article 4848. The aim of this article is mainly to maintain cultural values, develop, spread, present, consider, prevent historical and cultural existences from extinction, reconsider the touristic attractions, which can support the economy of the country. The Republic of Turkey Culture and Tourism Ministry. 25th July 2005 available from <http://www.kultur.gov.tr/TR,22959/kurulus-amaci-ve-gorevleri.html> accessed on 19th February 2015.

the exhibited pieces were highly centralized. The museum managers in the state museums are seen as state officers rather than curators. The selection, order and the exhibition of the new archeological findings were decided upon the orders of the central rather than the museum administration. The centralized administration slowed down the decision-making process as much as the adaptation to the new technologies and methodologies in the museums, happening all around the world. The insufficiency of the state museums in reproducing and maintaining the culture vividly brought about the new initiatives in the area of culture. As a response to the poorly managed state museums, private museums were established.

4.3.5. Privatization Process of Museums in Turkey

By the 1970s, the state was incapable of maintaining the culture by itself. The lack of state dominance in responding to the cultural needs of public gave away to the privatization of the culture. In 1973, the opening up the IKSŞ (Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts) indicated the institutionalization of the private investments in the art and cultural sector. IKSŞ embarked on the mission of exhibiting *“the finest examples of cultural and artistic production from around the world for Turkish audience...and introducing the world to Turkey's cultural and artistic assets and transforming Istanbul into a major international center for culture and the arts.”*¹¹ The role of promoting the Turkish culture shifted to the private sector.

¹¹ The depiction of IKSŞ:

“The Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSŞ) was founded in 1973 with the goal of offering the Turkish public opportunities to experience the finest examples of cultural and artistic production from around the world and learn about new initiatives and movements. Further objectives included introducing the world to Turkey's cultural and artistic assets and transforming Istanbul into a major international centre for culture and the arts.

The general objectives of the Foundation are: to make Istanbul one of the world's foremost capitals of culture and the arts; to create continuous interaction between national and universal values and traditional and contemporary values via culture and the arts; and to contribute actively to the development of cultural policies.

In addition to organising festivals, biennials and events in Turkey and abroad, the Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts is involved in conserving traditional arts and cultural heritage, encouraging and facilitating artistic production in diverse disciplines, and contributing to the development of cultural policies.”

Excerpted from: IKSŞ.(n.d.). Main objectives IKSŞ. Available from.

<http://www.iksv.org/en/aboutus/mainobjectives> (Accessed on 15th September 2014).

In 1980s, the concept of the museums has changed worldwide. Instead of the few and wide-ranging museums, the number of museums increased on specific issues. Besides modern approaches to the museum experience had changed the interaction between object and the subjects greatly. *“Visual culture within the museum is a technology of power”* (Hooper-Greenhill 2000, 162) Especially the involvement of the virtual material like movies and photographs influenced the responses of the audience, and eventually the knowledge production. The rise of the neoliberal economic system gave rise to a shift in the cultural capital as well. Private cooperations’ and companies’ presence in the art sector started to replace the state dominance. The capital holders transmit their capital on the cultural investments. On the other hand, museums were spaces to reproduce the hegemonic discourses. Even though, the postmodern approaches in the museums and biennials aim to abolish the ossified power relations, their sponsors limit the extent of the criticism considerably.

Till 1980s, the museums in Turkey were confined to exhibit the collected historical pieces from Anatolia in the name of displaying cultural heritage and educate the visitors. *“Museums were based around exhibition programs consisting of ‘archeological and historical artifacts’. As a result, the professionals and roles connected with the running of museums were defined as and limited with the running of museums were defined as and limited to archaeologists, historians, ethnographers and art historians.”* (Katoglu 2009, 49) After the opening up the private collections to the public, the private art museums came into being. So that museums transformed into profitable spaces since the private museums emerged with the capitalist practices like profiting with the museum shops and cafes. In a nutshell, the target and the aim of the museum practices changed after 1980s substantially.

The influences of neoliberal transformations in the economic system and 1980s and consequences of the coup d’état had substantial impacts on the cultural sector of Turkey. *“The Turkish Armed Forces intervened (September 12, 1980) by dissolving the parliament, the political parties, trade unions, and civil society organizations and by banning the party leaders from re-entering politics.”* (Karadag 2010, 13) The political pressure on the freedom of expression affected the involvement in the cultural sectors

ranging from performance to plastic arts. As an extension of the privatization of the state institutions, private museums were emerged in 1980s. According to Köseman (2012), the private sector's existence in the art and culture sector was approved by the state substantially. The reason for it is the decrease of the presence of the state in the art and culture sector in addition to the change in the state's position in the cultural sector. The ministry's budget decrease steady. (Köseman 2012, 154) To replace the cultural activities, *"Turkey was gradually transformed into a consumption society by prompting the shopping and the mass culture, including TV shows, football and pop music."* (Örnek & Üngör 2013, 11)

Neoliberalism accompanied the technological advancement, speeded up after 1980s in an unaccountable way. The technological advancements have being implemented since then. The new museums for living and an interactive space replaced the distant and poorly managed image of the state museums. The methods were developed to make feel the audience to experience the exhibitions with all their senses. Urry (2002) delineates the methodological changes in the exhibitions *"'Living' museums replaced 'dead' museums, open-air museums replace those under cover, sound replaces hushed silence, and visitors are not separated from the exhibits by glass."* (Urry 2002, 119) Visual presentations, sounds and lights applied in the exhibitions spaces change the climate of the knowledge productions. The museum experience becomes more vivid and the subjects become more involved with the setting and objects. As a consequence, the museum practices turns into living experiences.

Private museums' administration is regulated in accordance with the "The Cultural and Natural Heritage Protection Act"¹² (Regulation on the Private Museums and their Auditing) *"Private foundations and private and judicial persons."* (Terzioğlu 2012, 12) Inadequacy of the state provision of the collective public goods leads to proliferation in the cultural sphere. The privatization of the culture directly resulted in keen changes in the museum administration. Currently, 192 private museums are operating and 51% percentage of the private museums was opened up between 2000-2010. (Bakbasa 2010,

¹² According to the web page of The Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (n.d.) Available from: <http://www.kultur.gov.tr/TR/belge/1-42821/eski2yeni.html>. (Accessed on 25th December 2010).

25) This statistics indicate the high demand for the museums and exhibition spaces as well.

The first private museum, Sadberk Hanim Museum, was opened in Istanbul in 1980 with the initiatives of the Koc group which is one of the largest industrial conglomerate in Turkey. The museum was dedicated to exhibit the traditional materials and daily objects from the different periods of Anatolia and the Middle East.

Opening up the private museums brought about a considerable axis shift in museum policies. The involvement of the private capitals into museum sector resulted into more capital oriented museum practices. Museums were scaled up to the global level to obtain places in the global museum competition. In the global tourist market, the both public and private museums and art galleries gained an essential place. The growing cultural tourism and the spread of the investment in art led museum managers reconfigure the public image of the museums. In this aim, the museum administrations reconsidered the public images of the museums by adapting them into the tourist attraction spaces.

First of all, the museum names became brand names to earn a place in the international arena, namely Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam and Guggenheim Museum in New York City. Secondly, the private museums embarked on adopting the new museum practices. Movie screenings, panels, discussion forums, libraries and interactive exhibition methods became indispensable parts of the museum spaces. Thirdly, the popularity of the multi-culturalist discourse around the world forced Turkish museums to discover the multicultural roots of Turkey.

Multiculturalism designates *“the parameters of a new urban imaginary - devoid of ethno- racial conflicts, dilemmas of urban hierarchy or poverty - which connects us together as Istanbulites”* (Öncü 2007, 238) in other words as domestic immigrants to the old residents of Istanbul. In order to highlight the multiculturalist past of Istanbul, the new museum projects carried out. The Museum of Princes' Islands opened up with the initiation of the Istanbul 2010 ECoC Agency. Princes' Islands in Istanbul were well

know for the summer locations for Armenians, Greeks and Jewish communities besides Turkish people. Following this multi-ethnic and multi-religious composition, *“the Museum aspires to document and relate the known history, recent past and today of all the islands in the archipelago.”*¹³ The nostalgia for the past reshaped the identity construction process. The emerging collective feeling of nostalgia reversed the identity formation policies of the state. Since the foundation, the connection with the near past was denied. The EU candidacy for full membership in 1999, multiculturalist discourse and the increasing trend of the nostalgia for the past reversed the direction of the aimed policies and the good parts of the near past were remembered. In the end, the amalgamation of the altering power relations and the influence from the global networks forced to a reconsideration of the museum policies.

4.4. The AKP Government and Museum Policies

The AKP government obtained the power in 2002 with the promise of providing the economic stability and development after the severe economic crisis of 2001. A newly established political party created a fresh air after the long lasting and repeating political and economic crisis. Even though the party cadres were coming from the political Islam background, the political agenda of AKP was aiming to achieve the EU candidacy. Namely, the key AKP founders, like Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Abdullah Gül and Bülent Arinc were coming from pro-Islamist the Welfare party (RP). Zürcher (2010) evaluates the electoral victory of AKP as *“the return of Islamists.”* (Zürcher 2010, 305) Even though, the party located itself as a conservative democrat party, it portrayed its course like its European equivalents Christian democrats rather than a pro-Islamist party. (Karadag 2010, 22)

AKP came into the power in 2002 and since then the government launched serious of economic and political reforms to strengthen the relations with the EU with the aim of obtaining the full membership to the European Union. Consequently, in 2005, Turkey became a candidate country. The sustainable economic growth, coming through with

¹³ Museum of the Princes' Islands (2010) English Content-The Museum. (Online) Available from: <http://www.adalarmuzesi.org/cms/english> (Accessed 11th February 2015)

the neo-liberal revisions in the structure of the state, provided AKP not only credibility in international arena but also an increase in the supporters on the domestic level.

