

**Transnational Turks, Print Media, and U.S.-Turkish Ties,  
1919-1952**

**by  
Benjamin F.J. Dipple**

B.A., Gustavus Adolphus College, 2016

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

in the  
Department of History  
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

© Benjamin Dipple 2019  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
Summer 2019

Copyright in this work rests with the author. Please ensure that any reproduction or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

# Approval

**Name:** Benjamin F.J. Dipple

**Degree:** Master of Arts

**Title:** Transnational Turks, Print Media, and U.S.-  
Turkish Ties, 1919-1952

**Examining Committee:** **Chair:** Mary-Ellen Kelm  
Professor

Thomas Kuehn  
Senior Supervisor  
Associate Professor

Amal Ghazal  
Supervisor  
Associate Professor

Ilya Vinkovetsky  
Supervisor  
Associate Professor

Pheroze Unwalla  
External Examiner  
Instructor  
History Department  
University of British Columbia

**Date Defended/Approved:** May 22, 2019

## **Abstract**

Between 1919 and 1952 four Ottoman and later Turkish editors, journalists, and public intellectuals named Halide Edib Adivar, Ahmet Emin Yalman, Zekeriya Sertel, and Sabiha Sertel wrote extensively in English and Turkish about the U.S. and new Turkish Republic. Their education at American educational institutions and travel between the two countries allowed them to speak to both Turks and Americans through books and newspaper articles. Previously, information regarding the Ottoman Empire and Turkey came almost solely from American missionaries and Ottoman Armenians and centered on the Armenian Genocide. These figures, however, were able to establish themselves as authoritative voices about the U.S. in Turkey and Turkey in the U.S. I argue that they should be seen as cultural brokers who were able to speak to the inhabitants of both the U.S. and Turkey and strove to influence public opinion in both countries surrounding topics such as national security and democracy.

**Keywords:** Ottoman Empire; Turkey; Transnationalism; Cultural Brokers; Print Media

## Acknowledgements

Throughout the process of writing this thesis I received help and support from a significant number of people whom I'd like to thank here.

I'd like to thank Dr. Thomas Kuehn for all of his support, feedback, and understanding throughout this process. Dr. Kuehn not only provided expertise in late Ottoman and early Turkish Republican history, but also supported me in every way he could throughout these two years.

Dr Amal Ghazal provided me with numerous opportunities both inside and outside of the classroom. Her guidance has helped me to grow as a scholar and prepare me for life after graduation.

Dr. Ilya Vinkovetsky warmly welcomed me to SFU and provided significant guidance and encouragement as I wrote my thesis.

Dr. Pheroze Unwalla's gracious questions and support helped to make my thesis defence a rewarding experience.

Dr. Luke Clossey helped me to grow as a scholar by giving me a space to try out my different ideas and theories without judgement.

Ruth Anderson and Janine-Marie Conrad were always there to provide encouragement, answer questions, and tell interesting stories during these two years.

Dr. Elise Chenier and Dr. Emily O'Brien helped me to prepare for writing my thesis and provided guidance that aided me throughout my two years at SFU.

My friends Aali, Esther, Nick, Gritty, Joseph, Kirsty, Songwei, Jovana, Milena, Ray, Hailey, Kaitlyn, Andrea, Jordan, Lydia, Tanner, Phil, Sean, Quentin, Tye, and AR supported me throughout the program. Ranging from late night walks down the mountain to hanging out in the grad lounge, they provided me with the support, laughter, and optimism to finish this thesis.

My parents, Geoff and Sharon, my brother, Joseph, and sister-in-law, Hillary, supported me unconditionally throughout this process, especially when I was most uncertain. Without their love and support I never could have done this.

My mother-in-law, Nasrin, and father-in-law, Nasir, had faith in me throughout, and their prayers helped me when I needed them most.

Finally, I want to thank my amazing wife, Nishat. From two time zones and over 2,000 kilometers away, she always supported me. Her love and encouragement form the basis of this thesis and allowed me to accomplish what I have in the program.

# Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
<b>Chapter 1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2. ....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Chapter 3. ....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Chapter 4. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>61</b>

# Chapter 1.

## Introduction

Writing in his 1956 memoirs, the prominent Turkish journalist and newspaper editor Ahmet Emin Yalman remarked that during the War of Independence (1919-1922),<sup>1</sup> “the eyes of patriotic Turks turned to America.” Emphasizing U.S. President Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points<sup>2</sup> that contained the provision of self-determination for national groups, Yalman argued in favour of the Turkish Republic maintaining a strong and close relationship with the United States.<sup>3</sup> Although Yalman wrote during the Cold War, long after the War of Independence (1919-1922), he was not alone in his focus on the United States. Other Ottoman and, later, Turkish editors, journalists, novelists, and public intellectuals, such as Halide Edib Adivar, Sabiha Sertel, and Zekeriya Sertel, too, over several decades showed a sustained and profound interest in the political system and the foreign policies of the United States, both in their daily news commentaries and in their more programmatic political writings.

These individuals are notable as they spent a great deal of time in both the United States and Turkey and were educated in American educational institutions. They also

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “Turkish War of Independence” is controversial amongst historians. While this term is often used by members of the Kemalist regime, scholars such as Erik-Jan Zürcher have argued that the independence movement organized by Mustafa Kemal was primarily centered on Ottoman-Muslim nationalism. Additionally, Michael Provence has argued that movements similar to the rebel movements in Anatolia sprouted up in other areas of the Empire, and in fact strove to save the Empire rather than establish new nation-states. Therefore, he uses the term “Anatolian insurgency” rather than Turkish Nationalist Movement. I use the term War of Independence as the Turkish element of the War is controversial, and I will follow Provence’s lead in referring to the Nationalist Movement as the Anatolian insurgency. Erik J. Zürcher, “Young Turks, Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists,” in *Ottoman’s Past and Today’s Present*, ed. Kemal H Karpat (NL: Brill, 2000), 164-166, 173; Erik J. Zürcher, “Fundamentalism as an Exclusionary Device in Kemalist Turkish Nationalism,” in *Identity Politics in Central Asia and the Muslim World*, ed. W Van Schendel (UK: I.B. Taurus, 2001), 209; Michael Provence, *The Last Ottoman Generation and the Making of the Modern Middle East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 110-112.

<sup>2</sup> President Woodrow Wilson announced the Fourteen Points in front of the U.S. Congress in January 1918. Wilson argued that these points should guide the peace process, and their central theme was self-determination for nations. Most important here is the Twelfth Point which promised self-determination both to the Turkish elements of the Ottoman Empire as well as non-Turkish groups. Seçil Karal Akgün, “Louis E. Browne and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress,” in *Studies in Atatürk’s Turkey: The American Dimension*, ed. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden Brill, 2009), 17.

<sup>3</sup> Ahmed Emin Yalman, *Turkey in my Time* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956), 71.

wrote in English and Turkish for American and Turkish audiences. In this thesis, I argue that these figures should be understood as cultural brokers who broke the hold of American missionaries and Ottoman Armenians on information regarding the Ottoman Empire and later Turkey in the U.S. while simultaneously serving as some of the most influential sources of information regarding the United States in Turkey. I understand these figures as cultural brokers in the same vein as E. Natalie Rothman, who has described cultural brokers as those with experience in two worlds to the degree that they can speak to the inhabitants of both.<sup>4</sup> These figures primarily tried to influence audiences in both countries surrounding issues such as national security and democracy. For Yalman and Adıvar, the U.S. represented a key ally against the imperial designs of Western Powers as well as the Soviet Union. The Sertels presented more complicated views, at times criticizing the United States as another imperialist power, while at others looking to the United States to help protect democratic states during World War II. Furthermore, the United States represented a key democratic power they looked to at times as a model for the Turkish Republic as well as a foil against which they could criticize the Turkish government for its democratic shortcomings. Through this thesis, I aim to show that these non-state actors<sup>5</sup> played key roles in trying to influence public opinion and popular understandings of these two countries during the formative period of their relationship.

During World War I, the United States and Ottoman Empire severed diplomatic relations in 1917 and Americans held overwhelmingly negative views of Ottoman Muslims, in large part due to the Armenian Genocide in 1915-1916.<sup>6</sup> The end of the War produced political dynamics that led to the War of Independence and the proclamation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 out of the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. Despite severing relations in 1917, the emerging Turkish republican government sought closer relations

---

<sup>4</sup> E. Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects Between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 248.

<sup>5</sup> By non-state actors, I mean that these figures did not hold official government positions while they were writing. They all held connections to government officials in both countries and took part in key events, such as the War of Independence, but they did not hold official government positions while publishing their papers and journals.

<sup>6</sup> George S. Harris, "Repairing Turkish-American Relations After the First World War: Ahmet Muhtar in Washington," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, ed. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 145, 147, 156-157.

with the United States as the United States was not considered to hold imperialistic ambitions.<sup>7</sup> Historians, however, have not looked beyond the actions of the Turkish and American governments and their diplomatic representatives in their understandings of U.S.-Turkish relations from this period onward.

The Turkish public intellectuals I study played a key role in trying to shape public opinion in both countries through their memoirs, books, and articles discussing the United States and Turkey. In particular, they focused on mutual national security threats to both countries, such as the Soviet Union, as well as democratic developments in Turkey. They disagreed greatly on many political issues, as Yalman and Adıvar represented a more liberal wing of the Turkish nationalists, while James Ryan has described the Sertels as social democrats whose views moved further to the left during the later years of this period.<sup>8</sup> These differences were manifested in their works, as the Sertels at times criticized the United States and the broader capitalist system, whereas Yalman and Adıvar were more supportive. Despite these differences, all of them viewed the United States as a key power in the Eastern Mediterranean and world more generally. Through their works, they all emphasized the precariousness of Turkey's newfound sovereignty. This led them to emphasize Turkey's value as a regional national security boon to the United States, and, at least in the case of Adıvar and Yalman, to turn to the United States as a source to maintain Turkish sovereignty. In the context of the growing threat from Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, the Sertels likewise emphasized Turkey's position as a regional asset to the United States during World War II. Additionally, to their Turkish readers they at times discussed aspects of the United States, such as

---

<sup>7</sup> Nur Bilge Criss has shown that Turkish Republican leaders were quite sensitive about the fact that Western countries were not appointing ambassadors or ministers to Turkey in the early years of the Republic. This included American High Commissioner Mark Bristol who was questioned frequently why he did not take on the title of minister. I contend that the Turkish government's concern stemmed from a desire to obtain formal recognition from Western countries as sovereign equals during a period when outside powers doubted whether the new Republic would survive. Nur Bilge Criss, "Shades of Diplomatic Recognition: American Encounters with Turkey (1923-1937)," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, ed. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 101, 110-112; Akgün, "Louis E. Browne and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress," 39-41.

<sup>8</sup> James D. Ryan, "The Republic of Others: Opponents of Kemalism in Turkey's Single Party Era, 1919-1950" (PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2017), 25, 100.



freedom of the press, as a model for the new Turkish Republic, while emphasizing the Westernizing efforts of the Turkish government to an American audience.<sup>9</sup>

To an important degree these efforts were meant to protect the newly created Turkish state against the encroachment of European imperial powers, such as Britain, France, Russia, Italy, and the Soviet Union and thus to maintain Turkish national sovereignty that had been won at tremendous costs through the War of Independence and the diplomatic efforts around the Treaty of Lausanne (1923). In large measure, it was the experience of growing up during the final years of the Empire that informed these objectives. However, the United States represented more than solely a possible ally or protective power in certain circumstances. Even though the Sertels viewed the United States as pursuing imperialist policies to a degree, all of them commended the United States for key elements of its political system, especially freedom of the press, democracy, and some level of political transparency. On some level these values represented a model of sorts for the new Turkish Republic. However, perhaps more significantly, these values and the United States served as a foil against which they could criticize the Turkish government for its democratic shortcomings.

### **Historiography**

The work of these four key transnational Ottoman and later Turkish figures remains largely unstudied, particularly as it relates to the United States.<sup>10</sup> In addition to the notion of cultural brokers defined by E. Natalie Rothman, the editors of *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*, Simon Schaffer, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo have defined “go-betweens” thus: “The go-between in this sense is thus not just a passer-by or a simple agent of cross-cultural diffusion, but

---

<sup>9</sup> Halide Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib* (New York: The Century Co., 1928), 6; Yalman, *Turkey in my Time*, 225.

<sup>10</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman and Sabiha Sertel were both Dönme, or Jewish people who had converted to Islam following Rabbi Shabbatai Tzevi, who claimed to be the Messiah in 1666. The Dönme were endogamous for much of their history and developed their own religious traditions and customs. They were largely considered Muslims under the Ottoman Empire but became more closely scrutinized with the Turkish nationalist project after the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Yalman and Sertel faced considerable criticism and racism due to their Dönme background. However, their background does not seem to have influenced their views of the United States or had much influence in their articles, so I have not discussed it much in this paper. Marc David Baer’s work represents the most significant work on this community, including some sections on Yalman and Sabiha Sertel. His work, however, does not look at their broader political views vis-à-vis the United States. Marc David Baer, *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 1-4, 12-15, 20, 121-123.

someone who articulates relationships between disparate worlds or cultures by being able to translate between them.”<sup>11</sup> Due to their considerable experiences in both countries, I argue that these figures served as cultural brokers between the United States and Turkey, and I hope to shed light on their role in changing perceptions in both the United States and Turkey. It is important to note, however, that I do not consider this status as cultural brokers to mean that they solely presented positive views of the United States in Turkey and vice-versa. Rather, I consider that they are cultural brokers in that they could speak to the inhabitants of both countries, including criticizing the two countries. It is undoubtedly difficult to ascertain the level of influence on public opinion. However, these figures received invitations to speak at important public forums, were frequently quoted in the American press, received favorable reviews of their books, and in the case of Adivar, one of her books was sent to the American ambassador to Turkey. I consider these factors signs of some influence and prominence in American discussions of Turkey and Turkish discussions of the United States.<sup>12</sup>

Writing numerous books over a period of almost six decades (from 1914 until 1972), Ahmet Emin Yalman published the prominent newspaper *Vatan (Homeland)* from 1922-1926 and again from 1940-1961, which was the second largest newspaper in Turkey. Yalman would likewise work with the Sertels at *Tan (Dawn)* from 1936 until 1938 when he left the paper due to disagreements with them.<sup>13</sup> He met with Turkey’s first president Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on multiple occasions, and Atatürk found Yalman’s publications important enough to intervene in order to stop a public feud between Yalman

---

<sup>11</sup> Simon Schaffer, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo, “Introduction,” in *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*, eds. Simon Schaffer, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo (Sagamore Beach, MA: Watson Publishing International LLC., 2009), xiv.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph C. Grew, *Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of Forty Years 1904-1945, Vol. 2*, eds. Walter Johnson and Nancy Harvison Hooker (Cambridge, Mass: The Riverside Press, 1952), 792-793; Clarence K. Streit, “Halide Hanum Recites the Epic of Turkey’s Revival: Her Second Volume of Memoirs Tells How the Kemalists Won Against Enormous Odds,” *New York Times (1923-Current File)* October 14, 1928. Accessed October 13, 2018; “‘New Turkey’ Seen As a Peace Factor: A Fertile Breeding Ground of War Has Been Wiped Out, Educator There Writes.” *New York Times (1923-Current File)* November 23, 1930. Accessed October 13, 2018; “Politics Institute Calls A Feminist: Mme. Halide Edib Hanum of Turkey First of Sex Invited to be a Speaker,” *New York Times (1923-Current File)*. May 28, 1928. Accessed September 29, 2018; “Turkish Editor on Visit Here Praises Choice of Marshall,” *The Milwaukee Journal*, January 26, 1947, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 1, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>13</sup> “An Experiment in Clean Journalism: The Life Story of the Turkish Daily *Vatan*,” 6, 1950, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 7, Hoover Institution Archives; Ahmet Emin Yalman, “Milestones from my life,” 1, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 9, Hoover Institution Archives; Baer, *The Dönme*, 221, 224-227.

and Yunus Nadi, the editor of the newspaper *Cumhuriyet (Republic)*, then and now widely considered Turkey's daily newspaper of record.<sup>14</sup> Yalman was also mentioned in various Western newspapers, including receiving the first Golden Pen of Freedom Award after his arrest for criticizing Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes in 1960.<sup>15</sup> He also attended Columbia where he studied history, sociology, and journalism.<sup>16</sup>

Likewise, Halide Edib Adivar established herself as a well-published feminist, political activist, educator, poet, and novelist during the final years of the Ottoman Empire and early years of the Republic. She also received an American education as the first Muslim woman to graduate from the American College for Girls in Istanbul in 1901.<sup>17</sup> She attracted significant attention as an Ottoman and later Turkish feminist, including one American journalist for the *New York Times* referring to her as an "honor to her sex and race." Additionally, she was considered to be one of Turkey's most notable novelists during this period under study.<sup>18</sup>

Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel left the Ottoman Empire in 1919 to study at Columbia University in New York where Sabiha studied social work and Zekeriya studied journalism. They returned to Turkey after the end of the War of Independence in 1923.<sup>19</sup> Their publications *Resimli Ay (Illustrated Month)* and *Tan* were quite popular, particularly on the left, and they were considered important enough as journalists to be suspended by the Turkish government on multiple occasions. Sabiha was even banned from writing from 1941 until 1944 due to her critiques of fascism at a time when the Turkish government sought to maintain relations with Nazi Germany as part of its policy of neutrality for most of World War II. Additionally, the Sertels, particularly Sabiha,

---

<sup>14</sup> Baer, *The Dönme*, 120, 158, 223.

<sup>15</sup> "Turkish Editor Hailed: Gets 'Golden Pen of Freedom' From World Publishers' Unit," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. May 29, 1961. Accessed March 10, 2019; "Turkey Frees Ill Journalist," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. April 16, 1960. Accessed March 10, 2019.

<sup>16</sup> "12 Foreign Newsmen to Get U.S. Awards," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)* May 8, 1960. Accessed November 8, 2017; Yalman, *Turkey in my Time*, 4, 34-36;

<sup>17</sup> Perin Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization: A Cultural History of America in Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), 55; Halide Edib, *Memoirs of Halide Edib* (1926; Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1972), 206.

<sup>18</sup> P.W. Wilson, "Halide Edib's Career an Honor to Her Sex and Race: She Has Reconciled the Christian Ideal of Womanhood With the Virile Turkish Social System." *The New York Times (1923-Current File)* June 6, 1926. Accessed November 8, 2017; Halide Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib* (New York: The Century Co., 1928), 143.

