



## From competitive to multidirectional memory: a literary tool for comparison

Çimen Günay-Erkol & Deniz Şenol-Sert

To cite this article: Çimen Günay-Erkol & Deniz Şenol-Sert (2017): From competitive to multidirectional memory: a literary tool for comparison, Turkish Studies, DOI: [10.1080/14683849.2017.1354703](https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2017.1354703)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2017.1354703>



Published online: 27 Jul 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 45



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



## From competitive to multidirectional memory: a literary tool for comparison

Çimen Günay-Erkol and Deniz Şenol-Sert

Faculty of Social Sciences, Özyeğin University, Istanbul, Turkey

### ABSTRACT



Recent research shows that Turkish society is very polarized and that different identities and ideological perspectives are in constant struggle with each other. In a multicultural society such as Turkey's, the question of how to think about the relationship between different social groups' histories of victimization becomes crucial. Following Michael Rothberg's conceptualization of multi-directional memory – beyond competitive memory, this article presents an archive for comparative work through a data set of novels on the military coups in Turkey. The major argument here is that while these novels are promoting the idea of competitive memory as a zero-sum game, if it is looked at more closely, there are traces of multi-directionality, of ongoing negotiation, cross-referencing, and borrowing. Doing so, it is argued, would help to reframe justice in the society, where different victimizations are not competing with each other, but start to talk to each other. This article is an attempt to create a literary tool of comparison on different stories of victimization as a first step towards transitional justice in a polarized society.

**ARTICLE HISTORY** Received 28 February 2017; Accepted 13 June 2017

**KEYWORDS** Turkey; military coups; novels; memory; literature

### Introduction

Turkey experienced the breakdown of its parliamentary regime three times in the period between 1960 and 1980. In addition to the first two successful military coups in 1960 and 1971, there were also three 'abortive' others, one in 1962 and another in 1963, and a third in 1971, when top commanders forced a left-wing military junta to resign. After the resignation of the leftist junta, another one toppled the government in 1971, and this was the second time Turkey's democracy was critically wounded. In 1980, the third 'fatal' intervention took place and the military outlawed all political parties. After the restoration of democracy in 1983, for a period of 13 years, there were no military coups, but the assumed role of the military as the 'guardian'

**CONTACT** Deniz Şenol-Sert  deniz.sert@ozyegin.edu.tr  Faculty of Social Sciences, Özyeğin University, Nişantepe Mah. Orman Sok, 34794 Çekmeköy, Istanbul, Turkey

© 2017 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

of Turkey's democracy continued. In 1997 and in 2007, two more interventions took place; these were with memorandums issued by the military, which 'warned' elected leaders about religious extremism. Following this trend of digitalization, another direct military coup with tanks on the streets was deemed to be impossible in Turkey. However, in 15 July 2016, another abortive attempt to topple the government took place, which appears to have been instigated by a splinter group and awkwardly carried out.

Military coups not only traumatized Turkey's walk toward democracy, but also had far-reaching influences on people's social and political engagements, creating conflicts about freewill, rights, the common good, and so on. In this paper, the legacy of military coups in literature is discussed through novels published during and after the military periods. The data used for the analysis is derived from a data set that was created as part of the project *Memory and Witnessing in Literary Studies: Literature and Military Coups in Turkey*.<sup>1</sup> The data set covered 137 novels that were written between 1960 and 2015. The novels entail both explicit and implicit accounts of the military coups and related events. To avoid ideological bias in the selection of novels, the authors have consulted experts from different socio-political spectrums in Turkey for their advice on the compiled list. The data set relates each novel to a military intervention throughout the history of the Republic in a chronological order. As it stands, the data set looms as a valuable tool for comparative study in cultural studies.

Considering the corpus, it is possible that literature inspired by the military coups aimed to elaborate on the sufferings of the victims. A variety of styles and different aesthetic strategies can be observed in these novels. While some gave documentary accounts of the period with victim/witness testimonies and graphic accounts of maltreatment, torture, and atrocities, many others are built on implicit stories of alienation and darkness represented in a modernist style, without any explicit reference to the history of Turkey. There are also nostalgic novels. These are built on trans-generational memories about several figures such as revolutionary student leaders of the 1970s and ultra-nationalist paramilitary figures of the period that were involved in armed clashes against each other. Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, who was executed with two of his ministers after the first military coup is also a character that is sporadically referred in these novels. Several novels, in addition to their documentary overtones, successfully represent the after-trauma in itself.

In such a variety of perspectives, it is possible to recognize a conflict of memories. The literary output urges the readers to think comparatively about the historical traumas of Turkey's military interventions as it articulates the pain and suffering caused by the military state, traumas of alienation, torture, and atrocities, and struggles of remembering via overlapping

memories. The military period forms an integral part of the novels, but writers of different political camps remember 'differently,' hence the novels' contribution to the collective consciousness show some memories were repressed while others were punctuated. Some of the novels were immediate reactions to what had been happening. Several more contemporary works, which have a time gap of tens of years between the events of the coups and their fictionalization, make it possible to witness the transformation of the memories in time. The 'remembering' in novels, which are built on trans-generational memories of the events, gives the opportunity to comment on how memories, dislocated from time and space, gain new meanings in contrast to their times.

Pressures of society operate in the rebuilding of memory in literature in Turkey as texts form the public sphere where different traumas, shared memories, and different versions of histories of the military coups confront each other. Since Maurice Halbwachs, it is commonplace to treat memory as simultaneously individual and collective.<sup>2</sup> Traumatic memories need to be faced and communicated to integrate the victims. They, therefore turn into 'shared memories,' forming a common ground not only for the victims but also for the witnesses. However, Halbwachs states that individual rebuilding of memory is also a collective act since the mind 'reconstructs its memories under the pressure of society.'<sup>3</sup> Studies on the collectivity of memory inspired several new concepts such as 'imagined communities' which have a common sense of past events forming a nation<sup>4</sup> or *lieux de mémoire* (memory sites), memorials and national ideals, which form the foundation of national belonging.<sup>5</sup> With a questioning of 'borders,' as memory studies moved into a trans-cultural and transnational perspective, circulation of different constructions of the past in and beyond the paradigm of nation has become a new arena of research.