In addition to the changes in the political area, states' official approach to the cultural matters shifted noticeably. National culture and its redefinition regained an importance in the state level. Instead of pursuing the 5 years of cultural plans like previous periods, the AKP government initiated set of cultural policies. This mind shift was the reflection of the new mentality about the state control over culture, ideology and nationalism. For instance, the European Union conditionality puts pressures on Turkey to change its cultural policies as well. Especially, the EU integration process required Turkey to revise fundamentally its laws with the aim of improving the minority rights and the cultural rights. *"The notion of citizenship in Turkey was conceptualized in large measure in terms of a monolithic, unique culture and identity that was the most fundamental product of the process of nation-building; in other words, in a sense, it implies the sense of belonging directly to a (national) community based on loyalty to the state."* (İçduygu, Çolak & Soyarık 1999, 197)

A result of the EU candidacy process, *"The fundamentals of Turkish citizenship"* (İcduygu et al. 2008, 378) were being questioned both on domestic level and the international level. As a fundamental of citizenship, the cultural identity became a collective matter. As a consequence of the EU integration debates, the domestic structures were subjected to considerable changes such as significant amendments in the constitution. For instance *"it became legal to broadcast in minority languages and dialects used traditionally by many Turkish citizens in their daily lives."* (İcduygu et al, 2008, 379) The nationalistic discourse, claiming that each and every citizen of Turkey is a Turk, had to change with the constitutional amendments.

The Prime Minister Erdogan claims the reborn of new and democratic Turkey as a result of the substantial political structure changes and the decrease in the deep-rooted Kemalist discourse. *"Certainly, the most important dimension of change in a positive direction has been a dramatic decline in the power and influence of the military in Turkish politics."* (Öniş 2013, 105) In addition to the decline in the political

interference of the military, the official recognition of the minority rights and practice their culture built up a democratic base with a stronger democratic presentation of the minorities. The discourse of new Turkey discourse included and gave power to the conservative entrepreneurs and parts of the society who were excluded by the secularist Kemalist regime.

4.5. Integration Process into European Union

The EU membership process speeded up the inclusion of the Turkish economy into the neoliberal global economy. The neoliberal revisions affected, at the same time reshaped, the cultural policies as well as social, economic and political ones. Establishing closer ties with the EU and the neighboring countries also triggered the competition to obtain a secure place in the global network of culture. Consequently, the role of the sole protector over the cultural artifacts had been left and the dominance of the state over the cultural matters was reduced to the source of budget. In order to develop, maintain and sustain the cultural activities, the sector has been privatized. *“While using culture as a means to promote the country and the trademark the cities in the modern globalizing world, it prioritized the inclusion of the private sector with its investment capacity and short-term accomplishment.”* (Aksoy 2009, 193) Therefore in the area of culture private sectors dominance prevailed the cultural life. The more contribution of the private sector to the cultural domain meant the less involvement of the state support.

As a result of the neoliberal formation of the state, primarily tourism and relatedly cultural heritage tourism, has been modified to take advantage from the global economy of culture. *“Forced to depend more than ever on earned income, museums are becoming more service oriented.”* (Kirshenblatt-Gimlett 1998, 7) In order to find a place in the market competition of the tourism, national culture and cultural heritage were promoted as a brand image of the country. AKP perceives culture as a capital source to strengthen the economic growth and create the employment for the locals. Hence, *“culture is being instrumentalized as an area of competitive advantage for the national economy.”* (Aksoy 2009, 194) The AKP government approach to the cultural matters differentiated from the previous governments clearly. On the other hand, like

previous governments culture was a realm of hegemony over the society. Hence, the culture is reconfigured in accordance with the discourse of the “New Turkey”. The cultural identity and its redefinition is essential for the legitimization for their policy directions in the realm of their power, including politics and economics.

4.6. The New Turkey Discourse

The shift in the strategy of cultural policies did not mean an increase in the state sponsored culture production. The state quits to intervene into the cultural sector on the other hand encourages the involvement of the private sector by providing the tax reductions and the state help.¹⁴ Consequently, the private capital launched a bunch of large scale of investments. Namely, Eczacıbaşı industrial conglomerate opened up Istanbul Modern Museum. Likewise, Koc and Sabancı industries established and maintained museums in different locations and primarily based in Istanbul. Borusan orchestra, financed by Borusan Company, emerged as one of the best of orchestras of Turkey. Additionally, the private capitals support international biennials, music, film and theater festivals both boost the art and cultural life and to attract the global tourism. Turkey, especially Istanbul, becomes a rapidly growing cultural center. The central location of Istanbul between the Europe and Asia draws the attention of the international cultural capital besides international financial capital.

¹⁴ “In 2004, legal regulation no.5228 (entitled the Sponsorship Law) enabled companies to deduct donations, aid and expenses towards culture and cultural foundations from their income and corporate taxes...In 2004, with the passing of the Cultural Investment and Initiatives Law No.5224, cultural investments of private equity found great support, on a large and with amenable facilities. The articles mentioned under the title of cultural investment are:

- the building, maintenance and management of culture centers;
- the building, maintenance or management of locations such as libraries, archives, museums, art galleries, art workshops, filmsets, artistic design units, art studios and movie theatres where theatre, opera, ballet, concert and similar cultural and artistic activities or products are held or produced, and private research, education or activity centers for culture and art;
- The use of immovable cultural heritage and the research, collection, certification, archiving publication, education, instruction and presentation activities of cultural property and intangible cultural heritage. (Aksoy,199)

Although initiated by the private sector, this cultural renaissance maintains the support from the government in the form of legal and regulatory changes, including a controversial new law for the ‘renewal’ of historic areas (Law 5366), in addition to well-financed programmes for the development and promotion of the city’s cultural and tourism infrastructure.”(Aksoy 2009, 4)

The shrinking budget of the state on cultural affairs and the investment commitment of the large private companies developed a firm cooperation between the state and the private initiatives in cultural sector. In other words private capital actively participated in the reproduction culture and cultural identities. Then again, the decentralization of the cultural sector conduces to the empowerment of the local municipalities as well as lead to the local governors to obtain partial autonomy. In a similar line, the efficient private sector support and collaboration with the local governances speed up the process of reaching the global. *“In order to attract investment capital and the spending power of the middle class, regions now differentiate themselves by emphasizing the aesthetic qualities of material commodities and services which represent symbolic capital.”* (Richards 2000, 6) Therefore, each region developed its own cultural policies. The different geographical regions created and highlighted their cultures to attract the tourists. However, Istanbul remains the main center of the cultural life of Turkey.

To sum up the privatization process of the museums, the bourgeoisie class, which can invest money and time in art and cultural activities, is essential for the neoliberal structure of the culture scene. Cultural capital, theorized by Bourdieu (1983), signifies the symbolic capital. The integration of the neoliberal economic system into the Turkish economy distinguishes and differentiates the economic activities. Above all, the cultural capital becomes profitable and achieves *“comparative advantage”* (Zukin 1996, 268) because of its sustainability. Culture of the societies and countries carries a dynamic feature because of its flexibility in accordance with changing conditions. Furthermore, culture is an accumulation of the past in other words the fixed capital of the past, namely *“monuments, art collections, performance spaces, even shopping streets - accumulated over the past.”* (Zukin 1996, 268) Therefore, culture becomes popular investment area of neoliberals. Thanks to its ancient past and its multi-layered history, Istanbul receives not only domestic capital but also international capital. *“Henceforth the whole question [of refashioning the country’s future development] can be formulated as a better integration with the world economy’, with Istanbul as the primary connective node of this integrated economy”* (Keyder 1992, 85) For the year 2010, getting the European cultural capital officially carried the Istanbul’s name to the international cultural scene.

4.7. The Signs of the Cultural Integration into the European Union: the European Capital of Culture in 2010

The strategic location of the city between Europe and the Asia redefines the city as a bridge between Europe and Asia. Istanbul becomes the focus of the global investment groups. In order to attract the capital on the city, Istanbul Municipality, governed by AKP, should provide a sustainable and an organized city planning integrated into global networks. *“Using culture as a vehicle for sustainable tourism development is now becoming an important item in the priorities of public policy planners.”*(WTO Commission 2004, 3) Obtaining the title of European cultural capital incarnates Istanbul as a city where culture and culture promotion are critical to the daily life of the city. *“Central and local authorities of the AKP have instigated a number of key initiatives – for example, the Istanbul 2010 European Cultural Capital project – explicitly aimed at using Istanbul’s cultural assets and resources to improve the global image of the city (and thereby the country).”* (Aksoy 2009, 4) At the same time, this title secured a place in cultural globalization. In sum, Istanbul learns to *“capitalize on its historical and cultural wealth to boost economy and globalization.”* (Yardimci 2007, 16)

European Capital of Culture (ECOC) in 2010 had led to structural changes in adapting the global cultural life into the cultural urban life of Istanbul besides scaling it up to the global level. For the first time, the city planners adopted a cultural strategy to integrate the city into the global cultural competition. In 2010, Istanbul rescales itself in the global level through owning the title of the Cultural Capital. (Caglar 2007) Since, culture becomes a catchy and charming marketing strategy of cities to flourish global tourism, a wide array of cultural projects had been carried out in Istanbul, in the year of 2010, namely concerts, theatre performances, conferences, seminars, workshops, exhibitions and publications.¹⁵ (Rampton et al 2011)

¹⁵ “In terms of Istanbul 2010, between 2008 and 2011 568 projects were carried out. Besides 1598 concerts, 1127 theatre performances (77), 1201 conferences or seminars 735 workshops, 763 exhibitions, 336 publications, 350 literary readings, 52 festivals, 500 film screenings, 130 sites restored, maintained or renovated.” (Rampton et al 2011, 78)

The collaboration of the civil society organizations with the local and central administrations brought about a new understanding of culture management and led changes in state controlled culture. The motivation of the ECOC developed and sustained the cultural integration among the member states of the European Union. Economic and political integration of the European Union remains inadequate in order to maintain the further integration. Belonging to a common cultural identity for the people of the member states facilitates the idea of the European Union. The Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs consider that the European City of Culture event should be the expression of a culture, which in its historical emergence and contemporary development, is characterized by having both common elements and a richness born of diversity. (EU commission, 1985) Through the ECOC organization, the diversity of the European cultures are preserved and at the same time they are embodied as indispensable elements of the common European culture. The idea of the European Capital of Culture emerged with the attempts of the Greek Minister of Culture Melina Mercori in 1983. Since 1985, each year one or few European cities are elected to enrich and interconnect the cultural life in the city with the funds of the European Union.