<sup>19</sup> A. Holly Shissler, "'If You Ask Me': Sabiha Sertel's Advice Column, Gender Equity, and Social Engineering in the Early Turkish Republic," *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 3, no. 2 (2007): 6.

were the most critical of the United States. In 1945, both Sabiha and Zekeriya were put under house arrest and eventually tried for making false accusations against members of parliament in 1946, because of their critiques of the government. They were ultimately found guilty but won on appeal and left Turkey in self-imposed exile to Soviet Azerbaijan in 1950.<sup>20</sup> Clearly these figures possessed different levels of notoriety, but they all maintained influential roles in discussions about the United States and Turkey in their respective presses. Sabiha in particular was rarely mentioned in American news reports, but as a co-editor of *Tan*, which was frequently quoted, I consider her contributions to English language discussions of *Tan's* articles of equal importance to Zekeriya's.

My work is largely indebted to James H. Meyer and his work on Russian Muslims who travelled between the Russian and Ottoman Empires between 1856 and 1914. In his work, *Turks Across Empires: Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914*, he follows the lives of prominent Muslim activists and intellectuals from Russia who spent considerable time in the Ottoman Empire. These figures worked in the Turkic-language journal, *Türk Yurdu*, established in Istanbul after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908, which led to the creation of lodges called Turkic Hearths (*Türk Ocakları*). These Turkic Hearths became the sites of conferences surrounding the issues of Turkism and pan-Turkism.<sup>21</sup> He argues that these figures were “trans-imperial” in that they lived between the two empires and they were deeply involved in revolutionary activities and sought tangible change.<sup>22</sup>

While Meyer's work differs from mine both geographically and temporally, I find his discussion of activists across borders and “trans-imperial people” helpful in contextualizing the figures in my thesis. He defines these “trans-imperial people” as,

---

<sup>20</sup> Gavin D. Brockett, *How Happy to Call Oneself a Turk: Provincial Newspapers and the Negotiation of a Muslim National Identity* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 158, 177; Baer, *The Dönme*, 237-238; Ryan, “The Republic of Others,” 254-261, 274

<sup>21</sup> Pan-Turkish is often understood as a political goal to unite Turkic peoples of the world under a single political entity. Meyer, however, studies the “pan-Turkists before pan-Turkism” by showing that pan-Turkism did not develop seamlessly, but was rather developed in different stages by the people he studies in reaction to different political and changes in the Ottoman Empire and Russia. He also differentiates that Turkists were primarily concerned with the Ottoman Empire and Ottoman cultures, whereas pan-Turkists placed their emphasis on Russia. James H. Meyer, *Turks Across Empires: Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 3-5, 9, 13, 158-161.

<sup>22</sup> Meyer, *Turks Across Empires*, 9-13.

“those people who lived *between* the two states. This could mean spending a significant amount of time in both empires, possessing dual subjecthood, or simply traveling across the imperial frontier.”<sup>23</sup> While I am dealing with the period of nation-building and Turkish nationalism, I consider my figures to be transnational in a similar vein. None of my figures possessed dual-citizenship, but all of them travelled across national borders and spent considerable time in the United States and Turkey. My work, however, differs in that I seek to show the influence of my figures on the broader public opinion of both countries, rather than solely the Muslim or Turkic populations.

In addition to Meyer’s work on Russian Turkic-Muslims travelling between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire, historians have done some work on Ottoman subjects and their activities in the Americas. For instance, Kemal Karpat published his article “The Ottoman Emigration to America, 1860-1914,” in 1985. Karpat places the emigration of Ottoman Syrians into the broader emigration of Ottomans to the Americas. In particular, he analyzes this phenomenon through Ottoman governmental correspondence and examines the Ottoman government’s response to this emigration, including disputes with the United States over naturalization laws.<sup>24</sup> Additionally, Akram Fouad Khater has discussed the notion of transformation from a peasant past to middle class modernity for Lebanese migrants who returned to Lebanon from the Americas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He argues that the return of migrants from the Americas helped to stimulate discussions of modernity and the nation in this part of the Ottoman Empire before World War I, discussions that largely centered on gender and family.<sup>25</sup> More recently, historian Stacy Fahrentold’s PhD dissertation sheds new light on migrant communities from Ottoman Syria and Lebanon in the Americas. Fahrentold argues that Syrian and Lebanese journalists and activists in the diaspora created new transnational public spaces, such as “the press, philanthropic organizations, political committees, ethnic clubs, and mutual aid societies.” These public spaces helped give rise to nationalist discourses and definitions of Syrian and Lebanese nationalism.

---

<sup>23</sup> Meyer, *Turks Across Empires*, 9-10.

<sup>24</sup> Kemal Karpat, “The Ottoman Emigration to America, 1860-1914,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 17, no. 2 (1985): 175-176, 179, 189-190.

<sup>25</sup> Akram Fouad Khater, *Inventing Home: Emigration, Gender, and the Middle Class in Lebanon, 1870-1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 6-8, 15.

Diaspora activists and literati, Fahrentold shows, played an important role in shaping the Lebanese and Syrian nationalist movements on both sides of the Atlantic in the aftermath of World War I.<sup>26</sup>

David Gutman has also written about the efforts of the Ottoman State to stop Armenian subjects from leaving the Empire from 1888-1908. The Ottoman Government feared that Armenians who travelled to North America would aid revolutionary Armenian organizations in the Empire and could potentially return as revolutionary agents with American citizenship. These fears led to efforts by the central government to limit Armenian migration; these included restrictions on domestic travel within the Empire by making internal passports mandatory.<sup>27</sup> The work of these historians, although not focused on Turks in the United States, provides a framework of other transnational studies of Ottoman subjects abroad as well as governmental reactions to emigration.

Closer to the period at the center of this thesis, Biray Kolluoğlu-Kirli and Erik Jan Zürcher have discussed the ways in which policymakers in the early Turkish Republic adapted governmental practices from the Soviet Union and Fascist Italy for different aspects of Kemalist nation-building. In this connection, Kolluoğlu-Kirli has shown that municipal officials in Izmir, Turkey's second port city after Istanbul, took inspiration from Gorky Park in Moscow when constructing the Kültürpark in the early 1930s as part of their efforts to remake the city's urban space in ways that would further the objective of creating a modern Turkish nation.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Vahram Ter-Matevosyan has argued that Soviet politicians, journalists, and diplomats sought to understand Kemalist Turkey and initially viewed it rather favourably due to their common struggle against European powers. However, this perspective gave way to a more critical one, as Turkey followed a more "Western model of development" and became more tolerant of pan-

---

<sup>26</sup> Stacy Fahrentold, "Making Nations, in the Mahjar: Syrian and Lebanese Long-Distance Nationalisms in New York City, Sao Paulo, and Buenos Aires, 1913-1929" (PhD., Northeastern University, 2014), 12-13.

<sup>27</sup> David Gutman, "Armenian Migration to North America, State Power, and Local Politics in the Late Ottoman Empire," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 1 (2014): 177, 180-182, 187.

<sup>28</sup> Biray Kolluoğlu-Kirli, "The Play of Memory, Counter-Memory: Building Izmir on Smyrna's Ashes," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 26 (2002): 17-18.

Turkic rhetoric in the late 1920s, and ultimately began to move away from the Soviet Union in the 1930s.<sup>29</sup>

Zürcher has shown that the extreme nationalism, racist rhetoric, and personality cult of Fascist Italy heavily influenced Kemalist Turkey as the Turkish government copied many of its laws, although there were also many differences between the two regimes.<sup>30</sup> All of these scholars share a focus on states other than the United States while also all focusing solely on the ways in which these states influenced or tried to understand Turkey. I plan to fill this historiographical gap by elaborating upon the relationship between the United States and Turkey in this period. More significantly, I aim to show that this influence was not solely one-directional and that these key Turkish figures also sought to influence public opinion in the United States and interacted and pushed back against American views of Turkey. In so doing, I go beyond a still influential scholarly approach to studying Turkey in a world-historical that is heavily indebted to modernization theory in that it tends to consider the “impact” of Western ideas and practices on Turkish politics, society, and culture.

Much of the scholarly work on U.S.-Turkish relations has focused on the period beginning with Turkey’s accession to NATO in 1952. This period marks a growing importance in the relationship between the two countries as it is indicative of Turkey’s move towards the United States in the post-World War II era and the Cold War alliance between the two states. This important moment in 1952 will mark the end of my study. Instead, I will focus on the three decades before 1952 to examine the ways in which non-state actors tried to influence public opinion between the two states during this formative period in their relationship. Research on this earlier, formative period of the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s has focused primarily on the role of state actors, such as politicians and diplomats, in building the U.S.-Turkish relationship. Nur Bilge Criss and George S. Harris in particular have demonstrated convincingly the importance of individual American and Turkish diplomats in deepening relations between the two countries from the period before official diplomatic relations were restored in 1927 until after World War II. Significantly, Harris has also shown that Turkey’s first ambassador in the U.S.,

---

<sup>29</sup> Vahram Ter-Matevosyan, “Kemalism and Communism: From Cooperation to Complication,” *Turkish Studies* 16, no. 4 (2015): 510-515, 518-519.

<sup>30</sup> Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 186.

Ahmet Muhtar, undertook a concerted effort to improve Turkey's public image in the United States and received help from the *Washington Post*, which often published articles favorable to him and Turkey.<sup>31</sup>

Virtually the only work on cultural connections between Republican Turkey and the U.S. during this period is Perin Gürel's monograph *The Limits of Westernization*. In it, she argues that the United States served as a symbol for discussions of "westernization" in Turkey during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These discussions played out in the local context and included discussions of the "West" as a positive force in connection with efforts at building a modern, sovereign nation, but also a possible source of decay. The United States tried to look at Turkey within certain "civilizational templates" and tried to paint Turkey as an "intermediary example of successful, pro-American modernization." However, many educated Turks interacted with these views and came up with alternate conceptions, at times accusing different political opponents and elites as being either over-westernized or under-westernized. Additionally, the use of humor in the Turkish context regarding westernization and the United States has often challenged ruling conceptions of westernization.<sup>32</sup> I build on Gürel's work by showcasing the work of cultural brokers in the interactions between the two countries while also focusing on the three decades before the beginning of the Cold War.

I also place my works within the scholarly literature on the Turkish press. Seçil Karal Akgün has written one of the primary works on journalists from this period, focusing on American journalist Louis E. Browne's visit to the Sivas Congress in 1919 and how his work marked one of the first positive representations of the Anatolian insurgency to an international audience.<sup>33</sup> Gavin D. Brockett has elucidated the role played by the provincial press in Turkey after World War II in creating a more grassroots national culture as opposed to the more elite nationalism under Atatürk. He shows that journalists in this period began to emphasize the importance of Turkey to the world, especially in the face of Bolshevism and the Soviet Union. I build on Brockett's work by arguing that certain transnational figures, including journalists and editors, began to assert

---

<sup>31</sup> Criss, "Shades of Diplomatic Recognition," 98-101; Harris, "Repairing Turkish-American Relations After the First World War," 145, 147, 156-157.

<sup>32</sup> Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization*, 2-4, 7, 10-12.

<sup>33</sup> Seçil Karal Akgün, "Louis E. Browne and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress," 15, 54.



the importance of Turkey in blocking the Soviet advance as early as 25 years before this period.<sup>34</sup> Additionally, James D. Ryan's work on opposition to the Kemalist regime has shown the important and contentious nature of the press during the Single Party Era from 1919 to 1950, including the 1945 *Tan* riot when the Sertels' press was destroyed by an ultra-nationalist mob.<sup>35</sup> I add to these works by showcasing the transnational nature of Turkish journalists and editors and their role in influencing relations between the U.S. and Turkey.

### **Methodology**

My work draws on the newspaper and journal articles<sup>36</sup>, books, and letters of Halide Edib Adıvar, Ahmet Emin Yalman, Zekeriya Sertel, and Sabiha Sertel. As journalists and writers, they authored memoirs and other works throughout the period from 1919 to 1952 and beyond both in Turkish and English. I focus on the period from 1919 until 1952 as these years mark the formative years of U.S.-Turkish relations. 1919 marks the beginning of the War of Independence and coordination of rebel movements in the Ottoman Empire under Mustafa Kemal, while 1952 marks Turkey's accession to NATO and the beginning of a formal U.S.-Turkish alliance that lasted throughout the Cold War. Through my work, I aim to restore agency to these non-state, transnational Turks and show their importance in shaping public opinion and ties in each country.

As I will utilize in part memoirs published after the events they are describing, the interpretation of these sources has to be approached with caution. First and foremost, the memories of these figures have very likely been influenced by time and subsequent events, significantly impacting their views of various events and people from the early years of the Republic. While this is a rather important limitation, it is at the centre of my reasoning for using these sources. I am not concerned solely with what happened to these figures, but rather how they remembered it and have portrayed it to both Turkish and

---

<sup>34</sup> Brockett, *How Happy to Call Oneself a Turk*, 1-2, 145-146.

<sup>35</sup> Ryan, "The Republic of Others," 1-4, 25-26.

<sup>36</sup> Gavin Brockett has discussed that determining the circulation of Turkish newspapers from this period is incredibly difficult as no official records were kept. However, we know the *Tan* was likely the most prominent voice on the left and *Vatan* had the second largest publication at least during World War II. Brockett has also discussed that after 1945, large Istanbul dailies had circulations around 100,000, which likely would have included *Vatan*. Gavin D. Brockett, "Provincial Newspapers as a Historical Source: *Büyük Cihad* and the Great Struggle for the Turkish Nation (1951-53)," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 41, no. 3 (2009): 441, 443-444.

American audiences. Additionally, *Hatırladıklarım*, *Roman Gibi*, and *Turkey in my Time* were published after the end of my study in 1952. I will still utilize these sources even though they were published later to shed light on the involvement of my figures in the United States and how their views changed over time. As they are published after this period ended, I will not use them as pieces that influenced public opinion. Last, since I am covering a rather wide time period, I focus on key events, such as the War of Independence, Atatürk's death in 1938, and U.S. involvement in World War II. While this focus on specific events limits my thesis, it is necessary given space constraints.

My thesis contains two chapters. In chapter two, I elucidate how these figures gained a voice in both the American and Turkish public sphere. Prior to their efforts, information regarding the Ottoman Empire in the United States came almost solely from Ottoman Armenians and American missionaries. I argue that in large part due to their American education and efforts through newspapers and books, they broke this hold and enabled educated Turks to speak directly to an American audience. Additionally, they at times utilized their connections to the U.S. to take on a more prominent voice regarding the U.S. in Turkey. In chapter 3 I analyse the content of their writings. I argue that their work focused largely on issues of national security and democracy. As they had experienced the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and European imperial conquest, they held serious concerns regarding the sovereignty of the Turkish Republic and often emphasized the value of the United States and Turkey to each other surrounding this issue, particularly in the lead up to and during World War II. However, I will go beyond this discussion and show that while they were often critical of the United States on a number of issues, they also at times portrayed the United States as a model for Turkey. Of equal importance, they often used the United States as an example to criticize the Turkish government when they viewed it as behaving in a non-democratic fashion. Ultimately, my thesis brings out the agency of non-state, cultural brokers such as these Turkish figures. Displaying this agency simultaneously shows the importance of the formative years of the U.S.-Turkish relationship while also elucidating how important non-state actors are in these ties, an unexplored aspect of this important relationship.

## Chapter 2.

On November 26, 1922, a rather remarkable article appeared in the *New York Times*. Written at the end of the War of Independence (1919-1922) and during a period when American views of Turks were characterized by the stereotype of the “terrible Turk,”<sup>37</sup> this article praised Turkish feminist and novelist Halide Edib [Adivar] as “Turkey’s Fiery ‘Joan of Arc.’” This article went on to state “This is the woman that American education gave to Turkey. We are proud of her, but as she is the child of American education in the Near East, the Americans are as much entitled to this pride as we are.”<sup>38</sup> As suggested by the use of the pronoun “we,” this article was not written by an American, but instead M. Zekeriya [Sertel], like Halide Edib, a subject of the late Ottoman Empire to which Europeans and North Americans often referred as “Turkey.” M. Zekeriya and his wife Sabiha Sertel were both studying at Columbia University in New York during the War of Independence. Along with the Sertels and Adivar, Ahmet Emin Yalman was also educated at American institutions, studying sociology, economics, history, and journalism.<sup>39</sup> He received his PhD from Columbia in 1914 after writing his PhD dissertation on the role of the press in making a constitutional Ottoman Empire.<sup>40</sup> Due to their experiences in both countries, these figures were in unique positions as journalists, novelists, and public intellectuals to try to influence public relations between these two countries.

These efforts began in the early 1920s when most information regarding the Ottoman Empire came either from American missionaries working with Armenians or

---

<sup>37</sup> George S. Harris, “Repairing Turkish-American Relations after the First World War: Ahmet Muhtar in Washington,” in *Studies in Atatürk’s Turkey: The American Dimension*, eds. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 146-147.

<sup>38</sup> M. Zekeria, “Turkey’s Fiery ‘Joan of Arc’; Her Double Role as Leader: Pen and Gun Her Weapons,” *The New York Times* (1857-1922). November 26, 1922. Accessed September 28, 2018.

<sup>39</sup> A. Holly Shissler, “‘If You Ask Me’: Sabiha Sertel’s Advice Column, Gender Equity, and Social Engineering in the Early Turkish Republic,” *Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies* 3, no. 2 (2007): 6; Ahmet Emin Yalman, “Milestones from my life,” 1, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 9, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>40</sup> Ahmed Emin Yalman, *The Development of Turkey as Measured by Its Press* (1914; Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1968), 16.

from Armenians themselves and was colored by the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1916.<sup>41</sup> The Armenian Genocide began in 1915 and saw between 600,000 and 800,000 Armenians killed in a systematic genocide by the Ottoman government through deportations and mass executions. As American missionaries worked primarily with Ottoman Armenians, they became key witnesses to these atrocities.<sup>42</sup> As a result, Ottoman Muslims and later Turks had virtually no voice in the American press. In this chapter, I show that the figures here under study played a key role in enabling Turks to speak to the American public through publishing books in English and establishing a presence in the American press. Their status as former students of American institutions played a key role in this development.

