

THE CRIMEAN TATAR NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF INNER AND
OUTER DIASPORA: *LENIN BAYRAGI, EMEL AND DERGI*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ALTER KAHRAMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EURASIAN STUDIES

AUGUST 2014

Approval of the Graduate of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı
Head of the Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı	(METU, PSPA)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün	(METU, SOC.)	_____
Prof. Dr. İsmail Aydıngün	(Başkent, PSIR)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Alter Kahraman

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE CRIMEAN TATAR NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF INNER AND
OUTER DIASPORA: *LENIN BAYRAGI*, *EMEL* AND *DERGI*

Kahraman, Alter

M. Sc., Department of Eurasian Studies
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün
August 2014, 198 pages

This thesis analyzes the Crimean Tatar National Movement in and outside the USSR through their publications in different countries (*Lenin Bayragı* in Uzbekistan, *Emel* in Turkey and *Dergi* in Germany). It consists of two basic parts: the development of the National Movement in exile, and the evaluation of the documentary research and the interviews on *Lenin Bayragı*, Crimean Tatars' only newspaper in exile. Some concepts and terms, which were derived from the interviews, such as diaspora, collective memory, common trauma, and homeland are elaborated to understand the exiled Crimean Tatars' relationship with their homeland Crimea.

Keywords: Crimean Tatar National Movement, *Lenin Bayragı*, Collective Memory, Deportation, *Emel*

ÖZ

DAHİLİ VE HARİCİ DİASPORANIN YAYINLARINDA KIRIM TATAR MİLLİ HAREKETİ: *LENİN*
BAYRAGI, EMEL VE DERGİ

Kahraman, Alter

Yüksek Lisans, Avrasya Çalışmaları Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün
Ağustos 2014, 198 sayfa

Bu tezde Kırım Tatarlarının Anavatan Kırım’a dönebilmek için Sovyetler Birliği’ne karşı verdikleri mücadele Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi’nin farklı ülkelerde çıkardığı yayınlar üzerinden incelenecektir (Özbekistan’da *Lenin Bayragı*, Türkiye’de *Emel* ve Almanya’da *Dergi*). Tez iki kısımdan oluşmaktadır: Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi’nin tarihi gelişimi ve Kırım Tatarlarının sürgünde Kırım Tatarca çıkardıkları yegane gazete olan *Lenin Bayragı* üzerine yapılan belge araştırması ve mülakatların değerlendirilmesi. Araştırma süresince ortaya çıkan kolektif hafıza, travma, anavatan, diaspora gibi kavramlar sürgündeki Kırım Tatarlarının Kırım ile kurdukları ilişkinin açıklanmasında yararlanılabilecek uygun araçlar olarak değerlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi, *Lenin Bayragı*, Kolektif Hafıza, Sürgün, *Emel*

To My Parents, Bahtışen and Fayidin

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of people have made valuable contributions to this thesis, but first, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün for her everlasting guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research. Without her persistent help this thesis would not have been possible. I also thank her to support my thesis by giving me a chance to conduct a fieldwork, which was made possible by a grant from the Council of Higher Education (YÖK), in Crimea. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı for her criticism and advice, and I thank the examining committee members, Prof. Dr. İsmail Aydıngün and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı, for their valuable contributions.

It is my pleasure to express my appreciations to the informants from KIPU, *Mejlis* and *Lenin Bayragı* for their evaluations and contributions. I owe special thanks to the kind staff of IRCICA Library in Istanbul and Crimean Tatar Gasprinskiy Library in Simferopol (Akmescit), and the Crimeans for their help during and after the research in Crimea.

I would like to thank Asan E., Eldar S., Türker Yüksel, Safiye Olgun, Fethi K. Şahin, Susanna Mustafayeva, and others, who helped me with various stages of the study. Many thanks are also due to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elmira Muratova, Assist. Prof. Dr. Yuliya Biletska, Viktoria Demidova, and Natasha Nikolenko.

I would like to thank F. Bilge Cengiz, who helped and supported me during the study.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest concern and love to my beloved family for their support and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introducing the Study	1
1.2 Methodology	7
1.3 Field Research in Crimea	7
1.3.1 Documentary Research	8
1.3.2 Expert Interviews	9
1.4 Chapters	10
2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	12
2.1 Imperial Russian Period	12
2.2 The Soviet Period.....	15
2.2.1 The Struggle for Crimea	15
2.2.2 The Sovietization of Crimea	17
2.2.3 The German Occupation (1941-1944)	23
2.2.3.1 Crimean Tatar - German Relations	26
2.2.3.2 'Collaboration'	30
2.2.3.3 Motives for 'Collaboration'	37
2.2.4 The 1944 Deportation	44

3	CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	49
3.1	Diaspora.....	49
3.2	Collective Memory	52
4	OUTER DIASPORA IN FREE WORLD	65
4.1	Interwar Period: Prometheus League	65
4.1.1	<i>Dergi</i> and <i>Emel</i>	68
4.2	Cold War Years: Émigrés	75
4.2.1	Evaluation of the Developments in the USSR by the Diaspora Movement	77
4.2.1.1	Lenin Bayrağı	82
5	CRIMEAN TATAR NATIONAL MOVEMENT	84
5.1	The National Movement's Struggling Methods	88
5.1.1	Tone of the Petitions.....	92
5.1.2	The Requests by the Petitions.....	94
5.2	The Decree of September 5, 1967.....	96
5.3	Gorbachev Era	103
5.4	Organization of the Crimean Tatar National Movement and the Return.	106
5.5	Russian Occupation of Crimea (2014)	111
6	<i>LENIN BAYRAĞI</i> : BETWEEN TWO FIRES	116
6.1	A school and a Teacher	119
6.2	<i>Lenin Bayrağı</i> and the National Movement.....	127
6.3	The Methods - Paths Used by Crimean Tatar Literati.....	130
6.4	' <i>Cesaret</i> ' (Bravery).....	139
7	CONCLUSION	146
	REFERENCES.....	155
	APPENDICES	
A.	TURKISH SUMMARY.....	188

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASSR	Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CTNM	Crimean Tatar National Movement
KGB	Committee for State Security of the Soviet Union
KIPU	Crimean State Engineering Pedagogical University
NKVD	People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs
OCNM	Organization of the Crimean Tatar National Movement
POWs	Prisoners-of-war
SALT	Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UZLIT	National Committee for Protection of State Secrets in the Press
WWI	First World War
WWII	Second World War

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Bu yerge biz kelgen vakıtlar,
Kurgak çöl kuneşten yanardı...
Bu yerde olenler ve otlar
Ve, attı asırlar sarardı.¹

1.1 Introducing the Study

On May 18, 1944, Crimean Tatars were forcefully deported,² from their homeland Crimea³ to various republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), particularly to Uzbekistan, on the pretext of collaboration with the Nazis during German occupation of the peninsula. They lived under ‘special settlement’ regime, under police surveillance for 12 years at places where they were settled. Special settlement regime was lifted in 1956 by a decree for Crimean Tatars and other deported nations, yet they were not allowed to repatriate to Crimea and to restore their autonomous republic, which was abolished after the deportation.⁴ Instead, as soon as the police surveillance was lifted, some institutions designated for Crimean Tatars were established in order to facilitate Tatars’ life in Uzbekistan, or according

¹ “To this place in the times we came,
Arid desert used to sunburn...
In this place the dead and the hay
And even centuries yellowed.”

The first four verses of the poem ‘Yanıyer’ of Zakir Kurtnezir, translated by the author. Eşref Şemizade, **Halk Hızmetinde**, Tashkent, Gafur Gulam Publishing House, 1977, p. 9

² This day called as *Kara Gün* (the black day) of Crimean Tatar history.

³ Mongols-Tatars settled down in Crimea in the first half of the 13th century, and Crimea was governed by governors appointed by Golden Horde Khans. Following the dissolution of Golden Horde, Crimean Khanate was founded in 1441 by Haji Giray and his successors governed in Crimea until Russian occupation in 1783.

⁴ In addition to Crimean Tatars, Volga Germans and Ahıska Turks (Meskhetian) faced the same destiny and they also were not repatriated.

to another view, to make Tatars settle in Uzbekistan forever. These institutions were established in 1956 and 1957, e.g., the Crimean Tatar song program in Uzbek Radio, Crimean Tatar dance and song ensemble, Crimean Tatar section within Uzbek Writers Union, and the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı*.⁵

After Stalin's death in 1953, deported peoples, Chechens, Kalmyks, Balkars, Karachais and Ingushs,⁶ which were accused of collaboration with the enemy during Great Patriotic War, were released from the accusation and rehabilitated. Moreover, their autonomous republics, which were abolished following the deportations, were restored. However, none of these, as stated earlier, were bestowed to Crimean Tatars. It is probably because Crimea is located in a very strategic location in Black Sea, and the Soviet administration would not want a nationality which was considered 'unreliable' in such a strategic location. Besides, the policy of the Soviet Union was to cleanse the state frontiers and strategic territories from the non-Slavic elements (e.g., Koreans in 1937, Volga Germans in 1941, Crimean Tatars, Ahıska Turks, and other Caucasian nations in 1943 and 1944. Moreover, Russian administration, in the tsarist, communist and post-cummunist period, has considered Crimea as a Russian land, and pursued a policy of Russification in Crimea. The pro-Turkish orientation of Crimean Tatars and Ahıska Turks was laso another important factor influencing the policies of the Soviet regime.

Crimea has not lost its geostrategic importance in Black Sea and in the world politics. It has always been an important and valuable peninsula, and an object of collective memory of Russians and its indigenous people Crimean Tatars, and, like today a hotspot. For the scholars who are interested in identity, ethnicity, migration-

⁵ *Lenin Bayragı* was printed in Crimean Tatar language from 1957 until 1991 in Taskent, Uzbekistan. Throughout the thesis, the Crimean Tatar spelling of the name of the publications, *Lenin Bayragı* and *Yanı Dünya*, is used.

⁶ These five nations, Crimean Tatars were deported in the same period, from 1943 to 1944, under the same pretext, namely, collaboration with the Nazi invaders in the Patriotic War. Isabelle Kreindler, "The Soviet Deported Nationalities: A Summary and an Update", **Soviet Studies**, vol. 38, no. 3, 1986, p. 387-405

deportation and history, Crimean Tatars, their national movement and experience in exile seem a rewarding case to study. This was one of the reasons that pushed me to study the Crimean Tatars. The other reason was the growing interest of the global actors in the Black Sea region, and relatedly the growing influence of Russia in the peninsula and the pressure on the Crimean Tatars. The Russian invasion which took place after I finished my fieldwork was proof of that. After the Russian invasion of Crimea, the researchers' interest in Crimea will probably increase. However, doing research might also be difficult compared to the period I carried out my fieldwork.

Since the rehabilitation and repatriation of Crimean Tatar people and restoration of Crimean autonomous entity were not materialized in 1956, first steps toward an organized movement were taken by Crimean Tatars. The Crimean Tatar National Movement (CTNM) began on a ground where a distinct Crimean Tatar ethnicity was not identified and recognized by the Soviet Union. The first pioneers of the movement were "elder members of the party, participants in the revolution and the civil war, heroes of the Patriotic War, and former members of the government of the Crimean ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]".⁷ This first generation believed that their problem would be resolved by the Soviet government and the Communist Party. They obeyed the Soviet rules and acted in accordance with the Soviet system. Therefore, they began simply by sending petitions to Moscow, to 'the necropolis of complaints',⁸ and after 1960s, representatives to Moscow, to solve their case. In 1967, charges against the entire Crimean Tatar population for collaboration with Germans were removed by a decree, and they were partially rehabilitated, probably in consequence of Tatars' mass petitions to Moscow, the persistent existence of Crimean Tatar representatives in Moscow, and the upcoming 50th anniversary of October Revolution. The 1967 decree triggered individual Crimean

⁷ "Documents: '...Defense Speech of Mustafa Jemilev (1970)'"', **Tatars of the Crimea Their Struggle for Survival**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1988, p. 113

⁸ Muhammed Salih, **Yolname Özgürlük Mücadelesi**, İstanbul, Ötüken, 2002, p. 80

Tatar flow to Crimea, but few succeeded in settling there although the decree allowed them to live anywhere in the USSR.

At the second half of the 1960s, the National Movement contacted dissidents and foreign correspondents in Moscow. In this way, they were better known and heard outside the USSR. The Movement had to keep its activities low profile during Brezhnev years, or 1970s, due to arrests and trials until the Gorbachev reforms. The real break in the history of the USSR and the destiny of Crimean Tatars took place during Gorbachev years; it is the return for Crimean Tatars. In 1987, committees period started wherein authorities once again, but for the last time, sustained to appeal delaying tactics for Crimean Tatar problem. However, in November of 1989, a decree was issued by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR concerning not only Crimean Tatars but all repressed and forcefully deported peoples. With this decree, illegal acts of Stalinist era were condemned, and it was decided that committees would be formed. Unlike the previous committees, they did not aim to prevent Crimean Tatars from returning to Crimea. On the contrary, they aimed to conduct an organized return.

The analysis of the CTNM in the thesis is twofold: inside the USSR and outside the USSR. It is due to the physical (the Western Bloc vs. Eastern Bloc) and ideological (communism vs. liberalism and capitalism) division of Europe and of the world in the Cold War. As a result of this split, different methods (anti-Soviet propaganda vs. active democratic struggle) were applied and distinct lines (cooperation with anti-Soviet powers such as Poland during the interwar period, Germany in the Second World War (WWII) and the West in Cold War vs. struggle within the system and reference to Leninism) were followed by the Movement. Since National Movement outside the USSR was an elite-oriented movement, later it will be discussed around three prominent figures (Cafer Seydahmet, Müstecip Ülküsal and Edige Kırimal). Although the National Movement inside the USSR started as elite-oriented, too, in a short time it evolved into a mass movement. After all, countless documents bearing

millions of signatures were sent to the Soviet authorities, and thousands of Crimean Tatar representatives went to Moscow. For this reason, the movement inside the USSR will be narrated without focusing on specific characters.

The thesis argues that Crimean Tatar collective memory shaped and enhanced diaspora Crimean Tatar collective identity in exile. This memory was fed, first, by narratives concerning common tragedies and pains experienced during the deportation, and suppressions, humiliations, discriminations and injustices in the destination places; second, by the narratives of lost homeland, Crimea. Until now, similar points have been elaborated by scholars such as Aurelie Campana, Brian G. Williams and Greta L. Uehling in their writings.

This work contributes to the existing literature by its analysis of the role of *Lenin Bayragı* (Lenin Banner), a unique publication for Crimean Tatars in exile, and its function in strengthening of the collective memory. This study is the first to analyse *Lenin Bayragı* comprehensively in English and Turkish languages through documentary research and in-depth interviews in Crimea in 2013. It also discusses the newspaper's contribution to the Crimean Tatar collective memory in detail. The second part of the thesis focuses on the publications of the National Movement outside the USSR, though covering the latter with a limited scope: *Emel* in Turkey and *Dergi* in Munich.⁹ This section briefly discusses how the National Movement outside the USSR perceived the developments and activities of the National Movement in the USSR as is revealed in these publications.

The discussion of the concept of diaspora takes the Crimean Tatars as outer and inner diaspora community, and their national movement as a diaspora movement. The outer diaspora refers to Crimean Tatars who were outside the USSR and inner diaspora refers to Crimean Tatars who were dispersed throughout the USSR, mostly

⁹ *Dergi* was not published by Crimean Tatars but its editor was a Crimean Tatar: Edige Kırımal. He published there many articles and news regarding Crimean Tatars.

to Central Asia. Such a division is applied because these Crimean Tatar diasporas were not and are not alike. First, they did not share the same 'trauma', namely, the 1944 deportation. Second, while the former has been mostly based on an intellectual movement due to lack of self-awareness, myth of return and of homeland, the latter was a continuous mass movement. Also, it was a unique period in the post-Stalin USSR history marked by thousands of petitions and protests.

Collective memory approach is preferred to explain the Crimean Tatar case and their experience in exile. I argue that Crimean Tatar collective identity and/or collective consciousness were strengthened by collective memory of a shared trauma and also by the external factors (discriminatory policies of the Soviet state) and interethnic relations in exiled places. In other words, post WWII Crimean Tatar identity cannot be thought and explained without considering the 1944 deportation, common trauma, and Crimean ideal, cause of return, which united the community. Here, the collective memory was used as a tool to keep alive the return and collective consciousness of the group including new generations.

The interviews revealed that Crimea was always a part of the Crimean Tatar life in exile, and it was, in memory of Crimeans, kept alive and transferred to the new generations through narratives. The interviews also revealed the central place of Crimean Tatar family in the socialization of the Crimean Tatar youth and the transfer of community values to the young generation. Family visits and, in general, Crimean Tatar environment, were conducive to the circulation of narratives, stories and discourses on Crimea. In this setting was the collective memory produced and reproduced. Outside the Crimean Tatar environment, external factors, such as humiliation in the streets, discrimination in education, and pressure at work (i.e. censorship practices in the publishing) possibly reinforced the consciousness of Crimean Tatariness.