The cultural integration into the global networks, especially into the European Union, prompted the discussions about integrating into global culture and triggered the ongoing tension between the local conservative culture and the global Western culture. *“Motivation, given the diversity of cultures and ethnic groups in Istanbul as well as the city’s young, dynamic population, was to create a cultural scene that reflected and drew on the population create a cultural scene that reflected and drew on the population.”* (Ecroys 2011, 67) Even though, diverse cultures constitute the motivation for the title of the Cultural Capital of Europe, the diversity is also a serious source of the cultural conflicts. Through obtaining the title of Cultural Capitals of Europe in 2010, tensions concerning the culture transformed in another dimension. The residents of Istanbul became the consumers of the culture. In this way tensions continues in the spheres of the conflicting lifestyles and the consumerism. However, the organization was far away from all-inclusive. Consequently, the size of the organization is considerably immense and packed, however *“only 7.2% of Istanbul residents participated in an ECoC 2010 activity.”* (Unver &Ozan 2012, 58) Therefore, it would not be said that the ECOC

Istanbul 2010 events did not encourage the local participation substantially.

4.8. The Revival of Neo-Ottomanism

Ahmet Davutoglu, the prime minister of Turkey and the ex-foreign minister of the AKP government, reformulates the ideology of the Turkey, starting from the rule of the AKP government. In the book, the Strategic Depth¹⁶, he elaborates the position of Turkey between the West and the East and re-locates Turkey as a bridge between those two. By representing the West and the East as contrasting geographies, Turkey emerges as a country, which can provide the peace and the stability on the ex-lands of Ottoman Empire.

The legacy of the Ottoman Empire rule enforces the neo-Ottomanist claims of Davutoglu in terms of the direct economic, political and cultural involvement in the lands of former Ottoman Empire. Yavuz (1998) divides the neo-Ottomanism in two aspects: the reconsideration of the Turkish nationalism with the Ottoman past and the abolishment of the economic borders between the Balkan, Caucasian, and Middle Eastern countries', but respecting the political boundaries of the countries in the ex-Ottoman space. (Yavuz 1998, 40)

The neo-Ottomanist ideology did not come out with the AKP rule for the first time. *"In 1950 Menderes began to reemphasize the importance of Muslim identity to the Turks. He began shifting Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle-East as much as the West."* (Ergec 2014, 141) Neo-Ottomanism, as an intellectual idea that has been proposed to characterize the foreign policy of Turgut Özal, is not so much concerned with Islam but with the repositioning of Turkey in the international order after end of the cold war by re-discovering Turkey's historical bonds to that former multi-national and multi-ethnic "community" of the Ottoman empire in its contemporary form. (Ergec 2014, 142)

¹⁶ Ahmet Davutoglu. (2001) *Strategik Derinlik, Turkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu* (Strategic Depth, Turkey's International Position). Istanbul, Kure Yayinlari.

Özal, the ex-prime minister and ex-president initiated the revival of the Ottoman legacy. He launched the privatization of the public industries and introduced the neoliberal policies by abolishing import substitution policy and instead implemented economic growth based on export. Abandoning the control over the currency brought about the capital mobility as well. In the realm of the society, he highlighted *“the necessity of constructing a new common cultural identity binding groups with different particular affiliations in Turkey, and who attempted to unify the heirs of the Ottoman Empire, especially by pragmatic and cultural means.”* (Colak 2006, 558)

At the same time, he relocates the strategic geographical position of Turkey in the context of the Cold War by referring the Ottoman past and its legacy. The trend of nostalgia for the glorious past in 1980s was stemming from the Thatcher’s England, where she emphasized the reviving the Victorian values from the era of the British Empire. She implemented the neoliberal policies when she was claiming herself as conservative. Consequently the neoliberal conservatism emerged as a world governance trend. (Hall 1980)

Davutoglu explicitly defines his identity as Ottoman. Namely, on 3rd of October in 2009 he states that in international contexts he claims that he is an Ottoman though always feeling Turk in order to challenge the other participants. (Iba 2014) Furthermore on 22 of November 2009 he responds the critics by saying *“We have a heritage from the Ottoman Empire. Yes we are new Ottomans. We have to pay attention to the neighboring countries”*¹⁷ (Iba 2014)

AKP government embarked on the policy directions of establishing “the new Turkey”. In doing so, neo-Ottomanism provides cultural and social base for policy directions. AKP claims that thanks to policy directions of new Turkey, the country becomes more democratic while rediscovering its roots. The hard-core Kemalism was declining with the increase of New Turkey discourse. The decline of the political power of the military,

¹⁷ Iba, Saba. (2014). Davudoglu’nun restarasyon söylemi. (The talk of Davudoglu about restoration discourse) Available from: http://www.ozgur-gundem.com/index.php?haberID=118538&haberBaslik=Davutoğlu’nun%20restorasyon%20söylemi&action=haber_detay&module=nuce. (Accessed on 19TH February 2015).

the recognition of the Kurdish language and the rights and the freedom to the headscarf in the public spaces were contradictory policies of the New Turkey with the Kemalist past. “*Its vice-president, Engin Altay, expressed his support for free expression and denounced what he described pejoratively as Osmanlıcılık (obsession with the Ottomans).*” (Kechriotis 2011, 100)

As a continuum of the rise of Ottomanism, the New Turkey defines itself as heirs of the Sunni Muslim Ottomans rather than the Western oriented modern citizens. This identity definition creates deepening polarizations within the society between Sunnis and non-Sunnis and between conservatives and non-conservatives. Additionally, the neo-Ottomanist discourse emerges as an obstacle in integrating the cultural scene into the global cultural market.

The devoted voters of AKP establish a connection between the Ottoman past, dated back to the rise period rather than the decline period. Through this connection, they appropriate the title of the carriers of the Ottoman heritage. Even though the revival of the so-called glorious Ottoman past cannot be revived under the name of the Turkish republic, the newly emerging life style reflects the nostalgia for the growth of the Ottoman Empire.

All in all, the museum journey of the Turkish Republic dated back to the modernization movements of the Ottoman Empire. In the course of the identity formation, young Turkish Republic perceived museums as integral parts of the identity formation. Culture and education constituted the core tools in shaping the Turkish identity. Museums appeared as spaces to cultivate and educate the citizens about Turkish identity.

The changing economic structure, started with the implementation of neoliberal policies, had impacts on the museum administration. Neoliberalism brought about the private museums, administered by the private capital holders. Consequently the dominance of the strict and centralized state control over museums was not on the agenda anymore. Through the proliferation of the private museums, the ideological mentality over exhibitions changed. The exhibition of private collections has become widespread. Therefore museums were not centered anymore to narrate the Turkish

Identity.

AKP government played an active role in the cultural sphere. Holding the title of the European Union Candidacy and later on obtaining the European Capital of Culture: Istanbul 2010 have had significant impacts in developing the cultural sphere in Turkey especially in recalling the minorities in Turkey. Even though the emphasis was on the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural past of Turkey, AKP government highlighted the Ottoman Past of Turkey. The nostalgia for the Ottomans came into existence in cultural commemoration rituals such as opening up new museums including Panorama 1453 History Museum.

5. The Case: Panorama 1453 History Museum

5.1. The City of Conquerors: Istanbul

"Verily you shall conquer Constantinople. What a wonderful leader will her leader be, and what a wonderful army will that army be!"¹⁸

The prophet Muhammad

The conflicting approaches in the cultural life, namely modernist and neo-Ottoman discourses, officially coexisted with the motto of not intervening into one another's sphere in Turkish society since Ottoman Empire. In reality, life styles of citizens are being modified through created rituals. Turkish republic features diverse lifestyles. For instance, in the line with the Westernization discourse, music, opera, theater and film festivals cherish the Western art and culture; on the other hand the commemoration day of the Istanbul conquest in 1453 becomes a national pride of the radical Muslims of Istanbul because of carrying out the deeds of the prophet Muhammed. The strict modernist discourse converted into conservative neo-Ottoman ideology. This diversification in the cultural reflections indicates the transformation of the modern and Western identity and state model of Turkey discourse into the neo-Ottoman identity.

Istanbul witnessed a long history of the conflicts and wars of the empires, including Roman, Latin, Byzantium and Ottoman. Obtaining the Istanbul meant controlling the intersections of the trade roads and possessing the power. The migration flows of the diversified people situate Istanbul at the crossroads of the ethnic and religious diversity. Consequently, Istanbul emerges as a crucial global city, containing various religious and ethnicities, besides being politically and socially significant city.

From the religious point of view, Istanbul is a holy city for Muslims because of the deeds of the prophet Muhammad. In Islam, the heaven is promised to the Muslim

¹⁸ Hadith of the Prophet Muhammed taken from *Conquest of Constantinople*. Available from: <http://www.sunnah.org/msaec/articles/Constantinople.htm> (Accessed on 20th September 2014)

conquerors of Istanbul. Therefore, the conquest of Istanbul was a victory for of Islam in addition to the militaristic and political ones. Till the abolishment of the Ottoman Empire, Istanbul was the center of the Islam because of the caliphate status of Ottoman sultans. The dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of a secular republic caused uneasiness among the Islamic communities like Anatolian Youth Foundation.¹⁹ Since then, certain Islamic groups aim to regain, in other words conquer, Istanbul and turn into it to the capital of the Islam.