There are different versions of memories of the military past, which form a plurality and heterogeneity of stories in Turkey. Plurality brings a discussion of 'multi-directionality,' a term introduced by Michael Rothberg, around which he questions synergies between memories. When do memories block out others and when do they react multi-directionally? Rothberg's work on multi-directional memory, which foregrounds the liaison between memories of different events, instead of the competition among them, inspired us to examine whether literature of the coups offers a sense of interaction between the victims of different political identities. Rothberg defines memory as multi-directional, 'as subject to on-going recognition, cross-referencing, and borrowing' rather than a zero-sum game.<sup>6</sup> He criticizes the competitive approach in memory studies, and argues against the idea that speaking of the Holocaust blocks or makes less visible, the speaking of slavery, or colonialism, and so on. The 'interaction of different historical memories illustrates the productive, intercultural dynamic' that he calls multi-directional memory.<sup>7</sup>

Rothberg's multi-directionality is an important contribution to the growing field of the cultural study of memory, the road to which is designed by the study of collective images, representations of trauma in certain forms of memory and the circulation of memory in the media by several scholars including Jan Assman, Astrid Erll, and Wulf Kansteiner. Jan Assman defines cultural memory as:

The characteristic store of repeatedly used texts, images and rituals in the cultivation of which each society and epoch stabilizes and imports its self-image; a collectively shared knowledge of preferably (yet not exclusively) the past, on which a group bases its awareness of unity and character.<sup>8</sup>

Following this definition, Wulf Kansteiner and Astrid Erll negotiate memory by their works on the theory and methodology of cultural memory, and on narratives of memory and trauma by which social groups gain recognition and self-esteem.<sup>9</sup> Such problems that these and several other scholars of memory revolve around, that is, the unifying function of narratives, its response to the pluralism of 'memory' and the continuing cultural negotiation for the society's cultural memory are also relevant to our research. But our principal manifold is Rothberg's multi-directionality as we seek to understand the conflicts in cultural remembrance around the military coups in Turkey.

The question in this paper is whether fiction that revolves around the memories of military coups succeeds in turning collective memory from a site of conflict to a site of consolidation for victims and witnesses in Turkey. Following Rothberg, the dialectic relation in which memories of the military periods emerged is explored, and whether their representation in literature brings out multiple dialogues toward transitional justice is questioned. It is of course possible to say that even when literature succeeds in offering a multidimensional view of memory, readers might tend to be selective on the traumatic memory they hold on to, depending on their political identities. While claiming their victim/witness memory as the most traumatic, in other words, several readers might continue to exclude the memory, identity, and victimization of others.

### **Legacy of the military coups in Turkey: how to remember to forget?**

Rothberg's definition of multi-directional memory is a reaction against comparative and competitive tendencies in memory studies. At the core of his analysis is the combination of Holocaust memories with the French colonial oppression against Algerian independence. In contrast to a competitive model that would weigh victims of each occasion, this approach suggests a new and challenging look at how memories converge and foster each other. Certainly there are memories 'better' or 'more easily' remembered and events

considered 'more important' or 'more significant,' but a new type of new thinking emerges as the focus of critical research shifts from the repression of one memory by the other to their interconnectedness. With multi-directional memory, Rothberg enlarges the vision of memory studies significantly with his discussion of transmission across boundaries and time.

Here, in the Turkish context of military coups, the role of literature in the transmission of memories across cultural boundaries of the same society is analyzed in the extensive period around the four major interventions in 1960, 1970, 1981, and 1997. The history of Turkey's military interventions is relatively known outside of the country but even those familiar with the history hardly have an idea of the literary trails of the coups since very few of the coup novels are available in translation.<sup>10</sup> Fiction is an important field of research in studies on traumatic periods across the globe but in countries with a fragile freedom of speech such as Turkey, it gains a special significance. The fictional medium gives the possibility of a more nuanced discussion of the traumatic events and political opposition, which are otherwise intimidating or life threatening to narrate. That is why novels that revolve around the coups open up productive lines of inquiry to understand the memories of those periods.

The first military intervention in Turkey was justified with the 'guardian' role of the military, leaving this as a trend for the following generations, who kept seeing military take-overs as agents of institutional reform. The positive post-coup responses even referred to the intervention as 'The Turkish Revolution' early in the 1960s.<sup>11</sup> The reformist constitution with several civil liberties and social rights that followed the intervention are considered as proof of the reformist nature of the military's takeover. Feroz Ahmad underlines intellectuals' being invited by the military as collaborating partners to brainstorming meetings for the new constitution as an important distinguishing trait.<sup>12</sup> The guardianship metaphor, with the strong state tradition it implies, had a post-generational power and produced approving positions in the 1970s and the 1980s as well.

Considering the coups, overall, Metin Heper emphasizes the responsibility felt by the military against internal and external threats as the reason beneath the move into the political domain; he gives General Hüseyin Kıvrıkoğlu's (chief of general staff in August 1998–August 2002) dictum that 'if necessary the guardianship role of the military over politics in Turkey would continue one thousand years!' as an example.<sup>13</sup> While coups are evaluated as agents for the reestablishment of democracy and the safety of the state in Turkey from the lenses of the archetypal guardianship metaphor, drastic changes forced by the military to social, economic, and political structures are also noted.<sup>14</sup> The return to civilian control after short periods is emphasized to distinguish Turkey from other military states; Ben Lombardi states that the military goes back to the barracks *as soon as* 'civilian control was restored after a

transition period during which purported problems were addressed, justice meted out, new constitutions adopted, and economic growth accomplished.<sup>15</sup>

In contrast to the ‘safety valve’ metaphor, there is the infamous ‘sledgehammer.’ In his pivotal monograph *The Socialist Movement in Turkey 1960–1980*, Igor Lipovsky describes the 20-year period between 1960 and 1980 as the ‘unique moment in the history of the propagation of socialist ideology’ in the country, which is pushed into silence and victimization by the military interventions.<sup>16</sup> While discussing the limited nature of the debate on military coups in Turkey, İsmet Akça warns that the development of capitalism (and the resistance against it) in Turkey are left out, which leaves grounds for a shallow discussion of de-militarization built around the critically non-productive military–civil dichotomy.<sup>17</sup> Cangül Örnek notes the intense Americanization in several fields around the coup periods specifically in the cultural sphere; foundations such as Rockefeller and Ford distributed several grants, the Rockefeller Foundation spending 16 million USD for Turkey between 1952 and 1971 and Ford distributing ‘half of its total Turkish grants in 1950s and 1960s, during its 60 years of service in the country.’<sup>18</sup> Ümit Cizre Sakallıoğlu, likewise, emphasizes the blind spots of the debate on military coups in Turkey, as the ‘autonomy’ of the military makes the guardianship metaphor a problematic one.<sup>19</sup> The civil-war atmosphere in the streets in the wake of the 1971 and 1980 interventions, the public support for the military to re-establish order, and popular approval of authoritarian politics show that ‘guardianship’ is not (and never has been) limited to the military.