While Ahmet Emin Yalman was quoted a few times in American newspapers before World War I, this process gradually grew in the 1920s but became more prominent in the 1930s and 1940s. During this period, the relationship between the two countries deepened, including some small arms sales during the 1930s, growing trade in the late 1930s, American customs experts helping Turkey recover from the Great Depression, and the growing view within the U.S. government that Turkey held a key geopolitical place during World War II.<sup>43</sup> Additionally, they also established themselves as prominent voices in the newly emerging Turkish Republic. As journalists, editors, and novelists, they were able to gain influence in the public sphere through their popular publications despite facing considerable obstacles in the form of racism, censorship, and even exile. They also used this position and their experiences in the U.S. to take on prominent roles in discussing the U.S. within Turkey.

---

<sup>41</sup> Çağrı Erhan, "Main Trends in Ottoman-American Relations," in *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present, and Future*, eds. Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 17-18.

<sup>42</sup> There is a great deal of controversy surrounding the Armenian Genocide, in large part due to the Turkish government's continual denials that a genocide took place. Additionally, there is a significant disagreement over numbers. I have chosen to use the range 600,000-800,000 as this is the number used by Erik Zürcher. Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 115; Roger R. Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971), 9-12; Peter Balakian, *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003), xvi.

<sup>43</sup> Harris, "Repairing Turkish-American Relations after the First World War," 169-170; George S. Harris, "Cementing Turkish-American Relations: The Ambassadorship of (Mehmet) Münir Ertegün (1934-1944)," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, eds. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 185-186, 194; Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939*, 108.

## **American Missionaries, The Treaty of Lausanne, and the “terrible Turk”**

As these figures under study sought to establish a presence in the American public sphere, their biggest obstacle was the monopoly that American missionaries and Ottoman Armenians held on information regarding the Ottoman Empire. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, American protestant missionaries organized under groups such as the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) represented one of the most significant American interests in the Ottoman Empire. American missionaries had been active in the Ottoman Empire since 1819 and represented such an important interest in the Empire that key missionaries, James Burton and Cleveland Dodge convinced President Woodrow Wilson not to pursue war against the Ottomans during World War I as it would hinder future missionary interests. These missionaries oversaw a number of different efforts, particularly in the field of education where they established numerous schools in the Empire, including Robert College, which is now Boğaziçi University, as well as the American College for Girls, both in Istanbul.<sup>44</sup>

By the beginning of World War I in 1914, the (ABCFM) oversaw 174 missionaries, 17 mission stations, 9 hospitals, “and either operated directly or supervised 426 schools with twenty-five thousand pupils” in the areas of the Ottoman Empire that would come to constitute the Turkish Republic.<sup>45</sup> As missionaries were forbidden from proselytizing to Muslims, much of their efforts were directed towards local non-Muslim communities, such as Ottoman Armenians.<sup>46</sup> As a result of this focus on Armenians, missionaries became key witnesses of the massacres from 1894-1896 and the 1915-1916 Armenian Genocide. Their reports regarding the treatment of Armenians had a profound

---

<sup>44</sup> Ussama Makdisi, *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 2-3, 91; Karine V. Walther, *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 1, 273, 280; Seçil Karal Akgün, “Louis E. Bryant and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress,” in *Studies in Atatürk’s Turkey: The American Dimension*, eds. Nur Bilge Criss and George S. Harris (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 28.

<sup>45</sup> Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939*, 9-12.

<sup>46</sup> Selim Deringil has argued that conversion became an increasingly controversial subject during the nineteenth century. He argues that as religion became intertwined with national identity, conversion came to be seen as de-nationalization. By this he means “the loss of a soul and a body from an increasingly ‘nationally imagined’ community.” Additionally, Deringil has shown that the Ottoman government closely monitored American missionaries, as they viewed missionaries as undermining the legitimacy of the Ottoman state, by using religious influence for political purposes and potentially stimulating separatist tendencies amongst minorities. Selim Deringil, *Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1-5; Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999), 114, 125.

impact on Americans who took part in massive fundraising efforts for Ottoman Armenians and others in need of relief in the Ottoman Empire during and immediately after the war.<sup>47</sup> Between 1915 and 1926 the relief organization Near East Relief raised over \$110 million and at its peak fed over 300,000 people daily in the eastern Mediterranean.<sup>48</sup> Due to these connections, missionaries served as the main sources of information on the Ottoman Empire in the United States before, during, and after World War I.

As a result, press coverage during the War of Independence was decidedly against the rebel movement led by Mustafa Kemal. After World War I, numerous “Defense of Rights” movements had sprung up in Anatolia and ultimately coalesced under the leadership of Kemal in 1919 after the Greek occupation of Izmir. This movement was galvanized by the Treaty of Sèvres between the Entente and remaining Ottoman Empire. The treaty would have divided the Ottoman Empire between France, Greece, Italy, Armenia, and a prospective independent Kurdish state, leaving only a small Ottoman rump state in central Anatolia. The resulting Turkish Independence War between the nationalist forces and the Greek military ended in 1922 with the defeat of the Greek military in western Anatolia, the exile of the last Sultan Mehmed VI Vahidettin (1918-1922), and the re-occupation of Istanbul by nationalist forces.<sup>49</sup> It was first and foremost this military victory that allowed the nationalist leadership around Mustafa Kemal to re-negotiate the Treaty of Sèvres.

The result of these efforts was the Treaty of Lausanne signed in 1923 that established a sovereign Turkish state in Anatolia and eastern Thrace with internationally recognized boundaries. The United States were not signatories of the Treaty of Lausanne as they had never declared war on the Ottoman Empire. However, the U.S. and Turkish Republic did sign their own separate Treaty of Lausanne designed to restore diplomatic and commercial relations in 1923, which had been severed after the U.S. joined the war against Germany in 1917. Although the atmosphere in the press had become somewhat more favorable towards Turkey in the aftermath of the declaration of the Republic in

---

<sup>47</sup> Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, xvi.

<sup>48</sup> Keith David Watenpaugh, *Bread From Stones: The Middle East and the Making of Modern Humanitarianism* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2015), 92, 97-98.

<sup>49</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 155-156, 160, 162, 166.

1923, there still remained considerable opposition, particularly amongst Democratic Party senators who purportedly opposed the treaty primarily for domestic political reasons.<sup>50</sup>

As a result, the Treaty of Lausanne signed between the U.S. and Turkey was not introduced for ratification by the U.S. Senate until 1924. Due to opposition from Democratic Senators, the Treaty was not ratified by the Senate. Regardless, the Coolidge Administration was able to exchange diplomatic notes with the Turkish government to restore diplomatic relations shortly after despite the Senate rejection of the Treaty. The debate surrounding the Treaty aroused fierce debate in the United States with different news sources taking opposing sides. Many Armenian-Americans, religious figures, including 110 Episcopal bishops, and primarily Democratic Senators in the U.S. fiercely fought against the Treaty, whereas American businessmen in Turkey and in fact many missionaries publicly supported it, as they thought the Treaty was necessary to preserve their own vested interests in the country.<sup>51</sup>

A significant factor in this opposition was a belief that the United States needed to support Christians, in particular Armenians. Yet, the political climate had clearly changed considerably, as a number of public figures, including scholar Edward Meade Earle, and organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce supported the Turkish position.<sup>52</sup> However, information regarding the Treaty still came almost exclusively from Americans. Additionally, significant opposition remained: according to Perin Gürel, “The first sociological test for ‘nationality preferences’ conducted in the United States in 1928 found ‘Turk’ to be the most disliked group after ‘Negro.’”<sup>53</sup> It was within the context of this stereotype of the “terrible Turk” and a virtual monopoly on information about the Ottoman Empire and Turkey by American missionaries that Halide Edib Adıvar, the Sertels, and Ahmet Emin Yalman strove to influence the American public discourse on Turkey.

### **Gaining A Voice in the American Press**

---

<sup>50</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey*, 147-150, 152-156, 160-161; Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform*, 27-28, 30-32, 34-39, 44.

<sup>51</sup> John Vander Lippe, “The ‘Other’ Treaty of Lausanne: The American Public and Official Debate on Turkish-American Relations,” *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations* 23 (1993): 49-59.

<sup>52</sup> Vander Lippe, “The ‘Other’ Treaty of Lausanne,” 53, 57.

<sup>53</sup> Perin Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization: A Cultural History of America in Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), 35-36.

During the final years of the Ottoman Empire, Ottoman Muslims were on very few occasions able to make their voices heard in the American public sphere. However, these efforts were few and far between and usually consisted of published letters to the editors of newspapers, such as the *New York Times*. Prior to World War I, Ahmet Emin Yalman, then a correspondent for the Istanbul daily newspaper *İkdam* and journalism student at Columbia University was featured in several articles. In 1913, he travelled to Kansas City and was interviewed about the impacts of the Balkan Wars on the Ottoman Empire by the *Kansas City Star*. In his discussion of the Empire, he argued that the loss of European territory had made the Empire a nation and that newspapers had a role to play in the creation of this nation. As a result, he had come to America as Ottoman Muslims looked “upon the United States as a model of individual liberty.” Additionally, he drew attention to the position of Halide Edib stating that, “the woman’s movement is as much discussed in Constantinople now as the war. The most striking individuality produced by the revolution is a woman, Halide, a writer.”<sup>54</sup> He was also mentioned in articles from the *St. Louis Dispatch* on July 27, 1913, in which he again discussed the push for women’s rights in the Ottoman Empire and discussed Halide Edib [Adivar]: “Halide Hanoum... is unquestionably the most eminent of the leaders of the movement... She is a leader not only of the women’s movement, but of the Turkish national movement [sic], which has for its object the adaptation, rather than the imitation, of Western ways.” He went on to emphasize that she was the first Turkish graduate of the American College for Girls in Istanbul.<sup>55</sup>

Around the same time, he responded to an editorial in the *St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat* in which he took issue with a previous editorial that had criticized the Ottoman Empire:

Having gained much love and respect for American people during my stay in this country, it is very sad to me to have to face these questions. My only consolation is that I found people here always ready to modify their ideas about Turkey [sic] as soon as they get the facts. So I hope the *Globe-*

---

<sup>54</sup> “War Made Turks A Nation: Ahmed Emin Bey, Here on a Visit, Says Loss Was A Gain,” *Kansas City Star*, July 17, 1913, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 6, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>55</sup> Carlos F. Hurd, “Turkish Women Ask Right of Courtship: They Discuss Reforms Sought at Matinees,” *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, July 27, 1913, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 17, Hoover Institution Archives.



*Democrat* will treat us in future not as a pack of wrong-doers, but a misunderstood and misrepresented nation...<sup>56</sup>

All of these articles were published within a week, and seem to stem from Yalman's visit to several Midwestern newspapers on his way back to New York from a conference in Colorado.<sup>57</sup> In these pieces, Yalman's desire to influence public perceptions of Ottoman Muslims comes through in his discussion of key issues, such as women's rights and views of the Turks as a nation. Additionally, the emphasis placed on his status as a student at an American university can be seen as a key factor in allowing him to speak to the American public through the local press.

However, this desire to change perceptions was severely curtailed by an overall lack of an Ottoman Muslim presence in the American press, particularly during World War I. Thomas C. Leonard has argued that Ottoman Muslims were able to present their point of view in the American press during World War I, but this was rather minimal. Aside from a few editorials from a figure known as Mufty-Zade Zia Bey and some denials of the atrocities committed against Ottoman Armenians from Ottoman officials, Ottoman Muslim voices are absent.<sup>58</sup> This is not surprising as the CUP-dominated Ottoman central government and their local allies were engaged in a genocide against Ottoman Armenians, an event that was covered extensively in the United States primarily from reports of relief workers and missionaries. The *New York Times* on average wrote a story about the genocide of Armenians every 2.5 days during 1915, clearly a key contributor to the remarkable achievement of American relief organizations raising over \$110 million between 1915-1926.<sup>59</sup> This lack of Ottoman Muslim and later Turkish voices continued after World War I and throughout the War of Independence.

Perhaps unsurprisingly given the discussions by M. Zekeriya Sertel in his 1922 article and Yalman in his articles from 1913, Halide Edib [Adivar] received the greatest deal of attention amongst the figures that I discuss here as cultural brokers. These positive

---

<sup>56</sup> Ahmed Emin, "Cites Hindrances to Turk Progress: Crescent Followers' Efforts to Develop Underrated, Ahmed Emin Says," *St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat*, July 22, 1913, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 17, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>57</sup> Carlos F. Hurd, "Turkish Women Ask Right of Courtship: They Discuss Reforms at Matinees," *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, July 27, 1913, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 17, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>58</sup> Thomas C. Leonard, "When News Is Not Enough: American Media and Armenian Deaths, in *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, ed. Jay Winter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 301.

<sup>59</sup> Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, xvi-xix, 80-82; Watenpaugh, *Bread From Stones*, 92, 97-98.

portrayals were not just produced by Turkish observers, though. Adıvar was discussed in numerous instances in the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*. In fact, M. Zekeriya Sertel was not the first to refer to her as the “Turkish Joan of Arc” as the *Washington Post* referred to her as the “Turkish Joan” in an article from March 1920.<sup>60</sup> These discussions and portrayals of Adıvar continued throughout the 1920s. While Adıvar did not write any of these articles, she was frequently interviewed and took part in speaking engagements in the United States. For example, she was the first woman to speak at the Institute of Politics in Williamstown, Massachusetts.<sup>61</sup> In the reporting of the event, Adıvar was frequently quoted and presented as an expert on the new Turkish Republic.<sup>62</sup> In contrast to previous articles that had reported *about* her, she was now often quoted at length and given a platform to speak about Turkey alongside missionaries.<sup>63</sup> This notion that finally Turks were being able to speak for themselves through Halide Edib Adıvar was even discussed by journalist Clair Price from the *New York Times*. Price attributed this to Turks being tongue-tied, stating “no European race has been more widely written about and talked about by foreigners.” She contrasted this, however, with the situation of Adıvar who was “a Turk who can write and talk and this in the United States... whose name is known wherever Turkish is read.”<sup>64</sup>

These articles appeared at a time when certain newspapers began to publish articles that presented Turkey in a more positive light. The *Washington Post*, for example, published numerous favorable articles about Turkey’s first ambassador to the United States, Ahmet Muhtar, who took up his post in Washington D.C. in 1928.<sup>65</sup> Despite the more favorable coverage of the Turkish government and Halide Edib [Adıvar], the American public and press rarely heard from Turkish figures from outside the government. The desire to reach an American audience and present their own view of

---

<sup>60</sup> “Turkish Joan is Exiled: Halide Edib, Woman Who Defied Allies, in Deported Party,” *Washington Post* (1877-1922). March 21, 1920. Accessed September 29, 2018.

<sup>61</sup> “Politics Institute Calls A Feminist: Mme. Halide Edib Hanum of Turkey First of Sex Invited to be a Speaker,” *New York Times* (1923-Current File). May 28, 1928. Accessed September 29, 2018.

<sup>62</sup> Russel B. Porter, “New Turkey Lauded at Williamstown: Republic a Force for Peace, Declares Mme. Edib, Who Fought in Nationalist Army,” *New York Times* (1923-Current File). August 4, 1928. Accessed September 29, 2018.

<sup>63</sup> Zekeria, “Turkey’s Fiery ‘Joan of Arc.’”; Porter, “New Turkey Lauded at Williamstown.”

<sup>64</sup> Clair Price, “A Woman Speaks For the New Turkey: Halide Edib Hanum Comes to America as a Striking Symbol of the Changed Life of the Near East,” *New York Times* (1923-Current File). July 29, 1928. Accessed September 29, 2018.

<sup>65</sup> Harris, “Repairing Turkish-American Relations After the First World War,” 156-157.

the new Turkey likely influenced the decision of our public intellectuals to turn to books in the late 1920s and 1930s to spread their views.

The most prolific writers of English language books during the 1920s and early 1930s were Halide Edib Adıvar and Ahmet Emin Yalman. Adıvar published one of her most famous works *Ateşten Gömlek* in Turkish in 1922 and translated it herself to be republished in English in 1924 as *The Shirt of Flame* as well as two volumes of memoirs published in 1926 and 1928 respectively. This was followed in 1930 by another work titled *Turkey Faces West*. During the same period, Yalman, on the other hand, only published one book with Yale University Press titled *Turkey in the World War* (1930). These books were published for a number of reasons and often discussed the United States and Turkey within the context of national security and democracy, topics which I will explore further in chapter three of this thesis. Of equal importance to these key topics, these works can be seen primarily as an attempt to gain a voice in the Western world and, in some cases, Turkey.

Philipp Wirtz has argued that in the case of the late Ottoman Empire and early Turkish Republic, more or less prominent individuals often wrote autobiographies in order to intervene in debates about different aspects of Ottoman history. These debates also often had key political, economic, and cultural implications for the Turkish Republic. Their autobiographies were attempts by different figures to break the monopoly of the Turkish state on its origins. As the Turkish state sought to present one image of the War of Independence, establishment of the Turkish Republic, and subsequent developments in Turkey, these figures sought to push back against this narrative.<sup>66</sup> In particular, Hülya Adak demonstrates that along with the works of other figures from the War of Independence who had been pushed out of the governing circles, including Kazım Karabekir, Halide Edib Adıvar's 1928 memoirs, *The Turkish Ordeal*, was an attempt to contest the view Turkey's first president Mustafa Kemal Atatürk had outlined in his famous six-day 1927 speech known as *Nutuk*. This speech laid down the official view of the War of Independence and its aftermath. Importantly, it criticized Halide Edib Adıvar as a traitor for purportedly favouring an American mandate over Turkey at the expense of

---

<sup>66</sup> Philipp Wirtz, *Depicting the Late Ottoman Empire in Turkish Autobiographies: Images of a Past World* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 2, 11.