On the contrary of the status of Istanbul in Islam, Istanbul had also been the symbolic city of the Westernization movement of the Ottoman Empire and later on Turkish Republic. Thus, the city sheltered contradictions so called discursive symbols of the West and the East. These symbols ranged from the clothing to the education methods. Hence, the modernization movements in Istanbul gave away to the conflict between conservatives and the people for the Westernization. For example the traditional education system, namely Madrasa education, was replaced with the Western methods. The clash between modernists and traditionalists led to the severe polarizations in the life styles in the long run. Even though the tensions were emerging, the co-existence of the different religions and ethnicities, including Greeks, Armenians and Jews renamed the city as a cosmopolite one.

The Turkish Republic followed strict policies concerning non-Muslims since its establishment. During the years of the Second War World, Turkey put a new wealth tax on non-Muslim minorities. This heavy tax on non-Muslim minorities led to the substantial changes in the Turkish economy since many non-Muslims were unable to effort their tax debts to the State. Therefore, non-Muslims either chose to leave the country or sell their properties. Consequently, first decades of the republic witnessed changes in capital holders.

¹⁹ Anatolian Youth Foundation (Anadolu Gençlik Derneği) was founded through the initiatives of Necmettin Erbakan, the ex-prime minister of Turkey between the years of 1996-1997. He was the president of the Welfare Party (RP) which was founded on the advocacy of the virtues of Islam and the denial of the Western values. Through the line of the ideology of Necmettin Erbakan, Anatolian Youth Foundation promotes Islam among the youth. The more info is available on the official website: <http://www.agd.org.tr/hakkimizda.html>.

In 1950s, Istanbul had become the center for the Turkish nationalism. The year of 1953, the 500th years of commemoration of the conquest of Istanbul, signified the intense discussions on the re-Islamification of Istanbul. Following this, in the 6-7th of September in the year of 1955, large-scale riots took place against Greek citizens.²⁰ As a result of the heavy taxes and the nationalism movements against non-Muslims decreased their population considerably.

Since 1950s Istanbul was redefined as a Sunni- Islam city rather than a city of different ethnicities and religions as a result of the minority policies of the early Turkish Republic. Furthermore, the Turkish society experienced a collective amnesia about the past events, namely the existence of the non-Muslim minorities and the most importantly the riots against them. *“Infused with the spirit of globalism, Istanbul's 'multicultural' heritage becomes a general term to designate an imagined past of harmonious cultural coexistence, one that offers the potential of 'openness' to cultural flows from across the world without fear of contamination.”* (Öncü 2007, 241) Namely, the collective memory about the multi-cultural past of the Istanbul came to the light with the EU integration process since one of the objects of the ECoC 2010 nomination was emphasizing multi-culturist elements of Istanbul. As a consequent, the non-Muslim past of Istanbul was revealed publically through the integration process into the European Union.

5.2. The Conquest Museum: Panorama 1453 History Museum

In 1950s, the Democrat party with the rule of Adnan Menderes expanded the ceremonies of the commemoration of the conquest of Istanbul. The aim was to accentuate the Islam and Turkish identity of Istanbul in a coherent way. The rise of Turkish nationalism together with Islamism brought about the hatred and non-tolerance to the non-Muslim citizens. Since the modernization of the late Ottoman Empire, Istanbul becomes the city of the conflicting parts: modern versus conserved, the West

²⁰ Istanbul riots, in other words Events of September 6–7, took place in the year of 1955. The Turkish government, under the rule of the Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, organized the riots against the Greek minority in Istanbul. The fake news about the bombing the born house of Atatürk in Thessaloniki, in Greece, triggered a violent mob in Istanbul against the Greek community.

versus the East. Non muslims, including Greeks and Armenians, were counted as representations of the Western Countries, even though they were residing in Turkey for many generations. The co-existence of contrasting worlds caused troubles and created a kind of enmity between conflicting parts. In the republican period, the tension between the West and the East accelerated because of the attempts to create a unique Turkish identity. All the other identities were seen as threats to the unity of Turkish identity.

According to Islamists, Istanbul is a promised land of Islam. Therefore, Constantinopolis should be conquered by a Muslim state. According to radical Islamists, in the aim of the religious deeds, Fatih Sultan Mehmet conquered it in 1453. Consequently, Istanbul became the center of the World and Islam. However, in time the city of Islam was degenerated with the Westernization and modernization movements. Islamists claim that, Istanbul lost its beauty with the decadent Western influences. Therefore, Istanbul should have been conquered again. (Bora 1995, 45) Thorough re-conquest, the city of the Fatih the conqueror will be revived. The global city project of Istanbul of the Welfare Party (Sunni Islamist/Conservatist political party) aims at reviving the Istanbul's heritage from the Ottoman Empire, which is being the capital of the World. Transforming Istanbul into a commerce and finance center illustrates the few of the efforts of the Welfare Party's government. (Bora 1995, 56)

The nostalgia for the Fatih's Istanbul resulted into various remembering practices. Namely, the initiative to turn Hagia Sophia Museum into the Mosque symbolizes a possible victory of the Islamists over Westernization and modern values. Hagia Sophia, built in 360 by the Byzantium Emperor Constantius II, was converted into mosque after the conquest of Istanbul in 1453. After the abolishment of the Ottoman Empire, it was turned into a museum in 1935. However the conversion into a museum was controversial because the museumification of the mosque symbolized the victory of the West over the Muslim world according to the opponents of the modernization movement.

The commemoration of the conquest of Istanbul under the name of the 'Conquest Festival' (Fetih Söleni) is being celebrated since 1950s. The Welfare Party (WP) government, especially WP's Istanbul municipality under the rule of Erdogan, was

diligent to expand the commemoration ceremonies. Erdogan aimed to make Istanbul a city of Islam rather than a Western oriented city. In this aim, in 1994, he made a speech about the most Western influenced neighborhood of Istanbul: Beyoglu. He states, that *“the focal point of Istanbul tourism is Beyoglu. A tourist should understand that she/he comes to a Muslim city in this region.”* (Bora 1995, 45)²¹ Beyoglu has been regarded as the degeneration point of Istanbul since the Ottoman Empire because of the Western influence in the region. *“The principal strategy is to emphasize Istanbul’s identity as an Islamic city, through such symbolic acts as constructing a mosque and Islamic cultural center in the middle of the city’s modern window that opens to the West, Taksim.”* (Bora 1995, 49) Therefore, obtaining the power in a regions where symbolizes the Western part of the city, is a matter of ideological power rather than administrative one.

Besides, Beyoglu region, the other symbolic regions for the Ottomans in Istanbul had become the focus in reviving the Ottoman past of the city. For instance, the Golden Horn, the significant region of the Tulip era (1718-1730) was gentrified and has become the new cultural sphere of the AKP government.²² (Demircan, Zaman, 2006) Namely, the congress center of AKP is in that region was built there. Furthermore, the opening up the Miniaturk Thema Park in 2003 was continuation of the Golden Horn project.

Miniaturk Thema Park was opened up in 2003 with the initiation of “the Islamic Science and Technology Museum” by K lt r A.Ő. (Culture JS. Company). The park contains small scale of imitations of the historical constructions, which marked the history of Turkish territory. In that sense, especially the buildings of the Turkish and Islamic civilizations are dominant in the exhibition. *“The design of the news museums has been facilitated with the representation of Golden Ages of Ottoman- Turkish as well*

²¹ “Istanbul turiziminin p f noktası o b lgedir. O b lgeye gelen kisi bir defa, o merkezi g rd ğ nde bir Islam kentinde oldugunu anlayacak.(...) Sehrimizin tarihi ve k lt rel dokusunu yavas yavas ortaya cikarinca  yle zannediyorum ki, Istanbul’a gelen turist halki m sl man olan bir sehre geldigini anlayacak.” (Beyoğ lu) is the key point of that region. A person, coming that region for the first time, will understand he/she is in an Islamic city. When the historical and cultural patterns come out slowly, tourists who come to Istanbul are going to understand that they are in a city with a muslim population.) Tayyip Erdogan’s speech in the daily newspaper Yeni Zemin in 1994, p.12. taken from Tanil Bora’a article (Tanil Bora 1995, 45) Bora, Tanil (1995) Fatih’in İstanbul’u. (Istanbul of Mehmet the Conqueror) *Birikim Yayınları*, 76, 44-53.

²² The exact quotation: (Golden Horn and its region are going to be the favorite resting and tourism center. Halic Basin is goin to return its glorious days like in the past) Altın Boynuz ve  evresi, yeniden İstanbulluların en g zde mesire alanı ve turizm merkezi olacak. Hali  Havzasını ge miŐteki ihtiŐamlı g nlerine d nd rmek i in  alıŐmalar t m hızıyla s r yor.

as Islamic civilization with the support of new technologies- video, interactive tours, and virtual reality opens up a new way for communication.”(Bozkus 2014, 3) The de-historicized and de-contextualized narration results in the commodification of the object itself. *“The analysis of de-historicizing and de-contextualizing epistemology is indispensable in order to dissolve the logic and the narration of multicultural ideology inserted in the narration of the exhibition in Miniaturk.”* (Yilmaz 2005, 79) In the case of perceiving the image and the presentation of *Miniaturk* as the *“Showcase of Turkey”* (Yilmaz & Uysal 2007, 115), the identity of the Turkish Republic is being interfered as a consequence of the exhibition of de-historicized and de-contextualized buildings. The symbolic versions of the historical buildings alienates the visitors from the buildings itself. Therefore they are taken as components out of their current identity and glorified as the remnants of the past rather than the living constructions of the presents.