1.2 Methodology

The research adopts the multi-method approach to qualitative research.¹⁰ That is, an ethnographic research is employed; semi-structured qualitative interviewing (and limited micro-ethnography-participant observation) is conducted¹¹ along with the documentary research on the newspaper *Lenin Bayragi*. Semi-structured indepth interviews are carried out with experts and elites.

The analysis of the data began as soon as accumulated, and this, as Bryman points out, shaped the continuing data collection.¹² Transcription of interviews and analysis of the collected documents continued hand in hand. Documentary research on the newspaper, in addition to expert interviews, altered the question list, and the same took place vice versa. As field research in Crimea progressed, collective memory approach emerged especially from the interviews.

1.2.1 Field Research in Crimea

Field research in Crimea took three months from February to May, 2013, and was based on in-depth interviews with Crimean Tatars and documentary research on the specific issues of the Crimean Tatar newspaper *Lenin Bayragi*. Documentary research was not limited to *Lenin Bayragi's* relationship with the National Movement. Since there was no direct and positive link with the two, concentrating only on this would make the research infertile. The newspaper was one of the organs of the Uzbek Communist Party,¹³ and the writings and articles were being censored. For this

¹⁰ Alan Bryman, **Social Research Methods**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 267-68

¹¹ Zoe Bray, "Ethnographic Approaches", **Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences**, Ed. by. Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 305-306; Alan Bryman, **Ibid.**, p. 293

¹² Alan Bryman, **Ibid.**, p. 399

¹³ The other newspapers were *Sovyet Uzbekistani* in Uzbek, *Pravda Vastoka* in Russian and *Hakikati Ozbekistan* in Tajik.

reason, direct relationship could not be established. However, it indirectly served the National Movement. *Lenin Bayragı* was unique; it was the single publication, until *Yıldız*, serving the Crimean Tatar culture, language and especially honor of the nation via the articles published on the Crimean Tatar heroes in the war.

Thus, the focus of the research turned out to be its indirect service for Crimean Tatar people and its culture during the continuing documentary research and conducted interviews. The interviews probed the views and attitudes of Crimean Tatar people and the National Movement activists toward *Lenin Bayragı*, and the way *Lenin Bayragı* approached the Movement.

1.2.2 Documentary Research

Documentary research on *Lenin Bayragı* was conducted in Crimean Tatar Gasprinskiy Library, in Simferopol (Akmescit), and its scope was between the years 1957, when the first issue was printed, and 1991, when the newspaper altered its name as *Yanı Dünya* (New World).¹⁴ When necessary, certain issues of *Yanı Dünya* belonging to the period 1992-93 and 2013 were also searched. All the issues of a 33 year publication span were not researched but some specific years were selected in accordance with the developments of the life of Crimean Tatars in exile. Also, as the data gathering unfolded, the scope of years was expanded. After the issues of the years 1957 and 1958, those of 1961 were searched, and five-year periods were followed. After the issues of 1965, 1971, 1975, and 1980 were scanned. On the other hand, since the partial rehabilitation took place in 1967, this year and the following two years were also included to observe the developments and possible shifts in the newspaper. Gorbachev period, 1985-1991, was entirely included to the research.

¹⁴ *Lenin Bayragı*, its issues, is the most valuable collection of Crimean Tatar Gasprinskiy Library.

The real motive behind this kind of sampling of the documentary research was the existence of similar trends in the content of the newspaper throughout years, and the uniformity was the unchanging fact of the 33-year life of *Lenin Bayragı*. This was probably because it was the organ of the Uzbek Communist Party and was under heavy control and censorship. Moreover, journalists and writers in the newspaper could not defy the Communist Party's rules and regulations unless they were relaxed or changed by the party itself. Although tolerance was given to some extent such as using the name Crimean Tatar, and zig-zags were experienced during some periods, the content of the newspaper remained largely the same and aligned itself with the Party. For instance, the place of Party and State news such as decisions and decrees, and cotton news was secured from the very beginning to the *perestroika*.

1.2.3 Expert Interviews

While the documentary research was carried out in the Gasprinskiy Library, expert interviews were made with 5 Crimean Tatar scholars from the Crimean State Engineering Pedagogical University (KIPU), with 12 Crimean Tatar journalists, writers, poets and other people affiliated with the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı*, and with 6 Crimean Tatar activists in Crimean Tatar National Movement past and present. Elites and experts are valuable informants for us since they have deep knowledge in their fields, are in a high social status, enjoy leading position in their community, and provide a valuable source of first-hand information.¹⁵

Semi-structured interviews were preferred to unstructured and the structured ones due to their advantages such as flexibility.¹⁶ Interviews began with predetermined questions, and additional questions were asked spontaneously, and some of these

¹⁵ **Avrasya'da Yeniden Çizilen Sınırlar İnşa Edilen Kimlikler** (Proje Tanıtım Kitapçığı), Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, p. 9-10

¹⁶ Alan Bryman, *Ibid.*, p. 283

questions were added to the question list for the remaining interviews. Questions were adapted to each of the three groups: academicians, activists and people associated with *Lenin Bayragı*. In addition to the core questions which were directed to all groups, new questions emerged throughout the interviewing process. They were asked to the workers of the newspaper, and when needed, additional interviews were made. Some key informants were interviewed twice and some even for three times.¹⁷ Along with flexibility, in this type of interviewing, informants could express themselves freely to grasp the whole picture.¹⁸

In the interviews, roughly three groups of questions were directed. The questions in the first group were asked to all interviewees. They were concerned with the newspaper, particularly the place and importance of it for the Crimean Tatar population in exile. They also probed how people affiliated to *Lenin Bayragı* reacted to the National Movement, and how the activists perceived the newspaper. This group of questions evolved as interviews are made. The second group of questions were directed primarily to activists and academics, and concentrated on the developments regarding Crimean Tatar issue in the Soviet Union. For instance, they attempted to shed light onto how this group evaluated the government policies, decrees, and Crimean Tatar institutions in exile. As to the last group, these questions pertained to the situation after the return to Crimea.

1.3 Chapters

The thesis consists of seven chapters. Following the Introduction (the first chapter), the second chapter, Historical Background, presents the history of the Crimean Tatars in Crimea until the deportation in 1944. This chapter is divided into two: Imperial Russian and Soviet Periods. The German Occupation era is included into the latter. In

¹⁷ Matthew David and Carole D. Sutton, **Social Research**, Oxford, Sage, 2004, p. 87

¹⁸ Transcribed interviews given in the thesis were edited by a Crimean Tatar expert.

the third chapter, Conceptual and Theoretical Framework, concepts and/or approaches such as diaspora, collective memory and constructivist theory's external factors, which are referred to in the work, are discussed. In the thesis, Crimean Tatar community and its national movement are considered as diaspora and diaspora movement. Being diaspora and/or diasporization of a community create solidarity within the group and strengthens collective consciousness among the group members. Moreover, diasporas are different from other migrant groups by their organizational and oppositional process, which also means the National Movement. Furthermore, like the concept of diaspora, it is argued that collective memory of a trauma and state policies as in the case of Crimean Tatars can also feed the group consciousness.

The fourth chapter, Outer Diaspora in Free World, covers the history and evolution of the outer Crimean Tatar National Movement. Moreover, it discusses the way the diaspora approached and evaluated the developments among the blocs and in the USSR, and the concepts which were circulated in their publications such as *Emel* and *Dergi*. The fifth chapter, Crimean Tatar National Movement, includes the Movement, which accomplished the goal-return to Crimea-, its activities, methods and progress. In the sixth chapter, *Lenin Bayragı: 'Between Two Fires'*, the role of the Uzbek Communist Party's newspaper in the Crimean Tatar language for the Crimean Tatar people is elaborated with particular reference to its effect on the collective memory of Crimean Tatars in exile. In the final chapter, the findings are analyzed. Moreover, recent developments in Crimea since March, 2014, are summarized and elaborated.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Imperial Russian Period

Crimean Tatar history has been a history of migrations and deportations since the 18th century. Crimean Tatars had to migrate continuously from Crimea. When Crimea was annexed to Imperial Russia in 1783, history of Crimean Tatars' migration began. They migrated to Anatolia and European parts of Turkey of the time, and to current Romania and Bulgaria. In a few years, the number of people who migrated peaked, and those years were the years following the Russo-Turk wars.¹⁹ Kırımlı's words "Russian annexation of the Crimea in 1783" meant "more than the loss of their age-old independence for the Crimean Tatars; it was also the beginning of a long and continuous process of their emigration to the Ottoman Empire..."²⁰ For instance, according to *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia* from the Russian occupation of Crimea in 1783-84 to 1790, 300.000 Muslims left Crimea for Turkey.²¹ In 1792, approximately 100 thousand more Crimean Tatars left Crimea.²² During Russo-Turkish war of 1806-12, around 3200 Muslims emigrated to Turkey, and 7000 Nogais from the steppe to Turkish controlled regions. According to preemptive measures,

¹⁹ The wars took place in 1812, 1828-29, 1860-61, 1874, 1890, 1902. Hakan Kırımlı, "Kırım: Rus İdaresi Dönemi", **DİA**, Ankara, cilt 25, 2002, p. 458

²⁰ Hakan Kırımlı, "Emigrations from the Crimea to the Ottoman Empire during the Crimean War", **Middle East Studies**, 44:5, 2008, p. 751

²¹ Peter J. Potichnyj, "The Struggle of the Crimean Tatars", **Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes**, 17:2/3, 1975, p. 302

²² Brian Glyn Williams, **The Crimean Tatars: The Diaspora Experience and the Forging of a Nation**, Leiden, Brill, 2001, p. 167. And until the year 1800, around 500.000 people migrated to Turkey. H. Yıldırım Ağanoğlu, **Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyete Balkanlar'ın Makus Talihi Göç**, İstanbul, Kum Saati, 2011, p. 99

they were resettled away from coastal line to the steppe because the Russian authorities generally distrusted them.²³

During and just after the Crimean War, approximately 20-30 thousand Crimean Tatars migrated to Turkey, mainly to Rumelia (Balkan Peninsula-Bulgaria and Romania).²⁴ A few years later, migration of Circassians and Nogai Tatars in steppe took place. Their movement triggered the migration of Crimean Tatars in Tauride Province. Rumors were various among locals. "Russian government intended to forcefully convert the Crimea's Muslim population or expel them to Siberia."²⁵ They would have two options: either to settle inland of Russia or to leave Crimea.²⁶ For sure, some people might have wished to live in the midst of their co-believers and die in holy soil of the Caliphate and in 'white soil' of Turkey.²⁷ Moreover, immigrations might have been encouraged and considered in positive terms by the Turkish side. According to Kırımlı, immigration was encouraged because it would change the demographic balance of Rumelia, considering most of the immigrants who were settled in Bulgaria and Romania.²⁸ Moreover, the Porte generally tended not to reject Muslims' immigration requests to Turkey. Such an act (refusing immigration attempts) was considered inconsistent with the magnanimity of the Caliph and the Sultan. Thus, the Porte endeavored not to refuse immigrants to the utmost.²⁹ While Crimean Tatars migrated and settled to Ottoman Bulgaria, some Bulgarians migrated

²³ Brian Glyn Williams, **The Crimean Tatars: the diaspora experience and the forging of a nation**, p. 141-143

²⁴ Hakan Kırımlı, "Emigrations from the Crimea to the Ottoman Empire during the Crimean War", **Ibid.**, p. 767; Brian Glyn Williams, **Ibid.**, p. 148

²⁵ Brian Glyn Williams, **Ibid.**, p. 156

²⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 160

²⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 155

²⁸ Hakan Kırımlı, "Emigrations from the Crimea to the Ottoman Empire during the Crimean War", **Ibid.**, p. 768. As a general policy the Porte endeavored to settle immigrants to strategic places like Dardanelles (H. Yıldırım Ağanoğlu, **Ibid.**, p. 99), in case of Crimean Tatars it was Bulgaria.

²⁹ Tufan Gündüz, **Alahimanet Bosna: Boşnakların Osmanlı Topraklarına Göçü 1879-1912**, İstanbul, Yeditepe, 2012, p. 30; Hakan Kırımlı, "Emigrations from the Crimea to the Ottoman Empire during the Crimean War", **Ibid.**, p. 758-59

to Russia in 1861.³⁰ Apart from Bulgarian immigration to Crimea, many other nonnative people were settled in Crimea such as Russians, Ukrainians, Germans, and Jews.³¹

Apart from religious motives, as stated above briefly, and the Ottoman Empire's urge to accept immigrants, the Russian Empire also encouraged Crimean Tatars' emigration.³² Crimean Tatars were considered untrustworthy by the Russian administration; however especially when migration figures increased to undesirable numbers in the coming period, they predicted that such a high number would affect the Crimean economy negatively and something had to be done to stop it.³³ Moreover, such a tendency could spread to Volga Tatars, which would be a threat to the Tsardom. Consequently, the Russian government stopped issuing passports to Crimean Tatars³⁴ and tried to persuade them not to migrate. After the exodus, the total number of people who migrated from Taurida province was around 200-230 thousand between the years 1855-1862. Another migration wave from Crimea which is worth mentioning was the one that took place in 1874. After the Russian decree on military conscription which extended military duty to Crimean Tatars, a minor migration started. Young (Crimean) Tatars who did not want to serve in Christian Russian army, i.e., around 5 thousand Muslims, left Crimea.³⁵

³⁰ Mark Pinson, "From the Danube to the Crimea and Back: The Bulgarian Migration of 1861-1862 in Recent Bulgarian Historiography", **Harvard Ukrainian Studies**, 3/4:2, 1979/1980, p. 663. This also took place between 1806-12 and 1828-29 when Russo-Turkish wars took place.

³¹ Peter J. Potichnyj, **Ibid.**, p. 303

³² Mark Pinson, "Russian Policy and the Emigration of the Crimean Tatars to the Ottoman Empire, 1854-1862", p. 105 (Available) <http://www.iudergi.com/tr/index.php/guneydogu/article/viewFile/14589/13805>, 23.12.2012.

³³ Brian Glyn Williams, **Ibid.**, p. 155

³⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 164-65

³⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 184, 189. Only the major migrations which were stated in sources are included in this section. It is for sure that low scale, minor migrations continuously took place from Crimea to Turkey.

2.2 The Soviet Period

2.2.1 The Struggle for Crimea³⁶

From the late 1917 until the late 1920, Crimea and Crimea's people witnessed various power struggles and challenges in Crimea's administration. Power in Crimea was handed over many times, from Crimean Tatars to Bolsheviks, from Bolsheviks to Germans and to the Whites³⁷ or vice versa. After the first revolution took place in Russia on February, 1917, like other nationalities, Crimean Tatars also got organized in the time of chaos surrounding Russia. They first established Crimean Tatar Executive Committee in spring of 1917 and formed a national party (*Milli Fırka*) in the summer. At the end of the year, on December 9, Crimean Tatar National Parliament (*Kurultay*) was assembled, and it adopted Crimean Tatar constitution on 26th day of the same month. Moreover, Crimean Democratic Republic was established and the government was formed in conformity with the constitution.

Nevertheless, the Crimean Tatar government in Crimea succeeded to exist for only one month. Bolshevik forces occupied the peninsula at the end of January, destroyed Crimean Tatar national organizations and institutions that had been previously established. However, a Tatar Socialist Party was formed, and according to Alaç, this party defended Crimean Tatar interests in Crimea.³⁸ Because of the German occupation, this first Bolshevik rule had a short life, only lasting until May of 1918. In June, a German controlled government was established by Crimean Tatars, Russians and Germans. Süleyman Sulkiewicz, who was a Lithuanian Tatar and soldier in Tsarist

³⁶ The following sources were used in this part. Valeri Vozgrin, "Bolşevik İhtilalinden Sonra Kırım", **Türkler**, Ankara, vol. 18, 2002, p. 760-764; Hakan Kırımlı, "Kırım: Rus İdaresi Dönemi", **Ibid.**, p. 459-460; **Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice**, Ed. by. Robert Conquest, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1967, p. 24; "Crimea", **Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia**(Great Soviet Encyclopedia), p. 226; M. Alaç, "Kırım'ı Bolşeviklerin Birinci İşgali", **Emel**, no. 7, year 2, Ankara, 1961, p. 10-12; M. Alaç, "Kırım'da Süleyman Sulkiewicz Hükümeti", **Emel**, no. 11, year 2, Ankara, 1962, p. 14-17; M. Alaç, "Kırım'da Salomon Krym Hükümeti", **Emel**, no. 27, year 5, Istanbul, 1965, p. 10-15

³⁷ Pro-tsarist and anti-Bolshevik forces of Russian Civil War during 1917-1922.

³⁸ M. Alaç, "Kırım'ı Bolşeviklerin Birinci İşgali", **Ibid.**, p. 10-11.

Russian Army, undertook the leadership of this government.³⁹ Although important positions like foreign and internal affairs, defense and marine ministries were held by Tatars such as Sulkiewicz, Cafer Seydahmet (Kırimer), A. Ahmetowicz, the structure of the government did not satisfy Crimean Tatars because its official language was Russian. As for Russian inhabitants, they were disappointed by the existence of Crimean Tatars in the government.