Turkish independence. As Adıvar and her husband Adnan had left Turkey in self-imposed exile in 1925, not to return until 1939, a year after Atatürk's death, Adak shows that Adıvar used her memoirs as an effort to subvert the narrative propagated in *Nutuk*. However, her memoirs were not published in Turkish until 1962, albeit in an abridged form, leaving solely her English version aimed at a Western audience.<sup>67</sup>

The prefaces and introductions of these books showcase the attempts by these figures to reach a Western audience. In Adıvar's *Turkey Faces West*, the preface was written by Edward Mead Earle, a scholar at Columbia University who had supported Turkey in the debate over the Treaty of Lausanne.<sup>68</sup> Earle argued that Turks had been treated unfairly in the United States and had not been allowed to speak for themselves. In particular, he criticized the source of information regarding Turkey: "The principal witnesses for the prosecution have been missionaries and relief workers, politicians under the spell of the Gladstonian tradition, Armenian and Greek refugees and immigrants, and others whose impartiality and knowledge of the whole truth have left much to be desired." He contrasts this with Adıvar's book in which she "attempts... to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in frank and unashamed defense of her countrymen."<sup>69</sup>

Yalman's work, on the other hand, was seemingly aimed at a more academic audience, as it was published by Yale University Press. It is noteworthy that his book appeared as a part of a series by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which strove to explain the impact of World War I on all the countries involved. As many archival sources were not yet available, the organization turned to individuals with the requisite experience to explain the situation of these countries to a broader audience. It was in this context that the Carnegie Endowment asked Yalman to represent Turkey.<sup>70</sup> As was the case with many of the newspaper articles discussing these figures, their education at American institutions often played a key role in affording them the role of speaking for Turkey.<sup>71</sup> However, as was discussed earlier with the first sociological test taken on "nationality preferences" in 1928 showing Turks as the least favorably viewed nationality

---

<sup>67</sup> Hülya Adak, "National Myths and Self-Narrations: Mustafa Kemal's *Nutuk* and Halide Edib's *Memoirs and the Turkish Ordeal*," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (2003): 509-512.

<sup>68</sup> Vander Lippe, "The 'Other' Treaty of Lausanne," 53.

<sup>69</sup> Halide Edib Adıvar, *Turkey Faces West* (1930; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1973), ix-x.

<sup>70</sup> Ahmet Emin, *Turkey in the World War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), v-x.

<sup>71</sup> Adıvar, *Turkey Faces West*, x-xi.

in the United States, only ranked above the category “Negro,” their efforts did not immediately translate into different views of Turks among larger segments of U.S. society, something of which they seem to have been acutely aware.<sup>72</sup>

As a key aspect of their efforts to change public opinion, Yalman and Adivar specifically focused on the educational and purported separatist efforts of U.S. missionaries and Ottoman Armenians. They were generally hesitant to directly criticize American missionary schools, likely due to Adivar’s education in the Constantinople Woman’s College, but they did target other missionary efforts. In addition to Edward Mead Earle’s criticism of missionaries in the preface to Adivar’s *Turkey Faces West*, Yalman in particular criticized American missionaries for bringing about a “collective existence” amongst Armenians and described Russia as the main power behind the Armenians. In other words, he alleged that these missionaries had helped further Armenian separatist nationalism. He likewise referred to non-Turkish members of society as “conscious or unconscious tools of foreign designs for the dismemberment of Turkey.”<sup>73</sup> Neither Yalman nor Adivar denied that massacres of Armenians had taken place. However, they argued that the information presented about these massacres was exaggerated, used to turn opinion against the Turks, and neglected purported massacres by Armenians against Muslims.<sup>74</sup> In her memoirs, Adivar likewise discusses massacres by Greeks against Turks during the late Ottoman period as well as during the War of Independence.<sup>75</sup> Adivar perhaps had a more vested interest in downplaying atrocities committed against Armenians as Keith David Watenpaugh has shown that she briefly helped run an orphanage north of Beirut during World War I in which she tried to “Turkify” Armenian and Kurdish children. Watenpaugh compares her efforts to those of North American residential schools for indigenous peoples.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization*, 35-36.

<sup>73</sup> Yalman seems to be suggesting a sort of ethnic definition when discussing Turks and non-Turks here. He not only accuses Armenians of having the backing of foreign powers, but also Kurds, Arabs, and Albanians. He seems to suggest Armenians had the backing of Russia, which caused the biggest problems, but he argues that other minority groups, including Muslims groups, also had very little interest in maintaining the integrity of the Empire. Emin, *Turkey in the World War*, 36-37, 188-189.

<sup>74</sup> Emin, *Turkey in the World War*, 217-223; Adivar, *Turkey Faces West*, 142.

<sup>75</sup> Adivar, *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib* (New York: The Century Co., 1928), 8, 299-300, 308.

<sup>76</sup> Watenpaugh, *Bread From Stones*, 119-120, 144-147.

As the testimonies of Armenians, Greeks, and missionaries had been the principal sources of information about the Ottoman Empire, Yalman and Adivar clearly believed that they needed to counter these previous accounts in order to gain a voice in the American public sphere. While it is difficult to say exactly how influential their books were, Adivar's *The Turkish Ordeal* and Yalman's *Turkey in the World War* were both favorably reviewed by the *New York Times*.<sup>77</sup> Perhaps more significantly, Joseph C. Grew, the first American ambassador to Turkey from 1927-1931, read *The Turkish Ordeal* which was sent to him by diplomat Howland Shaw shortly before it was published in 1928. Grew referred to it as "excellent publicity for the Nationalist cause and their heroic deeds, painting the crimes of the British, Armenians and Greeks in most lurid colors." Further, he argued that it "might have a useful effect on American public opinion if it obtains any wide sale."<sup>78</sup> The fact that Grew received the book from another prominent diplomat before it was published suggests that *The Turkish Ordeal* was well-known to officials dealing with Turkey. While he was hopeful that it would have a significant impact if it sold well, his concern with sales highlights the possibly more limited reach of these works. They represent a new phase of the efforts of the figures here under study to bring their views to the attention of Americans, but it would not be until the late 1930s and early 1940s that they were able to address an audience of readers in the United States more directly through the American press.

In both the United States and Turkey, very few articles and books seem to have been published by these figures about the two countries during the 1930s. It is not clear to me why that was the case, but there are a few possible reasons. First, the early 1920s were characterized by the War of Independence, the establishment of the Turkish Republic, and resulting debates about the direction it should take. In this connection, the United States was sometimes discussed as a possible model for the new Turkey or in other cases as a potential ally. Moreover, controversies over the ratification of the Treaty

---

<sup>77</sup> Clarence K. Streit, "Halide Hanum Recites the Epic of Turkey's Revival: Her Second Volume of Memoirs Tells How the Kemalists Won Against Enormous Odds," *New York Times (1923-Current File)* October 14, 1928. Accessed October 13, 2018; "'New Turkey' Seen As a Peace Factor: A Fertile Breeding Ground of War Has Been Wiped Out, Educator There Writes." *New York Times (1923-Current File)* November 23, 1930. Accessed October 13, 2018.

<sup>78</sup> Joseph C. Grew, *Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of Forty Years 1904-1945, Vol. 2*, eds. Walter Johnson and Nancy Harvison Hooker (Cambridge, Mass: The Riverside Press, 1952), 792-793.

of Lausanne in 1927 and the subsequent re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Turkey were prominent features of debates, particularly in the United States, which likely spurred them to reach out to an American audience. Finally, by turning Turkey officially into a one-party state in 1931, the Kemalist regime concluded a process of consolidation that had started with the passing of the Law on the Maintenance of Order in 1925.<sup>79</sup> Atatürk's death in 1938 and concerns regarding the rise of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy may have played a role in the resumption of discussions regarding the relationship between the U.S. and Turkey. Significantly, it is from early 1939 onwards that we come across the most significant instances of Turks speaking directly to the American public through the American press.

The realization that the Kemalist one-party state did not fall apart after the death of its founder but was there to stay, and the slowly deepening relationship between the two states around issues such as national security that Nur Bilge Criss and George S. Harris have documented likely played a role in the renewed interest in Turkey among U.S. policymakers and the American public. In particular, Harris has shown that the Roosevelt administration began to see Turkey as an important ally in the context of their efforts at blocking the Axis powers from expanding their influence in the Middle East during World War II.<sup>80</sup> Within this context the American press began to turn towards key Turkish editors and newspapers to understand the political and economic realities not only of Turkey but of the Eastern Mediterranean more generally. At the centre of these discussions were the left-wing newspaper *Tan* edited by Zekeriya and Sabiha Sertel and the daily newspaper *Vatan* owned and edited by Ahmet Emin Yalman. As with the earlier pieces on Halide Edib Adıvar, these articles in the American press almost always mentioned the American education of Zekeriya Sertel and Ahmet Emin Yalman in establishing their credentials.

The late 1930s and early 1940s thus mark the period when educated Turks begin to truly have a voice in the American press. Many of these articles centred on the issue of

---

<sup>79</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 176.

<sup>80</sup> Nur Bilge Criss, "Shades of Diplomatic Recognition: American Encounters with Turkey (1923-1937)," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, eds. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 97-99; Harris, "Repairing Turkish-American Relations After the First World War," 145-147; Harris, "Cementing Turkish-American Relations, 177, 194.

national security and the broader political situation in the Eastern Mediterranean. This included the *New York Times* turning to articles from Zekeriya Sertel and his newspaper *Tan* for information on the Balkans, with Sertel arguing that Hitler had told Mussolini to pull his army out of Albania.<sup>81</sup> The American press also began to take note of editorials in these papers. Quoting both *Tan* and *Vatan*, the *New York Times* ran a story in 1940 discussing Yalman and an editorial in *Tan* urging the United States to join World War II.<sup>82</sup> By 1942, the British government stepped up its efforts at drawing Turkey into the alliance against Germany, Italy, and Japan. However, as Selim Deringil has demonstrated, under Turkish President İsmet İnönü, Turkey remained committed to staying neutral for virtually the entire war.<sup>83</sup> It was in this context that U.S. newspapers turned to our authors to understand the political climate in Turkey. In October 1942, the *New York Times* spoke with Yalman, Sertel, and three other Turkish editors who were visiting the United States at the invitation of the American government, who informed the *Times* that Turks were strongly pro-Ally. As with previous publications, the article emphasized the American education that Yalman and Sertel received, thus signalling that these particular ties to the U.S. had made the two journalists principal interlocutors of the *New York Times*.<sup>84</sup>

This statement claiming that Turks were pro-Ally is rather surprising given that during this period many pan-Turanists in Turkey openly supported Nazi Germany – a support that was amply reflected in numerous pan-Turanist publications. James Ryan has elucidated these connections showing that many of these writers likely had connections to the German ambassador in Turkey, Franz von Papen, and received Nazi propaganda materials.<sup>85</sup> Furthermore, both Yalman and Sabiha Sertel, who belonged to the Sabbatean community (then referred to as *dönme*), were viciously attacked in the press by Nazi

---

<sup>81</sup> G.E.R. Gedye, “Hitler Said to Ask End of Greek War: Withdrawal From Albania Is Urged on Mussolini, Says Istanbul Newspaper,” *New York Times (1923-Current File)*. December 19, 1940. Accessed October 24, 2018.

<sup>82</sup> “Turks Suggest U.S. Part in War: Entry, Without Sending Troops to Europe, Proposed by Istanbul Editor,” *New York Times (1923-Current File)*. December 23, 1940. Accessed October 24, 2018.

<sup>83</sup> Selim Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An ‘Active Neutrality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 4-5, 133-135, 141-142.

<sup>84</sup> “Turks Said to Lean to United Nations: But They Will Defend Country Against ‘Any Aggressor,’ Visitors Here Assert,” *New York Times (1923-Current File)*. October 1, 1942. Accessed October 24, 2018; Ahmed Emin Yalman, *Turkey in my Time* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956), 190.

<sup>85</sup> James D. Ryan, “The Republic of Others: Opponents of Kemalism in Turkey’s Single Party Era, 1919-1950” (PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2017), 115.



sympathizers due to their purportedly Jewish background.<sup>86</sup> Their claims that Turks were pro-Ally and their support for U.S. involvement in the war point to their own pro-Ally views. Additionally, they indicate that these figures hoped to present a positive image of Turkey to the American press. This is not to say that they never criticized the Turkish government, but they strove to influence the relationship between the two countries to what they viewed as a favorable conclusion.

These articles were not confined to the period of World War II. Indeed, Yalman gradually took on an even more prominent position in the American press, as Turkey joined NATO as the Cold War between the United States, the Soviet Union, and their respective allies intensified from the late 1940s onwards. The Sertels largely disappear from the stage after World War II due to political persecution by the Turkish state, which will be discussed in the next section. Their prevalence before and during World War II, however, marks an important point in the political and cultural connections between the U.S. and Turkey. While these figures were at times discussed in the American press and wrote their own books during the 1920s, they were not generally able to speak for themselves. In a climate dominated by American missionary and Armenian narratives of the late Ottoman Empire, the American public rarely heard from Turkish journalists. This period marks the point where these figures broke the hold of missionaries and Armenians on information regarding the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. In so doing, they not only gave educated Turks an opportunity to address a U.S. audience directly in the American press, but they also became key sources of information about Turkey for readers in the United States. No longer did they need to write editorials in the American press, but the American press began to draw on and translate their Turkish editorials about Turkey, the Middle East, and the Balkans. Their efforts generally tried to deepen cultural connections and relations between the U.S. and Turkey, by focusing on possible connections, such as democracy and national security. These efforts were not confined to their efforts in English but can also be seen in their Turkish works.

---

<sup>86</sup> Marc David Baer, *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 235-239.

## **Gaining A Voice in Turkey**

Adıvar, the Sertels, and Yalman faced rather different circumstances in their efforts to gain a voice in the emerging Turkish Republic. While they did not have to fight against an established cultural narrative in order to gain a voice, they did face at times significant pressure from the Turkish government, including having their newspapers suspended, legal prosecution, and in the case of Halide Edib Adıvar and the Sertels, ultimately facing exile from Turkey. Not having to confront an established negative view of the United States meant that they did not have to emphasize their connections to the United States quite as clearly as they did in their efforts to influence American public opinion. They did, however, play to their travels in the United States at key points. These efforts set them up as important figures in the Turkish media landscape and as individuals with significant connections to the United States.

As in the case of their efforts in the United States, Halide Edib Adıvar took part in some of the first efforts to bring about governmental connections between the United States and Turkey. In the face of European encroachment after the Treaty of Sèvres in 1919, Adıvar helped to establish a Wilsonian League in Istanbul and even wrote letters to both President Woodrow Wilson and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk trying to convince the U.S. to take the mandate over Turkey. Adıvar and many other Ottoman Muslims believed that asking the United States to take a mandate over the Ottoman Empire was the only way to stave off European imperialism. They hoped that United States would appoint an “advisor-in-chief” for fifteen to twenty-five years and further develop industry and education, amongst other subjects.<sup>87</sup> This was different from the conception of mandates held by the Western powers who envisioned more direct control. This ultimately resulted in the rebel groups under Mustafa Kemal opposing any form of mandate. As a part of these efforts Adıvar championed Wilson’s Twelfth Point, which called for self-determination in the Ottoman Empire and arranged for American journalist Louise Browne to visit the rebel movement under Mustafa Kemal to publish favorable coverage in the United States.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization*, 19-21; Akgün, “Louis E. Bryant and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress,” 28.

<sup>88</sup> Akgün, “Louis E. Bryant and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress,” 21-26, 40-43.

As Adıvar was a novelist, she did not write articles trying to shape the relationship between the two countries. Instead she wrote numerous novels during this period, including the aforementioned *Ateşten Gömlek*. Unfortunately for Adıvar, the Sertels, and Yalman, their efforts to gain a significant voice in the Turkish public sphere were curtailed on some level in 1925. In February 1925, a largely Kurdish revolt known as the Sheikh Sait Rebellion erupted in southeastern Turkey. This revolt was partially inspired by Kurdish nationalism as well as more religiously-inspired elements, such as a desire to restore the caliphate which had been abolished in 1924. The revolt was crushed by the Turkish military, but Atatürk did not stop there. He used the revolt and a supposed plot to assassinate him implicating members of the first Turkish opposition party, the Progressive Republican Party (*Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*), to crack down on dissent. The Turkish government quickly passed the Law on the Maintenance of Order, which allowed them to close down organizations considered a “disturbance to law and order,” while also setting up two special courts, the so-called Independence Tribunals (*İstiklal Mahkemeleri*). In addition to closing down the Progressive Republican Party, the government also targeted the press.<sup>89</sup>

While, Halide Edib Adıvar and her husband Adnan Adıvar had supported the Anatolian insurgency and Atatürk during the War of Independence, they represented a more liberal ideological viewpoint and supported the Progressive Republican Party. After the Progressive Republican Party was closed in 1925, Adıvar and her husband left Turkey in self-imposed exile in the United Kingdom, only returning in 1939, a year after Atatürk’s death. It was within this context that she wrote her autobiography *The Turkish Ordeal* in English and Turkish with the goal of challenging the hegemonic narrative espoused by Atatürk regarding the War of Independence, but the Turkish version was not published until 1962. Further, despite remaining a famous novelist, none of her works were published between 1927-1935.<sup>90</sup> Perin Gürel and Hülya Adak have shown that Adıvar was characterized as a traitor by Atatürk due to her support for the American mandate. Despite the purportedly liberating efforts aimed at women under the early Republican government, Adıvar was often criticized for being “overly-westernized,”

---

<sup>89</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 168-174.

<sup>90</sup> Adak, “National Myths and Self-Na(rra)tions,” 510-512, 524.

which was frequently connected to tropes regarding her gender with criticism of her doing “men’s work.” This has included portrayals of her as not sufficiently nationalistic and as “a creature with the passions of the male and female.” These portrayals were aimed at de-legitimizing Adıvar as a key figure during the War of Independence due to her disagreements with Atatürk.<sup>91</sup>

This crackdown likewise targeted the Sertels and Yalman. During the early 1920s, the Sertels published a number of smaller publications. Most prominent among these were the popular magazines *Resimli Ay (Illustrated Month)* published monthly from 1924-1931 and *Resimli Hafta (Illustrated Week)*, which was published weekly. A. Holly Shissler has described the Sertels as “essentially friendly voices that sought to ‘push the envelope.’” The Sertels largely supported Kemalist modernization efforts, but also wanted to further women’s rights, push for greater democratization, and have serious debates regarding class. In the aftermath of the Independence Tribunals, Zekeriya was sentenced to eighteen months of internal exile. During this period, Sabiha edited *Resimli Ay* on her own. Shissler has shown that during this period she did not publish many provocative articles, but instead used her advice column known as *Cici Anne* to further critical debate on discussions of gender and society while avoiding government censorship.<sup>92</sup> However, Sabiha suffered her own political and legal persecution. After 1927 she became more vocal in her advocacy of women’s rights and in 1929 translated an American article about leadership. This article was ultimately seen as criticism of Atatürk, and she was sentenced to one month in jail in 1930. She became so controversial at this time that when Zekeriya formed the newspaper *Son Posta* in 1931, his partners would not allow Sabiha to write for the publication. She was only able to resume writing in 1934 when they formed what was arguably their most famous publication, *Tan*.<sup>93</sup>

The Sertels attracted a significant audience through *Tan*, representing likely the most influential voice on the Turkish left during the 1930s and early 1940s. Through *Tan* they often tried to push the government towards many of the same causes they championed with *Resimli Ay*.<sup>94</sup> During World War II for example, *Tan* was closed four

---

<sup>91</sup> Adak, “National Myths and Self-Na(rra)tions,” 511; Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization*, 51.