Miniaturk represents *“the nostalgia of the late nineteenth century of Ottoman Empire”* (Yilmaz 2005, 84) by exhibiting the constructions of the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. The exhibition in *Miniaturk* with architectural models of various periods representing Turkish-Islam and the Anatolian past presents a set of identity politics and a sense of struggle in the public sphere paving the way to a new citizenship construction through memories pertaining to a wider geography and a past emphasized within Anatolia, Istanbul, the Balkans and the Middle East. The neo-Ottoman policies of AKP government result in the symbolic constructions, emphasizing the legacy of the Ottoman Empire. In the context of the Neo-Ottomanism, *Miniaturk* exhibits *“the eagerness to claim a position in a fragmented and timeless post-colonial world by programmatically reinforcing a dehistoricized and decontextualized, yet inherently Ottoman, map on the surface of the Golden Horn.”*(Yilmaz&Uysal 2007, 123)

5.3. The Continuous Conquest

The modern museum technics combine the instruments of the visual and the sound effects in order to create timeless and spaceless dimensions. Through various show and representation technics, the exhibitions influence the audience from the first sight and have a longer persistent impact compare to simply showing the object. In the context of the exhibition technics, panorama museums use the technological devices in an integrative way. The visual and sound effects penetrates the senses of the audience and leaves on them the utmost impact. The panorama council defines panoramas as:

In its original sense the panorama is a large cylindrical painting together with its 360-degree foreground, surrounding the spectator in virtual continuum. Thus a panorama creates the illusion of standing in the middle of a landscape and scene, while the depicted events were happening. Natural lighting from an invisible source (windows all around in the roof, hidden from the spectator) adds to the virtual reality of the experience. (Panorama Council 2011, 2)

In the light of this definition, panorama museums aim to create an illusionary environment and influence the perceptions of the audience irreversibly. Therefore, panoramas create their own reality even though they mostly depict the scenes from important historical moments. Currently, there are plenty of panorama museums in various scales, including Australia, the United States, Germany and Turkey.

In 2009, Panorama 1453 History Museum was opened in Istanbul with the initiatives of the AKP government. The museum exhibits the victory moment of the conquest of Istanbul in 1453 with a detailed panoramic painting. The museum is located in Topkapi Culture Park where was strategically important during the conquest of Istanbul in 1453. Topkapi is a central region, situated between the city walls of Istanbul, remained from the Byzantium period. The region carries symbolic meaning in the history of the conquest. On the way to the museum, there is a gateway through the city walls on which stated that Fatih the Conqueror entered the city for the first time after the battle of conquest through this gateway in 1453. Therefore, the location of the museum was not

chosen randomly. The surrounding region of the museum and the museum itself compensate each other and reproduce the conquest by exhibiting the painting and the actual historical remnants.

The museum depicts the morning of 29th of May 1453, the last fight before entering the city with a large panoramic painting. The museum is the first full-panoramic museum of the world. Since 2009, Kultur A.S. is in the charge of the museum and in the first year 657.105 people visited the museum. (Ünsal 2009, 198) A long corridor welcomes the visitors. On the walls of the corridor, many posters and notices telling about the pre-conquest preparations and events are hanged. However, visitors walk through these posters without any notice. Since visitors are conditioned to receive visual information in the panoramic museum, the simple posters on the way to the main exhibition space do not attract an adequate attention. In that sense, the exhibition remains inefficient in giving the historical facts about the before and after the conquest.

The space for the visitors in the panorama part is quite limited. The crowd leads to the feeling of integration with the panoramic painting since the painting narrates a crowded at the same time a fierce battle between Ottomans and Byzantium. The panoramic painting situates 3000 square meter circular areas. It is a two dimensional painting consisting of almost 10.000 figures and the painting is in total 2350 meters. A team of 8 people with the lead of Hasim Vatandas painted the picture between 2005 and 2008. After the extensive research of the period, painting the figures took place.

The sizes of the figures depends their closeness to the horizon. The magnified figures are starting point whereas closer to horizon the figures shrink. In the official website of the Panorama 1453 History Museum the influence of the space is stated explicitly. *“Since there is finishing line in the painting in Panorama 1453 History Museum, the exhibition visitors cannot perceive the real size of the painting with their optical habits. The audience will experience a shock for 10 seconds when they arrive the panorama platform. The shock is the result of the surprise of perceiving the real dimensions of the painting and; finding the starting and finishing points of the painting.”*²³ (Panorama

²³ Translated from “İstanbul 1453 Pamik Müzesi”ndeki çalışmada resmin bittiği yer diye bir şey olmadığı için, resme bakan kişi optik alışkanlıklarıyla eserin gerçek boyutlarını kavrayamayacaktır. İzleyici,

1453 History Museum, Fiziki Mekan)

The visitors watch the painting from 14 meters away and in between the visitor platform and the painting there are realistic replicas of the munitions, namely cannon balls, arrows, barrels of gunpowder. The sound effects of janissary march, mahter, the sword sounds, fires of cannon balls, clip clops, sayings of Allahuekber reinforce the influence of the three dimensional panoramic picture. Mahter march is a very rhythmic; of which main instrument is drum. In the battlefields, the march of Mahter was functioning for exhilarating the soldiers in addition to give them strength. In the museum space, the sound effects together with a panoramic picture stir up the visitors to conquer Istanbul again and again. The huge space of exhibition aims to lay siege to the visitors.

The painting depicts the Janissary, trying to penetrate the walls. Some soldiers climb on the walls and some fall down. Fires both from Byzantium and Ottoman sides create the feeling of the devastation. The panorama picture freezes the time for the visitor for 10 to 20 minutes. The feeling of continuity caught with the outer space of the museum. After you got out from the museum, you find yourself in between the city wall where actual siege took place. The museum is disconnected from the real world and creates its own reality with the visual and sound effects.

platforma çıktığı anda 10 saniye kadar sürecektir bir şok yaşamaktadır. Bu durum, resmin gerçekliğini ve boyutlarını kavramayı sağlayacak referanslar, başlangıç ve bitiş gibi dayanak noktaları bulamamanın şaşkınlığıdır. Panorama 1453 Tarih Müzesi. *Fiziki Mekan*. Available from <http://panoramikmuze.com/panorama-1453/fiziki-mekân.aspx>. (Accessed on 5th May 2015)

5.4. The Founders of The Museum: The Speeches of Governors

The idea of museum came from the Istanbul Mayor Kadir Topbas. He stated that:

“This museum should be the best panorama on the World because the conquest of Istanbul closed an era and started another one. It opened up Istanbul civilization to the world. The emperor who conquered is known as the conqueror by the world. That’s why when we freeze the moment. All the world should be able to say that this is the most beautiful.”²⁴

The conquest of Istanbul is blessed as a turning point in the history of Turkey and named as a beautiful historical fact. According to museums founders, Panorama 1453 History Museum forms a space to revive the beauty of the past. Highly circulated conservative newspaper Zaman’s headline to depict the museum is that “*The museum makes people experience the spirit of the conquest.*” The same news continues with the statement of the head of Kultur AS. Nevzat Bayhan in which he states that “*Panorama 1453 gives the feeling of the eternity and it makes feel people as if they live the moment.*”²⁵ Relatedly, Kadir Topbas, the mayor of Istanbul, states that, “*the conquest of Istanbul in 1453 located Istanbul in the center of the World. Istanbul and Turkey need a new conquest spirit in the times we live now.*”²⁶

²⁴ Translated from “Bu panorama dünyanın en güzel panoraması olsun. Çünkü fetih, çağ acip çağ kapamıştır ve İstanbul medeniyetini dünyaya açılmıştır. Fetheden hükümdar, dünya tarafından hala ‘Fatih’ olarak anılıyor. Dolayısıyla o kareyin dondurduğumuzda bütün dünyanın en güzel budur diyebilmesi lazım.” In the newspaper article of Karahan, Esma(2010) Panorama 2453 Tarih Müzesi (Panorama 1453 History Museum), *Milliyet*.(Online) Available from <http://blog.milliyet.com.tr/panorama-1453-tarih-muzesi/Blog/?BlogNo=243113>. (Accessed on 5th May 2015).

²⁵ Translated from “İBB Kültür AŞ Genel Müdürü Nevzat Bayhan, Panorama 1453 Tarih Müzesi’nin insanların uzun zamandır beklediği bir mekan olduğunu söylüyor. Bugüne kadar fethiye yaşar bir müzenin olmayışının İstanbul için bir eksiklik olduğunu ifade eden Bayhan, “Biz yıllardır fetih kutlamasını gemilerin karadan yürütülmesinden ibaret olarak gördük. Halbuki fethin ruhunu yaşamak gerekiyordu. Panorama 1453, tam panoramik müze olması hasebiyle ziyaretçilere sonsuzluk hissi veriyor ve sanki o anı yaşıyor.” Taken from the article of Pektaş, Ali (2009) Panorama 1453’ün ziyaretçi sayısı Topkapı ve Ayasofya’ya yaklaştı(The Visitor Numbers of Panorama 1453 approaches to the Topkapı and Hagia Sofia Museums).(Online). Available from: http://www.zaman.com.tr/cuma_panorama-1453un-ziyaretci-sayisi-topkapi-ve-ayasofyaya-yaklasti_875525.html. (Accessed on 5th May 2015)

²⁶ Translated from “Bugün Topkapı Kültür Parkı içinde açılışını yaptığımız Panorama 1453 Tarih Müzesi ile çok önemli bir ilke imza atıyoruz. İnsanlık tarihi, İstanbul’un fethine eş değerde pek az olaya şahit olmuştur. Bu fetihle imparatorluklar başkenti İstanbul son sahiplerine kapılarını açmıştır. İstanbul’un fethi ile Sevgili Peygamberimizin fetih müjdesinden bu yana Müslüman devlet adamlarının ortak rüyası olan bir hadise gerçekleşmiştir. Bu fetih İstanbul’u yeniden dünya tarihinin merkezine oturmuştur. İçinde yaşadığımız zaman dilimi içerisinde İstanbul’un ve Türkiye’nin yeni bir fetih ruhuna ihtiyacı var.” İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality (2009) Türkiye’nin ilk panoramik müzesi “İstanbul’un Fethi’ni”

5.5. Evaluating the AKP Government with the Panorama 1453 Museum

The conquest of Istanbul in 1453 marked the history. The reign of a Muslim state in the Western World and the conquest Byzantium capital opened up a new era in the world history. Ottoman Empire did not have any official policy in terms of culture. The non-interference into each-others space and the cultural autonomy of different religious and ethnicities were the main policy concerning the society. The state distinction in terms of the governance and culture between the Ottoman Empire and the Western Europe was clear-cut till the decline period of the Ottoman Empire. The modernization period and the Westernization movements were intentional approachments of the Ottomans towards the Western Europe in order to maintain and strengthen the Empire. The emergence of Western concepts like nation, citizenship and independence on Ottoman soils made the Ottoman Empire cadres to reconsider its traditional structure of ruling the country.