At this point, it is necessary to review the relations between Russians and Crimean Tatars during this chaotic era. After the 1917 revolution and in the time of chaos during Russian Civil War, nationalities of Russian Empire demanded freedom. Crimean Tatars also tried to act in the same way. However, due to demographic reasons and physical power of Crimean Tatars, they opted for self-government of Crimeans. That is, for autonomous Crimea, they demanded freedom for all inhabitants of Crimea. At this stage, they had to prefer the motto 'Crimea for Crimeans' to 'Crimea for Tatars'.⁴⁰ On the other hand, local Russians considered Crimean Tatars' organizations as separatists. For Russians, Tatars were trying to find a way of unification with Turkey. The White refugees, who escaped from Bolsheviks to Crimea, also opposed to federation or self-government of non-Russians.⁴¹ In other words, Russians in Crimea objected to Crimean Tatars' activities, and their motto was 'Crimea for Russia'. Therefore, the latter was not helped by the Whites against the Reds during Crimean Tatars' organizational activities or military effort against the

³⁹ Sulkiewicz attended Russo-Chinese and Russo-Japanese Wars. He established 37th Muslim corps in 1918 and abandoned his mission in Russian army. He became leader of German controlled government in Crimea and after Germans left Crimea and White rule began, he left, too, and went Azerbaijan and was executed there after Bolshevik occupation in 1920. M. Alaç, "Kırım'da Süleyman Sulkiewicz Hükümeti", *Ibid.*, p. 16-17

⁴⁰ Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, *Bazı Hatıralar*, Emel Vakfı, İstanbul, 1993, p. 206-208, 212, 235, 274

⁴¹ Valeri Vozgrin, "Crimea After the Bolshevik Revolution", *The Turks*, Ankara, vol. 5, 2002, p. 915; Fevzi Altug, *Thornbush: Memoirs of a Crimean Tatar Nationalist and Educator Relating to the Russian Civil War and the Famine of 1921-1922*, trans. by. Inci A. Bowman, the Isis Press, İstanbul, 2004, p. 52-54; Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, *Bazı Hatıralar*, p. 207

Bolsheviks. Even the Whites helped the Bolsheviks with their effort against Crimean Tatars.⁴²

After the Germans withdrew from the war and from Crimea in November 1918, the peninsula was occupied by the White forces of Denikin and Wrangel for two years, except a short period of time of Bolsheviks' second occupation in 1919. Unlike the previous government, they formed a Russian-Jewish government led by Salomon Krym, who was a Karaim. Crimean Tatars were out of government and were discriminated against. This government and the White rule in Crimea aimed at the revival of Russia and favored the unitary Russia. During this era, balances and sides again shifted, and some Crimean Tatars supported Bolsheviks against the Whites for the independence of Crimea.⁴³ In the ensuing months, the final Bolshevik occupation took place in November 1920, and this was permanent. The White forces were defeated. The next stage began in Crimea: the Sovietization of Crimea.

2.2.2 The Sovietization of Crimea

For describing the Soviet period in Crimea, Edige Kırımal's periodization is adopted in this section. He periodized the Soviet rule in Crimea by nine leading events from the latest Soviet occupation of Crimea to the deportation in 1944. He based his writings on this periodization and repeatedly used it in his articles. However, most events that took place in the USSR and the Soviet policies that Kırımal focused on in his periodization were not unique to Crimean Tatars, as many nations in the country suffered from these policies. In other words, what happened in Crimea in the late 1920s and during the 1930s actually occurred all over the Soviet Union: collectivization of lands and confiscations of properties, deportation of *kulaks* (rich

⁴² Fevzi Altug, **Ibid.**, p. 41-42

⁴³ Fevzi Altug, **Ibid.**, p. 30-32. Salomon Krym administration was seen by Crimean Tatar as unlawful because it was not elected by people or selected by any legislation organ. M. Alaç, "Kırım'da Salomon Krym Hükümeti", **Ibid.**, p. 15

peasants) to *gulags* (forced labor camp), famine, purges of intelligentsia and cadres. Such tragic incidents in the Soviet Union were experienced *en masse*.

Kırimal concentrated on nine events which indicate the annihilation of Crimean Tatars (Crimean Turks in original).⁴⁴ The first one took place in 1920, just after the final and permanent occupation of Crimea by the Bolsheviks. In this period, the Bolsheviks were led by Hungarian communist Bela Kun, who was a murderer in the eye of Crimean Tatars, and who executed 60-70 thousand Crimeans by shooting.⁴⁵ This number was also confirmed by Bolsheviks, and for some sources even 120-150 thousand were killed.⁴⁶

The second event is about the famine of 1921-22. For Crimean Tatars, this famine was man-made. First, Bolsheviks arbitrarily confiscated food, grain, livestock (even chickens and eggs), and valuable items such as furniture, music devices, carpets, pictures, which led to famine in Crimea. Second, officials did not show any effort to help people combat the famine.⁴⁷ Instead, help offers to Crimea from relief agencies were either rejected or sent to other parts of Russia. The income obtained from selling and exporting of some products in Crimea was also sent to the north of Crimea, Russia, and according to Crimean Tatar sources, to Russians outside of Crimea. People in Crimea stopped cultivating land, and as a result the amount of cultivated lands decreased by one third because the grain they farmed was confiscated by Bolsheviks.

⁴⁴ Edige Kırimal, “Kırım’da Topyekûn Tehcir ve Katliam”, **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 2, no. 5, 1956, p. 13-34; Edige Kırimal, “Moskova’nın Sürgün ve İmha Ettiği Milletler” **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 3, no. 9, 1957, p. 119-124; Edige Kırimal, “Sovyet Rusya Hâkimiyeti Altında Kırım”, **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 13, no. 49, 1967, p. 59-66; Edige Kırimal, **Kırımda Türk Katliamı**, Trans. by. Kemal V. Gül, Istanbul, Toprak Yayınları, 1962.

⁴⁵ Edige Kırimal, “Kırım’da Topyekûn Tehcir ve Katliam, **Ibid.**, p. 17. According to Great Soviet Encyclopedia, Bela Kun occupied active positions in the struggle against the Whites and after occupation in the administration of Crimea. “Crimea”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), p. 226

⁴⁶ Around 30-60 thousand were Crimean Tatars. Valeri Vozgrin, “Bolşevik İhtilalinden Sonra Kırım”, **Ibid.**, p. 768

⁴⁷ Valeri Vozgrin, **Ibid.**, p.769; Fevzi Altug, **Ibid.**, p. 52-54

They grinded seeds instead of farming. They tried to farm in secret small plots of lands, but Bolsheviks did not allow farming in these places. As Vozgrin wrote, mothers killed their children so that they would no longer suffer or starve, suicides were committed, and cannibalism was seen because of famine.⁴⁸ Dogs and cats disappeared. People struggled to survive by eating weed, leaf and root. While all these occurred, Bolsheviks exported grain.⁴⁹ Due to famine in the peninsula, 100 thousand people perished, most of whom were Crimean Tatars (60 thousand).⁵⁰ According to Crimean Tatar sources, famine was inflicted intentionally in Crimea to exterminate Crimean Tatars. Russification of Crimea by demographic change could also be included.⁵¹ At the end, famine led to voluntary disposing of valuable possessions such as gold, jewelry of Crimean Tatars into the hands of authorities in order to overcome starvation.⁵² One might think that one of the goals was to achieve this shift. Because, Russians claimed that Crimean Tatars were hiding grain and gold.

The third leading event was purges of 1928 in Kırimal's periodization. This year marked the end of *korenizatsiia* (indigenization) policy and the beginning of Russification or Sovietization policy in Crimea. During New Economic Policy years in Crimea and in other parts of the USSR, indigenization policy was put into practice. In this period, it was intended to revive national languages and cultural characteristics of nations. National schools, museums, libraries and theaters were established in Crimea. In the meantime, Crimean Tatar was accepted as the official language alongside Russian, so the national literature quickly developed.⁵³ Moreover, in these years, Muslims of Crimea were allowed to practice their religious rites (Eids, fasting, circumcision etc.) along with other religions' members. Temples such as churches,

⁴⁸ Valeri Vozgrin, *Ibid.*, p.769-770

⁴⁹ Fevzi Altug, *Ibid.*, p. 68-69

⁵⁰ Edige Kırimal, "Moskova'nın Sürgün ve İmha Ettiği Milletler", *Ibid.*, p. 121

⁵¹ Valeri Vozgrin, *Ibid.*, p. 772

⁵² In the text: "into the hands of the Jews and Russians". Fevzi Altug, *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁵³ Edige Kırimal, "Kırım'da Topyekûn Tehcir ve Katliam", *Ibid.*, p. 18-19

synagogues and masjids were open.⁵⁴ Likewise, Crimean Tatars, Crimean Tatar institutions and their culture were respected, and some of their institutions, which would be considered dangerous, had been allowed until 1928. In this year, the head of Crimean ASSR, Veli İbrahim was accused of 'bourgeois nationalism' and anti-Sovietism and thus was executed.⁵⁵ Along with Veli İbrahim, 3500 Crimean Tatars, most of whom, were from administration and educated strata, were either executed or deported.⁵⁶ According to Vozgrin, Veli İbrahim was liquidated because he tried to solve the land problem of Crimeans by opening the unused lands in steppe to agriculture. This would provide land to the landless peasants of Crimea. However, higher authorities in Moscow must have been displeased with this plan because they did not really wish to solve the land issue by encouraging them to have their own land, but to urge peasants to join *sovhozes* (state farms).⁵⁷

Kırımal regards collectivization and the deportation of peasants to be the fourth tragic event in Crimean history. Collectivization was implemented in accordance with the 1st five-year plan throughout the Union, and it seems voluntary transition to collective farms had not received support. Authorities blamed well-off peasants and began to take measures to eliminate them. To this end, they introduced some criteria to label them as *kulak* (wealthy farmer). For instance, criteria to become a *kulak* in Kazakhstan was "defined by size of the farm holding, by the size of the area under crops, by livestock numbers, the ownership of a single mechanical engine."⁵⁸ As for Crimea, "those urban and rural Tatars who had enough food reserves at their homes and a few farm animals were accused of being 'kulaks'" and were deported to

⁵⁴ Edige Kırımal, "Kırım'da Sovyetlerin Din siyaseti", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 1, no. 1, 1955, p. 57-58. Starting from 1928-29, all temples began to be shut down and according to Kırımal until 1938 no temple were open in Crimea. **Ibid.**, 61-62

⁵⁵ Peter J. Potichnyj, **Ibid.**, p. 305

⁵⁶ Edige Kırımal, "Sovyet Rusya Hâkimiyeti Altında Kırım", **Ibid.**, p. 60-61

⁵⁷ Valeri Vozgrin, **Ibid.**, p. 770-771; For English text, Valeri Vozgrin, "Crimea After the Bolshevik Revolution", **The Turks**, Ankara, vol. 5, 2002, p. 924

⁵⁸ Mukhamet Shayakhmetov, **The Silent Steppe The Story of a Kazakh Nomad under Stalin**, Trans. By. Jan Butler, London, Stacey International, 2006, p. 31

Siberia.⁵⁹ In practice, 35-40 thousand Crimean Tatars were classified as *kulaks* or *lower kulaks* and were deported to *gulags* in Siberia and Ural.⁶⁰ As a result, these policies (forceful collectivization and confiscation of properties and deportation of people) in coastal Crimea triggered an uprising known as Alakat in 1929, and those involved were severely punished.⁶¹

In the next period, the policies aforementioned also caused the famine of 1931-33, which also marked the fifth tragic event of Kırımlı's periodization. In fact, the famine of 1931-33 did not only affect Crimea and Crimeans. Famine hit some regions in the USSR even more (e.g., Kazakhstan and Ukraine). Millions of people perished because of grain quotas and confiscation of grain in Ukraine (estimates range from 4 million to 10 million), rapid collectivization of nomads, seizing of grain and livestock in Kazakhstan (around one and a half million).⁶² Crimeans, too, were doomed to death while ships were loaded with grain and wine at Crimean ports and dispatched for export. According to Cafer Seydahmet, millions of tons of salted fish, fruit and tobacco were exported to European markets, and Crimeans were obliged to eat bread like black mud.⁶³ Moreover, a local Crimean Tatar communist, who was deported after his complaint, criticized the center and stated that "Moscow is openly robbing Crimean Republic. She exports all products of Crimea and does not give any bread to people who are starving."⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Fevzi Altug, *Ibid.*, p. 70-71

⁶⁰ Edige Kırımlı, *Kırım'da Türk Katliamı*, p. 15-16

⁶¹ Edige Kırımlı, "Sovyet Rusya Hâkimiyeti Altında Kırım", *Ibid*, p. 61

⁶² Roman Serbyn, "The Ukrainian Famine of 1932-1933 as Genocide in the Light of the UN Convention of 1948", *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. LXII, No. 2, 2006; Jacques Vallin, France Meslé, Sergei Adamets and Serhii Pyrozhkov, "The Crisis of the 1930s", *Mortality and causes of death in 20th-century Ukraine*, Ed. By. F. Meslé, J. Vallin, London, Springer, 2012, p. 13-38; Niccolo Pianciola, "Famine in the Steppe The Collectivization of Agriculture and the Kazak Herdsmen 1928- 1934", *Cahiers du Monde Russe*, vol. 45, no.1, 2004.

⁶³ Cafer Seydahmet, "Famine in Crimea", Emel, Romania, no. 9, 1931, (available) <http://www.iccritea.org/historical/famine1931.html>, 02.03.2014

⁶⁴ Edige Kırımlı, *Kırım'da Türk Katliamı*, p. 16- 17

The following tragic period, 1931-1936, was described as the years of Sovietization. In this sixth period, Crimean Tatar national literature was disregarded and Russification of Crimean Tatar language began. Meanwhile, Crimean Tatar intellectuals began to be eliminated with accusations such as *bourgeois nationalism*, *counter revolutionism* or *Trotskyism*.⁶⁵ This period was followed by Great Purges of 1937-38, which is the seventh tragic event, or *Yezhovshchina* (the Yezhov regime⁶⁶) years. Similar to other republics in the USSR, Crimean ASSR suffered from Stalinist purges of 1937. Indeed, Crimean Tatars' all social classes were affected by the purges. Local communists in the administration and intellectuals were either executed or deported.⁶⁷ At this onrush, specifically intellectuals seem to have been 'favored'. Many notable scientists, writers and others were executed, even outside Crimea, Crimean Tatars were chased and punished.⁶⁸

The eighth tragic event took place just before the German occupation. Prior to the occupation, during the Bolshevik evacuation of Crimea in autumn of 1941, NKVD (The People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs) forces committed massacres in Crimea. As Kırımal stated, prisoners, who were in local jail and in the NKVD building, were executed before the evacuation. Moreover, wounded soldiers in a train were burned and the same happened to 36 people in a city hospital.⁶⁹ Moreover, 'scorched earth' policy was carried out in Crimea as in other places in European parts of the USSR while Soviet forces retreat in front of Germans.⁷⁰ Furthermore, Bolsheviks implemented century-old policies and "took all bread stocks and animals and burned

⁶⁵ Edige Kırımal, "Kırım'da Topyekûn Tehcir ve Katliam", *Ibid.*, p. 21-22

⁶⁶ Yezhov was the head of NKVD (The People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs) in this period.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 23

⁶⁸ Valeri Vozgrin, *Ibid.*, p. 773

⁶⁹ Edige Kırımal, *Kırım'da Türk Katliamı*, p. 23-24

⁷⁰ This is century-old policy subjected to Crimean Tatars by Tsarist forces. During Crimean war, too, Russian forces carried out same tactics and 'destroyed sown fields, pulled up garden trees, and set Tatar villages ablaze in order to force people to move and to leave the enemy without shelter and food...' and also moved Tatars away from coastline. Valeri Vozgrin, "The Turkish National Movement in Crimea During the Tsarist Period", *The Turks*, Ankara, vol. 5, 2002, p. 768

the statehouses and blow up everything that would be useful for the Soviet people that were left defenseless against the enemy occupation".⁷¹ Finally, the last calamity, or the ninth tragic event, was the deportation of the people and abolishment of Crimean ASSR.⁷²

2.2.3 The German Occupation (1941-1944)

The general belief among nationalists of non-Russian nations, whether Ukrainians or other non-Slavic nations, especially émigrés in Europe, was that Germans would free their homelands from the Soviets and give the control of their homelands to them. They considered the German occupation as a chance to establish their independent states. Indeed, the émigré leaders of Prometheus nations like Mehmet Emin Resulzade, Azerbaijani nationalist and the head of Azerbaijani Movement in Prometheus Project in inter-war period; Ayaz İshaki, the leading figure of Idil-Ural Tatars outside the USSR and representative in the Prometheus; and Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, the leader of CTNM in Europe and in Turkey, all regarded German-Soviet War as a hope to get their independence.⁷³ Specifically, Kırimer stated that it would be a shame if they did not make use of this historic opportunity.⁷⁴ They thought that the war created suitable conditions for them, just as the First World War (WWI), which

⁷¹ Valeri Vozgrin, "Crimea After the Bolshevik Revolution", *Ibid.*, p. 927

⁷² Edige Kırimal, "Moskova'nın Sürgün ve İmha Ettiği Milletler", *Ibid.*, p. 122

⁷³ Prometheus Project was designed by Polish statesman and Marshal Jozef Pilsudski against Russian Empire and then its successor state the USSR. Its aim was to form a geographical buffer zone of Polish "allies out of peoples of Ukraine, Georgia, the North Caucasus, Armenia and Azerbaijan". Alex Marshall, **The Caucasus Under Soviet Rule**, Taylor & Francis Group, New York, 2010, p. 218. How, as narrated in the ancient Greek myth, Prometheus stole the fire from the gods for human use and bestowed it on humanity and how this allowed progress and enlightenment, Prometheus Project by backing national independence movements of non-Russian nations against Russian Empire and by weakening and dissolving Russian Empire would also bring enlightenment to enslaved nations of the Russian Empire (the USSR). Collected from, George Jan Lerski, **Historical Dictionary of Poland, 966-1945**, Greenwood Press, The USA, 1996, p. 476. Prometheism actually a plan to protect Poland's wellbeing against the century-old enemies and to prohibit Poland to experience the annihilation, again, that came over after 1795 and lasted till WWI.