<sup>92</sup> Shissler, ““If You Ask Me,”” 2-3, 7-9, 17-20.

<sup>93</sup> Shissler, ““If You Ask Me,”” 19-20, 25.

<sup>94</sup> Ryan, “Republic of Others,” 60-62, 66, 154.

times by the government and three times by martial law authorities which amounted to a total period of two months and thirteen days.<sup>95</sup> In the intensely ideologically polarized debates that characterized Turkish history during and after World War II, the Sertels came to be associated with the Soviet Union and communism in the Turkish press. Furthermore, Adnan Menderes, who helped found the first successful opposition party, the Democrat Party in 1946, openly asked Zekeriya if he was a communist. This came to a head on December 4, 1945, when a mob of possibly thousands of students and Turkish ultra-nationalists destroyed the *Tan* publishing house. Rather than punishing those responsible for the riot, the government cracked down on the left, trying the Sertels for making false accusations against members of parliament. In the aftermath of their trials and destruction of their publishing house, the Sertels would ultimately leave Turkey for exile in Soviet Azerbaijan in 1950, ending their print media career in Turkey. Sabiha would go on to write her memoirs *Roman Gibi* and would die from cancer in 1968, while Zekeriya would publish his memoirs in 1977.<sup>96</sup>

Ahmet Emin Yalman likewise faced serious opposition from the government, but unlike the Sertels and Adıvar he would never be exiled from the country. Yalman, too, was caught up in the 1925 crackdown and was forced to close down his paper *Vatan*. He was only able to write again in the 1930s after receiving permission from Atatürk, when he joined the Sertels at *Tan* from 1936-1938. In the meantime, Yalman helped American companies such as Goodyear import goods into Turkey and took part in the Turkish commission to the 1939 New York World's Fair. In 1940 he re-established *Vatan*, which would ultimately become the second largest daily newspaper in Turkey after Yunus Nadi's *Cumhuriyet*. As a *dönme*, Yalman would face opposition from ultra-nationalist Turks, including members of the government, particularly during World War II.<sup>97</sup> Similar to *Tan*, *Vatan* was suspended from publishing five times by the government and four times by martial law authorities during World War II, for a total time of over seven and a half months.<sup>98</sup> Unlike the Sertels, though, Yalman was a committed liberal and staunchly

---

<sup>95</sup> Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War*, 9.

<sup>96</sup> Ryan, "Republic of Others," 156, 160, 163, 167, 173 184-185, 254-257, 303; Zekeriya Sertel, *Hatırladıklarım* (1977; reprint, Istanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2015).

<sup>97</sup> Baer, *The Dönme*, 221, 224-227; Ahmet Emin Yalman, "Milestones from my life," 1-2, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 9, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>98</sup> Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War*, 9.

supported the move towards a formal alliance with the United States after World War II. Yalman would continue to face opposition in Turkey including an assassination attempt by a militant Islamist in 1952 and imprisonment for translating two American articles critical of Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes in 1960. However, he remained an influential voice in both the U.S. and Turkey until his death in 1972.<sup>99</sup>

In the midst of these difficulties in maintaining independent voices in the Turkish public sphere, these figures on various occasions emphasized their connections to take positions as authoritative figures regarding the United States. As A. Holly Shissler has shown, the Sertels, particularly Sabiha, were fond of utilizing surveys and answering questions from their readers.<sup>100</sup> In one such column known as “Question and Answer” (*Sual Cevap*), they received a number of questions regarding the U.S. political system and political parties. Instead of merely answering the first question of how many parties there were in the U.S. and to which party President Roosevelt belonged, they provided a longer answer explaining the ideological background of the Democratic and Republican Parties. They stated that Republicans were protectionists who wanted to stay out of European affairs, whereas Democrats were more open-minded and believed in global cooperation. They went on to explain the political implications of the most recent congressional election in which the Democrats had lost seats.<sup>101</sup>

More significantly, however, both the Sertels and Yalman utilized their trips to the United States as opportunities to showcase their connections. In particular, both Yalman and Zekeriya Sertel took part in an October 1942 Turkish press delegation to the United States at the invitation of the American government as part of which they met President Roosevelt. During this trip they wrote articles discussing Americans’ impressions of Turkey, including an article by Zekeriya in which he highlighted America’s appreciation of Turkey’s neutrality and growing importance in the Middle East.<sup>102</sup> Additionally, Sertel interviewed 1940 Republican presidential candidate Wendell

---

<sup>99</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, “Milestones from my life,” 2-3, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 9, Hoover Institution Archives; “Turkish Editor Wounded: Yalman, of Vatan, Show While With Premier Menderes on Tour,” *New York Times* (1923-Current File). November 23, 1952. Accessed October 27, 2018.

<sup>100</sup> Shissler, “If You Ask Me,” 8-10.

<sup>101</sup> “Sual Cevap,” *Tan*, 2, November 16, 1938, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>102</sup> Zekeriya Sertel, “Türkiyenin Orta Şarkta Oynadığı Rolün Ehemmiyeti,” *Tan*, 1, November 21, 1942, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

Willkie in 1942, whose “One World” idea and subsequent bestselling book promoted global cooperation and praised Turkey as a model for other countries.<sup>103</sup> Yalman likewise featured his trip to the United States, Canada, and the UK in *Vatan* in late 1942.<sup>104</sup> While they were not faced with confronting the same dominant cultural narrative as they were in the United States, these figures still at times highlighted their connections to Americans in order to establish their credentials in discussions of the United States and international affairs.

Articles such as these helped to establish the Sertels and Yalman as key sources of information regarding the United States. While they do not seem to have emphasized their American education in the same way they did in their English writings, they did utilize their connections to establish their positions. As figures with prominent publications to their names, they likely represented a key source of information regarding international affairs for many educated Turks. These figures struggled greatly against the monopoly of information regarding the Ottoman Empire and later Turkey held by American missionaries and Armenians in the United States and against the restrictions of the Turkish government and Turkish nationalists in Turkey. Their struggles and, in many cases, successes allowed them greater space to speak more directly to the American and Turkish people than previous Ottoman Muslims and even many of their fellow Turkish citizens were afforded. It is through this space that they established that they should be seen as cultural brokers who could speak authoritatively on some level to both American and Turkish audiences. Significantly, their articles regarding the United States and Turkey were not confined solely to their trips and connections. Rather, the United States and emerging Turkish Republic maintained key points of discussion in many of their articles. These articles varied in topic, but the most prominent positions for the United States and Turkey were often linked to national security and democracy. It is to these topics that I will turn in chapter three.

---

<sup>103</sup> At the time of its publication in 1943, Willkie’s book *One World* was the fastest selling book in American history. Gallup estimated that by the middle of 1943 over four million people had read his book. Zekeriya Sertel, “Harp Sonu Dünyası İçin Örnek Memleket: Türkiye,” *Tan*, 1-2, April 16, 1943, Atatürk Kitaplığı; Samuel Zipp, “When Wendell Willkie Went Visiting: Between Interdependency and Exceptionalism in the Public Feeling for *One World*,” *American Literary History* 26, no. 3 (2014): 484, 488-489.

<sup>104</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, “Amerikadan Dönerken,” *Vatan*, 1, December 24, 1942, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

## Chapter 3.

In their efforts to gain a voice in the American and Turkish public spheres, these figures focused on a number of key themes. Chief among these were a strong focus on maintaining Turkish national sovereignty and democracy. Adıvar as well as the Sertels and Yalman were deeply concerned about the spectre of European imperialism and encroachment on the new Turkish Republic. They differed on whether they viewed the United States as a potential ally or an imperialist power, though. Adıvar and Yalman seemingly viewed the United States as an ally, while the Sertels were more critical. The Sertels, however, did turn to the United States as a potential source for protecting democratic countries during World War II.<sup>105</sup> These concerns varied over time, beginning with the War of Independence and Greek invasion backed by Western Power in 1919, to Italian designs towards Anatolia during the late 1920s and through World War II, and finally the possibility of Soviet invasion after World War II. I argue that these figures were particularly concerned about Turkish national sovereignty due to their experiences in the late Ottoman Empire. Lerna Ekmekçioğlu has shown that concerns over connections between Western Powers and minorities in the late Ottoman Empire continued into the early Turkish Republican period and in large part led to Turkish government officials opposing the mechanisms for minority protections put forward by the League of Nations.<sup>106</sup> In a similar vein, as these figures under study had experienced the downfall of the Ottoman Empire, European occupation of Istanbul, and the Greek invasion of Anatolia, these experiences deeply impacted their world views and raised concerns about maintaining the national sovereignty of the new Turkish Republic.

I argue that these experiences caused Adıvar and Yalman to turn to the United States as a possible ally, in large part due to a focus on the Wilsonian principle of self-determination. While the Sertels did not go as far as Adıvar and Yalman, they too tried to show Turkey's important position in the Middle East and looked to the United States as a possible source to help defend democracy during World War II. Adıvar and Yalman in

---

<sup>105</sup> "Turks Suggest U.S. Part in War: Entry, Without Sending Troops to Europe, Proposed by Istanbul Editor," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. December 23, 1940. Accessed February 21, 2019

<sup>106</sup> Lerna Ekmekçioğlu, "Republic of Paradox: The League of Nations Minority Protection Regime and the New Turkey's Step-Citizens," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46, no. 4 (2014): 657-658.



particular often emphasized these Wilsonian principles in their English writings, likely with the goal of urging American policymakers and the American public to adhere to these principles. More significantly, they often discussed Turkey as being in a vital position to block the advance of the Soviet Union. While many scholars have discussed that Turkey was viewed as a key national security ally during the Cold War, I aim to show that in fact Adıvar and Yalman tried to paint Turkey in this way as early as the 1920s, and the Sertels likewise emphasized Turkey's strategic position during World War II.

In addition to their focus on national security, they also frequently discussed the United States in conjunction with debates regarding democracy and good governance. At times these discussions took the form of viewing the United States as a model republic for the new Turkish Republic surrounding issues such as freedom of press and democracy. However, Sabiha and at time Zekeriya Sertel did not always view the United States as a model for Turkey and in many cases were quite critical of the United States government surrounding issues of racism and imperialism. Despite this criticism of the United States at times, they all utilized the United States as a way to criticize the Turkish government when they felt it was lacking. They did this by emphasizing issues such as freedom of speech and governmental transparency in the United States as contrasted with Turkey. Particularly as the United States and Turkey developed warmer diplomatic relations before, during, and after World War II, largely in relation to the growing belief amongst American policymakers that Turkey represented a possible key geopolitical ally as well as growing trade during the 1930s, these figures at times utilized democratic successes in the United States as way to criticize the Turkish government and push it to further democratize.<sup>107</sup> Although they differed quite markedly in their views of the United States, through their efforts they tried to influence public opinion in both countries by showcasing how Turkey was an important part of American national security while also portraying the United States as a possible country for support and in some cases emulation in Turkey.

---

<sup>107</sup> Roger R. Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971), 108; George S. Harris, "Cementing Turkish-American Relations: The Ambassadorship of (Mehmet) Münir Erteğün (1934-1944)," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, eds. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 185-186, 194.

## Anti-Imperialism and Turkish Sovereignty

Likely the most significant issues these figures discussed with regards to the United States were the topics of Turkish sovereignty, national security, and anti-imperialism. This focus primarily stemmed from their experiences in the late Ottoman Empire and coloured their understandings of international politics. In May 1919, the government of British Prime Minister David Lloyd George lent its support to Greece's occupation of Izmir and its surrounding areas, as George believed Greece could act as a balance against Italy and France in the Eastern Mediterranean. This was followed by Britain occupying Istanbul in March 1920. Furthermore, the Treaty of Sevres, which was agreed upon in 1920 aimed at dividing the Ottoman Empire amongst the French, British, Italians, and Greeks.<sup>108</sup> Additionally, the Russian Revolution of 1917 and rise of the Soviet Union was viewed as another possible imperialist threat.

Our authors were deeply impacted by these events and the subsequent War of Independence (1919-1922). Ahmet Emin Yalman was initially exiled to Kütahya in 1919 by Sultan Mehmed VI as a result of his criticisms of the Sultan and the Ottoman government after World War I. He was then exiled to Malta by the British from 1920 to 1922 due to his nationalist sympathies, in his words as a "political hostage."<sup>109</sup> The occupying powers likewise detained Zekeriya Sertel in 1918 but released him a year later. After he was released, Zekeriya and Sabiha went to New York in 1919 to study at Columbia University until 1923.<sup>110</sup> It was in this context that Zekeriya wrote his *New York Times* article calling Halide Edib Adıvar "Turkey's Fiery 'Joan of Arc,'" while also criticizing the "imperialist attitude of the Allies."<sup>111</sup> Adıvar would face the most direct involvement in anti-imperialism after World War I by remaining in the Ottoman Empire and fighting in the War of Independence. She worked in a number of capacities

---

<sup>108</sup> Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 136, 139, 146-147, 149, 152-156, 160-161;

<sup>109</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, "Milestones from my life," 1, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 9, Hoover Institution Archives; Ahmed Emin Yalman, *Turkey in my Time* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956), 80-86, 100.

<sup>110</sup> A. Holly Shissler, "'If You Ask Me': Sabiha Sertel's Advice Column, Gender Equity, and Social Engineering in the Early Turkish Republic," *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 3, no. 2 (2007): 5-6.

<sup>111</sup> M. Zekeria, "Turkey's Fiery 'Joan of Arc'; Her Double Role as Leader: Pen and Gun Her Weapons," *The New York Times* (1857-1922). November 26, 1922. Accessed September 28, 2018.

throughout the War, including as a nurse, journalist, and soldier, amongst others.<sup>112</sup> These experiences deeply impacted their writings at the time in both Turkish and English, as well as their subsequent views regarding the United States.

The concerns of these four figures regarding anti-imperialism and national sovereignty are especially reflected in their efforts surrounding the War of Independence. In the aftermath of World War I, these figures, particularly Ahmet Emin Yalman and Halide Edib Adivar, seemingly placed a great deal of trust in American President Woodrow Wilson and his Fourteen Points. Wilson's Twelfth Point specifically promised self-determination to national groups, including the Turkish population of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>113</sup> As discussed in the previous chapter, Adivar helped create a Wilsonian League in Istanbul that pushed for the United States to take the mandate over Turkey, which Ahmet Emin Yalman also joined.<sup>114</sup> While they likely had a different understanding of what the mandate truly meant and the Anatolian insurgency ultimately decided not to ask the United States government to take the mandate, the focus on self-determination and President Woodrow Wilson remained a key part of their English writings.

Historian Erez Manela has argued that there existed a “Wilsonian Moment” from 1918-1919 in which peoples of colonized areas had hope that Wilson's principle of self-determination would guide the postwar settlement. Manela argues that the failure of the Peace Conference to address these groups and their demands led to an outburst of anti-imperialist and nationalist movements in many parts of the colonized world. He also asserts that many of these nationalist movements were transnational in reach.<sup>115</sup> While Sabiha Sertel in a 1943 *Tan* article dismissed former Republican presidential candidate Wendell Willkie's “One World” idea as “look[ing] like a utopian world” similar to

---

<sup>112</sup> Hülya Adak, “National Myths and Self-Narrations: Mustafa Kemal's Nutuk and Halide Edib's Memoirs and the Turkish Ordeal,” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (2003): 510-511.

<sup>113</sup> Seçil Karal Akgün, “Louis E. Bryant and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress,” in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, eds. Nur Bilge Criss and George S. Harris (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 17, 24-25.

<sup>114</sup> Perin Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization: A Cultural History of America in Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), 19-21; İpek Çalışlar, *Halide Edib: Biyografisine Sığmayan Kadın* (İstanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2010), 163.

<sup>115</sup> Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 5-6, 9, 13.

Wilson's principles, Adıvar and Yalman seemingly remained committed to Wilson's principles and viewed them as a possible way to secure Turkish national sovereignty.<sup>116</sup>

In her 1928 memoir *The Turkish Ordeal* in which she recounted her efforts during the War of Independence, Halide Edib Adıvar discussed the approach of Ottoman Muslims towards the United States, stating, "enlightened Turks naturally turned their eyes to President Wilson and America."<sup>117</sup> This sentiment was echoed by Ahmet Emin Yalman in his later 1956 memoirs in which he argued that, "the eyes of patriotic Turks turned to America," during the War of Independence.<sup>118</sup> In his *New York Times* article from 1922, Zekeriya Sertel likewise emphasized the faith Halide Edib Adıvar placed in the United States and Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points: "She thought that America fought to make the world safe for democracy and that President Wilson brought a new gospel to the world and that the application of the Wilsonian principles would save Turkey."<sup>119</sup>

Their discussions of President Wilson, the United States, and Wilson's Fourteen Points were not solely positive, however. They also pointed to Americans' seeming abandonment of these principles. Zekeriya Sertel for example remarked that Americans were "too tired of European diplomacy" and that "the unfavorable response of the American public showed her [Adıvar] that there was no hope of deliverance from that part of the world."<sup>120</sup> Yalman in his 1956 memoir likewise discussed urging Americans to defend their principles, while Halide Edib Adıvar emphasized in *Turkey Faces West* that Wilson's principles had previously been revered by colonized peoples, but this had begun to change and the Soviet Union was now taking up this position.<sup>121</sup> This discussion of the Soviet Union points to another key aspect of Adıvar and Yalman's writings throughout the period from 1919 to 1952. The Soviet Union would remain a key feature of their writings throughout this period in a number of different capacities. Chief among these were discussions of the Soviet Union as an imperialist threat to the new Turkish state as

---

<sup>116</sup> Sabiha Sertel, "Mr. Wendel Willkie'nin Bir Dünyası," *Tan*, 1-2, April 19, 1943, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>117</sup> Halide Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib* (New York: The Century Co., 1928), 15.

<sup>118</sup> Ahmed Emin Yalman, *Turkey in my Time* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956), 71.

<sup>119</sup> M. Zekeria, "Turkey's Fiery 'Joan of Arc,'" *The New York Times* (1857-1922).

<sup>120</sup> M. Zekeria, "Turkey's Fiery 'Joan of Arc,'" *The New York Times* (1857-1922).