Turkey’s transition from a single-party system to a multi-party system with the Democrat Party’s (*Demokrat Parti*, DP) electoral victory ended after 10 years of DP rule with a military intervention. In the second half of the 1950s, the DP took an authoritarian approach to suppress the opposition-friendly press and passed laws to overwhelm the political opposition, which resulted in protests reaching a significant volume on 19 April 1960.<sup>20</sup> There was a growing discontent from the military, the opposition and the public. Large-scale student protests led to violent clashes with the police. On 27 May 1960, the military staged a coup and overthrew the government. General Cemal Gürsel announced that they would re-establish a just democratic order and afterwards they would reinstate civilian rule. Following the establishment of the National Unity Committee as a legislative organ with Gürsel as the chairman, the military opened the way for a new constitution under military tutelage but with extended civil liberties.<sup>21</sup> In October 1961, democratic elections were held and a coalition government was established, with İsmet İnönü, the leader of the Republican People’s Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*, RPP), as the Prime Minister. The coalition government ruled until 1965 when Süleyman Demirel came to power as the head of the Justice Party.

Through the second half of the 1960s, the political polarization between the left and right increased. Student activism was closely connected with intellectuals. The Workers' Party of Turkey (*Türkiye İşçi Partisi*, TİP) found supporters among the majority of the writers, some of which repeated the party line in their daily columns.<sup>22</sup> Some factions in the left tried to activate the 'revolutionary potential' in the armed forces for a socialist regime, adding the military to the student-worker-intelligentsia alliance. A left-wing junta (later known as the Madanoğlu Junta) was deciphered on 9 March 1971, on their intended date of intervention. The members of the junta, '5 generals, 1 admiral, and 35 colonels' quickly obtained forced-retirement.<sup>23</sup> Turkey in 1968 rose to prominence in close parallel with Paris in terms of timing: four weeks after the occupation of the Sorbonne on 13 May 1968, Istanbul Technical University was occupied by students on 17 June 1968. The tone in the streets became more and more aggressive as student leaders turned into urban guerrillas under the influence of global anti-authority and anti-American movements such as Paris's 1968, Vietnam, the Chinese revolution, and Che Guevara's armed struggle. Street violence paralyzed Turkish politics and depreciated the economy.

The leftist student movement in Turkey also saw the Palestinian 'Fedayeen' movement as a model of anti-imperialist resistance. Some members of the Turkish left stationed themselves in Palestine to take part in the fight against Israel.<sup>24</sup> Meanwhile, right-wing paramilitary organizations convened in boot camps to learn to 'combat communism' under the protection of the extreme-right-wing Nationalist Action Party (*Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*, MHP) headed by Alparslan Türkeş. Members of those radical right-wing pan-Turkist factions organized under Ideal Hearths (*Ülkü Ocakları*) and referred to themselves as 'ülkücü/idealist' or 'bozkurt/greywolf'.<sup>25</sup> Jacob Landau states that in some 1500 hearths, about 100,000 people were gathered by 1970.<sup>26</sup>

When the 1969 elections resulted in an intensified victory of Süleyman Demirel's Justice Party, the heir to the executed Prime Minister Adnan Menderes' Democratic Party, revolution with the help of a military intervention became a more popular choice for some leftists. The National Democratic Revolution (*Millî Demokratik Devrim*, MDD) movement advocated that the contribution of the armed forces was crucial in abolishing the existing regime in Turkey. The military was critical of inefficient civilian rule and, consequently, on 12 March 1971, the government was forced to resign after the army gave an ultimatum, threatening the elected leaders with military intervention. Demirel resigned the same day, and a new cabinet, mostly consisting of technocrats, was formed. The interim government suppressed the press, arrested scores of intellectuals, trade-union leaders, and students, dissolved some political parties, and declared a state of emergency in eleven cities.

Turkey became a site of torment under the military regime from 1971 to 1973, overwhelmingly for the leftists.

In 1973, a new government under the RPP and with the leadership of Bülent Ecevit came to power. In the period that followed the general amnesty in 1974 were attempts at normalization; however, the country was far from being steady and peaceful. Unstable governments increased the problems. In addition to a major economic crisis, the country also faced the rise of religious extremism and Kurdish separatist intentions. The parliament was unable to elect a new president and political deadlocks increased the tension. Trying to prevent another coup by the military, Demirel's Justice Party proposed the previous intervention's infamous General Faik Türün as a presidential candidate, but this attempt did not refrain the military from assuming power in 1980.

On 12 September 1980, the military intervened for the third time with tanks lining the streets of Ankara. The main purpose of the coup was announced as to stop violence and re-establish democracy in the country. After the coup, General Evren became the leader of the state as head of the National Security Council with enlarged powers. All political activities were banned and party leaders were suspended. In contrast to the 1971 coup, the militancy of the right wing was also punished to give an impression of balance. A new constitution, a new election law and a new political parties act were drafted to prevent possible future political deadlocks and to guarantee effective governance. The new constitution, which is still grounded in the fundamental structures of today's Turkey, was accepted with a majority vote following a referendum. Elections were held in 1983 but the army kept the power to limit individuals and political parties from running in this election. In the 1983 elections, Turgut Özal, the leader of the Motherland Party, was elected.

To see military interventions as the safety valves of the country continued in the post-1980s as well. Another intervention in Turkish politics from the military came in 28 February 1997, with a memorandum that forced the prime minister, the leader of the coalition partner, the Islamist Virtue Party, to resign on the grounds of rising religious extremism in the country. The process was later labeled a 'postmodern coup.' Here the term 'postmodern,' as pinned by the press, attempts to suggest an indirect pressure. However, several people were also taken into custody, jailed, and had to leave their posts because of their political choices. The trend to digitalize military interventions continued and another memorandum followed in 27 April 2007, the 'midnight memorandum' or 'e-memo,' prepared by-then-Chief of General Staff and a group of other commanders. The midnight memorandum was published online on the Armed Forces' webpage following the political crisis over Turkey's presidential election, as there was a parliamentary

deadlock on whether the presidential nominee's spouse should wear the Islamic headscarf.

The guardianship metaphor was irreparably damaged by the last abortive military intervention in 2016, during which the parliament building was destroyed with heavy artillery. Several people were wounded at the parliament building in Ankara. On the Bosphorus Bridge in Istanbul, soldiers stopped traffic, where unarmed civilians lost their lives in front of military tanks. Similar to previous military coups, the last abortive one also produced victims of different political identities. All interventions deprived Turkey's democracy of power and forced it into a state of immaturity. A nuanced discussion of the collective memory of military coups in the literature is vital to evaluate the sense of dialogue between the victims and to analyze, critically, the legacy of the military coups in Turkey.