⁷⁴ Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p. 306 ("Bu tarihi fırsattan istifade etmemek milli bakımdan günah olurdu")

they could not benefit from. This time they were more prepared. To utilize the situation created by war, they cooperated with Germans as much as possible.⁷⁵

However, after the German occupation, some émigrés in Europe realized that the Germans had different plans. For example, Resulzade went to Berlin, to Adloniade, to negotiate with Germans, but they could not agree. Said Shamil, grandson of Imam Shamil and a representative of North Caucasia within Prometheus could not come to any agreement for freedom of North Caucasia, either. Thus, both parties left Germany in autumn of 1942. Some others too left Germany to show solidarity with Shamil.⁷⁶ There was also disharmony between Germans and Ukrainians, for Germans had plans on Ukraine. Nazis saw Ukraine as a source of human and natural resources to be exploited. Their real intention is evident in the following words of Erich Koch, the administrator of Reichskommissariat Ukraine⁷⁷: "...we have not liberated it to bring blessings on the Ukraine but to secure for Germany the necessary living space and a source of food"⁷⁸ and "...our task is to suck from Ukraine all the goods we can get hold of, without consideration of the feelings or the property of the native population."⁷⁹ Some 2.3 million people were sent to work either to Germany or to southern Ukraine as forced laborers, like other *ostarbeiters* (eastern workers).⁸⁰

Unquestionably, eastern peoples were seen by Nazis as *untermenschen* (as secondary subhuman) and not included within their future plans. As a matter of fact, the initial plans for Crimea was that Germans would drive away the inhabitants of Crimea, settle

⁷⁵ Müstecip Ülküsal, *Ibid.*, p. 256-57

⁷⁶ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Gamah Haç ile Kızılyıldız Arasında*, Mavi Yayınlar, Ankara, 1984, p. 84, 109

⁷⁷ Ukraine was divided into three by the Nazis as General Government of Poland (western Ukraine), Reichskommissariat Ukraine (the Central) and front region in the east (German military administration)

⁷⁸ Steven Merritt Miner, *Stalin's Holy War: Religion, Nationalism, and Alliance Politics, 1941-1945*, London, The University of North Carolina Press, 2003, p. 54

⁷⁹ Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005, p. 467

⁸⁰ Vic Satzewich, *The Ukrainian Diaspora*, New York, Routledge, 2002, p. 86, 91

down in their places, and designate Crimea as a holiday destination.⁸¹ Germans had plans for Caucasia as well as for Ukraine and Crimea; it was considered as the oil depot for the German war machine. These were the reasons why Germans and national groups failed to foresee the future of aforementioned territories. When the tide turned against the Nazis during the war, Germans changed their policies toward non-Russian nations in occupied lands. For this reason, they formed national armies. Before that, in accordance with Nazi race policy, these nations were labeled as *untermenschen*, whose cause of existence was to serve Germans as laborers. The Nazis did not plan that the war against Communists would last so long. In accordance with their first plan, attitude toward peoples (and their émigré representatives in Germany) in territories with special importance for Nazis was harsher than the attitude toward peoples in territories with secondary or less importance.⁸² That is, if Nazis had some interest and plans for a nation's homeland, these nations had limited freedom of activity in Germany such as Crimean Tatars, and if they did not have any concrete interests, those nations would have more space to their activities, i.e. Turkistanis. The latter was far more favored than the former because the Nazis did not have concrete plans for Turkestan but for Crimea. Thus, they intended to Germanize Crimea. Not incidentally, in the spring of 1942, Turkistanis became the first group to establish their national committee and to win approval for its National Committee as *ad interim* Turkistani National Government.⁸³ This rule also applied to the Ukrainian case. Nazis demanded that Ukrainian Insurgent Army be abolished despite its achievements against the Soviets,⁸⁴ and they did not accept establishment of Ukrainian state which was declared by one sect of Ukrainian Nationalists.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Hakan Kırımlı, "Kırım: Rus İdaresi Dönemi", *Ibid.*, p.461

⁸² Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 83

⁸³ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 83, 102

⁸⁴ Vic Satzewich, *Ibid.*, p. 90

⁸⁵ Orest Subtelny, *Ibid.*, p. 463-464

2.2.3.1 Crimean Tatar - German Relations

As discussed above, because of Nazis' intentions regarding Crimea, German attitude to the two Crimean Tatar representatives in Berlin was based on delaying tactics, and the representatives were not welcome, and their visits were regarded as suspicious especially by *ostministerium* (The Reich Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories) led by Rosenberg.⁸⁶ Two Crimean Tatars, Edige Kırimal and Müstecip Ülküsal, arrived in Berlin on December 2, 1942, with the aim of coming to an agreement and cooperating with Germans, getting permission to enter Crimea, and getting organized with local Crimean Tatars for independence. They first contacted with other Turkish émigrés from Idil-Ural, Turkistan and the others.⁸⁷ In the following months, they had several meetings with Germans (and also émigrés) who had different affiliations in the German state but what they encountered was hesitation, coldness, distrust, suspicion, and intrigue to delay.⁸⁸ Apparently, there was a trust problem on the side of Germans against the two Crimean Tatars. Since Kırimal and Ülküsal were Turkish citizens who were lobbying for the future of Crimea, they and their activities were met with suspicion in Germany. In fact, the Nazis would not hand over Crimea to a handful Crimean Tatars since they had distinct and incompatible plans with Tatars about the future of Crimea. Besides, they were against any unity attempts within the occupied territories of the USSR and were afraid of pan-Turkism, pan-Islamism and interestingly, according to Ülküsal, any future occupation of Crimea by Turkey.⁸⁹ Therefore, they constantly delayed the two's requests to enter Crimea and to bring more Crimean Tatars to Berlin and thousands to Crimea. Ülküsal's disappointment by the German treatment of the Crimean Tatar representatives deepened day by day, and he felt trapped in a blockade in Berlin.⁹⁰ In the end, after long and tough

⁸⁶ Müstecip Ülküsal, *Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar*, p. 369

⁸⁷ Müstecip Ülküsal, *Ibid.*, p. 284

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 355

⁸⁹ Müstecip Ülküsal, *Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar*, p. 383

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 369

negotiations, Germans acknowledged Kırimal as a 'Crimean Tatar' probably because he was born in Crimea, and a representative of Crimean Tatars.⁹¹ Ülküsal was frustrated and annoyed due to being delayed for a long time by Germans and their 'lies' and aware that Germans would not allow him to go to Crimea-probably because he was not born there and he was a Turkish citizen. He left the country in August 1942, after promising that he would not propagandize against Germany.⁹² For the Germany trip, he wrote that "we could not succeed in any of our wills and requests during the seven months in Berlin to where we had come with high expectations."⁹³

As stated earlier, Kırimal managed to stay in Germany. His status was approved by Germans and in the last moments of the war he was even confirmed that he was the head of the Committee of Crimean Tatar National Center.⁹⁴ Throughout his stay in Germany during the war, he was aware that their (refugees') plans and Germans' plans were dissimilar. His Azeri counterpart Resulzade, before leaving Germany, stated that his goal was to establish a free Azerbaijan but his policy did not cohere with German policy. Kırimal too realized the fact that German plans for Crimea was to Germanize it, not to give freedom.⁹⁵ Then, it should be asked why he was willing to work with Germans when Ülküsal left Berlin and many other refugees did the same in autumn of 1942 and especially when the two were not allowed to visit the occupied Crimea. He might have hoped that German plans could change. Besides, since there were Crimean Tatar captive soldiers and *ostarbeiters*, somebody had to fight for Crimean Tatars' problems in Germany or in occupied territories of the USSR. Other motives could also include wanting to improve the conditions of these Tatars and

⁹¹ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 123; Müstecip Ülküsal, *Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar*, p. 395

⁹² Müstecip Ülküsal, *Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar*, p. 383, 391, 398

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 397

⁹⁴ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 130

⁹⁵ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 109

with other Crimean Tatar representatives and trying to increase Tatar population in Crimea by settling some Tatars from Romania and Lithuania.⁹⁶

Before and when Ülküsal and Kırimal were in Germany, Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer supported them from Turkey. He did not go to Berlin; instead, he supported the two from Turkey. It was probably because of the fact that, although he was *de facto* leader of the diaspora movement, he (and his circle) had strong ties with the national leaders of Prometheus nations when the Prometheus Project was still alive, and was respected as the representative of Crimean Tatars in the Project. Actually, the Turkish ambassador to Berlin, Hüsrev Gereade, asked Ülküsal about Kırimer's absence and long-distance support. The answer to the question is sought for based on available traces and speculations due to lack of printed evidence from witnesses or parties.

According to Muhlen, Seydahmet Kırimer had always been against the Nazis due to his links with (the Prometheus Project and) Polish government-in-exile in London. He did not change his position during the war, and the two representatives went to Berlin upon obtaining Kırimer's silent approval.⁹⁷ However, this claim cannot be verified by memoirs of Ülküsal, who was a main witness of the issue in Berlin. In contrast to Muhlen's statement, according to Ülküsal, Kırimer personally took action and lobbied before Turkish authorities and indirectly before German embassy in Ankara for Ülküsal and Kırimal so that they could depart to Berlin.⁹⁸ That is to say, Ülküsal and Kırimal left Turkey with Kırimer's influence.⁹⁹ Moreover, Kırimer interestingly suggested that they should mention him in the opening ceremony of the Crimean Radio, probably to show his influence among the people. This might also mean that he wanted the people to know that the two Crimean Tatar representatives

⁹⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 123

⁹⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 119

⁹⁸ Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p. 349

⁹⁹ Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p. 284, 292-93

were backed by him.¹⁰⁰ In short, he supported their lobbying in Germany, but the question still waits to be explained: why was he not part of the initiative there? Unfortunately, Ülküsal did not write his reply to Gerede's question in his memoirs. He did not give us certain information on this issue but only faint clues. Obviously, as Muhlen stated, the relation between the Germans and Kırimer was tense due to his links with Polish government.¹⁰¹ As for the German side, they also knew his connections. For instance, Franz von Papen, the German ambassador to Ankara during WWII, expressed his opinions about some leading refugees such as Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, Resulzade and Prometheus Movement in his secret report to Germany on Pan-Turanian Movement. He was suspicious of Kırimer and his connections. He stated that "A Crimean Turk, Ahmed Cafer (Djafer, also Ahmed Sayit Djafer) is considered an unreliable man; he is a government spy. There are rumours that he is still close to General Sikorsky's¹⁰² London 'Prometheus' organization..."¹⁰³

Moreover, when the Nazis invaded Poland, Kırimer accepted that 15 Crimean Tatar volunteers from Romania joined the Polish army as a symbolic action. It was Ülküsal's suggestion to the Polish embassy in Romania.¹⁰⁴ Besides, he published some articles against Germans (probably Nazis) just before the WWII in *Emel* Journal which were translated to German by von Mende.¹⁰⁵ All these indicate that Kırimer did not have positive sentiments about the German rule especially after German occupation of Poland. Nevertheless, although he (and together with him, other Prometheus national leaders) was annoyed by the occupation of Poland, he revised his position

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 349

¹⁰¹ Poland was divided into two by the Nazis and the Soviets.

¹⁰² General Władysław Eugeniusz Sikorski was head of Polish government in exile during WWII.

¹⁰³ Charles Warren Hostler, **The Turks of Central Asia**, Praeger, Westport, 1993, p. 133-134. From this report it may be concluded that some refugee members of Prometheus organization other than Kırimer were suspicious about Germans (if not against). Furthermore, it can also be said that some refugees (Resulzade and Kırimer) had connections with the Polish during WWII.

¹⁰⁴ Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p. 259-60

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 309

to Nazis and adapted to new conjunctures following German occupation of the Soviet Union.

2.2.3.2 “Collaboration”

As the course of war turned against the Germans, the fate of some nations in the USSR changed too. Nationalities such as Chechens, Ingushs, Karachai, Kalmyks, Crimean Tatars, Balkars, and Ahiska/Meskhetian Turks were forcefully resettled in the period from the last quarter of 1943 to the end of 1944. Forced settlements were not new in the USSR and unique to these nations. First resettlements were carried out in 1919-20 for rebelled Cossacks, which followed deportations of wealthy peasants. However, the mass resettlements were launched during collectivization years of late 1920s and early 1930s. In this period *kulaks* were liquidated; their properties were confiscated, and they were deported to uninhabited territories, and used as cheap labor force.¹⁰⁶ Apart from *kulaks* in early 1930, thousands of Finns from Karelia, Poles and Germans from Ukraine were deported in 1935.¹⁰⁷ However, first, Soviet Koreans, as a whole nation, were deported in 1937 from Soviet Far East to the inland.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, Volga Germans were also deported with pre-emptive motives after the Nazis had attacked the USSR on June 22, in 1941.¹⁰⁹ However, the six nations (except Ahiska Turks who had never seen Germans) were deported as punishment for collaboration with the Nazis.

¹⁰⁶ Pavel Polian, **Against their Will: the History and Geography of Forced Migrations in the USSR**, Budapest, Central European University Press, 2004, p. 60-92. Deportations prior to the war were conducted due to a few reasons which were security of borders, populating less inhabited regions of the country so that decreasing unemployment, and decreasing labor force of overcrowded places.

¹⁰⁷ Pavel Polian, **Ibid.**, p. 95-97

¹⁰⁸ Michael Gelb, “An Early Soviet Ethnic Deportation: The Far-Eastern Koreans”, **Russian Review**, Vol. 54, No. 3, 1995, p. 390

¹⁰⁹ J. Otto Pohl, “Stalin's genocide against the ‘Repressed Peoples’”, **Journal of Genocide Research**, vol. 2, no.2, 2000, p. 279

The act of collaboration with Germans during the war is generally associated with the members of deported nations, who were blamed and punished. However, this is not the whole picture. Not only were the members of these peoples in collaboration, but also most of the nations within the USSR including members of Slavic origin nations such as Russians, White Russians and Ukrainians.¹¹⁰ After Germans attacked the western parts of the USSR, they occupied Soviet cities and regions one by one. Some people welcomed their arrival. For instance, occupiers were welcomed traditionally with bread and salt and with flowers in Ukraine.¹¹¹

More than 5 million Red Army soldiers were captured by the Germans or deserted for German *Wehrmacht* (armed forces) during the war. The Germans mostly recruited prisoners-of-war (POWs) in camps, if they could survive these camps, for legions to be established. Moreover, émigré volunteers from Russians, Ukrainians, Caucasians, Tatars, and Turkistanis applied to the German administration to fight against the USSR, and major legions such as 450th Turk-Tatar battalion, Bergman (mountaineers) battalion, and 162nd Turk division were established within the German army. Other than these nations, Georgians, Armenians, Kalmyks, and White Russians, too, had their own forces.¹¹²

Among the Red Army soldiers (mostly among non-Russians) self-mutilation and unwillingness to fight were prevalent.¹¹³ Many soldiers left their posts and deserted, i.e., from newly occupied (by the USSR after 1939) western regions of Ukraine, from Galicia and Volhynia.¹¹⁴ Significant escapes were seen within the 89th Armenian division. Azeris, Georgians, Lezgins, Armenians, Ukrainians and Russians deserted a

¹¹⁰ Robert Conquest, **The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities**, London, Macmillan, 1960, p. 187-188

¹¹¹ Karel C. Berkhoff, **Harvest of Despair**, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004, p. 20

¹¹² Patrik von zur Mühlen, **Ibid.**, p. 52-60

¹¹³ Steven Merritt Miner, **Ibid.**, p. 65; Karel C. Berkhoff, **Ibid.**, p. 12

¹¹⁴ Karel C. Berkhoff, **Ibid.**, p. 12

Soviet army located along the Black Sea. Non-Russian soldiers constituted 80 percent of this army.¹¹⁵ Some Soviet-Georgian soldiers passed up to German lines, when they faced their kinsmen. The same occurred vice versa later in the war.¹¹⁶ According to a Soviet report, in Crimea, Tatars did not help partisans, and were hostile against them. Inhabitants of some villages in the southern coast of Crimea took up arms against partisans and protected themselves.¹¹⁷ In Caucasia, too, many locals refused to be part of Red Army. In Belorussia, at first, locals acted prudently. They were cautious against both sides and provided very little or no help to Soviet partisans.¹¹⁸ A Don Cossack Major defected from the Soviet Army with his personnel to the Germans in the summer of 1941. He formed a Cossack cavalry regiment in the *Wehrmacht*.¹¹⁹ According to Fischer, they were 'probably the most favored' units compared to other legions¹²⁰ in the German army, probably because Germans did not consider them as Slavic but Gothic.