<sup>121</sup> Yalman, *Turkey in my Time*, 71; Halide Edib Adıvar, *Turkey Faces West* (1930; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1973), 194-195.

well as a way through which to gain American support for the Turkish government and to push Americans to uphold their purported principles of self-determination.

Historian Gavin D. Brockett has argued that anti-Soviet sentiment in the Turkish press began primarily in the aftermath of World War II as a result of fears over Soviet imperialism as well as religious opposition to Soviet atheism.<sup>122</sup> Brockett is certainly correct that a great deal of anti-Soviet sentiment arose in the aftermath of World War II, as evidenced by the riot that destroyed the Sertels' *Tan* publishing house.<sup>123</sup> Furthermore, Samuel J. Hirst has shown that during the War of Independence the Soviets gave a great deal of weapons and funding to the rebel movements under Mustafa Kemal and had quite close relations, which formed the initial basis for their approach to broader nationalist and anti-imperialist movements. Additionally, the Soviet Union and new Turkish Republic were allied in a form of anti-Westernism against Western Europe during the 1920s and into the early 1930s, whereby they hoped to push back against the current Western order to include the European periphery and create greater parity in the European system.<sup>124</sup> However, the works of these figures here under study show that in fact the Soviet Union emerged as a key focus in the works of Yalman and Adivar as early as the early 1920s.

In the books published by Halide Edib Adivar and Ahmet Emin Yalman during the 1920s and 1930s, they frequently discussed the Soviet Union as a possible threat to the new Turkish Republic. In her 1928 memoir, Adivar tried to paint the Soviet Union not only as a threat to the new Turkey, but also to the broader Western world. In this connection, she quoted a Turkish man stating, "We are the only possible obstacle to the great wave of Bolshevism. We could have been the only buffer state if they had treated us decently. Now we will let it inoculate us and pass the germ on to the West."<sup>125</sup> For his part, Yalman discussed Russia as the primary power behind Armenian nationalists and separatists in the late Ottoman Empire in his 1930 book, *Turkey in the World War*.<sup>126</sup> In

---

<sup>122</sup> Gavin D. Brockett, *How Happy to Call Oneself a Turk: Provincial Newspapers and the Negotiation of a Muslim National Identity* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 140-146, 153, 164-165, 168-169.

<sup>123</sup> James D. Ryan, "The Republic of Others: Opponents of Kemalism in Turkey's Single Party Era, 1919-1950" (PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2017), 156, 160, 163, 185, 254-257

<sup>124</sup> Samuel J. Hirst, "Transnational Anti-Imperialism and the National Forces: Soviet Diplomacy and Turkey, 1920-1923," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 214-215; Samuel J. Hirst, "Anti-Westernism on the European Periphery: The Meaning of Soviet-Turkish Convergence in the 1930s," *Slavic Review* 71, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 33-35.

<sup>125</sup> Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal*, 6.

<sup>126</sup> Ahmet Emin, *Turkey in the World War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), 36-37.

this sense both Yalman and Adıvar painted Russia and later the Soviet Union as a primary national security threat to the new Turkish Republic. As Adıvar's work was written in both English and Turkish and Yalman's was written in English, these works sought to influence a Western, English-speaking audience.

While the common view is that Turkey became a key national security boon to the United States during the Cold War, Yalman and Adıvar used the Soviet Union and Yalman and the Sertels later used the Axis powers during World War II to try and influence American public opinion much earlier. As has been discussed, these earliest efforts to influence American public opinion and maintain Turkish national sovereignty largely stemmed from their experiences during the disillusionment of the Ottoman Empire. These experiences seemingly continued to influence their approaches to international relations throughout the period from 1919 to 1952. These concerns should not be seen as irrational as the supposed "Sèvres Syndrome" is often discussed in relation to modern Turkey.<sup>127</sup> Instead, as these figures were connected to numerous government and press figures from multiple countries, they likely were aware of outside discussions of the Turkish government and its future. For example, American Ambassador Joseph C. Grew remarked in his diary that many foreign diplomats believed that the Turkish Republic would not survive after the death of Atatürk, due to the number of "internal threats."<sup>128</sup> Perhaps more significantly, Nur Bilge Criss has shown that officials from Italy and the United Kingdom met in 1926 and agreed that the Turkish government would ultimately collapse and Italy could then intervene in Anatolia.<sup>129</sup> These figures were likely aware of these discussions and were highly concerned about maintaining the territorial and national sovereignty of the new Turkish Republic.

---

<sup>127</sup> Sevres Syndrome refers to the purported fear in Turkey that outside countries, particularly Turkey's neighbors as well as the Western world are conspiring to dismember and occupy Turkish territory. This harkens back to the Treaty of Sevres and its aftermath when the Western Powers did indeed plan to divide Ottoman territory between Armenia, Greece, France, Italy, and possibly an independent Kurdistan. Taner Akçam, *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2004), 22.

<sup>128</sup> Joseph C. Grew, *Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of Forty Years 1904-1945, Vol. 2*, eds. Walter Johnson and Nancy Harvison Hooker (Cambridge, Mass: The Riverside Press, 1952), 778-780.

<sup>129</sup> Nur Bilge Criss, "Shades of Diplomatic Recognition: American Encounters with Turkey (1923-1937)," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, ed. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 101.

Adivar and Yalman quite clearly tried to use American concerns about the spread of the Soviet Union and communism to tie Turkish and American national security together. In addition to her discussions of colonized peoples turning to the Soviet Union, Adivar in *Turkey Faces West* also viewed the Great Powers as divided into two camps, with the West led by the United States on one side and the Soviet Union on the other. She argued that the United States represented a new West, as the political and economic clout of European powers faded and she hoped that Turkey would side with capitalism and the technological and financial advances of the United States instead of the Soviet Union.<sup>130</sup> These discussions of the expansion of the Soviet Union and the fate of colonized areas should also be seen as an effort to convince Americans to stand by the principles of self-determination and purported anti-imperialism of Woodrow Wilson. As these figures expressed serious concerns about the expansion of European powers and the Soviet Union, I argue that these discussions of the Soviet Union appealing to colonized areas were in part an effort to push the United States not only to support Turkish territorial sovereignty, but also to adhere to its self-proclaimed principles of self-determination. All of these figures expressed dismay that the American public did not fully support the principle of self-determination, which pushed them in part to emphasize the biggest perceived threats to the United States as mutual threats to the new Turkish Republic.

As these figures faced government pressure, exile, and suspensions from writing during the late 1920s and early 1930s, there is much less work written by them in Turkish during this period. This begins to change significantly in the mid to late 1930s, as the Sertels began the newspaper *Tan* together with Ahmet Emin Yalman. While they did not seem to focus on the United States much during the initial years of this publication, concerns about national security and the United States re-emerged in the late 1930s. The catalyst for these discussions seemed to stem from two main sources. First, in November 1938, Turkey's first president Mustafa Kemal Atatürk died. As has previously been discussed, many foreign observers doubted whether the Turkish Republic would survive the death of the man who was widely regarded as its founder. This is reflected in articles from *Tan* in the aftermath of his death. In multiple articles after Atatürk's death, Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel extolled Atatürk's role in securing the national sovereignty of the

---

<sup>130</sup> Edib Adivar, *Turkey Faces West*, 240, 259-260.

Turkish Republic during the War of Independence and emphasized that the subsequent generations would work to maintain said sovereignty.<sup>131</sup> While this is largely a part of mourning Atatürk and celebrating his achievements as a nation and state builder, it also seems to mark a new period where our authors begin to discuss national sovereignty more significantly again. This renewed focus is perhaps due to concerns about the ability of Atatürk's successors to maintain Turkish independence in the increasingly tense and precarious international order of the period.

The second key factor that seems to have influenced the renewed focus on national security was the rise of a fascist regime in Italy and of the National Socialists in Germany. Selim Deringil has shown that Italy represented possibly the biggest perceived threat to the new Turkish Republic amongst government officials throughout the 1930s and into World War II. This fear stemmed from Italy's possession of heavily-fortified islands off the coast of Turkey and threatening statements made by Mussolini regarding territory in Anatolia.<sup>132</sup> Additionally, Mussolini's propaganda Bari radio often broadcasted in Turkish. This angered figures such as Zekeriya Sertel who argued that Turkey was not an Italian colony and thus wondered why the Italians were broadcasting Turkish language Italian government propaganda in Turkey. Fears over Italian expansionism and the Italian occupation of Albania pushed the Turkish government towards Britain and the Allies.<sup>133</sup> However, despite pressure from the British and German governments to enter World War II as an ally of either the Axis Powers or the Allies, Turkey would not join the War until the virtual end in 1945 on the side of the Allies.<sup>134</sup> These years immediately before and during World War II mark a further development in the discussions of national security in the United States and Turkey in both the Turkish and American presses.

These concerns about national security featured in the editorials of both *Tan* and *Vatan*. In December 1940, the *New York Times* published an article discussing editorials

---

<sup>131</sup> Sabiha [SIC] Zekeriya Sertel, "Atatürkün Ölüsünü Bekliyen Subaylar," *Tan*, 5, November 14, 1938, Atatürk Kitaplığı; Zekeriya Sertel, "Babamızı Kaybettik: Büyük Şefimiz Atatürk Dün Sabah Hayata Gözlerini Yumdu," *Tan*, 1, November 11, 1938, Atatürk Kitaplığı; Sabiha Zekeriya Sertel, "Türkiyenin Büyük Adamı," *Tan*, 2, November 11, 1938, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>132</sup> Selim Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An 'Active' Neutrality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 7-8, 32, 36.

<sup>133</sup> Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War*, 72.

<sup>134</sup> Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War*, 75, 78, 89-90, 114-115.



from both *Tan* and *Vatan* that urged the United States to join the War on the side of Britain. In addition to discussing the arguments made in both newspapers, including the *Tan* editorial which argued regarding American involvement that, “the moral repercussions of such an action would suffice to change the whole aspect of the war,” the article also emphasized that the Turkish government was far more concerned with Italy to the extent that “Italian reverses and signs of Italian weaknesses therefore are received with almost extravagant satisfaction.”<sup>135</sup> Furthermore, the *New York Times* remarking on the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean and turning to Turkish newspapers for information discussed the enthusiasm for Italian defeats in Turkey: “Nothing has contributed more to the general feeling of confidence than news of the Italian disaster at Taranto, which is received with an enthusiasm that can have been surpassed only in London and Athens.”<sup>136</sup> This focus on Turkish national security was likewise emphasized in the Turkish press during the remainder of the war.

Selim Deringil has argued in his pioneering study on Turkish foreign policy during World War II that a majority of Turks could not read and that much of the press was aimed at the outside world.<sup>137</sup> There is clearly some credibility to this statement as many of the editorial and articles they wrote ended up being quoted in the American press. Additionally, when Ahmet Emin Yalman was chastised by Turkish prime minister Saracoğlu during World War II for criticizing the Varlık Vergisi, or Wealth Tax, which disproportionately targeted Turkey’s non-Muslim communities, he argued that his criticism was actually a way of defending Turkey from outside attacks. His defense suggests that foreign observers of Turkey were an important audience of his newspaper.<sup>138</sup> However, Deringil’s view is problematic in several respects. First, Deringil ignores that Turkish newspapers may have been read and discussed in public settings

---

<sup>135</sup> “Turks Suggest U.S. Part in War,” *The New York Times* (1923-Current File).

<sup>136</sup> Taranto refers to the Battle of Taranto when the British navy inflicted heavy losses on the Italian navy. G.E.R. Gedye, “Turks’ Confidence in Russia on Rise: Faith in Resistance to Nazi Demands is Bolstered by the British Victory at Taranto,” *The New York Times* (1923-Current File). November 15, 1940. Accessed February 21, 2019.

<sup>137</sup> Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During World War II*, 8.

<sup>138</sup> The Wealth Tax was ostensibly put in place to tax the profits of war profiteers. However, it was implemented in a discriminatory manner, resulting in non-Muslim communities being taxed at considerably higher rates, with those unable to pay being sent to hard labor camps. Scholars such as Marc Baer have argued that the tax was intended to create a Muslim Turkish bourgeoisie by eliminating the presence of a non-Muslim bourgeoisie, particularly in Istanbul. Marc David Baer, *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 224-227, 230-233.

such as coffee houses or possibly *Halkevleri* (*People's Houses*), a practice that had been common during the late Ottoman period.<sup>139</sup> Furthermore, Gavin Brockett has shown that in the aftermath of World War II there was an explosion in the number of Turkish newspapers published at the provincial level, suggesting a larger reading public and appetite for newspapers than Deringil allows.<sup>140</sup> In this sense, while the articles published in Turkish regarding Turkish national security and the United States should be viewed as being clearly aimed at influencing the American reading public including policymakers in Washington, D.C., they were also aimed at a Turkish domestic audience who witnessed with growing concern how southeastern Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean were rapidly engulfed in the War.

In addition to exhorting the United States to enter the War on the side of Britain to defend democracy, both Yalman and the Sertels discussed Turkey's relations with the Western world, particularly the United States. In 1943, Yalman featured a speech from British Prime Minister Winston Churchill in which Churchill emphasized Turkey's new role in the Middle East and how it could benefit Britain and the Western powers.<sup>141</sup> Importantly, this piece was published shortly after the Soviet victory at Stalingrad, which led many analysts to suspect that Germany would probably lose the war.<sup>142</sup> Additionally, while both Yalman and Zekeriya Sertel were visiting the United States in 1942, Sertel published a lengthy article discussing American views of Turkey and that Americans were beginning to view Turkey as the "watchman of the gates of the Middle East," due to Turkey's position blocking the Axis Powers from the region.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> The "People's Houses" refers to a series of centres established under the early Republican Turkish government. Alexandros Lamprou has shown that these spaces were intended to communicate the reforms of the Republican government, introduce "modern" practices, and spread Turkish nationalism to the population. They were opened in most cities and towns between 1932 and 1951. The Republican government viewed coffee houses as possibly subversive and dirty, and therefore tried to paint "People's Houses" as a preferable replacement. As a part of these efforts, they also established *Halk Okuma Odaları* (*People's Reading Rooms*), but it is unclear from Lamprou's work how often newspapers would be read in these venues. For this reason, I only speculate that newspapers might have been read in this context. Alexandros Lamprou, *Nation-Building in Modern Turkey: The 'People's Houses', and The State and The Citizen* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2015), 2, 40, 125-126, 128-130, 132-133; Ahmed Emin Yalman, *The Development of Turkey as Measured by Its Press* (1914; Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1968), 34, 132-133.

<sup>140</sup> Brockett, *How Happy to Call Oneself A Turk*, 1.

<sup>141</sup> "Kuvvetli bir Türk milleti: Orta Şark için faydalı bir unsur olabilir," *Vatan*, 1, February 13, 1943, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>142</sup> Ryan, "Republic of Others," 212.

<sup>143</sup> "Türkiye'nin orta şarkta kapıları tutan mühim bir bekçi." Zekeriya Sertel, "Türkiye'nin Orta Şark'ta Oynadığı Rolün Ehemmiyeti," *Tan*, 1, November 21, 1942, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

The Sertels also presented potentially anti-imperialist views from American statesmen. For example, they interviewed and frequently quoted former Republican presidential candidate Wendell Willkie when discussing his “One World” idea which sought to foster international cooperation and was critical of the imperialism of America’s allies and foes alike.<sup>144</sup> Zekeriya Sertel seemingly interviewed Willkie twice, who praised Turkey as a model for the postwar era. Willkie argued that Turkey was a symbol for other Middle Eastern countries, as he believed Turkey sought closer economic ties with Western countries and was moving in the direction of greater freedom and democracy.<sup>145</sup> Zekeriya’s interviews of Willkie included excerpts regarding Turkey from his speeches in the United States. While the Sertels seemingly expressed some sympathy for his views, they ultimately dismissed his ideas as being utopian and insufficient to deal with the realities of imperialism. For Sabiha, the realities of the global capitalist system with the free movement of capital would lead on some level to a form of imperialism.<sup>146</sup>

These articles show that the Sertels and Yalman were deeply concerned about the spectre of imperialism, whether it be direct foreign control or what Zekeriya and Sabiha viewed as economic imperialism. Additionally, it shows that they turned to the United States as a key power during this period and paid close attention to the statements and actions of the United States government. Furthermore, I consider that their discussions of Turkey’s important geopolitical location to the Western world may have been in part an attempt to garner support possibly both from the Turkish reading public as well as American policymakers and the American reading public for closer diplomatic and possibly military relations with the Allies. By emphasizing Turkey’s geopolitical position as a barrier against Axis Power access to the Middle East from southeastern Europe and the southern portion of the Soviet Union (both considered possibilities into the spring of 1943), they possibly hoped to gain Western diplomatic support for Turkish neutrality or

---

<sup>144</sup> Samuel Zipp, “When Wendell Willkie Went Visiting: Between Interdependency and Exceptionalism in the Public Feeling for *One World*,” *American Literary History* 26, no. 3 (2014): 484-488.

<sup>145</sup> “Willkie Demands Global Thinking: Says He Found East Disturbed by Emphasis on Anglo-U.S. Philosophy of War,” *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. November 7, 1942. Accessed February 21, 2019.

<sup>146</sup> Zekeriya Sertel, “Harp Sonu Dünyası İçin Örnek Memleket: Türkiye,” *Tan*, 1-2, April 16, 1943, Atatürk Kitaplığı; Sabiha Sertel, “Mr. Wendel Willkie’nin Bir Dünyası,” *Tan*, 1-2, April 19, 1943, Atatürk Kitaplığı; M. Zekeriya Sertel, “M. Willkie İle Dünya Vaziyeti ve Türkiye İçin Neler Konuştum?” *Tan*, 4, November 14, 1942, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

even military support in the event that the Axis Powers attacked. These fears about imperialism and focus on Turkey's geopolitical position continued after World War II.