### **The trendsetter and its sequel: 27 May 1960 coup and the Turkish experience of 1968**

The first military intervention in 1960 was treated rather positively in the literary field. Several intellectuals who consider the military as the 'guardian' partner in Turkey's democracy welcomed the intervention. This first military coup did not give rise to reactionary testimonials, despite the fact that there were writers and intellectuals such as Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Orhan Duru, Mina Urgan, Adnan Benk, Afşar Timuçin, Vedat Günyol who lost their jobs, were taken under custody or had been sent to prison by then. The literature of the 1960s reflects the political tensions around the coup and discusses, in various forms, student demonstrations, the resistance to the Menderes government, and so on but do not voice an overall rejection of the military power. The fact that the military sought agreement and support among the intellectuals in the process of making the new constitution also contributed to the silence. In time, when people started to recognize that the military was not willing to give its privileges back to elected leaders, the people's reaction to the 1960 coup started to change.

Novels that revolve around the 1960 coup started appearing only after the second military intervention in 1971. These novels do not provide a personal and testimonial account of the 1960 intervention. Critical accounts appeared in the post-1990s, when the history of the military coups became an inspiration for novelists. Sevinç Çokum's *Karanlığa Direnen Yıldız* (1996), Yılmaz Karakoyunlu's *Yorgun Mayıs Kısrakları* (2004), and Nilüfer Kuyaş's *Yeni Baştan* (2007) explore generational and post-generational memories of the 1960 coup, and question the legacy of recurring military regimes in Turkey.<sup>27</sup> It is interesting to notice that despite the lack of oppositional perspectives in the 1960s, heterogeneity of views and memories appear in those late-1990 novels of the 27 May 1960 coup. Sevinç Çokum's *Karanlığa Direnen*

*Yıldız* (1996) for example, has an apartment as its focus in which inhabitants are from different political colors and negotiate the legacy of the military's move into politics.

Çokum, whose works published in the 1970s on the 12 March military coup were critical of the left and angry about the public's finding only leftists youngsters' deaths 'grievable,' opens her work to a criticism of the right in the post-1990s. She allows a multi-directionality of memories by giving voice to different personas and presenting conflicting memoirs of the same events. While her earlier work was an attempt to record (and construct) the memory of the sacrifices of the anti-communist youth, in her later works she calls for an exchange of 'pre-built' collective memories of both camps. Çokum, in other words, realizes that keeping collective memories of the left and the right alive without any genuine contact with each other makes it impossible to start a real political dialogue in Turkey. The 'zero-sum' game is therefore challenged in the 1990s with an imposed alliance among different groups of coup victims.

The earlier absence of dialogue is relatively understandable, considering that there was an active 'war' in the streets between political camps, starting from the late 1960s with the impulse from the Vietnam War. In the late 1960s, under the increased tensions of the Cold War realpolitik, Turkey fell into an alarming atmosphere with streets, youth, trade unions and the public partitioned into camps. The major split was recognized as a split between the left and the (anti-communist) right, but the left and the right were also under political fragmentation themselves with several factions with different agendas. To see the military as a 'guardian' partner in Turkey's democracy was a major tendency in the 1970s in both camps as well. The military did not assume direct power in the second intervention in 1971, but urged an above-parties' government and, during the military regime from 1971 to 1973, Turkey turned into a giant prison.

There is a very small time gap between testimonial novels of the second intervention and the coup when compared to the first.<sup>28</sup> Intellectuals who became victims in the military regime immediately wrote about their experiences in the form of fiction, providing testimonial accounts of the 1970s especially after the return to democracy in 1974.<sup>29</sup> Erdal Öz's *Yaralımsın* (1974) is an ironic tale of a leftist intellectual's finding himself first tortured and then in prison, surrounded by regular prisoners of burglary, homicide, and so on, which punctuates that the plurality of voices does not easily end up with a consensus because of a shared prison experience. In this novel, 'the other' prisoners fail to understand the 'intellectual,' they simply do not care that he was tortured on the basis of his political thoughts. In Sevgi Soysal's *Şafak*, a family gathering ends up in the police station as the police raids the house to catch the 'leftists' and does not refrain from taking into custody the anti-communist neighbors and friends of the family. Two

Kurdish men who are late additions to the custody cell further complicate the story of police brutality. Everybody tastes police brutality, but their responses to it, and hence their memories of it, never coincide. Soysal, who is an ardent criticism of her camp, conducts a very powerful criticism of the left, and shows that there are discrepancies in views (and hence memories) of the people of the same ideological position.

In the 1970s when street fights between the two camps became extreme, dialogue was much more necessary, but fiction was again initially busy with documenting the pains of certain victims on the basis of their political orientations.<sup>30</sup> The initial responses to the 12 March coup were prison-based narratives and overwhelmingly from the left. Prison was a meeting point for the anti-communists as well, but the overwhelming distance between the two mind-sets was often reflected in fiction rather than even a slight probability of dialogue. A conflict of memories of the coup atmosphere surfaced in the mid-1970s in writings by women, as writers from the conservative right attempted to challenge the leftist testimonials of political victimization.

Emine İşinsu's *Sanıcı* (1975) and Sevinç Çokum's *Zor* (1977) provide the initial examples of 'the other side' of the story of 12 March. The narrators created by these writers 'remember' the events differently. In hagiographies of young men who have to sacrifice their lives in fights with the leftists for the well-being of the Turkist political cause, İşinsu and Çokum whitewashed the crimes of the Turkist (anti-communist) movement. Tarık Buğra's *Gençliğim Eyvah* (1979) likewise blames the leftists for the chaos in the country and defends the neo-nationalist youth, guardians of the grand ideal of the Turk-Islam synthesis, who organized in gangs to fight against 'communism.' Conservative writers with Turkist tendencies reflect their positions by emphasizing the Russian influence on the Turkish left, blaming the state authorities with inaction against the terrorization of everyday life and arguing that it is this inaction which pushed the neo-nationalist members of the society into a role of armed guardianship. Hardly any comment appears in their work on state-oriented human rights abuses or violence caused by neo-nationalist gangs.

Adalet Ağaoğlu's *Bir Düşün Gecesi* and Tarık Buğra's *Gençliğim Eyvah* serve as examples of multi-directionality as both writers turn their questioning of the 12 March atmosphere into a larger field with references to earlier political crises. Ağaoğlu expands her perspective by examining the previous coup, Turkey's accession to NATO, and involvement in the Korean War, connecting the suppression of the left and the 'Americanization' of Turkey with historical pressures on the country. The memory of 12 March, in her work, clearly builds on the memory of 27 May and signals that the roots of authoritarianism are deeper in Turkish modernism. Buğra, a conservative pen, likewise returns to the past but he traverses further depths. He argues that oppositional movements almost always have links to outer allies, the

enemies of the Turkish state, and he blames them all in a wide range of periods, ranging from conspiracies in Republican times to the opposition of leftist revolutionaries in Turkey's 1968. Such alternative memories of the leftist student movement compete for public attention, and, although these novels never became as popular as their leftist counterparts in the post-coup period, they give powerful insights into the public remembrance in the 1970s.