As for Russian soldiers, the Germans established a Russian Unit, called Russian Liberation Army or Vlasov Army named after the captured Russian General A. Vlasov who took charge of the Unit.¹²¹ Ukrainians were used as concentration camp guards and worked in local administrative units as police force. Ukrainian POWs and volunteers formed divisions such as *Galicia*, wore German uniforms, and fought against Soviet forces. For the *Galicia* Division, around 80 thousand people applied to it, 13 thousand of whom were accepted.¹²² They also formed underground partisan units (Ukrainian

¹¹⁵ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 64

¹¹⁶ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 59

¹¹⁷ Edige Kırmıl, *Kırım'da Türk Katliamı*, p. 24

¹¹⁸ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 61-64

¹¹⁹ Aleksandr Nekrich, *The Punished Peoples*, Trans. By. George Saunders, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1978, p. 8

¹²⁰ George Fischer, *Soviet Opposition a Case Study in World War II*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1970 (first published in 1952), p. 49

¹²¹ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 66

¹²² Vic Satzewich, *Ibid.*, p. 95

Insurgent Army) and fought against Soviets as well as Germans.¹²³ In 1944, around 1 million Soviet citizens were serving in the German Army, in Eastern Units.¹²⁴ According to Subtelny, around one fifth of this number were made up by Ukrainians, and the remaining group consisted of Russians. According to Muhlen, the six deported nations, Turkistanis and Volga Tatars constituted 280-355 thousand.¹²⁵ As stated in Nekrich's *the Punished Peoples*, there were 300 thousand Russians in the Vlasov Army by the end of the war. He added that the Soviet citizens serving for the enemy were about 1 million and non-Russians constituted 700 thousand men.¹²⁶

As can be seen here, defection, desertion and escapes from the Red Army, and collaboration with the Germans were not committed only by the six deported nations, who were punished for them, but practiced by members of many nations, in particular Russians and Ukrainians. However, collaborators among the 'favored nations' were punished individually, whereas those members of deported nations were punished both individually and together with their kins *en bloc*. There are possible reasons for this. For Khrushchev, "Ukrainians avoided meeting this fate only because there were too many of them and there was no place to which to deport them. Otherwise, [Stalin] would have deported them also."¹²⁷ However, as can be seen in Furr's book, which rewrites history and rehabilitates Stalin and his rule, this was not the case because only "a tiny number of Ukrainians...was in revolt...against the Soviet Union" whereas massive numbers of deported nations (more than half of the populations; in the case of Crimean Tatars, most of the population) collaborated with the Germans against the Soviet Union.¹²⁸ In fact, such a claim is not plausible since

¹²³ Orest Subtelny, *Ibid.*, p.471-74

¹²⁴ Catherine Andreyev, *Vlasov and the Russian Liberation Movement: Soviet Reality and Emigré Theories*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 7; Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 55

¹²⁵ Orest Subtelny, *Ibid.*, p.472-73; Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 55

¹²⁶ Aleksandr Nekrich, *Ibid.*, p. 9; There are various numbers given by different sources ranges from 400 thousand to a million. George Fischer, *Ibid.*, p. 45

¹²⁷"Speech to 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.", (available) <http://www.marxists.org/archive/khrushchev/1956/02/24.htm>, 31.12.2012

¹²⁸ Grover Furr, *Khrushchev Lied*, Erythros Press and Media LLC, Ohio, 2011, p. 98-99

more than 200 thousand Crimean Tatars were forcefully deported, most of whom were elders, women and children.

Moreover, for Furr, deportations were beneficial for the deportees and necessary for several reasons. It was a military necessity because deported nationalities were allegedly collaborating with Germans, creating serious threat for the security of the Soviet forces in the rear.¹²⁹ It seems, however, a controversial claim to make since, according to Soviet periodization of Great Patriotic War,¹³⁰ the course of war entered a radical turning point in the second period of the war, which ended in late 1943. "The Red Army advanced between 500 and 1300 km west and liberated almost two-thirds of occupied Soviet territory" including Kiev.¹³¹ Furthermore, in the next period, during the winter campaign of 1944, beginning from January of 1944, Soviet forces began offensive operations, and they had entered Romania by May.¹³² Moreover, the same Soviet source explains the German defeat in Crimea as follows: "as a result of the destruction of the enemy's Crimean grouping, the threat to the southern wing of the Soviet front was removed, significant forces were freed, and more and better bases for the Black Sea Fleet were made available."¹³³ Apparently, the so-to-speak importance of deportation was merely subjective, not based on justifiable reasons.

Second, for Furr, if the Soviet government had punished only 'the guilty', which constituted most of the population, then the whole nation could have been

¹²⁹ Grover Furr, *Ibid.*, p. 98

¹³⁰ First period of the Great Patriotic War lasted from June, 1941 to November, 1942; second period, from November, 1942 to the end of 1943; and the final period, from January, 1944 until the end of the war in Europe, in May 9, 1945. "Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union of 1941-1945", *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 4, 1974, p. 336

¹³¹ "Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union of 1941-1945", *Ibid.*, p. 343

¹³² *Ibid.*, 345

¹³³ "Crimean Operation of 1944", *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 13, 1976, p. 231

destroyed. Thus, by doing so, the Soviet Union actually saved them rather than making a genocide. That is, deportation was for their good because it kept them together and gave them a chance to survive in population, culture and language.¹³⁴ It does not seem to make sense, either. Actually, according to Crimean Tatars' own calculations, half of the population perished during and after the deportation. Moreover, after the deportation, they lost cultural institutions such as schools, institutes, libraries, theatres, newspapers and during the deportation era, Crimean Tatar generations, who were raised in exile, were not thought in their native language, except a handful. Currently the most urgent problem among Crimea's native population is the language problem since newer generations can hardly speak Crimean Tatar and learn it as a foreign language. There are only fifteen Crimean Tatar schools whose language of instruction is Crimean Tatar in Crimea. Nevertheless, only few courses such as history, literature, and geography can be thought in the native language because there are no teachers for applied sciences courses and the lexis of the language itself is not conducive to this.

Based on Soviet sources, Furr stated that around 20 thousand Crimean Tatar soldiers deserted. Kirimal also makes mention of the same number. However, to defend massive collaboration and deportation *en masse* due to deported nations' wellbeing¹³⁵ is quite naïve, if not purposeful and manipulative.

¹³⁴ Grover Furr, *Ibid.*, p. 99

¹³⁵ Furr claimed that if only the guilty was punished referring 20 thousand soldiers who constituted the 10% of the population, then such an act would mean genocide because all able-bodied would be separated from the population. This is also very controversial and commentary, if it was the case then after WWII most nations in the USSR would disappear because Soviet casualties (deaths) due to war was 25-27 million which was more than 10% of the total population, 196 million. For instance, only Russian Republic lost 13.6 million people which 12 percent of the population before the war. Elizabeth Brainerd, **Uncounted Costs of World War II: The Effect of Changing Sex Ratios on Marriage and Fertility of Russian Women**, Williams College, 2007, (available) <http://web.williams.edu/Economics/faculty/brainerd-rfwomen.pdf>, 20.01.2013

Another claim from Furr was that “deportations themselves were almost completely free of casualties.”¹³⁶ One source which Furr also referred to claimed that approximately 8 thousand Crimean Tatars out of 191 thousand of the deported perished during the deportation.¹³⁷ This is the “lowest” record on the deportation. On the other hand, Kırimal claimed that 80 thousand Crimean Tatars perished during arrests, deportation, and in the deported area.¹³⁸ Another source gave even higher number of casualties: 110 thousand during the deportation and in the next 18 months in the destination spot. Even if the Soviet sources are taken into consideration, Crimean Tatars casualties were 33 thousand until 1946 in Uzbekistan.¹³⁹ As for other deported nationalities, e.g., Chechens, Furr states that their loss during deportation was less than one and half thousand.¹⁴⁰ According to Williams, 70 thousand Chechens and Ingushs died in a couple of months after they arrived at special settlements.¹⁴¹ It goes without saying that Furr does not take the losses into account at the destination points (in special settlements) where the deportees perished because of the harsh environmental conditions of Central Asia, the attitudes of the locals, and famine. All he counts is the losses during the course of deportations (on trains), which lasted a couple of weeks at maximum.

Such a view (claiming and championing that deported nations deceived massively and deserved to be deported), ironically, applied to other peoples such as Ahıska Turks; who they had never seen the Nazis, and their region had never been occupied by Germans. They were accused of collaborating with Turkey and doing illegal trade at

¹³⁶ Grover Furr, *Ibid.*, p. 99

¹³⁷ Brian Glyn Williams, *The Crimean Tatars: the diaspora experience and the forging of a nation*, p. 390

¹³⁸ Edige Kırimal, “Kırım’da Topyekun Tehcir ve Katliam”, *Ibid.*, p. 29

¹³⁹ Ann Sheehy and Bohdan Nahaylo, “The Crimean Tatars, Volga Germans and Meskhetians: Soviet Treatment of Some National Minorities”, *Minority Rights Group*, Report no. 6, 1980 (first in 1971), p. 8

¹⁴⁰ Grover Furr, *Ibid.*, p. 367

¹⁴¹ Brian Glyn Williams, “Commemorating ‘The Deportation’ in the Post-Soviet Chechnya”, *History & Memory*, Vol. 12, No. 1, Spring/Summer 2000, p. 112

the frontier. In fact, Stalin carried out the policy of deportation for 'unreliable' nations such as Koreans in 1937, Volga Germans in 1941, Crimean Tatars, Ahiska Turks, and other Caucasian nations in 1943 and 1944. These nations inhabited basically in frontiers and strategic territories, and the reasons for their resettlements were basically related with the security and defense of state frontiers.¹⁴² According to Williams, the Soviet state used the accusations as a pretext to cleanse the country's frontiers of non-Slavic nations.¹⁴³

2.2.3.3 Motives for 'Collaboration'

This section investigates the reasons why all those people 'betrayed', 'defected', and 'served' the enemy behind the front line and fought against their country in the front line, for this was a unique phenomenon in the history. The answer should be deducted from the previous two decades.

Some Soviet people in addition to the soldiers welcomed the enemy, collaborated with them, and worked with and for them because they did not share the same feelings with Bolsheviks in Moscow against the Germans. They might not have considered the Soviet Union as their motherland. Moreover, their perception of motherland might have been different from those in the center. Furthermore, some simply had problems with the Bolsheviks. For example, some Russians "believed that their first duty to their country was to rid of the Communist regime..."¹⁴⁴ Some might have questioned whether the Germans or Bolsheviks are the real enemy.¹⁴⁵ Those groups seem to have strong or individual motives to work against their country. First

¹⁴² Robert Conquest, *Ibid.*, p. 70; Pavel Polian, *Ibid.*, p. 156

¹⁴³ Brian Glyn Williams, "The Hidden Ethnic Cleansing of Muslims in the Soviet Union: The Exile and Repatriation of the Crimean Tatars", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2002, p. 331

¹⁴⁴ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 66

¹⁴⁵ Orest Subtelny, *Ibid.*, p. 471

of all, they experienced the tragic years of famine in the early 1920s and the second time in the years of Great Famine of 1932-33. As some scholars claim, famine was manmade.¹⁴⁶ For instance, Crimean Tatar intelligentsia accepted that starvation of 1921-22 in Crimea was Bolshevik-made because a large part of crop and villagers' food were confiscated in 1921. Moreover, Bolsheviks used the crop, which was sent by Turkey to Crimea, for their own interests, let alone accepting Italian Red Cross' offer of help to Crimea. According to Kemal Ortaylı, father of renowned historian İlber Ortaylı, grain was sent to Moscow for sale in Torgsin shops for gold.¹⁴⁷ The famine lasted from late autumn of 1921 until early summer of 1922, and around 100.000 people perished.¹⁴⁸ As for the Great Famine, they argued that while the best quality of grain and wine were being loaded to ships for export, people in Crimea were dying of starvation.¹⁴⁹ In the Great Famine, called *Holodomor* by Ukrainians, 3 million peasants perished in Ukraine, which made 10 percent of the population.¹⁵⁰ In Kazakhstan, 1.5 million Kazakhs died during the years of the Great Famine, approximately 35 percent of population.¹⁵¹

Soviet peoples survived chronical shortages such as house shortages or scarce goods such as salt, soap, kerosene, bread, fish, shoes, grain in villages.¹⁵² Soviet people had

¹⁴⁶ Karel C. Berkhoff, *Ibid.*, p. 8

¹⁴⁷ Kemal Ortaylı, "Bir Sovyet Müellifinin Kırım Türkleri ve Mazileri Hakkında İftiraları", *Dergi*, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 9, no. 34, 1963, p. 62. Ortaylı might be wrong for his statement on the part of Torgsin shops -at least timing- because they functioned during 1930-1936 rather than early 1920s, and sold goods for hard currency, gold and silver, as the Soviet government needed hard currency to continue its industrialization drive. Julie Hessler, "Zoloto dlia industrializatsii: TORGsin (review)", *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 12, No. 2, Spring 2011, p. 518; Sarah Davies, "'Us against Them': Social Identity in Soviet Russia, 1934-41", *Russian Review*, Vol. 56, No. 1, 1997, p. 87; Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 57

¹⁴⁸ Edige Kırimal, "Kırım'da Topyekun Tehcir ve Katliam", *Ibid.*, p. 17-18

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20; Edige Kırimal, "Moskova'nın Sürgün ve İmha Ettiği Milletler", *Ibid.*, p. 121

¹⁵⁰ Karel C. Berkhoff, *Ibid.*, p. 8. Dağcı stated in his memoirs that although great famine hit Crimean Tatars, it was worse for Russians than the former group. The reason is unknown for the writer. Cengiz Dağcı, *Hatralarda Cengiz Dağcı*, İstanbul, Ötüken, 1998, p. 48

¹⁵¹ Niccolo Pianciola, *Ibid.*, p. 137

¹⁵² Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Ibid.*, p. 41-50

seen system of *rationing* and *closed distribution* and *food privileges* in 1930s.¹⁵³ As Fitzpatrick stated in her book, Soviet people lived throughout 1930s with the hope of the bright future days. The Bolsheviks made the following promise for them: “In the future, there would be abundance; for the present, there was scarcity.”¹⁵⁴ Moreover, they experienced tragic years of de-kulakization, confiscation of properties, and deportations, which were all concurrent with collectivization and massive industrialization. Furthermore, peoples in the USSR survived from purges, which wiped away the cadres of the state and the party in 1937-38. Crimean Tatars could not escape from purges, either. “Crimean Tatars’ *all* (italics in original) social strata strictly were the victims of this terror...nationalist communists...most of Soviet intelligentsia (professors, doctors, teachers, journalists, poets, artists etc.) were arrested, deported or executed.”¹⁵⁵ According to Kırimal, between 1921 and prior to German occupation in 1941, approximately 160 thousand people were either killed or deported.¹⁵⁶

According to Kırimal, starting with 1928, everything began to be Russified in terms of culture, literature, language, and all domains of life in Crimea.¹⁵⁷ For instance, Russification of Crimean Tatar language was promoted by adding Russian loan words into it. On the other hand, Turkish, Arabic and Persian loan words were associated with bourgeoisie and banned.¹⁵⁸ Forced adoption of Cyrillic script for most of the languages of nationalities in the Soviet Union between 1930-1940 including Crimean Tatar was another step for Russification, even it was not suitable for some languages such as Crimean Tatar. Even the orthography and syntax of some languages (of

¹⁵³ **Ibid.**, p. 55, 96. In rationing system, people took goods by showing their ration cards along with money payment. In closed distribution system, goods were sold in workplaces for only workers of that people in the workplace or for people on the list.

¹⁵⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 95

¹⁵⁵ Edige Kırimal, “Moskova’nın Sürgün ve İmha Ettiği Milletler”, **Ibid.**, p. 123

¹⁵⁶ Edige Kırimal, “Sovyet Rusya Hâkimiyeti Altında Kırım”, **Ibid.**, p. 64

¹⁵⁷ Edige Kırimal, **Kırımda Türk Katliamı**, p. 14

¹⁵⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 18

peoples of Turkestan) were reformed.¹⁵⁹ However, for Soviet sources, adoption of Russian scripts was beneficial for those languages and peoples in two ways; firstly languages were enriched in terms of Russian vocabulary, and secondly it helped non-Russian peoples accept assimilation of Russian. Additionally, it was not forceful, but “carried out exclusively on the basis of the free choice by peoples...”¹⁶⁰ It is quite interesting to observe that in 1920s some cliques within nationalities such as supporters of Veli İbrahim¹⁶¹ (chairman of the Crimean Central Committee and Crimean Council of People’s Commissars) in Crimea, ‘counter revolutionary’ Sultan Galiev, and some other Tatar bourgeois nationalists in Tatarstan and Musavatists in Azerbaijan¹⁶² resisted Latinization of alphabets, but in 1930s this somewhat changed, and nationalities voluntarily re-altered their alphabets twice in a decade.¹⁶³

In the light of all reported, it should come as no surprise that some did not want to die for Bolshevism, Stalin and his Commissars. Their feeling are put beautifully in the following words: “they want us to die for them-no, we are not as stupid as they think”, “they sucked our blood for twenty-five years, enough already!”, “they left our children without bread, to starve to death, but force us to defend Stalin and his

¹⁵⁹ This is what Kırımal and Nadir argued in their articles. Edige Kırımal, **Kırım'da Türk Katliamı**, p. 18; Nadir Devlet, “Kırım Tatarlarında Kültürel Gelişmeler” **Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Dergisi**, İstanbul, Aralık 2008, no. 57, p. 4-5. For instance, there were two Lenin Bayragı newspaper in Uzbekistan, one printed in Crimean Tatar and the other in Uzbek. The one in Crimean Tatar written as *ленин байрагы* and the one in Uzbek as *ленин байроғи*. Ленин Байрагы, **Ўзбек Совет Энциклопедияси**, Тошкент, 1975, vol. 6, p. 327. Encyclopaedia was written in Azeri Turkish as *енциклопедијасы* and in Uzbek as *Энциклопедияси*.