In the early Turkish Republic period, the state focused on re-narration of the Turkish history. The culture and identity policies of the young Turkish state were centered on the promotion of the Turkishness with the association of its Modern elements rather than remembering the Ottoman Past. Therefore, the focus of the identity researches was focused on the pre-Ottoman times, including the pre- Islam time of the Turkish race in Asia. Through these connections, Turkish identity was constructed as a secular one with the influence of the Western values but at the same time nationalistic. The combination of the modern Western face of Turkey with the Turkish identity was the official state discourse in the early years of the Republic. Establishments like Turkish Historical Society (Turk Tarih Kurumu) and Turkish Language Society (Turk Dil Kurumu) were the continuation and also reproduction tools of these discourses. Furthermore, the first museums of the Turkish Republic were built to prove and reconstruct the official history and identity narrations in the nation building process, including ethnography and archeology museums.

yeniden yaşatacak (The first panoramic museum of Turkey will revive the the conquest of Istanbul)
(Online) Available from: <http://www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/Pages/Haber.aspx?NewsID=17004#.VCr1BkudfFo>(Accessed on 5th May 2015).

The conquest museum aimed to connect the Turkish citizens with the growth period of the Ottoman Empire. The conquerors are heroically personalized narrated as the ancestors of the Turkish citizens. Thus, the conquerors of Istanbul in the picture arouse the feelings of the proud of the museum visitors. The supremacy of Sunni Muslim Turkish identity of the Ottoman Empire is proven by the commemoration of the conquest. Moreover, the museum creates nostalgia for the past victorious days. The ancestral connection between the conquerors and the visitors brings about the strong connection. Through this connection, the neo-Ottoman discourse of AKP government is being reinforced rather than Kemalist ideology.

The contemporary Turkish nation is being constructed around the Ottoman past rather than Turkish people living in Asia. The remembering and forgetting practices are being changed with the government of AKP. The conservative Turkish-Muslim Ottoman past replaces the Western oriented modernist prospects. Assuming that museums are the facilitators of the identity re-productions, the AKP government changes the Kemalist ideology of the museums. Accordingly, Erdogan states:

“Our children will look at the future with the proud of the past and they will realize themselves. We don’t want any young person grows up with the inferiority complex. On the contrary, we want a youth, growing up with self-confidence. We will achieve this self-confidence with this museum.”²⁷

The museums were established in Turkey as a consequence of the Westernization movements. Becoming a modern citizen was set as an aim in the early years of the Republic so that everything not related to the Western world was perceived as inferior. Therefore, the Prime Minister Erdogan touches upon the feeling of inferiority against the Western Culture. In order to escalate the national proud the neo-Ottomanism was formalized in the line with the nationalistic discourse. Through the manipulation of the

²⁷ Translated from “Yavrularımız, geleceğe o tarihin mehabetiyle bakacaklar ve ‘Ben neymişim’ diyecekler, bunu görecekler. Bir aşağılık kompleksi içinde yetişen gençlik istemiyoruz, tam aksine kendine öz güveniyle yetişen bir gençlik istiyoruz. İşte bununla olacak bu” Taken from: Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (2009) Türkiye’nin ilk panoramik müzesi “İstanbul’un Fethi’ni” yeniden yaşatacak (The first panoramic museum of Turkey will revive the the conquest of Istanbul) (Online) Available from: <http://www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/Pages/Haber.aspx?NewsID=17004#.VCr1BkudfFo> (Accessed on 5th May 2015).

public memory concerning the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish identity is being reformulated in the name of neo-Ottomanism.

The Panorama 1453 History Museum revered the Ottoman past by emphasizing the turning points in the Ottoman history. Through the presentation of the glorified Ottoman past, Panorama 1453 History Museum gives voice to the deeds of the AKP cadres and embolden the museum visitors to reconquer the with its realist depiction of the conquest. Not emphasizing the historical facts of the conquest led to the timeless and the spaceless perception of the conquest. Therefore, the museum visitors can easily identify themselves with the event of the conquest.

The battle and consequently Ottoman victory symbolize how Ottoman Empire was superior to the Byzantium in other words to Western Civilizations. The proof of superiority is a tool to dissolve the feeling of inferiority as it is mentioned above in the speech of Erdogan in 2009. Discourse on belonging to the West and the Western values, which especially emerged in the European Union candidacy talks, shifted the access to the Ottoman past by emphasizing the Sunni-Muslim roots. All in all, modernist Kemalist state ideology converted into the neo-Ottoman one with the rule of the AKP government. Relatedly, museum policies reflect the transformed state ideology and Panorama 1453 History Museum illustrates this change substantially.

6. Conclusion

Since the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, those matters concerning culture and the cultural development were handled at the state level. Turkish culture was considered to be as an integral part of the national identity and the history formation in the line with the Kemalist state discourse. Respectively, cultural institutions were under the strict control of the centralized state system. The museum employees were appointed by centralized institutions of the, namely the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Therefore, the museum space, including the exhibition itself was designed in accordance with the state directions.

The aim of controlling culture was to establish a unified Turkish identity. A Westernized and modern Turkish identity was the defining element of the official state. The Western-oriented state policies came together with the denial of the Islamic and conservative past. In doing so, degrading the Ottoman past and the glorification of the pre-Islam Turkish identity constituted one of the few state policies of the young Turkish Republic along side the modernization.

The rule of the AKP government aimed to change the accustomed state policies in the sphere of the culture. Rather than emphasizing the Western and the Turkish elements of the Turkey, AKP government focused on the promotion of the Islamic and Turkish roots together as the essence of the Turkish public. In order to analyze this policy change, this thesis focuses on the museum policies of the Turkish Republic. The case study is the Panorama 1453 History Museum, which was established in the period of the AKP government with the initiations of the AKP cadres.

In order to look into this change the museum policies and the Panorama 1453 History Museum, the thesis started with an introduction, followed by the research questions and the argument developed through those research questions. The argument is through the

method, the literature review, the historical background and the case study parts. The conclusion part summed up all of these parts stated above and turned back to the core of the thesis: the research questions and the arguments.

My research questions mainly focused on how museum policies were changed during the rule of the AKP government. To go into the policy directions more specifically, the museum management was interviewed. Later on in order to investigate the case of the Panorama 1453 History Museum several questions were posed namely, how can the museum politics of the AKP government be seen in the foundation of Panorama 1453 History Museum and how does this museum reinforce the identity of the AKP government? In the line with these questions, the argument is that Museum policies are the reflections of the AKP government in addition to recreate and reproduce the a Turkish-Ottoman identity, under the name of neo-Ottomanism from the beginning of their rule in 2002.

The analysis started with the literature review. The concept of the culture and museums are being unpacked with the sections focusing on the idea of the museum and the historical developments of the museums. Museums were founded in the Western Europe, it is being revealed that, the literature exclusively looked into the Western discourse of the museums. Since the discourse analysis of Foucault and Gramsci set basis for the literature, the literature review focused on the arguments developed through the footsteps of these two scholars. The concept of the “*exhibitionary Complex*” of Tony Bennett illustrates the argument developed from the discourse analysis of Foucault and Gramsci.

After the theoretical parts, the museum history of the Turkish Republic is being explained. In doing so, the section starts with the Ottoman History of museums, because the continuation between the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic is undeniable. Consequently, the development of museums in Turkey is classified in the Ottoman period and the Turkish Republic period. In order to observe the policy changes through the era of the Turkish Republic the museum history part of Turkey is divided in accordance with several pivotal changes. The establishment of the Turkish Republic

until the multi-party system (the years between 1923 and 1950) comes out as the first period. The introduction of the neoliberalism, starting from 1950 constitutes the second essential change in the history of Turkey. Thirdly, the establishment of the Justice and the Development Party (AKP) and its rule since 2002 is a turning point in the museum politics of Turkey. The European Union candidacy of Turkey, the new Turkey concept, earning the title of the European Capital of Culture: Istanbul 2010 and last but not least the promotion of the Neo-Ottoman identity are the sections which are being reviewed in order to expose the changing museum policies of the AKP government.

The young Turkish Republic gave a considerable importance to the cultural establishments, including museums, as the extensions of the realms of the state. Museums are perceived to be the sites where national history and its contemporary modifications should be exhibited. (Greenhalgh 2006, 84) Correspondingly, museum officers, employed by the state, reconfigure the historical materials and the facts in accordance with the aim and target of the state. Therefore, the museum sector and its activities are substantial showcases for displaying the cultural policies of the Turkish Republic.

The changing museum policies are illustrated with the Panorama 1453 History Museum, founded during the rule of the AKP government. In the name of considering the Museum the idea of the re-conquest of Istanbul is being disclosed. The history of the opening up of the museum and its physical observations are being used in order to support the argument and the case study example.