### **The sledgehammer: 12 September 1980 and the rise of political Islam**

While young people were engaged in an armed struggle with an almost civil-war atmosphere in the streets in the late 1970s, the military was also triggered. Another coup in 1980 brought the military to power once again and a strong military presence took the streets.<sup>31</sup> The third military coup in 1980 had a higher toll of casualties and the post-1980s witnessed a boom of novels that revolve around the memories of the intervention.<sup>32</sup> Memories of 1980 in literature conflicted with the 'official' or state-approved memory, which silenced and censored all channels of communication, deleted records of 'the disappeared,' and denied maltreatment by authorities. This created a self-censorship among writers as well; but still, several novelists made the detention, maltreatment and torture of citizens and the atmosphere of terror in the country their explicit or implicit focus in literature. While the military obtained civilian control by forcing a psychology of fear into the society, writers deepened their search in the past and problematized memories of the coup.

In most of the novels, there is sympathy for the victims of the military coup, who were overwhelmingly leftists. Student leaders, syndicate leaders, teachers, publishers, and family members of those involved in leftist political activism were targeted, detained, and tortured. Actually, victims were from all political positions in the 1980s, but for the left, there was a wide campaign, which put family members into danger as well. Memories of the leftists turned into stories with urgency while Turkist and Islamist perspectives of the coup appeared in fiction with a time gap.

The second half of the 1980s witnessed novels that examine alienation of former activists who were blamed for the betrayal of the revolutionary cause and for being traitors under military fascism.<sup>33</sup> Writers revealed the traumas of the military coup with different agendas, but with a common urge to understand the dynamics of the post-coup atmosphere. Not only the witnesses, but also the victims of the 1980 coup published novels. A. Kadir Konuk, for example, who was arrested in 1982, obtained a death sentence a year later, and escaped to Germany, published *Gün Dirildi* (1987) and *Çözülme* (1988) both of which have torture as a leading theme.<sup>34</sup>

Another memory conflict surfaced visibly in the late 1980s as victimized Islamists also moved to the front lines of political opposition. The cloistering state pressure in their work implemented a targeted criticism of the Turkish state tradition and problematized the overlap between the 'military state' and the 'democratic state.' Islamists argued that even in its quasi-democratic times, the Turkish state affairs were based on discrimination and lacked an understanding of fundamental human rights. Mehmet Zeren's *Öz Yurdunda Garipsin* (first volume in 1987, second and third in 1988 and 1989. The fourth volume of this novel was published in 1999, two years after the fourth military intervention of 28 February 1997) prioritized students with headscarves as the major victims of the military, as the students' access to higher education was prevented by bans on headscarves.<sup>35</sup> Testimonials with autobiographical overtones continued in the late 1980s and early 1990s with different political accents, further proving how Turkey is divided socially and politically in remembering the coups.<sup>36</sup>

The 'remembering' of the next coup which took place on 28 February 1997, also reflects a heterogeneity of perspectives. Mehmet Efe's *Mızraksız İlmihal* (1993), which was written four years before the coup and which successfully represents the crisis in politics that caused the tensions to increase, confronts the alienation of the Islamists in the political movement. Halime Toros' *Halkaların Ezgisi* (1997) and Ahmet Kekeç's *Yağmurdan Sonra* (1999) are novels that revolve around the pressures of the modern life under militarist minds. Efe's *Mızraksız İlmihal* and Toros's *Halkaların Ezgisi* make swipes to memories of the 12 September coup, while negotiating the power of Islamist opposition. Building their victimization on earlier versions of the coups, these writers attempted to form a multi-directional memory of the events of the 28 February intervention.

In the initial half of the 1990s, a ban on the headscarf was active for state officials and students of state schools. Several writers discussed the delicate issue of 'punishment' of Islamist subjects with headscarf bans, the 'mental' torture and the traumatic destruction of Islamist women's identities. While this issue kept its popularity in the second half of the 1990s, some writers chose to focus on the 12 March coup and discussed the post-generational trauma of the memories of the coup.<sup>37</sup> The ongoing discrimination or human rights abuses in the 1990s appeared on the writers' radar but on a divided political basis. While the headscarf ban was a priority for Islamists, for leftists the urgency was in some other discriminative state affairs.

### Post-coup, post-trauma, post-truth: the future of coup novels in Turkey

There is extensive academic literature on transitional justice that is defined as 'political decisions made in the immediate aftermath of the transition and

directed towards individuals on the basis of what they did or what was done to them under the earlier regime.<sup>38</sup> This definition largely focuses on the institutional processes such as lustration, compensation, prosecution, and truth commissions, where other symbolic elements of transitional justice such as practices of memorialization and commemoration are rather ignored.<sup>39</sup> Despite general acknowledgement that memorialization has an important part in healing wounds of the past as means of giving recognition to those who suffered, there is either a gap within the literature on the subject, or the emphasis is usually just on the monuments, and the like.<sup>40</sup> In fact, following Barahona de Brito, it is proposed here that the study of transitional justice could benefit from the visions of memory studies, demonstrating some of the restrictions of abstract normative perspectives within historically grounded and context-specific angles of two partial ways of looking at the same reality.<sup>41</sup> Like Barahona de Brito and others, it is argued, not only the official political discourse, but also unofficial social initiatives and the wider politics of memory are important to keep alive. In this case, novels are keeping the memory alive, even when there is resistance to accountability.<sup>42</sup>

An analysis of the 1986 short novel, *Farewell, Ayacucho* by Peruvian writer Julio Ortega, Buendia demonstrates that in order for transitional justice to achieve its central objective of reinstating and enhancing citizenship in the wake of massive human rights violations, 'it should engulf not only centralized institutional attempts at memory building but also alternative narratives that recognize the plurality of perspectives and voices that plague an inevitably fragmented social body.'<sup>43</sup> Others also follow this constructivist approach, which endorses that fabricating a common memory is a dialectical process where there is a need to respect multiple narrators' discourses, whether or not they contradict common or official narratives.<sup>44</sup> Similarly, López maintains that collective memory that transpires from collaborative narrative is important, as it fortifies a desired social solidarity.<sup>45</sup> The data set of coups and novels try to achieve this goal of recognizing alternative narratives in the creation of a collective memory.

Despite the widespread popularity in Turkey of the claim that the circumstances around the conflicts of the country are *sui generis*, it is argued here that problems such as civil-war, ethnic clash, or *coup d'état* hold several common characteristics worldwide, which make countries comparable with each other. There are plenty of novels, films and like that make a plea for transitional justice in Turkey similar to those in Latin America, some of which are studied in Turkey. A scholarship that questions the capacity of this production to bring transitional justice is on the rise, as several of the narratives and films gradually get translated to different languages, pass the borders of the country, and become part of a greater call for transitional justice.