¹⁶⁰ **Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice**, Ed. by. Robert Conquest, p. 75

¹⁶¹ İbrahim Valiev in original text.

¹⁶² **Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice**, Ed. by. Robert Conquest, p. 73

¹⁶³ Crimean Tatars used Arabic alphabet (in fact it should be Persian version of Arabic alphabet just like old Turkish alphabet used in Turkey until 1928) until 1929, Latin scripts until 1938, since then Russian scripts. “Crimean Tatar”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 13, 1976, p. 231. Currently, they use both Latin and Cyrillic scripts. They adopted Latin scripts for Crimean Tatar alphabet after they migrated to Crimea from Uzbekistan and other parts of the USSR; mainly Cyrillic-oriented alphabet is being used. It may be encountered some sites in internet in Latin scripts (<http://medeniye.org/>) and also Cyrillic scripts (<http://www.yanidunya.org/>) or in Russian and mixed (<http://www.atr.ua/pages/default.aspx>). It seems language and alphabet issues of Crimean Tatars are real mess. Unless they decide and concentrate the one either Latin or Cyrillic, it will be worse for the future of Crimean Tatar language.

Commissars.”¹⁶⁴ According to Soviet General Petro G. Grigorenko, a large number of Soviet soldiers surrendered because of the Soviet system’s ‘policy of terror’. The party, as Grigorenko wrote in his memoirs, “had led masses of people to the point where they preferred to be prisoners of war to living in such a country.”¹⁶⁵ Another account comes from Vlasov. He asked himself why he fought for homeland or Bolshevism, and he rejected to fight for bolshevism under the name of homeland.¹⁶⁶ Besides, the Red Army itself was in chaos, soldiers were hungry, miserable under-equipped.¹⁶⁷ Solzhenitsyn argued that there had not been such a phenomenon in history wherein hundred thousand people fought against their homeland on behalf of their enemy. There was disorder in the army and among the soldiers.¹⁶⁸ Vlasov, too, mentioned in his open letter about disorder of the army just before the war due to Stalin’s liquidation of higher command strata and establishing the institution of commissar in the army.¹⁶⁹ For some others, (Soviet) inertness was the reason.¹⁷⁰ That is, individual’s initiative and enthusiasm were lacking. In this situation, persons act only on commands and approval from above. There are traces of it in the memoirs of Dağcı and Hüseyin İkrâm Han, who participated in the war and were captured by the Germans. For instance, in the memoirs of İkrâm Han, people, including himself, hesitated to mobilize themselves without any superior.

As for fighting against the homeland, which is *transcendent* form of betrayal, hatred against Bolsheviks and Stalinist system may be added here, too.¹⁷¹ That is to say, it was a valid reasoning both for deserting and fighting against the USSR. Some

¹⁶⁴ Karel C. Berkhoff, *Ibid.*, p. 12-13

¹⁶⁵ Petro G. Grigorenko, *Memoirs*, Trans. by. Thomas P. Whitney, London, Harvill Press, 1983, p. 332

¹⁶⁶ George Fischer, *Ibid.*, p. 34-35

¹⁶⁷ Karel C. Berkhoff, *Ibid.*, p. 12

¹⁶⁸ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 66

¹⁶⁹ George Fischer, *Ibid.*, p. 34

¹⁷⁰ George Fischer, *Ibid.*, p. 5-6

¹⁷¹ It is not valid only for soldiers but for normal people, villagers. Kırimal discusses about why Crimean Tatar villagers took up arms against Bolshevik partisans and helped Germans and Rumanian troops. Edige Kırimal, *Kırında Türk Katliamı*, p. 24-25

collaborated because they wanted to destroy the USSR and to establish their own independent states.¹⁷² This especially applied to émigrés of most of the Soviet peoples from Crimean Tatars to Ukrainians. Another reason was to get rid of German camps wherein captives either died or had to cooperate with the enemy to avoid death.¹⁷³ This was how Russians and Ukrainians recruited their kinsmen to legions.¹⁷⁴ According to German authorities, hundreds of thousands Soviet POWs died due to hunger and cold until October 1942.¹⁷⁵ Soviet prisoners did not have any rights, even war-time rights because the USSR had not signed Geneva Convention for POWs. Soviet soldiers considered legions as a chance to survive for a while,¹⁷⁶ and to have “a soft and comfortable life.”¹⁷⁷ Being in legions meant food, clothes, shelter, and doctor.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, they could have wages, right to take a holiday sometimes, and

¹⁷² Orest Subtelny, *Ibid.*, p. 472

¹⁷³ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 56-57. Hüseyin Ikram Han, an Uzbek prisoner, published his memoirs after he survived from the war and camps. He wrote “this life (camp life) was to wait for breakfast, lunch and dinner every day.” Hüseyin Ikram Han, *Bir Türkistanlının İkinci Dünya Savaşı Hatıraları*, Istanbul, Bedir, 1999, p. 75. Hunger was real. They were given only 300-350 gr piece of bread for each person daily and plenty hot tea. Both Ikram Han and Dağcı stated in their memoirs, for daily meal they were given a case muddy potato dish. Cengiz Dağcı, *Ibid.*, p. 111. Soviet prisoners in German camps accepted to work outside the camps in agriculture due to lack of food, and when they had chance to work, they secretly picked grains and hid them in their pockets or elsewhere and tried to eat them raw without cooking. This caused pain for them; they could not digest raw grain and were in pain. *Ibid.*, p. 77. Some lucky ones were being sent to help for Polish farmers to pack potatoes, beets etc. If they were able to put them into the camp, they then could cook in the hatches. *Ibid.*, p. 88-89. In winters, situation was worse, they were sent to cut trees and to work in coal work. *Ibid.*, p. 89. They mostly had no clothes or shoes for winter conditions. Some ate grass; some ate poisonous fruits of trees because of hunger. *Ibid.*, 90-91

¹⁷⁴ When Russians and Ukrainians tried to convince their kinsmen, they said “If you stay here, there is no way around it, you will die like a dog.” Aleksandr Nekrich, *Ibid.*, p. 7

¹⁷⁵ George Fischer, *Ibid.*, p. 44

¹⁷⁶ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 66

¹⁷⁷ Aleksandr Nekrich, *Ibid.*, p. 7

¹⁷⁸ Ikram Han and people around him were offered either to join legions to fight against the USSR or if they do not want, they would be sent to worker battalions. Ikram Han joined to worker battalion and worked in military hospital, in munitions and guarded industrial firms and Polish cemeteries. They obviously lived in better places even they were still in camps. They had better food, clean uniforms, shelter etc. Hüseyin Ikram Han, *Ibid.*, p. 112-114, 118, 128. Dağcı joined Turkistan Legion and trained as military officer but according to memoirs they did not fight against the USSR. Mostly Members of the legion were sent to guard train lines and armories. As stated in the text, after Dağcı took days off he went to German occupied Crimea for two weeks to see his family.. Cengiz Dağcı, *Ibid.*, p. 128, 131

even the opportunity to date with women while they were in legions or worker battalions.¹⁷⁹

According to memoirs of the two Muslim-Turkish survivors from the German camps, the Germans engaged Soviet prisoners in warfare easily. According to Ikram Han and Dağcı, joining to legions or participating in worker battalions was natural and smooth. They (Ikram Han and Dağcı) were not even asked whether or not they accepted to be part of the German service. They simply became part of the German army and wore German uniforms. On the other hand, this occurred after a transition period in camps. Namely, they lived for months in camps and experienced such unfavorable camp conditions as hunger, cold, illnesses, mistreatment, and deaths. All having been experienced, prisoners readily accepted Germans' offer (actually the Germans used prisoners' kinsmen to persuade). They did so because they knew they would have only one future in camps: death. Thus, they easily entered Germans service. At this point, one might want to ask how they began to fight for the enemy although just a few months ago they were serving the Soviet army, and for their homeland. There is not a single answer to this question, and the available answers may not be convincing. As Solzhenitsyn said, "this was a phenomenon totally unheard of in all world history."¹⁸⁰ To conclude, the motives aforementioned do not have to be meaningful or acceptable or reasonable, but they are motives which soldiers and ordinary people used to justify their actions.

¹⁷⁹ Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Ibid.*, p. 58. Dağcı met his future Polish wife in Poland when he was member of German Army. Cengiz Dağcı, *Ibid.*, p. 144. Ikram Han too met a Dutch girl in Berlin, but she disappeared, probably died, in an American bombardment to Berlin. Hüseyin Ikram Han, *Ibid.*, p. 148-154

¹⁸⁰ Steven Merritt Miner, *Ibid.*, p. 66

2.2.4 The 1944 Deportation

Crimean Tatars, specifically Dr. Edige Kırmal claimed that the Soviet government had planned to deport Crimean Tatars *en masse* to Kazakhstan in the autumn of 1941. He referred to confidential Soviet documents, which were unavailable then and seen by a Crimean Tatar in a secret safe.¹⁸¹ It is hard to confirm this claim's validity, though a few clues exist verifying it. First, it would not be the first case in which a nation had been deported by the Soviet regime from the way of Germans into the Soviet inland. When the German-Soviet war started in June 1941, Volga Germans were deported in September of that year due to preventive reasons with the decree on August 28.¹⁸² Thus, it would not be unique and unprecedented for the Soviet government to have such plans for Crimean Tatars. Second, there had been previous experiences among Crimean Tatars and Germans during WWI, when Germans occupied Crimea for some time. In that period, there were some pro-German Crimean Tatars in addition to pro-Bolsheviks. After approximately 20 years of Bolshevik rule full of tragic events, it would be difficult to expect them to trust each other. Bolsheviks must have considered Crimean Tatars untrustworthy and thought that Crimean Tatars would not fight for the Soviet Union. In short, it was a claim difficult to prove, but easy to believe.

After the decree on the annihilation of Chechen-Ingush and Crimean ASSRs published in *Izvestia* in 1946, there was not any concrete, first-hand information on the fate of these non-Russian nations until the Secret Speech of Khrushchev in 1956. However, there was some unconfirmed information obtained from the POWs who were near these peoples in exile, from the magazines of Prometheus Émigrés of the USSR such as *Prometheus* and *Kavkaz*, and from some defectors like Colonel Burlitski, who was there during deportations. Also, a comparative analysis of old and new books, maps and encyclopedias published in the USSR before and after deportations revealed a

¹⁸¹ Edige Kırmal, **Kırım'da Türk Katliamı**, p. 32. He repeatedly emphasized this claim in his articles.

¹⁸² Walter Kolarz, **Russia and Her Colonies**, London, George Philip and Son Limited, 1953, p. 75

lot.¹⁸³ In the second half of the 1960s, *Samizdat* appeared and began to be an important source of information about the USSR both for the Western readers and for the insiders.¹⁸⁴

The first eye witness testimony on the deportations of these seven nations came from MVD defector, Lieutenant Colonel Grigori Stepanovich Burlitski.¹⁸⁵ He went over to the West in 1954 and was one of the witnesses who gave testimony to the US House of Representatives Select Committee on Communist Aggression and had interviews with magazines like *Life*. In the Report, he describes mass deportation of Chechen-Ingush peoples. The example of Chechen-Ingush case will be helpful for us to understand how in general the deportations took place. Lt. Cl. Burlitski told the Select Committee that “the technique, the pattern of these deportations is the same as the one employed in the Chechen-Ingush Republic- exactly the same, and I would be repeating myself if I told the story again.”¹⁸⁶

According to Burlitski, “The people were given exactly one hour to get ready. Each family was allowed to take 100 kilograms of clothing and food, etc...”¹⁸⁷ In the deportation of Crimean Tatars, Soviet soldiers came in the morning, at dark, while people were asleep or awake in the table. They were given limited time, which,

¹⁸³ Robert Conquest, *Ibid.*, p. 55-58, 82.

¹⁸⁴ F.J.M.Feldbrugge, *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union*, Netherlands, A.W. Sijthoff International Publishing Company, 1975, p. 4-6; Peter Steiner, “Introduction: On Samizdat, Tamizdat, Magnitizdat, and Other Strange Words That Are Difficult to Pronounce”, *Poetics Today*, 29:4 (Winter 2008), p. 615; Albert Boiter, “Samizdat: Primary Source Material in the Study of Current Soviet Affairs”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 31, No. 3, Jul., 1972, p. 282-285

¹⁸⁵ See the story of Lt. Cl. Burlitski in magazine *Life*. Charles W. Thayer, “MVD Man's Declaration of Independence,” *Life*, 5 Jul. 1954.

¹⁸⁶ The US Congress, **Report of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression against Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Russia and the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.** Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session, Under Authority of H. Res. 846 and H. Res. 438, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1954, p. 13

¹⁸⁷ The US Congress, *Ibid.*, p. 13

according to different testimonies, varied from 15 minutes to one hour to pack up. They were allowed to take some necessary goods only.

At the dawn of May 18, 1944, while we, mother and three children, were having breakfast, an officer walked into our home and declared that all Crimean Tatars were going to be deported from Crimea, and told to take with us the most needed stuff only. We were assembled at the the bridge.¹⁸⁸

Like in the Chechen-Ingush deportation, all people gathered in the assembly area and carried to the railroad stations by American trucks which aided to the USSR under 1941 the U.S. Lend-Lease Act.¹⁸⁹ Then, they were “loaded into waiting railroad cars, cattle cars and freight cars”¹⁹⁰ and departed to their final destination points.

The journey in these railroad cars, ‘crematoria on wheels’ Crimean Tatars say,¹⁹¹ took more or less 2-3 weeks, and many people died during the journey because they were “without proper food or medical attention,...fresh air.”¹⁹² When the train stopped and the doors were opened, dead bodies were thrown away alongside the rails, and the train run again. An interviewee depicted the deportation in the following words: “In 1944, I was a 6-7 year old child... I remember, the deportation was terrifying...all those hardships on the railroad cars. My mother died and was thrown alongside the road.”¹⁹³

¹⁸⁸ Quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar in “Adile Emirova, “Vatan Asreti”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 14, February 1, 1990, p. 4”

¹⁸⁹ The Lend-Lease Act was passed in 1941, and with this act the USA began to give military aid such as arms and defence materials to foreign countries such as Britain, the USSR, China and so on.

¹⁹⁰ The US Congress, **Ibid.**, p. 13

¹⁹¹ Ayshe Seytmuratova, “The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections”, **Tatars of the Crimea Their Struggle for Survival**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1988, p. 27

¹⁹² **Ibid.**, p. 27

¹⁹³ Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, March 27, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “44’te biz 6-7 yaşında bala idik...Hatırlıyorum, sürgünlük pek dehşetli sürgünlük oldu... vagonlarda nasıl kıyın alğanlarımız. Hatta anamlar vefat etip yolun içine taşılayıp edildi.”

During the journey, they mostly prepared their own meals, when the train had a break. The deportees tried to make primitive stoves with stones in order to cook and boil.¹⁹⁴ An informant pointed out the same scene: “We went 18-20 days on the train. We did not know where we were going. The railroad cars were cattle and freight cars. When the train stopped, we cooked corn, wheat and barleycorn seeds or whatever we had with us. We lived on them like this for 18-20 days.”¹⁹⁵

After the trains with deportees entered Uzbekistan, they were dropped off at the stations. They either settled around or another journey started for them for the destination points where they would be staying for a while. What they encountered were the propagated and agitated locals by the KGB and the famine. One interviewee said:

They [locals in Uzbekistan] were agitated against us. They were told that Crimean Tatars were traitors, a nation of evils, can hit and eat [people]. They were simply frightened. If they could, they would kill us. [For a while later they saw the Crimean Tatar] nation on whom the misery of the war was inflicted. No men, all were children and women. They realized that what the government said was different than what they actually saw.¹⁹⁶

The main loss took place in the final destination points, in the special settlements.

They realized [what the Soviet government propagated was different from the reality], but it was too late. Many of our people died, they [the locals] did not help. Men of the government [in Uzbekistan] and NKVD did not give all that the government [central

¹⁹⁴ Adile Emirova, *Ibid.*, p. 4

¹⁹⁵ Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, April 5, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “18-20 kün trende kettik. Qayda ketecekmiz haberimiz yoq. Tren de yük taşığan, hayvan taşığan vagonlardan ibaret edi. İşte yemeklerimizi bazı bir toqtağan duraklarda sırta çıkıp elimizde arpadır, buğdaydır, mısırdır almış insanlar, olsun nesi var. Olarnı suda pişirip, qaynatıp, onunun bu 18-20 gün devamında böyle kettik.”