All in all, museum policies changed in accordance with the ideology of the ruling governments. The museums were firstly established in the modernization era of the Ottoman era. The Turkish Republic embarked on developing the museum policies as a continuation of the modernization discourse. Museum policies, implemented after 2002, are considerable reflections of AKP government ideological line of the AKP government in addition to recreate and reproduce an Turkish-Ottoman identity, under the name of neo-Ottomanism from the beginning of their rule in 2002

7. Bibliography

- Anderson, B. R. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Revised and extended. ed.). London, Verso.
- Aksan, V. H. (2005/2006) Ottoman to Turk: Continuity and Change Turkey: Myths and Realities. *International Journal*, 61(1), 19-38.
- Aksoy, A. (2009) "İstanbul's Choice: Openness." *LSE Cities*. (Online) Available from: http://v0.urban.net/publications/newspapers/istanbul/articles/12_AsuAksoy/en_GB/12_AsuAksoy_en.pdf (Accessed on 20th August 2014)
- Alexander, V. D. (1996) Pictures at an Exhibition: Conflicting Pressures in Museums and the Display of Art. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(4), 797-839
- Ahiska, M. (2003) Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102(2-3), 351-379.
- Atasoy, S. (1983) Türkiye'de Müzecilik, In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Altan-Olcay, Ö. (2012) Protest, memory, and the production of 'civilized' citizens: two cases from Turkey and Lebanon. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(2), 135-151.
- Anderson, B. (1992) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. 2th ed. London, Verso.
- Bakbaşı, C. (2010) İstanbul'da Müzeler, Temel Yapısal Özellikler, Fırsat Ve Tehditler, Politika Önerileri, unpublished report, 2010. Available from: http://www.envanter.gov.tr/files/yayin/ISTANBULDA_MUZELER.pdf

(Accessed on 5th May 2015)

Benediktsson, G. (2004) *Museums and tourism Stakeholders, resource and sustainable development*. Master's Dissertation. International Museum Studies Museion, Göteborg University.

Bennett, T. (1995) *Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London and New York, Routledge.

Bennett, T. (1988) The Exhibitionary Complex. *New Formations*, 4, 73-102.

Bennett, T. (2004) *Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism*. London and New York, Routledge.

Bennett, Tony (2005) Civic Laboratories: Museums, Cultural Objecthood and the Governance of the Social, *Cultural Studies*. [Online] 19(5), 521-547. Available from: http://www.uws.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/185863/Bennett_CivicLaboratories_ICSPre-Print_Final.pdf [Accessed 4th May 2015].

Bora, T. (1995) Fatih'in İstanbul'u. (Istanbul of Mehmet the Conquerer) *Birikim Yayınları*, 76, 44-53.

Bourdieu, P. (1983) *Forms of Capital*. Göttingen: Otto Schartz & Co.

Bourdieu, P. and Richard N. (1980) The Production of Belief: Contribution to an economy of symbolic goods. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 261-293. Available from:

<https://blogs.commonsgorgetown.edu/cctp-748spring2013/2013/04/23/google-art-project-and-its-role-in-the-artworld/>

(Accessed on 15 September 2014)

- Chalmers, D. (1977) The Politicized State in Latin America, In Molley, J. (eds.) *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 23-45.
- Crane, S. A. (1997) Producing the Past: Making Histories Inside and Outside the Academy. *History and Theory*, 36(4), 44-63.
- Çaglar, A. (2007) Rescaling cities, cultural diversity and transnationalism: migrants of Mardin and Essen. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1070-1095.
- Çolak, Y. (2006) Ottomanism vs. Kemalism: Collective memory and cultural pluralism in 1990s Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*. 42(4), 587-602.
- Çolak, Y. (2008) Neo Ottomanism, Cultural Diversity and Contemporary Turkish Politics. In Detrez, R. and Segaert, B. (eds.) *Europe and the Historical Legacies in the Balkans*. Brussels, P.I.E. Peter Lang.
- Dagi, Ihsan D (2005) Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization. *Turkish Studies*, 6(1), 1-16.
- Davutoglu, A. (2001) *Strategik Derinlik, Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu* (Strategic Depth, Turkey's International Position). Istanbul, Kure Yayinlari.
- Demircan, H. (2006) 'Sadabad'ın eski günlerine dönüş için geri sayım başladı. *Zaman*. 14 August 2006. Available from: http://www.zaman.com.tr/gundem_sadabad-in-eski-gunlerine-donus-icin-geri-sayim-basladi_329888.html (Accessed on 9th May 2015)
- Dodd, J., Jones, C., Sawyer A. and Tseliou, A. M. (2012) Voices from the Museum: Research Conducted in Europe's National Museums, EuNaMus Report (6), European Commission. *Linköping University Interdisciplinary Studies*, (17) Available from: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:572100/FULLTEXT01.pdf> [Accessed 4th May 2015].

- Duncan, C. (1991) Art museums and the ritual of citizenship. In Karp, I. and Lavine, S.D. (eds.) *Exhibiting cultures: The poetics and politics of museum display*, Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Duncan, C. (1995) *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Duncan, C. (2005) *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. New York: Routledge.
- Ergec, N. E. (2014) To creation discourse by the press: Neo-Ottoman discourse. *European Journal of Research on Social Studies* 1(1), 141-145.
- European Commission (1985) 'Resolution of the Ministers Responsible for Cultural Affairs Concerning the Annual Event 'European City of Culture'. Doc. 7081/84, 4 June, EC Brussels. Available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/GA/TXT/?uri=CELEX:41985X0622> (Accessed on 5th May 2015)
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London, Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1982) The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*. 8(4), 777-795.
- Goldstein, K. (2005) Secular Sublime: Edward Said at the Israel Museum. *Public Culture*, 17(1), 27-53.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. In Hoare, Q. and Smith, G. N. (eds.). New York, International Publishers. Available from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/prison_notebooks/selections.htm [Accessed 4th May 2015].
- Greenhalgh, P. (2006) Education, Entertainment and Politics: Lessons from the Great International Exhibitions. In Vergo, P. (eds.) *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books, pp. 84-108.

- Hall, S. (1980) Thatcherism- a new stage?. *Marxisim Today*, (Online) 26-28. Available from: http://www.amielandmelburn.org.uk/collections/mt/pdf/80_02_26.pdf (Accessed on 5th May 2015)
- Hall, S. (1990) Cultural identity and diaspora in Identity: Community, Culture, difference. In Rutherford J. (eds.) London, Lawrence& Wishart, pp. 223-237.
- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T. W. (2002) *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. In Noerr, G. S. (eds.), Stanford, StanfordUniversity Press.
- Iba, S. (2014) Davudoglu'nun restarasyon söylemi.(The talk of Davudoglu about restoration discourse) Available from: http://www.ozgur Gundem.com/index.php?haberID=118538&haberBaslik=Davutoğlu'nun%20restarasyon%20söylemi&action=haber_detay&module=nuce (Accessed on 19TH February 2015).
- Içduygu, A., Çolak Y. and Soyarik, N. (1999) What is the matter with citizenship? A Turkish debate, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 35(4), 187-208.
- Içduygu, A., Toktas, S. and Soner, B.A. (2008) The politics of population in a nation-building process: emigration of non-Muslims from Turkey, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(2), 358-389.
- International Panorama Council (2011) *Introduction, Statutes*, pp 1-11.
- Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. (2009) *Türkiye'nin ilk panoramik müzesi "İstanbul'un Fethi'ni" yeniden yaşatacak*. (The first panoramic museum of Turkey will revive the the conquest of Istanbul) (Online) Available from: <http://www.ibb.gov.tr/tr TR/Pages/Haber.aspx?NewsID=17004#.VCr1BkudfFo> (Accessed on 5th May 2015)
- Karadag, R. (2010) *Neoliberal Restructuring in Turkey: From State to Oligarchic*

Capitalism. Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies. Cologne, MPIfG Discussion Paper. (Online) Available from: http://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp10-7.pdf (Accessed on 6th May 2015)

Karahan, E.(2010) Panorama 2453 Tarih Müzesi (Panorama 1453 History Museum), *Milliyet*.(Online) Available from: <http://blog.milliyet.com.tr/panorama-1453-tarih-muzesi/Blog/?BlogNo=243113> (Accessed on 5th May 2015).

Katoglu, M. (2009) The Institutionalization of High Art as a Public Service in the Republican Era. In Ada, S. and Ince, H. A. (eds.) *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey*. Istanbul, Bilgi University Press, pp. 27-86.

Karp, I. (1991) *Culture and Representation*. In Karp, I. and Lavines S. D. (eds.) *Exhibiting Cultures the poetics and politics of Museum Display*. Washington and London, Smithsonian Institution Press, pp. 215-251.

Karpat, K.H. (2000) Historical Continuity and Identity Change or How to be Modern Muslim, Ottoman, and Turk, In *Ottoman Past and Today's Turkey*, K.H. Karpat, K. H. (eds.) Leiden, Boston and Köln, Brill, pp. 1-28.

Kechriotis, V. (2011) From Oblivion to Obsession: The Uses of History in Recent Public Debates in Turkey. *Historein*, 11.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998) *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, University of California Press.