Yet, despite the popularity of coup novels and films, these periods did not produce common memorial practices for the Turkish society. Ozan Tekin,

reminds that influences of cinema on the society was huge but also warns that 'it is not wrong to state that Turkish amnesia still continues in relation to the events of the 12 September and memories.'<sup>46</sup> Çimen Günay-Erkol sees the study of coup periods as 'little cracks on a longstanding wall' in her book on 12 March coup and argues that the cracks will eventually shatter the wall.<sup>47</sup> The necessity for a comparative study of coups in Turkey is emphasized by a recent book of articles edited by Mehmet Ö. Alkan, covering the 140 years (between 1876 and 2016) that connect Ottoman history to the history of modern Turkey.<sup>48</sup> These are important steps to move beyond borders to compare the Turkish experience with others, and to direct the discussion to transitional justice.

Writers of the coup novels connect their personal experiences with dramatic aspects of social polarization. They mostly work on themes such as alienation, doubt, and angst, lament for the victims, and elaborate a historical and political critique. Some of the novels inspired by the memories of the military coups are testimonial novels that make use of real personages and events, whereas some of them keep a certain distance from such journalistic tendencies and color the memories of the military coup with an abstract style. There are several testimonial novels written by victims of maltreatment, torture, and political imprisonment but the corpus overwhelmingly rises over fictional testimonials that dramatize being a victim and witness to the military periods.

Coup literature is a growing literature and even in the 2000s, memories of the military coups inspire writers in Turkey.<sup>49</sup> In *Remembering Pinochet's Chile*, a book that covers the political divisions in Chile until Pinochet's arrest in London in 1998 and examines how the Pinochet period is remembered, Steve J. Stern argues that Chilean memory of the dictatorial past is analogous to a 'giant, collectively built memory box.'<sup>50</sup> In the Turkish context, a similar box 'opens' in literature and the box is not tidy at all. There are novels that 'record' pains of the victims and witnesses single-handedly. There also are moments of didacticism produced by pro-coup/anti-coup positions, leftist/anti-communist worldviews, and so on. However, in several works, there are examples of plurality, dialogue, and multi-directionality, in which writers show that there are several layers and points of view in any political position and that memory is not a 'zero-sum' game. Novels can be used productively with the box metaphor in the context of plurality and diversity but it is very important to see that they also problematize the very metaphor as a secure place, in which memories are kept, to be retrieved and reconsidered later. The box is a complex confrontation with memories of the coup and, as the heterogeneity implies, it is obviously proof of the lack of consensus in Turkish society on the events.

Memories of the coups are best understood when considered comprehensively. Fiction pushes victims of the military coups, who used to compete for

political power, into a dialogue with each other. In almost all examples of the novels that revolve around the coups, positions of power are negotiated. State agents, police officers, decision-makers are contested within different ideological positions such as leftist, anti-communist, Islamist, neo-nationalist, pro-coup, or anti-coup. Sometimes it is the oppressor and the oppressed that are juxtaposed, as seen in novels that make torture their defining paradigm, and sometimes it is the victims only, as seen in novels that measure the victimization of the left-wing youngsters with a comparison to the right wing. Family and friendship are negotiated over political dissonances. All these provide a multi-directionality of memories, despite the battles that keep people in different camps as political subjects.

Considering that several writers were still turning to the memories of the previous coups – in hybrid works of memory, testimony, and autobiography – in the aftermath of the fourth coup in 28 September 1997, it is possible that the urge to confront those memories is still very much alive in Turkey. More time is needed to confront the memories as some people find the courage to look back at their past only when the climate of fear becomes less threatening. The ‘pressures’ in the atmosphere is a vital phenomenon in discussing the multi-directionality of memories in literature because of the limited political positions forced to the public in the post-coup periods. For example, the first military intervention becomes an explicit center only in late 1990 novels, when writers tended to have a look at the past and tried to understand the ‘trendsetter’ after two successive military coups in 1970 and 1980. The confrontation with painful and violent memories of the coups is not complete until these memories are properly addressed and the society moves forward to build a better future. Fiction plays an important role in bringing conflicting memories into contact with each other, and keeping the memory ‘box’ open is just a beginning for transitional justice in Turkey.

## Notes

1. Further information about the project and the dataset is available at: <http://edebiyattadarbe.com/>.
2. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*.
3. Ibid., 51.
4. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.
5. Nora, *Realms of Memory*.
6. Rothberg, “Introduction,” 3.
7. Ibid.
8. Assmann and Czaplicka, “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity,” 125.
9. Kansteiner, “Finding Meaning in Memory”; Erll, “Literature, Film and the Mediality of Cultural Memory.”
10. After the 1971 intervention, foreign media attention to Turkey increased and a new set of writers became of interest for translators. The prestigious publishing company Flammarion published the French translation of Çetin Altan’s *Büyük*

Gözaltı (1972), as *Étroite Surveillance* in 1975, when the novel was in its fifth edition in Turkey. Erdal Öz's popular book *Yaralısın* (1974) followed in Dutch (*Je bent gewond*, Ambo, 1988) several years after the second military intervention took place in Turkey. Adalet Ağaoğlu's *Ölmeye Yatmak* (1973) was published in German by Unionsverlag (Sich hinlegen und sterben, 2008) and Sevgi Soysal's *Yenişehir'de Bir Öğle Vakti* (Noontime in Yenişehir, 2016) was very recently published by Milet Publishing.