¹⁹⁶ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Olarga Qırımtatarlarını yamanlaya yamanlaya, Qırımtatarları satqın, yaramaz halk, urabilir, aşayabilir dep agitatsiya yapığan olarğa. Qorqarak bizni qarşıladılar. Çaresi olsa edi öldürmege tırışır ediler. Amma keldi halk, qıynalğan, cenkin azaplarını çekken, erkekler yoq, bütün balalar, qadınlar. Kördiler, yok, hükümetin dedigi başka edi, olar köre edi başka.”

Soviet government] allocated for us. Thus, our people were affected. Families died one after the other...¹⁹⁷

Crimean Tatars had been forced to inhabit under the special settlement regime until 1956 when this regulation was lifted by a decree during the destalinization period. According to Crimean Tatars half of the population perished prior to the deportation, during the course of the deportation and in the first few years after the deportation at the destination points in special settlements, due to the famine, attitudes of the locals and harsh environmental conditions in the Central Asia. The following chapter discusses the concepts and dynamics, which were derived from the interviews, such as diaspora, collective memory, common trauma, homeland, family and external factors of constructivist theory (interethnic relations and state policies) to understand the exiled Crimean Tatars' relationship with their homeland Crimea.

¹⁹⁷ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 16, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Anladılar amma keç oldı. Bizim halqımız pek çoq öldü. Yardım köstermediler. Bizge hükümet bergen de kırıttılar hükümetin NKVD'nin adamlarını. Bermediler hepsi. Onıñ için bizim halq pek yaramay oldı. Aile aile öldüler..."

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Diaspora

The term diaspora originally referred to the Jewish experience for centuries, together with the Greek one.¹⁹⁸ However, it is currently used for various communities in addition to Jews. Indeed, Butler contends that “communities that [were] once labeled as immigrant, nomadic, exilic [and so on] began to be called diasporas”.¹⁹⁹

In this thesis, Safran’s definition of diaspora and of diaspora community is adopted. It seems to overlap with the Crimean Tatar case, helping to understand it. Since his ideal type was the Jewish case, the definition of the concept was built on it. The definition and the Crimean Tatars’ case entail six characteristics: (1) Crimean Tatars had been *en masse* expelled from the ‘original center’, Crimea, to multiple ‘foreign regions’ of Central Asia and Russia; (2) they maintained ‘a collective memory’ through intergenerational narrative regarding the homeland *Vatan* Crimea; (3) their interaction with the host societies was troublesome, and deportation experiences, discriminations and injustices they encountered never let them mentally root where they were forced to settle down; (4) they considered Crimea as ‘their true, ideal home’, and they never ceased to insist on returning and repatriating²⁰⁰; (5) they got organized for the ‘restoration’ of homeland Crimea and Crimean Autonomous Soviet

¹⁹⁸ Gabriel Shaffer, **Diaspora Politics At Home Abroad**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 9

¹⁹⁹ Kim D. Butler, “Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse”, **Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies**, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2001, p. 190

²⁰⁰ Even though they were offered an autonomous oblast in Uzbekistan and were forced to settle there, very few of them were convinced to go. What they searched was not an ‘autonomous’ lawn to graze but the homeland.

Socialist Republic; (6) they vividly attached their collective identity to the homeland during the struggle to return to Crimea.²⁰¹

Other scholars have put forward almost the same characteristics regarding diaspora communities. First and foremost, the indispensable element of being a diaspora, the birth of diaspora, is existence of a forced resettlement, 'dispersal', or 'a separation more like exile' of a community to 'a minimum of two destinations'.²⁰² The second element is 'self-awareness of the group's identity'²⁰³ or 'collective memory'²⁰⁴ that was circulated. A collective memory is constructed and fed by narrations, recollections, or 'transgenerational transmission' of both a 'chosen trauma' and the homeland.²⁰⁵

As Butler pointed out, "diasporization often arises from extremely traumatic conditions."²⁰⁶ For instance, deportation of a people is that kind of trauma. Moreover, violence, ill-treatment and tragic loss of close relatives before, during, and after migration all feed collective memory. The more tragic events they experienced, the stronger their collective memory became. 'Chosen trauma' in accompanying deportation, dispersal or exile, and recollections around it help to define deportees' and following generations' identity.²⁰⁷

However, without the attachment to a certain territory, to the historical homeland, which is the third element of being a diaspora,²⁰⁸ all 'collectives' aforementioned

²⁰¹ William Safran, "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return", **Diaspora**, 1991, p. 83-84

²⁰² James Clifford, "Diasporas", **Cultural Anthropology**, vol.9, no.3, 1994, p. 304; Kim D. Butler, **Ibid.**, p. 192

²⁰³ Kim D. Butler, **Ibid.**, p. 192

²⁰⁴ Khachig Tölölyan, "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment", **Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies**, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1996, p. 13

²⁰⁵ Vamik Volkan, **Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism**, Colorado, Westview Press, 1998, p. 48

²⁰⁶ Kim D. Butler, **Ibid.**, p. 204

²⁰⁷ Vamik Volkan, **Ibid.**, p. 48-49

²⁰⁸ Khachig Tölölyan, **Ibid.**, p. 14; Kim D. Butler, **Ibid.**, p. 204

would be groundless. Butler stated that “[homeland] functions as the constituting basis of collective diasporan identity.”²⁰⁹ Such a collective identity was probably grounded on two concepts: collective memories of a shared tragedy, and homeland ideal, i.e., myth of homeland, or ‘cause of return’ as in the case of Crimean Tatars.

Crimean Tatars’ experience of displacement from the land might trigger a loss of sense of identity, as Spicer pointed out for Indians in Americas. According to him, “retention of land bases was an important basic condition permitting a continuity of tribal sense among Indians...”²¹⁰ On the other hand, loss of land does not always mean loss of identity. Instead, total displacements can even reinforce collective identity as happened in such cases of Jews, Yaquis and Navajos.²¹¹ The answer to the question why some lose sense of identity while some others do not might lie in the combination of two concepts, which may be interchangeably used; oppositional process and diasporization, or organizational process of displaced communities. Both help “produce intense collective consciousness” and “promote solidarity among” these communities.²¹²

Although Safran’s characteristics of a diaspora is associated with Crimean Tatars, who were forcefully deported from Crimea at the night of 18 May, in 1944, the same characteristics may not fit the Crimean Tatars outside the USSR. For instance, despite the fact that Crimean Tatars in Turkey were ‘dispersed from the original center’, Crimea, to different regions of the Ottoman Empire during the 18th and 19th centuries, they were not *en masse* dispersed, (referring to the lack of a shared trauma) but were exposed to many voluntary or involuntary migrations. Moreover, they did not regard Turkey as a foreign region but as the land of the caliph and called ‘white soil’, *ak toprak*. Besides, except a handful intellectuals like Cafer Kırimer and Müstecip

²⁰⁹ Kim D. Butler, *Ibid.*, p. 204

²¹⁰ Edward H. Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest*, Tucson, The University of Arizona Press, 1967, p. 577

²¹¹ Edward H. Spicer, “Persistent Cultural Systems”, *Ibid.*, p. 798

²¹² Edward H. Spicer, “Persistent Cultural Systems”, *Ibid.*, p. 799; Gabriel Sheffer, *Diaspora Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 79-80

Ülküsal, they maintain a collective memory which is not as strong as the ones in Central Asia. The larger mass were assimilated to Turkish community. Return to Crimea, restoration of Crimean Tatar polity in Crimea, and Crimean Tatar identity based on the homeland Crimea might be only limited to a group of people, intellectuals, until the end of the Soviet Union.²¹³ In short, it is possible to argue that the 'outer diaspora' does not suit well with the characteristics of Safran, but as stated before, the term diaspora is expanding²¹⁴ to include the other cases or "categories which reflect processes of politically motivated uprooting and moving of populations, voluntary migration, global communications and transport".²¹⁵ Connor's broad definition of diaspora, the "segment of a people living outside the homeland"²¹⁶, includes Crimean Tatars in Turkey, as 'outer diaspora' in this study.

3.2 Collective Memory

Since the time of Halbwachs, collective memory has been associated with the social group or community despite the fact that a clear definition of it hardly existed.²¹⁷ Although it is "individuals who remember, not groups or institutions", they remember with the group since, according to Halbwachs, "every collective memory requires the support of a group delimited in space and time."²¹⁸

²¹³ Just before and after the collapse of the USSR, self-consciousness, collective identity of being Tatar among Crimean Tatars may be revitalized but this is out of this study.

²¹⁴ Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur, "Nation, Migration, Globalization: Points of Contention in Diaspora Studies", **Theorizing Diaspora A Reader**, Ed. by. Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur, Malden, Blackwell Publishing, 2005, p. 4; J. U. Jacobs, "Diasporic Identity in Contemporary South African Fiction", **English in Africa**, vol. 33, no. 2, 2006, p. 115

²¹⁵ Judith T. Shuval, "Diaspora Migration: Definitional Ambiguities and a Theoretical Paradigm", **International Migration**, vol. 38, no. 5, 2000, p. 42; Khachig Tölölyan, **Ibid.**, p. 3

²¹⁶ Safran, **Ibid.**, p. 83

²¹⁷ Qi Wang, "On the Cultural Constitution of Collective Memory", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 305-309; Celia B. Harris, Helen M. Paterson and Richard I. Kemp, "Collaborative Recall and Collective Memory: What Happens When We Remember Together?", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 213

²¹⁸ Maurice Halbwachs, **On Collective Memory**, Ed. and trans. by. Lewis A. Coser, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1992, p. 22

Collective memory is not the sum of random memories of individual persons. Instead, it is the memory of individuals of the community, and it makes sense in the whole group.²¹⁹ That is to say, in the Crimean Tatar case, individuals who experienced the deportation, a common trauma, remember it; they have memories about it, and these memories more or less resemble each other, and finally this makes the deportation meaningful for the whole group. This is only one part of the collective memory which is composed of two parts. Collective memory can be created through both 'experience' and 'received knowledge.'²²⁰ The ones who did not experience the 'event' might obtain the memory and add to the collective memory through 'received knowledge'. That is to say, younger Crimean Tatar generations 'remember' the deportation through narratives, 'purposeful conversations'²²¹, 'transgenerational transmissions'²²², circulation of knowledge²²³ or may be via 'discussions.'²²⁴ Moreover, unlike some deported groups who tried to handle the deportation by refraining from talking about it, Crimean Tatars were not silent about the trauma, deportation. As Uehling stated, experience of deportation was remembered, told, retold, and transferred to the newer generations.²²⁵

In addition to factors like narrations on the memory, periodic celebrations, festive enactment, music, food, communal meetings such as *duas* (prayers) and *toys* (feasts), and public commemorations can enhance collective memory.²²⁶ For Crimean Tatars,

²¹⁹ William Hirst and David Manier, "Towards a Psychology of Collective Memory", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 184

²²⁰ Elaine Reese and Robyn Fivush, "The Development of Collective Remembering", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 202

²²¹ William Hirst and David Manier, "Remembering as Communication: A Family Recounts its Past", **Remembering Our Past**, Ed. by. David C. Rubin, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 271-72

²²² Vamik Volkan, **Ibid.**, p. 44

²²³ Greta Lynn Uehling, **Beyond Memory**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p. 10

²²⁴ Celia B. Harris , Helen M. Paterson and Richard I. Kemp, **Ibid.**, p. 216-17

²²⁵ Greta Lynn Uehling, **Ibid.**, p. 106

²²⁶ Maurice Halbwachs, **Ibid.**, p. 23-24; Celia B. Harris , Helen M. Paterson and Richard I. Kemp, **Ibid.**, p. 214

commemorations mostly include sorrowful events like death anniversaries of people like Numan Çelebicihan on February 23rd,²²⁷ Pyotr Grigorenko on February 21st, but especially the day of deportation, the Black Day, *Kara Gün*, on May 18, 1944.

Collective memories are memories meaningful for and ‘shared by all group members’ regardless of their having been experienced personally or not.²²⁸ Moreover, they function to shape collective identity and maintain group cohesion.²²⁹ Especially in the cases of an ‘in-group suffering’, a ‘tragic history’, and a ‘trauma’, related memories might bond the group together and reinforce solidarity within the group.²³⁰ The 1944 deportation was kept alive and transferred to new generations through narratives by parents, and according to Williams, this “served as a primary marker of Crimean Tatar identity during the exile years and kept the dream of returning to the lost homeland alive among those born” outside Crimea.²³¹ In the family, it was always circulated that they were foreigners or obliged guests in Uzbekistan. They did not willingly come there, and they would return to Crimea. As a result, the return was kept vivid among the young. Hoping to return, some Crimean Tatars waited to build houses until 1960s. Even when the houses were built, they hoped to sell them in exchange for big houses in Crimea.²³²

²²⁷ First prime minister was Numan Çelebicihan, who was executed after the first Bolshevik occupation of Crimea in January of 1918. Together with him, 350 persons were executed. Cafer Seydahmet was minister of Internal Affairs and defense secretary of this government.

²²⁸ Celia B. Harris , Helen M. Paterson and Richard I. Kemp, *Ibid.*, p. 214

²²⁹ William Hirst and David Manier, “Towards a Psychology of Collective Memory”, *Ibid.*, p. 184; Celia B. Harris , Helen M. Paterson and Richard I. Kemp, *Ibid.*, p. 214

²³⁰ Baljinder Sahdra and Michael Ross, “Group Identification and Historical Memory”, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2007, p. 385

²³¹ Brian Glyn Williams, “The Hidden Ethnic Cleansing of Muslims in the Soviet Union: The Exile and Repatriation of the Crimean Tatars”, *Ibid.*, p. 345. The Chechen case is an appropriate example for our study, resembling a lot to the Crimean Tatar one. Williams argues that the Chechen deportation of 1944, and humiliations and sufferings during the special settlement regime altered the Chechens’ identity, giving them ‘a sense of unity’, and the collective memory regarding these shaped the Chechen collective identity. Brian Glyn Williams, “Commemorating ‘the Deportation’ in Post-Soviet Chechnya”, *Ibid.*, 113. Collective memory was created through narratives and recollections on the deportation, and Chechens passed on these narratives to younger generations during and after police surveillance years, so the collective memory was kept alive. *Ibid.*, p. 116

²³² “Her bir ailede sürgünlük hatıraları söylenir edi, anlatılır edi. Her bir bala balalıqtan bu şeyleri bilir edi. Nasıl sürgün ettiler, ne oldu, ne qaldı. Her bir aileniñ öz tarihi bar, bu tarihlerden hikâyelerden

Furthermore, according to the constructivist view, Crimean Tatar case, too, is a good example for the significance of external factors (state policies such as deportation, persistent discrimination, and interethnic relations, living in Uzbekistan and mistreatment by the locals) in shaping the ethnic identity and creating a sense of unity.²³³

Based on the interviews, it may be argued that humiliation and discrimination Crimean Tatars faced in every field of life, from streets, to markets and schools, strengthened their Crimean Tatar identity. Humiliation stories are widespread, which can be seen in the recollection of one participant in the Crimean Tatar Movement: “At school I hated history and the history teachers. And here is why. The elementary school teachers constantly slandered our people and history, calling us traitors and barbarians.”²³⁴ One of my interviewees noted the following:

They called us traitors in Uzbekistan. When they got angry, they said ‘you sold out Crimea’. Crimean Tatars were being humiliated in markets, in waiting lines and in stores. Children used to come from schools crying, and they were, too, humiliated by being labelled as traitors [predatel- предатель].²³⁵

Discriminatory policies of the state mostly flourish the national identity, as in the Crimean Tatar case.²³⁶ For instance, an interviewees’ struggle in the Movement began when she was discriminated against by a history institute in Moscow. She took three exams in three consecutive years but failed and she were told that she would not be

umumi bir tarih oluşur.” “Bütün varlığına bütün vücüdün Qırım. Bizim ana babamız bizge öyle öğretkenler Qırım benim vatanım. Haçanda olsa biz anda qaytacamız, balam unutma, balam unutma!”

²³³ Ismail Aydıngün and Ayşegül Aydıngün, “Crimean Tatars Return Home: Identity and Cultural Revival”, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2007, p. 114, 119. What has been referred previously here as sufferings and tragedy, it might be paraphrased as external factors in constructivist theory.

²³⁴ Ayshe Seytmuratova, “The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections”, *Ibid.*, p. 29

²³⁵ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 16, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Özbekistanda bizge satqınlar ayta ediler, açuvlansa... Qırımni sattıñız ayta ediler... Son, halqın vekilleri bazarda sırada dükkanlarda bütün yerde aşalay ediler, balalar mektepten kelip ağlay ediler, olarğa da predatel, satqın dep aşalay ediler.”