With the end of World War II came growing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union over the nature of a global post-war order. Before long, these tensions escalated into the Cold War: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) under the leadership of the United States formed in 1949 and in 1955 the Warsaw Pact was formed under the leadership of the Soviet Union. In the aftermath of World War II, the Soviet government demanded that Turkey return certain territories in northeastern Anatolia that had been a part of imperial Russia from 1878-1918. Moreover, Stalin sought to pressure Turkey's President İsmet İnönü to agree to the creation of a joint Soviet-Turkish defense force in the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, which would have amounted to de facto Soviet control of the Straits. Unsurprisingly, these conditions were rejected by the Turkish government and raised alarm in Turkey about Soviet expansionism, especially given the fact that the Soviet Union had just brought most of eastern and central Europe under its influence.<sup>147</sup> Gavin Brockett has shown that fears regarding Soviet expansion and imperialism as well as more religious concerns about the atheist Soviet Union turned public opinion against Turkey's imperial neighbor to the north. This was particularly acute during the Korean War, in which the Turkish military took an active role, contributing an entire brigade to the coalition forces that the U.S. assembled under the auspices of the UN against the communist regime in North Korea and its Chinese and Soviet allies.<sup>148</sup>

While Halide Edib Adıvar and Ahmet Emin Yalman had been critical of the Soviet Union before World War II, Yalman took a more stridently anti-Soviet stance after World War II, frequently accusing the Soviet Union of imperialism and barbarism.<sup>149</sup> Yalman also frequently criticized the Soviet Union in the American press and became an even more prominent voice, in particular due to his anti-communist stance. He in particular criticized the Soviet Union for what he viewed as de-stabilizing efforts in the Middle East, including accusations that a "fifth column" in Turkey took orders from

---

<sup>147</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 208.

<sup>148</sup> Brockett, *How Happy to Call Oneself A Turk*, 140-146, 153, 163-165, 168-169.

<sup>149</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, "Nereye Gidiyoruz," *Vatan*, 1, 3, July 25, 1951, Atatürk Kitaplığı; Ahmet Emin Yalman, "Yeni Rolümüz," *Vatan*, 1, October 12, 1951, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

Moscow. Unsurprisingly, he often cited Turkey's importance as a geostrategic ally for the United States and emphasized that Turkey had stood up to the Soviet Union first during and after World War II.<sup>150</sup> Yalman likewise received prestigious speaking invitations, including speaking at an international forum put on by the Cleveland World Affairs Council alongside prominent figures, such as Secretary of State James F. Byrnes and former Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles.<sup>151</sup> As was discussed in the previous chapter, however, the Sertels came to be associated with the Soviet Union and communism after World War II and eventually fled Turkey.

These efforts ranging from the War of Independence, through World War II, and into the Cold War showcase the importance that these figures placed on Turkish national sovereignty. These concerns largely stemmed from their experiences during the late Ottoman Empire as they experienced the dissolution of the Empire and subsequent war to establish the Turkish Republic. As we have seen, these experiences made them deeply concerned about maintaining the national sovereignty of the new Republic. These fears primarily centred on imperialism ranging from that of Western European powers, Italy, and in some cases the Soviet Union. Due to these concerns, they turned to the United States to some degree as a possible source of protection or at least powerful voice in the international community to help maintain Turkish sovereignty. These efforts varied greatly as Halide Edib Adivar and Ahmet Emin Yalman advocated directly for entering into a formal alliance with the United States, whereas the Sertels viewed the United States as a key actor amongst democratic states that should stand by its self-proclaimed principles of self-determination and democracy. However, this is not to say that national security was the only lens through which these figures viewed and discussed the United States. Instead, they discussed the United States in a myriad of ways ranging from portraying the United States as a model republic for the new Turkish Republic to criticisms of American policies regarding race. These discussions helped to establish our

---

<sup>150</sup> "Turkish Editor on Visit Here Praises Choice of Marshall," *The Milwaukee Journal*, January 26, 1947, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 1, Hoover Institution Archives; "Turk Sees Russia Fomenting Unrest: Editors Says His Nation Will Not Even Discuss Common Defense of Dardanelles," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*, January 3, 1947. Accessed April 9, 2019.

<sup>151</sup> "A Report from the World," *The Cleveland Press*, January 9, 1947, 1-4, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 4, Hoover Institution Archives.

authors as the principal Turkish commentators of U.S. affairs, while also providing an in-depth understanding of American politics and society to Turkish readers.

### **The United States and Democracy**

In addition to their focus on the United States as a possible source of protection in the face of threats to Turkish national sovereignty, the United States was also frequently discussed in the context of debates on democracy and as a possible model for the new Turkish Republic. As the new Turkish Republic formed in the early 1920s, these figures played a key role in discussing what direction it should follow. As Mustafa Kemal Atatürk established an increasingly authoritarian, one-party regime from the mid-1920s onwards, these discussions often took place in the American press and English language books and placed topics such as democracy at the centre of their portrayals of the new Turkey to the American public.

As early as his 1922 article about Halide Edib Adıvar, Zekeriya Sertel emphasized that Adıvar looked to the United States due to its purported goal of spreading democracy in the world.<sup>152</sup> The Sertels took a great deal of inspiration from their professors at Columbia University in New York, including Franklin Henry Giddings and William Ogburn, and hoped to return and shape the direction of the new republic when they returned to Turkey in 1923. In particular, James Ryan has shown that they hoped to utilize their position as journalists to help stimulate discussions of democracy in Turkey.<sup>153</sup> Halide Edib Adıvar furthered these discussions through her English language monographs. Much of her 1930 book *Turkey Faces West* is devoted to the topic of democracy. She argued that the ultimate political ideal of Turks was democracy and that Islam was inherently democratic. According to her, Turks were inherently democratic due to their nomadic background that required commitment to a larger tribe. Furthermore, Islam was a “religious democracy” with a caliph elected by “the faithful on the conditions of capacity and performance,” however, this democratic nature had been changed shortly after the Prophet Muhammad’s death. She further discussed the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States describing the United States as “a great experiment in democracy with capitalism behind it.” She finished her work discussing whether Turkey

---

<sup>152</sup> M. Zekeria, “Turkey’s Fiery ‘Joan of Arc,’” *The New York Times* (1857-1922).

<sup>153</sup> Ryan, “Republic of Others,” 47-50; Zekeriya Sertel, *Hatırladıklarım* (1977; reprint, Istanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2015), 104-105.

would follow in the footsteps of Europe, the Soviet Union, or the United States, concluding that they would remain on the side of capital and the West. This, however, did not necessarily translate into democracy, as she fiercely criticized the dictatorship taking shape since 1925 under Atatürk.<sup>154</sup> Interestingly, in the *New York Times* review of her 1928 memoirs in which she also criticized the emerging dictatorship in Turkey, journalist Clarence K. Streit defended Atatürk against some of her criticisms, specifically his Westernization efforts which Streit seemingly believed made up for some of Atatürk's faults.<sup>155</sup>

These discussions of democracy continued as Turkey and the United States moved closer together through some small arms deals, trade, and the growing importance placed on Turkey's geopolitical position amongst U.S. policymakers during World War II.<sup>156</sup> When Zekeriya Sertel and Ahmet Emin Yalman called for the American entry into World War II in several editorials that were discussed in the American press, they insisted that the United States should help Britain in defending "democratic civilization."<sup>157</sup> Further, when Yalman and Sertel visited the United States in 1942, they were welcomed by the Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles, who remarked:

We are glad... to recognize in them the representatives of one of the great democracies of the world today, a democracy created by the genius of Ataturk and his associates, a country which is a great stabilizing factor and a country that I think through its representatives of the press, here now, will appreciate the very high regard and admiration which the people of the United States have for their friends in Turkey.<sup>158</sup>

These figures clearly found it important to discuss Turkey and its relationship to the United States in the American press not only in connection with the issue of national security. Democracy and notions of progress remained key themes in their discussions.

---

<sup>154</sup> Edib Adıvar, *Turkey Faces West*, 4, 76, 204-205, 246, 255, 259-260.

<sup>155</sup> Clarence K. Streit, "Halide Hanum Recites the Epic of Turkey's Revival: Her Second Volume of Memoirs Tells How the Kemalists Won Against Enormous Odds," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. October 14, 1928. Accessed March 1, 2019.

<sup>156</sup> George S. Harris, "Repairing Turkish-American Relations After the First World War: Ahmet Muhtar in Washington," in *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, ed. George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 169-170; Harris, "Cementing Turkish-American Relations," 185-186, 194; Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939*, 108.

<sup>157</sup> "Turks Suggest U.S. Part in War: Entry, Without Sending Troops to Europe, Proposed by Istanbul Editor," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*.

<sup>158</sup> "Welles Indicates Levant's Big Role: Acting Secretary of State Says We Are Closely Watching Syria and Lebanon," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. October 4, 1942. Accessed March 1, 2019.

Importantly, in these discussions Yalman and Sertel criticized the lack of democracy in Turkey and at times deplored that the United States did not adhere to its own principles of democracy. However, Yalman and Adivar in particular often emphasized the progress and Westernization of Turkey under Atatürk and praised the United States in their English language writings, while the Sertels at times expressed support for the United States while at other times aiming criticism towards the American government. A good example of this is Adivar's *Turkey Faces West* where she criticizes the dictatorship under Atatürk but emphasizes the democratic nature of the Turkish people.<sup>159</sup> I argue that this focus on democracy in their English writings was due to two main factors. First, as Yalman, Adivar, and to a degree the Sertels hoped the United States would serve as a potential source of protection, they likely hoped to show that Turkey was not only a key strategic ally, but also a newly Westernizing country with a potentially democratic future. Second, as our authors encountered the almost uniformly negative views of Ottoman Muslims that many Americans held even after the end of the Ottoman Empire, they likely hoped to change the opinions of the American public in order to accomplish their goals vis-à-vis the two countries.

The publications and efforts of these figures, however, should not be understood as those of Turks copying the principles or institutions of Western countries. As Adivar discussed with the purportedly democratic nature of Islam and Turks themselves, she did not view their efforts to democratize as solely a form of Westernization.<sup>160</sup> Further, a 1944 editorial in *Vatan* argued that the reason why democracy had not worked in Turkey was that the state had simply attempted to copy the practices and institutions of Western countries rather than focusing on taking into account the specificities of the Turkish context.<sup>161</sup> At the same time, the United States provided a possible model of democracy which Turkey could follow in certain respects while carving out its own distinctive path. These themes emerged more fully in their Turkish language writings during this period.

---

<sup>159</sup> Edib Adivar, *Turkey Faces West*, 76, 246, 255, 259-260.

<sup>160</sup> Edib Adivar, *Turkey Faces West*, 76.

<sup>161</sup> An excerpt of this article was featured in a booklet about *Vatan* published in both English and Turkish in 1950. It's unclear if Yalman wrote this editorial himself, but the booklet indicates that this editorial represented the viewpoint of the newspaper. Additionally, Yalman wrote a significant number of editorials and columns, often one per day. "An Experiment in Clean Journalism: The Life Story of the Turkish Daily *Vatan*," 21-22, 1950, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 7, Hoover Institution Archives.



Within the context of the Turkish press, discussions of the United States went beyond the focus on democratization. Ahmet Emin Yalman in particular frequently addressed other aspects of the United States. These ranged from discussions of bureaucracy to economic issues. For example, in April 1942, Yalman wrote about American military and diplomatic officials visiting Turkey and the positive impressions they had of Turkey. In this connection, he also discussed the assistance Americans provided to Turks during the War of Independence, in particular the work of journalist Louise Browne, American High Commissioner Mark Bristol, and American support for Turkey's positions at the Treaty of Lausanne negotiations. Drawing attention to this historical precedent, Yalman argued that closer U.S.-Turkish relations were key to establishing peace in the world. His article ended with Yalman highlighting the considerable economic benefits Turkey would derive from a closer association with the United States: he advocated for Turkey replacing Japan as the main supplier of silk to the United States.<sup>162</sup> For Yalman, the positive relations he hoped to help establish between Turkey and the United States should not stop at discussions of national security. Rather, the United States and Turkey should form a much closer relationship characterized by economic cooperation and efforts to create peace in the world.<sup>163</sup> For Yalman, however, in order to fully realize these lofty goals, there needed to be a change in the Turkish government to include greater democratization and transparency.

The most significant aspect of the Sertels and Yalman's writings focused on using the United States as foil against which they could project their criticism of the Turkish government. For example, in December 1942, Yalman wrote an article arguing that the United States and Britain were fighting a war inside another war by battling the constraints of bureaucracy within their governments. In particular, he emphasized that President Roosevelt worked to improve manufacturing by combatting bureaucratic constraints and red tape. However, he was careful to emphasize that while bureaucratic

---

<sup>162</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, "Türkiye Amerika Münasebetleri," *Vatan*, 1, 3, April 28, 1942, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>163</sup> It's somewhat unclear what exactly about Turkish-American relations would lead to peace in the world, Yalman solely emphasizes that their relationship is important. "The increase of a conscious and understanding cooperation between the two is one of the bridges to transport the world to a secure and peaceful future. *Aralarında şuurlu ve anlayışlı bir işbirliğinin artması, dünyayı emniyetli ve barışlı bir istikbale ulaştırabilecek köprülerden biridir.* Yalman, "Türkiye Amerika Münasebetleri," *Vatan*, 1, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

constraints were a problem in all countries, “it is important to add that this struggle happened only in democratic countries during wartime, and, thanks to freedom of argument, it was assured that mistakes would be straightened out and productivity would increase.”<sup>164</sup> Additionally, when reporting about the parliamentary debate regarding a restrictive press law in 1946, Yalman criticized the governing Republican Peoples Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*) for sliding into authoritarianism in contrast to democracy as defined by former American presidential candidate, Henry Wallace.<sup>165</sup>

For Yalman, the United States provided a way to criticize the Turkish government for issues, such as excessive bureaucracy, press restrictions, and lack of democracy. During World War II this was a risky proposition as evidenced by the government suspending *Vatan* five times with martial law authorities suspending it a further four times.<sup>166</sup> Regardless, it seems as though the United States, or at least Yalman’s presentations of the United States, played a key role as a foil against which he could criticize the Turkish government. In the aftermath of World War II Yalman was likely afforded greater freedom in his criticism of the government. During this period the government tried to democratize on some level in response to internal opposition as well as a desire to obtain Marshall Plan funding and diplomatic support against the Soviet Union from the United States.<sup>167</sup> While these internal changes could in part explain his ability to criticize the government more fully by using the United States as a foil, his previous use of the United States shows that this technique was not new for him in the liberalizing political atmosphere after World War II.

In the aftermath of World War II, Yalman and the Sertels’ efforts would become even more prominent in the push for democracy in Turkey. In May and June 1945, four prominent members of the governing Republican People’s Party, including Adnan Menderes, Celal Bayar, Refak Koraltan, and Fuat Köprülü, openly criticized the government and demanded the establishment of multi-party democracy. While their

---

<sup>164</sup> “*Fakat şunu da ilave etmek lazımdır ki bu mücadele ancak demokrasi memleketlerinde harp zamanında bile eksilmeyen hür münakaşa sayesinde olmuş hataların düzelmesi ve verimin yükselmesi ancak bu sayede temin edilmiştir.*” Ahmet Emin Yalman, “Harp İçinde Harp: ‘Hazine Menfaati’ Sistemine Ait bir Hikaye,” *Vatan*, 1, 3, December 4, 1942, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>165</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, “Demokrasimizin Mukadderatı,” *Vatan*, 3, September 13, 1946, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

<sup>166</sup> Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War*, 9.

<sup>167</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 206-212.

proposal was rejected, they were not punished by the party. Furthermore, both Ahmet Emin Yalman and the Sertels gave these four politicians space in their papers to criticize the government, which ultimately resulted in Menderes, Koraltan, and Köprülü being expelled from the party. Within this context, the Democratic Party (Demokrat Parti) was established in January 1946 with the approval of the government. The Democratic Party would lose the 1946 elections in part due to vote rigging from the government, but would go on to win the election of 1950, marking the first point in which an opposition party won an election in Turkish Republican history.<sup>168</sup> Yalman would support the Democratic Party initially, but would go on to criticize it as it became more authoritarian during the 1950s.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the democratization process in the late 1940s did not include everyone. As tensions with the Soviet Union furthered and Turkey moved more and more towards an alliance with the United States, the government cracked down on leftists and social democrats, such as the Sertels. On charges of falsely accusing members of parliament of corruption or criminal activity, the Sertels were put on trial in two separate trials in 1946. Zekeriya would be found guilty and sentenced to three months in prison in the first trial and both Sertels would be sentenced to one year in prison in the second trial, but would win on appeal in both cases.<sup>169</sup> The articles that brought about these charges and the defense mounted by the Sertels, however, are quite notable in its discussion of the United States.

In his recent PhD dissertation, historian James Ryan has provided the most comprehensive discussion of the difficulties faced by the Sertels and other opposition figures during this period. Key in his discussion are the legal cases that the Sertels faced in 1946. The accusations of making false accusations against members of parliament stemmed from two articles that Zekeriya Sertel wrote in late 1945. In one of these articles from November 12, 1945, Zekeriya criticized the Turkish political class for concealing the sources of their wealth, which he contrasted with the United States. He focused on First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt in his discussion, recounting an instance where Roosevelt faced questions about her support for African Americans in the American South. The

---

<sup>168</sup> Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 208-212, 221.

<sup>169</sup> Ryan, "Republic of Others," 254-261, 272, 274.

person asking the question stated that there was a rumor that the Roosevelts made money from cotton production in the South and that they only defended African Americans in order to make money. According to Sertel, Eleanor Roosevelt openly answered the question, which he contrasted with Turkish political figures and argued that Turkish citizens should likewise be able to ask their political figures about the sources of their wealth. Furthermore, as a part of his legal defense, Sertel focused on the concepts of democracy and freedom of press to defend himself. In particular, he argued that throughout 1940, President Roosevelt faced significant attacks in the press but never prosecuted any journalists.<sup>170</sup> For Zekeriya, using the United States as a foil represented a key way to criticize the Turkish government. However, as Turkish politics became increasingly ideologically polarized after World War II the government cracked down on criticism, particularly from the left.<sup>171</sup>

The discussions of the United States by these figures were not solely positive, however. As was mentioned earlier, virtually all of these figures expressed some level of frustration that Americans did not always stand by their ideals of self-determination and democracy.<sup>172</sup> The Sertels, in particular Sabiha, frequently criticized the United States. For example, James Ryan has discussed that the Sertels were critical of the United States surrounding issues of racism. This criticism includes an article from 1930 in their journal *Resimli Ay* in which they criticized the Ku Klux Klan.<sup>173</sup> Additionally, in her article criticizing the ideas of Wendell Willkie, Sabiha criticized capitalism more broadly, arguing that “open competition, monopoly, and concentration, leads to financial capital’s exploitation of foreign markets, colonialism, and imperialism.” For Sertel, solely removing colonial governments would not end imperialism.<sup>174</sup> Likely in part due to articles like these along with a more sympathetic stance towards the Soviet Union during World War II, the Sertels came to be associated with the Soviet Union and communism in the Turkish press and public sphere. While James Ryan has shown that this association

---

<sup>170</sup> Ryan, “Republic of Others,” 256-262.