11. Weiker, *The Turkish Revolution 1960-1961*.
12. Ahmad, *The Turkish Experiment with Democracy*, 127.
13. Heper, "Civil-Military Relations in Turkey," 248.
14. Özbudun, *Contemporary Turkish Politics*, 26.
15. Lombardi, "Turkey," 203.
16. Lipovsky, *The Socialist Movement in Turkey*, 2.
17. Akça, "Türkiye'de Darbeler, Kapitalizm ve Demokrasi(sizlik)," 49.
18. Örnek, *Türkiye'nin Soğuk Savaş Düşünce Hayatı*, 175.
19. Sakalhoğlu, "The Anatomy of the Turkish Military's Political Autonomy," 151.
20. Varol, "The Democratic Coup d'état," 325.
21. Narlı, "Civil-Military Relations in Turkey," 113.
22. Bali, *Turkish Student's Movements and the Turkish Left in the 1950-1960*, 75.
23. Ahmad, *The Turkish Experiment with Democracy*, 292.
24. Çandar, "A Turk in the Palestinian Resistance," 69.
25. Bora, "Nationalist Discourses in Turkey," 450.
26. Landau, *Panturkism*, 148.
27. Some biographical novels about Prime Minister Adnan Menderes also tried to make use of the return of the Menderes image in Turkey's political discussions in post-2000: İsa Yılmaz's *Ben Bu Adamı Sevdim* (2012) and Melike İlgün's *Bir Başvekil Sevdim* (2013) which are melodramatic novels about the love affair between Menderes and Ayhan Aydan contribute to the surge of historical novels.
28. Ironically, one of the novels of the second coup even precedes the second military intervention. Melih Cevdet Anday's *Gizli Emir* (1970) depicts intellectuals, in an abstract time and setting, who wait to hear the announcement of the orders of a despotic regime.
29. Çetin Altan's *Büyük Gözaltı* (1972) and *Bir Avuç Gökyüzü* (1974), Füzuran's *47'liler* (1974), Tarık Dursun K.'s *Gün Döndü* (1974), Erdal Öz's *Yaralısın* (1974), Melih Cevdet Anday's *İsa'nın Günceci* (1974) provide minute details of political activism and prison life, elaborating on young people's engagement with leftist politics. Yılmaz Güney's Selimiye trio, *Salpa*, *Sanık* and *Hücrem*, which were written between 1971 and 1973, portray the class-conflicts around the war of ideologies with an autobiographical twist. Sevgi Soysal's *Şafak* (1975), Emine Işınsu's *Sanıcı* (1975) and Pınar Kür's *Yarım Yarım* approach political activism and victimization with a special emphasis on gender.
30. Samim Kocagöz's *Tartışma* (1976), Demirtaş Ceyhun's *Yağmur Sıcağı* (1976), Demir Özlü's *Bir Uzun Sonbahar* (1976), and Oktay Rifat's *Bir Kadının Penceresinden* elaborate on what it means to be a revolutionary, with autobiographical details. Sevinç Çokum's *Zor* (1977), Aysel Özakin's *Alnında Mavi Kuşlar* (1978), Tarık Buğra's *Gençliğim Eyvah* (1979), Demir Özlü's *Bir Küçük Burjuva'nın Gençlik Yılları* (1979), Ayla Kutlu's *Kaçış* (1979), and Adalet Ağaoğlu's *Bir Düşün Gecesi* (1979) discuss the dynamics and the legacy of the second

coup in the wake of the third. All of these novels were deliberate efforts to shape memories of the coup in order to contribute to the collective memory of the future generations.

31. Published in 1980, Tezer Özlü's *Çocukluğumun Soğuk Geceleri* (1980) signals the more devastating era to come. This novel illustrates the psychological pains of a young girl who grows into womanhood under the pressures of a military dad as a dramatic metaphor for the country's intelligentsia; Özlü draws parallels between her psychologically distressed persona subjected to electroshock therapy and political prisoners tortured with electricity. It is the most dramatic example of how political discrepancies disintegrated families and the military state assumed the role of guardianship.
32. Mehmet Eroğlu won a literary prize in 1979 with his testimonial *Issızlığın Ortasında* but hardly any publisher showed the courage to publish his book. Eroğlu finished his second novel *Geç Kalmış Ölü* in 1981, but left it unpublished as well. Aysel Özakan's *Genç Kız ve Ölüm* (1980) and Erol Toy's *Zor Oyunu* (1980) returned to the 1960s–1970s to illustrate the social frustration. Ahmet Altan's *Dört Mevsim Sonbahar* and Emine Işınsoy *Canbaz* (1982) explore young people's obsession from the left and the right with armed activism. Family struggles and the red-hunt of the 1970s formed the basis of Turkey's Nobel laureate Orhan Pamuk's *Sessiz Ev* (1983) and Ayla Kutlu's *Tutsaklar* (1983). Eroğlu published both of his novels after the return to democratic politics in 1984.
33. Ahmet Altan's *Sudaki İz* (1985), Bilge Karasu's *Gece* (1985), Latife Tekin's *Gece Dersleri* (1986), Mehmet Eroğlu's *Yarım Kalan Yürüyüş* (1986), Samim Kocagöz's *Mor Ötesi* (1986), Alev Alatlı's *İşkenceci* (1986), Adalet Ağaoğlu *Hayır* (1987), Ayla Kutlu's *Hoşçakal Umut* (1987).
34. Kaan Arsanoglu's *Devrimciler* (1988) and *Kimlik* (1989) examined the heavy burden on political activists. A. Kadir Konuk's *Sıcak Bir Günün Şafağında* (1989), Mehmet Eroğlu's *Adını Unutan Adam* (1989), Ümit Kıvanç's *Bekle Dedim Gölgeye* (1989), Feride Çiçekoğlu's *Uçurtmayı Vurmasınlar* (1989), and Bekir Yıldız's *Darbe* (1989) revolve around themes such as uprisings, international links of political activists, comradeship, prison conditions, torture and so on.
35. Yaşar Kaplan's *Sıfır Üç Depremleri* (1987), Tarık Buğra's *Dünyanın En Pis Sokağı* (1989) also deepened the question of the validity of the leftist victim position as the single example of the post-coup trauma.
36. Ömer Lütfi Mete's *Çiğliğin Ardı Çiğlik* (1989) had neo-nationalists' pain in prisons after the coup at its explicit focus. Halil Genç's *Koyabilmek Adını* (1988), Hüseyin Şimşek's *Ayrımı Bol Bir Yol'da* (1988) and Eylül Şifresi (1991), Kaan Arsanoglu's *Çağrısız Hayalim* (1992), Mehmet Eroğlu's *Yürek Sürgünü* (1994), Kaan Arsanoglu's *Kişilikler* (1995) explore memories of leftist activism, prison and torture, and also elaborate on the disintegration of the leftist political activists of the 1980s. In M. Naci Bostancı's *Seksenler: İşim Gölgesi* (1996) the victim is also a neo-nationalist.
37. Gürsel Korat's *Ay Şarkısı* (1997), Timur Ertekin's *Şamanın Üç Soygunu* (1999), and Tahir Abacı's *İkinci Adım* (1999) are such examples.
38. Elster, "Coming to Terms with the Past," 14.
39. Light and Young, "Public Memory, Commemoration, and Transitional Justice," 233.
40. *ibid.*

41. Barahona de Brito, "Transitional Justice and Memory."
42. Barahona De Brito, Gonzalez Enriquez, and Aguilar, *The Politics of Memory*.
43. Buendía, "Truth in the Time of Fear," 344.
44. Walker, "Troubles with Truth Commissions."
45. Lopez, "Legalizing Collective Remembrance after Mass Atrocities."
46. Tekin, *Factories of Memory*, 35.
47. Günay-Erkol, *Broken Masculinities*, 217.
48. Alkan, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Darbeler*.
49. Post-2000 coup novels are diverse in terms of their ideological perspectives and also in terms of the coup they tend to focus on. Ayşe Sarısayın *Ansızın Günbatımı* (2014), Lütfü Şehsuvaroğlu *Kafes* (2015), Gün Zileli *Çanlar* (2016), İskender Pala *Karun ve Anarşist* (2017) are just a few examples.
50. Stern, *Remembering Pinochet's Chile*, xxix.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

### Funding

This work was supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, TÜBİTAK under [grant number 114K137].