Kongar, E. (1986) Turkey's Cultural Transformation. In Renda, G. and Kortepeter, C. M. (eds.), *The Transformation of Turkish Culture, The Atatürk Legacy*, Princeton and New Jersey, The Kingston Press. Inc., pp. 19-68. Available from: http://www.kongar.org/aen_tr.php (Accessed on 5th May 2015)

Konstantios, D., Konstantios, N. and Tsombanoglou, L. (2005). A Manual For Museum Managers. Council of Europe. Available from: [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/Completed/STAGE/DGIV_CULT_STAGE\(2005\)4_EN.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/Completed/STAGE/DGIV_CULT_STAGE(2005)4_EN.pdf). Accessed on 5th May 2015

- Köseman, I. B. (2012) Türkiye’ de Özel Sektörün Kültürü ve Sanat Alanındaki Artan Görünürlüğü, *Marmara Üniversitesi İ.I.B. Dergisi*, 33(2), 145-172.
- Luke, T. (2002) *Museum Politics: Power Plays At the Exhibition*. Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota Press.
- Lyons, C. L. (2002) Objects and Identities: Claiming and Reclaiming the Past. In: *Claiming the Stones/Naming the Bones: Cultural Property and the Negotiation of National and Ethnic identity*. Barkaba, E. and Bush, R. (eds.) Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute. Available from: <http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1265508.files/Week%204/Lyonsarticle.pdf> (Accessed on 5th May 2015)
- Macdonald, S. J. (2003) Museums, National, Postnational and Transcultural Identities. *Museum and Society*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Milliyet (2005) Panorama 1453 müzesi. *Milliyet*, 11th May 2010. (Online) Available from: <http://blog.milliyet.com.tr/panorama-1453-tarih-muzesi/Blog/?BlogNo=243113> (Accessed on 5th May 2015).
- Moulard-Leonard, V. (2008) *Bergson-Deleuze Encounters: Transcendental Experience and the Thought of the Virtual*. New York, Sunny Press. Available from: <http://m.friendfeed-media.com/7f84d73756b56489d450f96b4292b74e88cc82a4> (Accessed on 9th May 2015).
- Museums Association (2008) Code of Ethics for Museums: Ethical Principles for all who Work for or Govern Museums in the UK. (Online) London, Museums Association. Available from: http://www.reading.ac.uk/web/FILES/merl/Museums_Association_ethics_code.pdf (Accessed on 5th May 2015)
- Museum of the Princes’ Islands (2010) *English Content-The Museum*. (Online) Available from: <http://www.adalarmuzesi.org/cms/english> (Accessed 11th February 2015)

- Nora, P. (2002) Reasons for the current upsurge in memory. Eurozin. (Online) Available from: <http://www.eurozine.com/pdf/2002-04-19-nora-en.pdf>. Accessed on 5th May 2015), 1-9.
- Ozan, B. and Unver, C. (2012) Exploring the impact for Istanbul of being a European Capital of Culture Ernst and Young. *Performance*, 4(4), 52-59. <http://performance.ey.com/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/11/Exploring-the-impact.pdf>.
- Önder, M. (1989) Müzeler ve Atatürk. (Museums and Atatürk) Atatürk Araştırma Dergisi, 16(6). Available from: <http://www.anadolumedeniyetlerimuzesi.gov.tr/TR,77766/muzeler-ve-ataturk.html>. (Accessed on 5th Many 2015)
- Önis, Z. (2013) Sharing Power: Turkey's Democratization Challenge in the Age of the AKP Hegemony. *Insight Turkey* 15(2), 103-122.
- Öncü, A. (2007) *The politics of Istanbul's Ottoman heritage in the era of globalism: refractions through the prism of a theme park*. In Drieskens, B. and Mermier, F. and Wimmen, H. (eds), *Cities of the South: Citizenship and Exclusion in the 21st Century*, London, Beirut, Saqi Books, pp. 233-264. Available from: http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/9395/1/Ayse_Oncu.pdf. [Accessed 5th May 2015].
- Örnek, C. and Üngör Ç. (2013) Turkey's Cold War: Global Influences, Local Manifestations. In Örnek, C. and Üngör, Ç. (eds.) *Turkey in the Cold War* [Online] Available at: <http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/doi/10.1057/9781137326690.0001>. (Accessed: 6 February 2015).
- Panorama 1453 Tarih Müzesi. (Panorama 1453 History Museum) *Fiziki Mekan*. (The Space) (Online) available from <http://panoramikmuze.com/panorama1453/fiziki-mekân.aspx>. (Accessed on 5th May 2015)

- Pektaş, A. (2009) Panorama 1453'ün ziyaretçi sayısı Topkapı ve Ayasofya'ya yaklaştı(The Visitor Numbers of Panorama 1453 approaches to the Topkapi and Hagia Sofia Museums).(Online). Available from: http://www.zaman.com.tr/cuma_panorama-1453un-ziyaretci-sayisi-topkapi-ve-ayasofyaya-yaklasti_875525.html (Accessed on 5th May 2015).
- Pratt, M. L. (1992) *Imperial Eyes: Travel and Transculturation*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Rampton, J., McAteer, N. Mozuraityte, N., Levai, M. and Selen A. (2011) Ex-Post Evaluation of 2010 European Capitals of Culture: Final report for the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture. UK, Ecorys Ltd. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/tools/actions/documents/ecoc/ecoc-2010-report_en.pdf (Accessed on 21th May 2014).
- Richards, G. (2000) The European Cultural Capital Event: Strategic Weapon in the Cultural Arms Race?. *Journal of Cultural Policy*, 6(2), 159-181.
- Shaw, W. M. K. (2003) *Possesers and Possessed: Museums, Archeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Berkley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Shaw, W. M. K. (2011) National Museums in the Republic of Turkey: Palimpsests within a Centralized State building National Museums in Europe 1750-2010. In: Peter Aronsson & Gabriella Elgenius (eds) *EuNaMus 2011, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28-30 April 2011*. EuNaMus Report No 1. Linköping, Linköping University Electronic Press http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_home/index.en.aspx?issue=064. [Accessed 4th May 2015].
- Starn, R. (2005) A historian's Brief Guide to New Museum Studies. *American Historical Review*. 110, 65-98.

- Şahin, G. (2007) Avrupalıların Osmanlı Ülkesindeki Eski Eserlerle İlgili İzlenimleri ve Osmanlı Müzeciliği, *AÜ. DTCF. Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26(42), 101-125.
- Terzioğlu, S. (2012) *Visitors of Art Museums: A Comparative Study of the Pera Museum in İstanbul and the Peggy Guggenheim Collection in Venice*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Koc University.
- T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü. (Turkish Republic The Ministry of Culture and Tourism) *Bakanlığımıza Bağlı Müzeler*. (Museums which are connected to our Ministry) (Online) Available from: <http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/TR,43253/bakanligimiza-bagli-muzeler.html> (Accessed on 04th September 2014)
- Urry, John and Jonas Larsen. 2011. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore and Washington DC: SAGE.
- Urry, J. (2002) *The tourist gaze*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Ünay, S. (2006) *Neoliberal Globalization and Institutional Reform: the political economy of development and planning in Turkey*. New York, Nova Science Publishers.
- Varutti, M. (2010) The Politics of Imagining and Forgetting in Chinese Ethnic Minority Museums. *Outlines- Critical Practice Studies*. 2, 69-82, Available from: <http://ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/outlines/article/view/2272/3344>. [Accessed 4th May 2015].
- Walsh, K. (1992) *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Post-modern World*. London, Routledge.
- Weil, S. E. (1995) *A Cabinet of Curiosities: Inquiries into Museums and Their Prospects*. Washington D.C., Smithsonian Books.

- Weil, S. E. (2002) *Making Museums Matter*. London and Washington DC., Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Witcomb, A. (2003) *Re-Imagining the Museum: Beyond the Mausoleum*. London, Routledge.
- WTO Commission (2004) ‘Technical Seminar on Cultural Tourism and Poverty Alleviation’. Available from: http://sdt.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/cambodia_finrep.pdf (Accessed on 15th September 2014)
- Yaman, Z.Y. (1998) 1950’li Yılların Sanatsal Ortamı ve “Temsil” Sorunu. *Toplum ve Bilim* 79, 94-136.
- Yardimci, S. (2007) “Festivalising Difference: Privatisation of Culture and Symbolic Exclusion in Istanbul.” EUI Working Paper. Mediterranean Programme Series. RSCAS 35.
- Yavuz, M.H. (1998) Turkish Identity and Foreign Policy in Flux: The Rise of Neo Ottomanism. *Critique: Middle Eastern Studies*, 7(12), 19-41.
- Yegen, M. (1996) The Turkish State Discourse and the Exclusion of Kurdish Identity. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 32(2).
- Yılmaz, S. (2005) *Visualization of Culture, History and Memory in Turkey: Museum Politics in the Post-1980s*. Master Thesis. Boğaziçi University.
- Yılmaz, S. and Uysal, V. Ş. (2007) „MiniaTurk: Culture, History, and Memory in Turkey in Post-1980s.“ Paper presented at NaMu, Making National Museums Program, Setting the Frames, Norrköping, Sweden, February 26 28, 2007), Available from: http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_article/index.en.aspx?issue=022;article=010 (Accessed on 5th May 2015)
- Zukin, S. (1996) *The Culture of Cities*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Curriculum Vitae

Education

- **University of Vienna** (Summer Semester 2012-Summer Semester 2015)
Vienna, Austria
Master thesis with the theme of „The Museum Politics of the AKP Government: Panorama 1453 History Museum“
- **Bogazici University** (2006-2011)
Istanbul, Turkey
BA in Political Science and International Relations
Ranked in the top 0,29% in the country for Student Selection Exam (ÖSS)
- **University of Salzburg** (2010)
Salzburg, Austria
BA in Political Science Erasmus-Exchange program (obtained the grant of the Erasmus-Exchange program)
- **Cagaloglu Anadolu Lisesi** (2002-2006)
German High School in Istanbul (graduated with Honors)

Work Experience

- **Erguvan Communications**
Bebek, İstanbul, Turkey
Account Executive (October 2015-present)
- **Republic of Turkey Ministry of European Union**
Ankara, Turkey
Internship at the department of Political Affairs (15.08.2011-26.08.2011):
- **TESEV (The Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation)**
Istanbul, Turkey
Internship at Democratization Program (03.03.2011- 03.06.2011)
- **GfK Turkey Market Research Company**
Istanbul, Turkey
Qualitative Research Department Internship (09.08.2010-24.09.2010)
- **Antoni Muntadas ‘In Between/ Arada / Tra’ Exhibition**
Istanbul, Turkey
Volunteer work at the European Cultural Capital Istanbul (20.01.2010-14.02.2010)