<sup>171</sup> Ryan, “Republic of Others,” 163, 167, 173 184-185, 224, 254-257.

<sup>172</sup> M. Zekeria, “Turkey’s Fiery ‘Joan of Arc,’” *The New York Times* (1857-1922); Edib Adivar, *Turkey Faces West*, 76, 246, 255, 259-260; Yalman, *Turkey in my Time*, 71.

<sup>173</sup> Ryan, “Republic of Others,” 134.

<sup>174</sup> “*Serbest rekabet, inhisar ve temerküz, mali sermayenin dış pazarları istismarını, müstemlekeçiliği, ve emperyalizmi intaç eder,*” Sabiha Sertel, “Mr. Wendel Willkie’nin Bir Dünyası,” *Tan*, 2, April 19, 1943, Atatürk Kitaplığı.

was overblown, the accusations stuck. After the destruction of their publishing house and subsequent trials, the Sertels applied for asylum in the United States, but ultimately the United States government sided with the Turkish government and rejected their application.<sup>175</sup>

Beginning with the War of Independence and continuing through World War II, these figures here under study played key roles in public discussions of the United States and Turkey in both countries. These discussions often focused on the topics of national security, democracy, and imperialism. As they had experienced the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, they were seemingly seriously concerned with maintaining the sovereignty of the new Turkish Republic. As a result, they often discussed American views of Turkey and appreciation for Turkey's national security importance in the Turkish press while simultaneously discussing Turkey's importance to the United States in their struggles against communism and fascism. These discussions additionally went beyond national security and often focused on issues such as democracy. In some cases, the United States represented a model regarding issues such as the freedom of the press and democratic elections. Perhaps more importantly, however, the United States represented a foil against which they could criticize the Turkish government for its democratic shortcomings. While they all differed in their views of the United States and the role it should play regarding the new Turkish Republic, all of these figures played key roles as cultural brokers between Turkey and the United States during this formative period.

---

<sup>175</sup> Ryan, "Republic of Others," 202, 204, 209,224-225.

## Chapter 4.

### Conclusion

As cultural brokers who travelled between the Ottoman Empire and later the Turkish Republic on one side and the United States on the other between 1919 and 1952, Halide Edib Adıvar, Ahmet Emin Yalman, Sabiha Sertel, and Zekeriya Sertel played key roles in trying to influence public opinion in both countries. Before the War of Independence, Ottoman Muslims had virtually no voice in the American press. For most Americans, their view of the Ottoman Empire was deeply influenced by the Armenian Genocide and previous massacres of Ottoman Armenians during the 1890s. As students of the American educational institutions, these figures here under study played a key role in giving educated Turks a voice in the American public sphere through their English language books and writings in the American press. Their education and experiences in the United States helped them to establish their positions as principle interlocuters for many in the United States. Somewhat similarly, their experiences in the United States helped them to establish themselves as key voices in the Turkish public sphere during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, despite significant governmental pressure.

Their prominent positions allowed them to speak about numerous important topics during this period. Most of their articles regarding the United States focused on the issues of national security and the United States. For Yalman and Adıvar, the United States represented a key power with which Turkey should ally, while for the Sertels, the United States represented a more complicated world power. Despite these differences, they all expressed serious concern about Turkey's national sovereignty and turned to the United States on some level as a source of support. These discussions took place in both the Turkish and American press and suggest that these figures hoped to influence the populations of both countries.

In addition to these discussions of national security, these figures also turned to the United States in their discussions of the future of the new Turkish Republic. These discussions often focused on issues such as democracy, press freedom, and bureaucracy. In some cases, the United States represented a model of sorts on certain issues, such as

press freedom. However, likely the most important role the United States played was as a foil against which they could criticize the Turkish government for its democratic shortcomings. Through these efforts, these figures established that they should be seen as cultural brokers who played a key role in trying to influence audiences in both countries during this formative period of Turkish-American relations.

In the ensuing years as the relationship between the two countries deepened, these figures took vastly different paths. As they went into exile in 1950, the Sertels' career as journalists and public intellectuals would end. However, they continued to follow developments in Turkey and wrote their memoirs in exile. Always the most critical of the United States, Sabiha seemingly became more critical of the United States in exile in Soviet Azerbaijan. In her memoirs, which were first published in 1969, one year after her death in 1968, she blasted American missionaries in Turkey arguing, "These missionaries, who came to Turkey in the period of [Sultan] Abdülhamid [II], benefited from the money that American capitalists had set aside for this purpose and opened Robert College and the Girls' College in Istanbul and American colleges in other cities."<sup>176</sup> Similarly, in discussing the positive developments in Turkey during the 1960s, she emphasized the progressives in Turkey could now oppose American imperialism.<sup>177</sup> Zekeriya would similarly publish his memoirs in 1977, three years before he died in Paris. He would be somewhat more positive towards the United States, however, crediting his years in the United States for helping him to develop many of his ideas.<sup>178</sup> The Sertels would likewise be largely erased from discussions of Turkey in the United States, as no further articles would be published about them after their trial in 1946. Furthermore, in his English language booklet about *Vatan*, Ahmet Emin Yalman would not mention the Sertels in his section on *Tan*.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> "Daha Abdülhamid devrinde Türkiye 'ye gelen bu misyonerler, Amerikan kapitalistlerinin bu işe ayırdığı paradan faydalanarak İstanbul'da Robert Koleji, Kız Koleji ve diğer şehirlerde Amerikan kolejlerini açmışlardı." Sabiha Sertel, *Roman Gibi*, (1969; reprint, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1987), 132.

<sup>177</sup> James D. Ryan, "The Republic of Others: Opponents of Kemalism in Turkey's Single Party Era, 1919-1950" (PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2017), 303.

<sup>178</sup> "Amerika'da kaldığım üç yıl, hayatımın en önemli yıllarıdır. Ben gazeteciliği orada öğrendim. Fikirce en büyük gelişmemi orada yaptım." Zekeriya Sertel, *Hatırladıklarım* (1977; reprint, İstanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2015), 104.

<sup>179</sup> "An Experiment in Clean Journalism: The Life Story of the Turkish Daily *Vatan*," 6, 1950, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 7, Hoover Institution Archives

Unlike the Sertels, Yalman would become an even more prominent voice in the American and Turkish press during the 1950s. Particularly in the American press, Yalman would come to represent Turkey in most cases. For example, in 1951 the *Denver Post* would write to Yalman asking him to write one editorial per month about Turkey for the *Post* while an American journalist would do the same for *Vatan*.<sup>180</sup> His writings in Turkey, however, would remain controversial. In part due to his steadfast support for the United States as well as his *dönme* background, he would face attacks throughout the rest of his career. In 1952, he was even shot by an Islamist militant in Malatya, but luckily survived the attack.<sup>181</sup> He was later imprisoned for a month at the age of 72 in 1960 for reprinting American criticism of Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes. As a result of his imprisonment, he would ultimately win the first ever Golden Pen of Freedom Award from the International Federation of Newspaper and Magazine Publishers.<sup>182</sup>

As mentioned previously, Halide Edib Adivar would live in the United Kingdom in self-imposed exile from 1925 until 1939, only returning after Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's death. As a result, most of her works were not published in Turkish during this period. This included *The Turkish Ordeal*, which was not published in Turkish until 1962, with the section in which she advocated for freedom and democracy removed.<sup>183</sup> Despite being one of Turkey's most famous novelists, she would remain controversial after her death in 1964. In 1970, the Turkish Women's Association erected a bust of her in Istanbul. Due to her affinity for the United States, a leftist group interrupted the ceremony erecting the bust and later destroyed the bust with dynamite. The bust has since been re-erected, but Adivar remains controversial for many.<sup>184</sup>

Despite the opposition they faced in both the United States and Turkey, these four figures played key roles in the debates and direction of the early Turkish Republic. While

---

<sup>180</sup> Edwin P. Hoyt, "Letter to Ahmet Emin Yalman," June 28, 1951, Ahmet Emin Yalman Papers, Box 6, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>181</sup> Marc David Baer, *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010),

<sup>182</sup> "Turkish Editor Hailed: Gets 'Golden Pen of Freedom' From World Publishers' Unit," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. May 29, 1961. Accessed March 10, 2019; "Turkey Frees Ill Journalist," *The New York Times (1923-Current File)*. April 16, 1960. Accessed March 10, 2019.

<sup>183</sup> Hülya Adak, "National Myths and Self-Narrations: Mustafa Kemal's Nutuk and Halide Edib's Memoirs and the Turkish Ordeal," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (2003): 511, 524.

<sup>184</sup> Perin Gürel, *The Limits of Westernization: A Cultural History of America in Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), 52.



they differed greatly in their politics, in their views of the direction the new Turkish Republic should take, and even their views of the United States, they established themselves as key voices on these subjects. Scholarly and popular discussions of the U.S.-Turkish relationship generally focus on governments and diplomats, but I have demonstrated in this thesis that we should look beyond those institutions and individuals to further understand the roots of this important relationship. Figures such as Sabiha Sertel, Zekeriya Sertel, Halide Edib Adıvar, and Ahmet Emin Yalman show that international relationships are not solely the realm of diplomats, but indeed should be studied through the lens of journalists, novelists, public intellectuals, and, ultimately, cultural brokers.

## References

### Archives Consulted

Atatürk Kitaplığı, İstanbul, Turkey  
Hoover Institution Archives, Palo Alto, California, USA

### Newspapers and Journals

*The Cleveland Press* (Cleveland)  
*Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal* (Lincoln)  
*Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles)  
*Milwaukee Journal* (Milwaukee)  
*The New York Times* (New York)  
*Resimli Ay* (Istanbul)  
*Tan* (Istanbul)  
*St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat* (St. Louis)  
*St. Louis Dispatch* (St. Louis)  
*Vatan* (Istanbul)  
*Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.)  
*Washington Post and Times Herald* (Washington, D.C.)

### Memoirs, Novels, Dissertations, and Primary Source Publications

- Adıvar, Halide Edib. *Ateşten Gömlek*. 1923; Reprint, Istanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2018.
- Adıvar, Halide Edib. *The Shirt of Flame*. Translated by Halide Edib Adıvar. New York: Duffield, 1924.
- Adıvar, Halide Edib. *Turkey Faces West*. 1930; Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1973.
- Grew, Joseph C. *Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of 1904-1945, Vol. 2*. Edited by Walter Johnson and Nancy Harvison Hooker. Cambridge, Mass: The Riverside Press, 1952.
- Edib, Halide. *Memoirs of Halide Edib*. 1926; Reprint New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Edib, Halide. *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halidé Edib*. New York: The Century Co., 1928.
- Emin, Ahmed. *Turkey in the World War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.
- Sertel, M. Zekeriya. *Hatırladıklarım*. 1977; Reprint Istanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2015.

Sertel, Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel. *Davamız ve Müdafaamız*. 1946; Reprint, Istanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2015.

Sertel, Sabiha. *Roman Gibi*. 1969; Reprint, Istanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1987.

Yalman, Ahmed Emin. *The Development of Turkey as Measured by Its Press*. 1914; Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1968.

Yalman, Ahmed Emin. *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim: Cilt 4 (1945-1971)*. Rey Yayınları, 1972.

Yalman, Ahmed Emin. *Turkey in my Time*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956.

### **Monographs and Academic Articles**

Adak, Hülya, “National Myths and Self-Narrations: Mustafa Kemal’s *Nutuk* and Halide Edib’s *Memoirs* and *The Turkish Ordeal*.” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (2003): 509-527.

Adak, Hülya. “Suffragettes of the Empire, Daughters of the Republic: Women Auto/Biographers Narrate National History (1918-1935).” *New Perspectives on Turkey: Special Issue on Literature and the Nation*, no 36 (2007): 27-51.

Akçam, Taner. *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide*. London and New York: Zed Books, 2004.

Akgün, Seçil Karal. “The General Harbord Commission and the American Mandate Question.” In *Studies in Atatürk’s Turkey: The American Dimension*, edited by George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss, 55-82, Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Akgün, Seçil Karal. “Louis E. Browne and the Leaders of the 1919 Sivas Congress.” In *Studies in Atatürk’s Turkey: The American Dimension*, edited by George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss, 15-54. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Aydın, Mustafa. “Introduction.” In *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, xvii-xxiv. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Baer, Marc David. *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Balakian, Peter. *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America’s Awakening to International Human Rights*. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.

- Brockett, Gavin D. *How Happy to Call Oneself a Turk: Provincial Newspapers and the Negotiation of a Muslim National Identity*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.
- Brockett, Gavin D. "Provincial Newspapers as a Historical Source: *Büyük Cihad* and the Struggle for the Muslim Turkish Nation (1951-53)." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 41, no. 3 (2009): 437-455.
- Criss, Nur Bilge. "Shades of Diplomatic Recognition: American Encounters with Turkey (1923-1937)." In *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, edited by George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss, 97-144. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Çalışlar, İpek. *Halide Edib: Biyografisine Sığmayan Kadın*. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2010.
- Danforth, Nicholas. "Multi-Purpose Empire: Ottoman History in Republican Turkey." *Middle Eastern Studies* 50, no. 4 (2014): 655-678.
- Deringil, Selim. *Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Deringil, Selim. *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An 'Active' Neutrality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1999.
- Ekmekçioğlu, Lerna. "Republic of Paradox: The League of Nations Minority Protection Regime and Turkey's New Step-Citizens." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46, no. 4 (2014): 657-679.
- Erhan, Çağrı. "Main Trends in Ottoman-American Relations." In *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, 3-25. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Fahrentold, Stacy. "Making Nations, in the Mahjar: Syrian and Lebanese Long-Distance Nationalisms in New York City, Sao Paulo, and Buenos Aires, 1913-1929." PhD diss., Northeastern University, 2014.
- Goode, James. "Archaeology and Diplomacy in the Republic of Turkey, 1919-1939." In *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, 49-65. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Gutman, David. "Armenian Migration to North America, State Power, and Local Politics in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 1 (2014): 176-190.

- Gürel, Perin E. *The Limits of Westernization: A Cultural History of America in Turkey*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.
- Harris, George S. "Cementing Turkish-American Relations: The Ambassadorship of (Mehmet) Münir Erteğün (1934-1944)." In *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, edited by George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss, 177-196. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Harris, George S. "Repairing Turkish-American Relations after the First World War: Ahmet Muhtar in Washington." In *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, edited by George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss, 145-176. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Harris, George Sellers. "Turkish-American Relations Since the Truman Doctrine." In *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, 66-88. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Hirst, Samuel J. "Anti-Westernism on the European Periphery: The Meaning of Soviet-Turkish Convergence in the 1930s." *Slavic Review* 71, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 32-53.
- Hirst, Samuel J. "Transnational Anti-Imperialism and the National Forces: Soviet Diplomacy and Turkey, 1920-1923." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 214-226.
- Karpat, Kemal. "The Ottoman Emigration to America, 1860-1914." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 17, no. 2 (1985): 175-209.
- Karpat, Kemal. "The Turks in America." In *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, edited by Kemal Karpat, 612-638. Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Khater, Akram Fouad. *Inventing Home: Emigration, Gender, and the Middle Class in Lebanon, 1870-1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Kolluoğlu-Kirli, Biray. "The Play of Memory, Counter-Memory: Building Izmir on Smyrna's Ashes." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 26 (Spring 2002): 1-28.
- Lamprou, Alexandros. *Nation-Building in Modern Turkey: The 'People's Houses', The State and The Citizen*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2015.
- Leonard, Thomas C. "When News is Not Enough: American Media and Armenian Deaths." In *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, edited by Jay Winter, 294-308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Makdisi, Ussama. *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

- Manela, Erez. *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- McCarthy, Justin. "Missionaries and the American Image of the Turks." In *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, 26-48. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Meyer, James H. *Turks Across Empires: Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Payaslian, Simon. *United States Policy Toward the Armenian Genocide and the Armenian Genocide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Provence, Michael. *The Last Ottoman Generation and the Making of the Modern Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Reed, Howard A. "Turkey and Her Nationalist Leaders as Seen in the 1923 Reports of Louise Bryant." In *Studies in Atatürk's Turkey: The American Dimension*, edited by George S. Harris and Nur Bilge Criss, 83-95. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Rothman, E. Natalie. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects Between Venice and Istanbul*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Ryan, James D. "The Republic of Others: Opponents of Kemalism in Turkey's Single Party Era, 1919-1950." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2017.
- Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1994.
- Schaffer, Simon, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo. "Introduction." In *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*, edited by Simon Schaffer, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj, and James Debourgo, ix-xxxviii. Sagamore Beach, MA: Watson Publishing International LLC, 2009.
- Shissler, A. Holly. "'If You Ask Me': Sabiha Sertel's Advice Column, Gender Equity, and Social Engineering in the Early Turkish Republic." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 3, no. 2 (2007): 1-30.
- Shissler, A. Holly. "Womanhood Is Not For Sale: Sabiha Zekeriya Sertel Against Prostitution and For Women's Employment." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 4, no. 3 (2008): 12-30.
- Ter-Matevosyan, Vahram. "Kemalism and Communism: From Cooperation to Complication." *Turkish Studies* 16, no. 4 (2015): 510-526.

- Trask, Roger. *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971.
- Vander Lippe, John. "The 'Other' Treaty of Lausanne: The American Public and Official Debate on Turkish-American Relations." *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations* 23 (1993): 31-63.
- Walther, Karine V. *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.
- Watenpaugh, Keith David. *Bread From Stones: The Middle East and the Making of Modern Humanitarianism*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2015.
- Wirtz, Philipp. *Depicting the Late Ottoman Empire in Turkish Autobiographies: Images of a Past World*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Zipp, Samuel. "When Wendell Willkie Went Visiting: Between Interdependency and Exceptionalism in the Public Feeling for *One World*." *American Literary History* 26, no. 3 (2014): 484-510.
- Zürcher, Eric J. "Fundamentalism as an Exclusionary Device in Kemalist Turkish Nationalism." In *Identity Politics in Central Asia and the Muslim World*, edited by W Van Schendel, et al., 209-222. UK: I.B. Taurus, 2001.
- Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey: A History*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.
- Zürcher, Erik J. "Young Turks, Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists." In *Ottoman's Past and Today's Present*, edited by Kemal H Karpat, 150-179. NL: Brill, 2000.