### Note on contributors

**Çimen Günay-Erkol** is an assistant professor of Turkish Literature at Ozyegin University, Istanbul. She got her BS from METU, MA from Bilkent University, and Ph.D. from Leiden University. Her fields of interest include gender and masculinity studies, disability studies, biography, and topics such as testimony and trauma. Recently, Dr Günay-Erkol co-edited *Dictionary of Literary Biography 373* (New York: Gale, 2013) and DLB 379 (New York: Gale, 2016) a collection of biographies of novelists in Turkey with Burcu Alkan. Central European University Press published her book *Broken Masculinities: Solitude, Alienation, and Frustration in Turkish Literature after 1970* in 2016. She is one of the editors of the journal *Masculinities: A Journal of Identity and Culture* based in Istanbul. She plans to continue working on trauma and disability.

**Deniz Senol-Sert** is an associate professor of International Relations at Ozyegin University, Istanbul. Before joining OzU, she was a Senior Research Associate at the Migration Research Center, Koç University, Istanbul. She is a renowned expert on migration issues in Turkey and globally who has taught and conducted research at several institutions domestically and abroad. Deniz received her BA in International Relations from Koç University, an M.Sc. in European Union Policy Making from the London School of Economics, and an M.Phil. in Political Science from the City University of New York. She received her Ph.D. in comparative politics in 2008 from the City University of New York; her thesis was entitled 'The Property Rights of Conflict-Induced Internally Displaced People: Ideals, Realities, Lessons.' Her articles have been published in journals such as *International Migration*, *Middle Eastern Studies*, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, and *Journal of Refugee Studies*.

## Bibliography

- Ahmad, Feroz. *The Turkish Experiment with Democracy: 1950-1975*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977.
- Akça, İsmet. "Türkiye'de Darbeler, Kapitalizm ve Demokrasi(sizlik) [Coups in Turkey, Capitalism and (non)Democracy]." In *Cumhuriyet Tarihinin Tartışılmalı Konuları* [Debated Topics in Republican History], edited by Bülent Bilmez, 49–71. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2013.
- Alkan, Mehmet Ö., ed. *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Darbeler* [Coups from Ottoman Times till Today]. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2017.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Assmann, Jan, and John Czaplicka. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." Translated by John Czaplika. *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125–133.
- Bali, Rifat. *Turkish Student's Movements and the Turkish Left in the 1950s-1960s*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 2006.
- Barahona de Brito, A. "Transitional Justice and Memory: Exploring Perspectives." *South European Society and Politics* 15, no. 3 (2010): 359–376.
- Barahona De Brito, A., C. Gonzalez Enriquez, and P. Aguilar. *The Politics of Memory: Transitional Justice in Democratizing Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Bora, Tanıl. "Nationalist Discourses in Turkey." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (2003): 450–451.
- Buendía, F. C. "Truth in the Time of Fear: Adiós, Ayacucho's Poetics of Memory and the Peruvian Transitional Justice Process." *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6, no. 2 (2012): 344–354.
- Çandar, Cengiz. "A Turk in the Palestinian Resistance." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 30, no. 1 (2000): 68–82.
- Elster, Jon. "Coming to Terms with the Past: A Framework for the Study of Justice in the Transition to Democracy." *European Journal of Sociology* 39, no. 1 (1998): 7–48.
- Erlil, Astrid. "Literature, Film and the Mediality of Cultural Memory." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by Astrid Erlil, and Ansgar Nünning, 389–398. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Günay-Erkol, Çimen. *Broken Masculinities: Solitude, Alienation and Frustration in Turkish Literature after 1970*. New York: Central European University Press, 2016.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Heper, Metin. "Civil-Military Relations in Turkey: Toward a Liberal Model?" *Turkish Studies* 12 (2011): 241–252.
- Kansteiner, Wulf. "Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies." *History and Theory* 41, no. 2 (2002): 179–197.
- Landau, Jacob. *Pan-Turkism in Turkey: A Study of Irredentism*. London: Hurst, 1981.
- Light, D., and C. Young. "Public Memory, Commemoration, and Transitional Justice: Reconfiguring the Past in Public Space." In *Post-Communist Transitional Justice*, edited by Lavinia Stan, and Nadya Nedelsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015 doi:10.1017/CBO9781107588516.017.
- Lipovsky, Igor. *The Socialist Movement in Turkey*. London: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Lombardi, Ben. "Turkey-the Return of the Reluctant Generals?" *Political Science Quarterly* 112, no. 2 (1997): 191–215.

- Lopez, R. "Legalizing Collective Remembrance after Mass Atrocities." In *The Performance of Memory as Transitional Justice*, edited by S. Elizabeth Bird and Fraser M. Ottanelli, 23–42. Cambridge: Intersentia, 2015.
- Narlı, Nilüfer. "Civil-Military Relations in Turkey." *Turkish Studies* 1, no. 1 (2000): 107–127.
- Nora, Pierre. *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996–1998.
- Örnek, Cangül. *Türkiye'nin Soğuk Savaş Düşünce Hayatı: Antikomünizm ve Amerikan Etkisi* [Cold War Thinking in Turkey: Anticommunism and American Effect]. Istanbul: Can Yayınları, 2015.
- Özbudun, Ergun. *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, (2009): 1–29.
- Sakallıoğlu, Ümit Cizre. "The Anatomy of the Turkish Military's Political Autonomy." *Comparative Politics* 29, no. 2 (1997): 151–166.
- Stern, Steve J. *Remembering Pinochet's Chile*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Tekin, Ozan. *Factories of Memory: Cinematic Representations of the 12 September Military Coup*. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing, 2014.
- Varol, Ozan O. "The Democratic Coup d' état." *Harvard International Law Journal* 53, no. 2 (2012): 323–332.
- Walker, M. U. "Troubles with Truth Commissions: Putting the Moral Aims of Truth Commissions to the Fore." In *The Performance of Memory as Transitional Justice*, edited by S. Elizabeth Bird and Fraser M. Ottanelli, 7–22. Cambridge: Intersentia, 2015.
- Weiker, Walter. *The Turkish Revolution 1960-1961*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1963.