²³⁶ Brian Glyn Williams, “The Crimean Tatar Exile in Central Asia: A Case Study in Group Destruction and Survival”, *Central Asian Survey*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1998, p. 304

accepted even if she were successful. She asked the reason for it never to be replied. She continues as follows: “‘I can answer my own question. You consider me as snake and you are afraid of letting the snake in your history since I can disclose all your treacheries. As of today I will fight with my people for my homeland’ and I left.”²³⁷ Cemilev, the leading dissident in the USSR and leader of the Crimean Tatars, encountered such discrimination too. He was not allowed to study in the Arabic Language and Literature Department in Tashkent in 1959 since he was Crimean Tatar.²³⁸ Crimean Tatars who met discrimination knew that this happened to them simply because they were Crimean Tatars. Thus, they anticipated it, let alone got shocked. For instance, one Crimean Tatar representative who joined the Movement in 1989 came to Crimea in order to complete his compulsory service, but was informed that there was no place to accommodate him. He stated the following:

I knew the laws. If the state send you, they can give you either an apartment or a place in the dorm. I said that I was ready to rent an apartment if you approve. However, he did not accept it and said that he has no right to do it. When I asked why, is it because I am [Crimean] Tatar. He nodded yes instead of speaking.²³⁹

Some Crimean Tatars, mostly those who went to Uzbek schools, tried to cope with discrimination by hiding their identity. An interviewee explained how he did this: “no one knew my Tatariness there [in school], no one knew that I was a Tatar. I was able to speak Uzbek better than Uzbeks...without accent.”²⁴⁰ However, when the examiner

²³⁷ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 16, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Özümün sualine özüm cevap bereyim mi dedim. Siz beni yıkan sayasınız dedim, yılını tarihinize kirsetmege qorqasañız. Ne için desenez men sizin bütün hayinliklerinizni açarım dep qorqasınız dedim. Bugünden başlap dedim men halqımnen beraber ...vatanım için küreşceğim, dedim. Çıqtım kettim.”

²³⁸ Hamdi Mert, **Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu**, Ankara, Bilig Yayınları, 2000, p. 31

²³⁹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 1, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Kanunlarını bile edim, devlet yollağan vaqtında, iki şekilde bar forma, apartament verebilirler ya da yataqhane, yataqhane de olmazsa men hazırım dedim kendim kirayğa almaya onıñ için. Bu sebepten yazın dedim alabilirmiz eger kendisi kirağa alırsa. Yoo dedi onu da yazmağa haqqımız yoq. Ne için dedim. Tatar olduğum sebeb mi dedim. Başını salladı. Söznen söylemedi.”

²⁴⁰ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, April 8, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Benim Tatarlığımı bilen yoktu orda, bir tanesi de bilmedi ben Tatarım diye. Ben Özbeklerden daha iyi biliyordum Özbekçeyi... bezaksent.”

learnt that (in most cases discriminations took place in exams or interviews in my examples) he was Crimean Tatar, then his chances of success shrank. On the other hand, discrimination did not automatically trigger the struggle every time. Sometimes, fear overpowered, which can be perceived in this account: “I am not a man of the National Movement, I was not. How could I be? I was working in the state, I would either leave the job or be fired out of the Party...I would fear.”²⁴¹ The fear was a threshold that other Tatars, too, had to overcome; coming face to face with fear, in this case KGB, Committee for State Security of the Soviet Union, might help. At least for one of the interviewees it worked. Grigorenko, who was one of the first supporters of Crimean Tatar Movement in the USSR, wrote about the fear and gave the solution: “whoever wanted to struggle against tyranny had to destroy within himself the fear of tyranny.”²⁴² It seems that those who destroyed the beast joined and publicly served the National Movement, and those who could not destroy secretly served the nation (e.g., some working in institutions designated to Crimean Tatars like the newspaper, the publishing house). Moreover, in the interviews, those Tatars put forward things they mostly struggled with such as censorship, while other Tatars, who struggled in the Movement, concentrated on different things. Since the censorship issue related with the publishing will be broadly discussed in one of the following chapters, only one example will be given here to show the importance and effect of the state repression, in the form of censorship, regarding Crimean Tatar consciousness. One journalist who worked in *Lenin Bayragı* and the publishing house stated that:

KGB always controlled us. I took and prepared the final version of the books and prior to publishing books introduced them to the *Uzlit*.²⁴³ They, people in *Uzlit*, checked the literature, the books.

²⁴¹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, April 8, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Ben Milli Hareket’in adamı değilim, olmadım... nasıl olacam ben, ben devletin ... çalışam da ya işimden gidecem, ya partiyadan çıkarılacam...lakin ben korkardım.”

²⁴² Petro G. Grigorenko, *Ibid.*, p. 289

²⁴³ *Uzlit* was the Uzbek branch of *Glavlit* (Glavnoe upravlenie po delam literatury i izdatel'stv- the Main Directorate on Literature and Presses), which was responsible for censorship in the USSR. Adele Lotus, “The Sound of Silence”, **Committee to Protect Journalists**, 2001, (available) <http://cpj.org/reports/>

There Russians, Uzbeks and Kazan Tatars read our books. There was no Crimean Tatars. They were not employed there. An *Özbechka*, Uzbek woman, an Uzbek guy and a Kazan Tatar dealt with our works. Kazan Tatar was mean. We introduced him and he read, read and said, "Why did you give so? You will correct these, you will throw away those." Otherwise, if you said no, you would be fired...We were on the third floor, *Uzlit* was on the fourth floor but the far side of the building. [By coming and going to *Uzlit*'s office, at the same building with *Lenin Bayragı*] I used to sweat from trouble and my eyes and hands became wet...That was so. They never made us forget... every minute and every second we were made to remember that we were Crimean Tatars.²⁴⁴

In addition to 'common/shared trauma' factor and discriminatory policies of the state and the humiliation of all which feed collective memory, homeland factor, also paraphrased as territory, landscape or geography, is also one of the markers of the identity and shapers of the collective memory.²⁴⁵ According to Smith:

...to become national, shared memories must attach themselves to specific places and definite territories. The process by which certain kinds of shared memories are attached to particular territories so that the former become ethnic landscapes (or ethnoscaples) and the latter become historic homelands, can be called the 'territorialization of memory'.²⁴⁶

2001/07/uzbek.php, 15.01.2014; Michael S. Fox, "Glavlit, Censorship and the Problem of Party Policy in Cultural Affairs, 1922-28", *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 6, 1992, p. 1045

²⁴⁴ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: "Bütün vaqıt KGB bizni teşkere edi. Bir kitap çıqacak, bu kitapnı alam hazırlayım, karekturasını hazırlayım. Nihai haline imza çekem, alıp Uzletke ketem. Uzlette Ruslar, Özbekler bizim kitaplarnı Özbekler çoq okuy ediler. Kazan Tatarlar. Uzlet, edebiyatnıñ KGB'niñ teşkeri bar. Edebiyatta kitaplarda ne bar ne yoq baqa ediler. Ruslar Özbekler, bir qaç tane de Kazan Tatarı bar edi, Qırımtatarı yoq edi. Qırımtatarını almay ediler. Bizim işimizge Özbeçka (özbek kadını) baqa edi, ...Özbek oğlu, ...Kazan Tatar adamı bakıyordu. Kazan Tatarı qattı edi, yazıp beremiz, okuy okuy, ne içün böyle beresiñiz diy. Bularnı tüzelteceksin, bularnı atacaqsıñ vs. diy. Yoq, desen işten keteceksıñ... Biz 3. qatta, o 4. qatta lakin o bir başta biz başta, uzaq. Terden ıslak ola edim sıqıntıdan. Kozlerinden, ellerinden yaş aqa edi... Böyle edi. Bütün vaqıt, her daqqa, her saniye biz Qırımtatar olduğanımıznı unuttırmay ediler.."

²⁴⁵ Gwendolyn Sasse, *The Crimea Question: Identity, Transition, and Conflict*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2007, p. 38-42; Edward H. Spicer, "Persistent Cultural Systems", *Science*, Vol. 174, No. 4011, 1971, p. 798

²⁴⁶ Anthony D. Smith, "Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism" *International Affairs*, vol. 72, No. 3, 1996, p. 453-454

For instance, it is the 'religious landscape of the Kazak steppe' that arouses the Kazak collective memory,²⁴⁷ and Ukrainian steppe for Ukrainian collective memory. Crimean landscape with its memorable mountains or rock shapes like *Ayudağ*, coastline (*yalıboyu*) and steppe (*çöl*) dominate Crimean Tatar memory.²⁴⁸

Scholars argue that the exact overlap of Crimean homeland with Crimean Tatar identity developed in two phases. At the first phase, in the last decades of Tsarist Russia, Young Tatars proceeded to pioneer a 'territorially-bound and defined' nation-building process in Crimea.²⁴⁹ They pulled out Crimean Tatars from the Turkish world and focused on Tatar inhabitants of Crimea 'as a distinct nation' rather than Gaspıralı's pan-Turkist inclination.²⁵⁰ This movement involved in a one-month state experience at the end of the WWI.²⁵¹ The second phase was dominated by Leninist nation-building process/nationality policies attaching ethnicities with distinct languages and alphabets to specific territories. That meant that every ethnicity had its own delimited land. In other words, Kazakhs who spoke Kazakh had their own republic, lived in Kazakhstan and were titular nationals of that republic. It created territorial-based nationality and a sense of attachment to the territory. Crimean Tatars got their own share: an autonomous republic in Crimea. The Crimean Tatar nation was accepted as not *de jure* because there was no reference to Crimean Tatars in the name of the Crimean autonomous entity such as the ones in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan Republics or Buryat-Mongol Autonomous Republic, but *de facto* founder titular nationality. Crimean Tatar was the official language along with Russian. Crimean Tatar cadres were introduced to local institutions, and the first secretary of

²⁴⁷ Bruce G. Privratsky, **Muslim Turkistan**, Great Britain, Curzon Press, 2001, p. 22

²⁴⁸ These three distinct landscape, *çöl*, *yalıboyu* and *orta yolak* also divided Crimean Tatar language into three accent. That is to say, Crimean territory shaped the Crimean Tatar language. The south-*yalıboyu*- is close to *Oğuz* subgroup of Turkish, while the north-*steppe*- is *Kipchak* and the middle-*orta yolak*- is literary language.

²⁴⁹ Brian Glyn Williams, "A Community Reimagined. The Role of 'Homeland' in the Forging of National Identity: the Case of the Crimean Tatars", **Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs**, vol. 17, no. 2, 1997, p. 232

²⁵⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 231-32

²⁵¹ These three also were founders of 'Vatan' in 1909. Cafer Seydahmet Kırımer, **Bazı Hatıralar**, p.59

the Autonomous Republic was a Crimean Tatar, Veli Ibrahim. Subsequent to establishing the autonomous entity, native Tatar culture, art and literature flourished.²⁵² Prior to the WWII, Crimean Tatars had approximately a thousand primary and secondary schools, five institutes including a language and literature research institute, newspapers, libraries, clubs, a song and dance ensemble, and a theatre. They had more than two hundred books printed in Crimean Tatar.²⁵³ After the deportation, books printed in Crimean Tatar, grave stones, institutions named after Crimean Tatar, the names of places, mountains and rivers, in short, anything conjuring up Crimean Tatars were erased in the peninsula, except a handful architectural monuments in Bakhchysarai, Kaffa and Kezlev (Yevpatoria). Exiled Crimean Tatars were expected to be assimilated among Muslims in Central Asia. However, in contrast to the expectations, they concentrated on survival, and continuation of their race during police surveillance years.²⁵⁴

For Crimean Tatars in exile, the homeland Crimea was part of the daily life, but only limited within the family and the Crimean Tatar environment. One participant of the National Movement pointed out these: “I do not remember a single day that passed in Samarkand on which our parents did not recall Crimea. It never happened. When we were children, they did not talk intentionally but recounted us, in the evenings, villages, what there was in the mountains.”²⁵⁵ Crimean ideal, especially, was kept alive through family visits of Crimean Tatar families. Crimea, here too, was at the center of the conversations. Below is how the same interviewee continues:

²⁵² Ann Sheehy and Bohdan Nahaylo, *Ibid.*, p. 7

²⁵³ Ayşe Seytmuratove, “Prof. Fazlur Rahman’ın ‘Rusya’daki Müslümanlara Karşı Sovyet Politikasının Gelişimi (1917-1965)’ adlı Makalesi Hakkında”, *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no.23, 1983, p. 171-172

²⁵⁴ Brian Glyn Williams, “The Hidden Ethnic Cleansing of Muslims in the Soviet Union: The Exile and Repatriation of the Crimean Tatars”, *Ibid.*, p. 338

²⁵⁵ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 1, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Men öyle hatırlamayım böyle bir kün keçti de Semerkantta ana babalarımız Qırımı hatırlamasınlar. Öyle bir şey yoq edi. Öyle bir bala iken saña her vaqıt bir şey anlatsalar mahsus anlatmaz ediler balam balam bilmiyim, amma işte laf ete ediler, aqşamları bizge köylerini añlatır ediler, dağlarda ne bar edi.”

People had very warm relationships at that time. I do not remember any evening that we were alone at home, it was not the case. Either we were at the neighbor or the neighbors were at us...Family visits were refreshing moments for people because the visits meant keeping alive the Tatariness. With whom could you talk? You could talk with the neighbor... [in these visits] the children were gathered in one room and one of the ladies or of the grandfathers, mostly the grandfathers would come and recount us. It was not like propaganda but they explained necessary things for the children. For example, how the sheep were herded, what kind of horses there were, how was water and weather in Crimea. Children were being disciplined.²⁵⁶

The family/home was relatively protected from the government's influence, and one of the least private sites, if not the only, Crimean Tatars almost freely unbosom. An activist described this as follows:

Both during the Stalin era and in the police surveillance years, it was forbidden to go beyond 4 kilometers. The most recreational activity for Crimean Tatars was family visits. We would go either to the neighbors or to the relatives. We had a [visit] schedule at home to show that we visited them, then they had to visit us. The talks were always about Crimea when guests came. How the events happened, what happened in war time, who was killed and who was captured. They used to talk openly, they trusted each other. For instance, if my father openly spoke to someone, then the person addressed was trustable. If not and he talked about trivial issues such as the garden, that meant that he did not trust the collocutor.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁶ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 1, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: "İnsanlar çoq bir birlerine sıcaq böyle bağları çoq sıcaq idi o vaqıt insanlarıñ men hatırlamayım men öyle aqşamlar olsıñ biz bir özümüz olayıq öyle değıl edi. Hep bizler qomşularda misafir bar edi ya qomşular bizde edi. Misafirlik böyle bir forma idi insanları canlandıran forma idi, çünkü misafirlik demek Tatarlığı saqlamaq, çünkü qayda laf etecen? Qomşunen laf etecen. Balalarını toplar edi bir odada birisi kelir edi hanımlardan birisi kelir edi ya da dedeler kelir edi, dedeler çoq sıq kele ediler, ve bizlerge anlatır ediler. Böyle siyasi propaganda değıl de, balalara gerekli şeylerni anlatır ediler. Misal için, eger Qırımını söylesele qoyunlarğa nasıl baqa ediler, nasıl atlar bar edi, çeşmelerde nasıl sular toplanğan nasıl temizlenir havalar başka şeyler olsa değıl edi işte, balalara terbiyeler bere ediler."

²⁵⁷ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, March 23, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: "Stalin zamanın olsun, ondan sonra, komindat rejimi altında olsun, 4 km'den dışarı çıkmak yasaktı, Qırımtatarlarının en büyük eğlenceleri birbirlerine misafirliğe gitmekti. Akşamları ya komşuya gidiyorsun, ya da akrabaya. Bizim evde grafik vardı, biz onlara gittik şimdi onların gelmeleri lazım.. Her misafir geldiği zaman konuşuyorlar, hep konuşmalar kırım hakkında. Nasıl oldu, o vakıyalar, savaş zamanında ne oldu, kim öldürüldü kim yakalandı... Misafirler geldiği zaman her şey açık konuşulurdu, birbirlerine güveniyorlardı. Eğer babam insanla açık konuşuyorsa demek güvenilir. Eğer bahçe hakkında vs. konuşuyorsa demek güvenmiyor."

Like other instances²⁵⁸, the family was a crucial site where Crimean Tatarness or Tatar identity was acquired by the rising generations. These generations obtained first the national sentiments through family or family visits. The family was the basis for Crimean Tatars in exile on which they preserved their distinct self-consciousness, their Tatarness.²⁵⁹

Crimean Tatar children were a bit different from other children. Soviet propaganda did not affect us. We were basically *disciplined* at home...When Stalin died on March 5th, 1953, it was broadcasted via radio. First words of my dad was 'the dog died'. That was normal to us. When I came to school, everybody, students, teachers etc., were weeping, saying 'Our omniscient [leader] passed away.' I realized that only Crimean Tatar children were not crying. There was one Crimean Tatar called Reşat also warned me that everybody was weeping except Crimean Tatars, and we also had to cry, otherwise our parents might be put into prison. He said he brought onion...Crimean Tatars knew where the shitty world he [Stalin] had gone, so we did not cry.²⁶⁰

Crimea, for Tatar children, was narrated as a kind of wonderland in fairytales. In other words, it was a land where heaven was. It was recounted like a heaven where there were forests, flowers and big grasses and where fountains were pouring, birds were flying and rabbits were running. On the other hand, upon returning to Crimea, what they saw was different from what they had previously dreamt about Crimea and they learnt to love it from the very beginning.²⁶¹ Crimea-memory of Crimea sometimes

²⁵⁸ Harry Goulbourne, Tracey Reynolds, John Solomos and Elisabetta Zontini, **Transnational Families**, New York, Routledge, 2010, p. 99

²⁵⁹ Brian Glyn Williams, "The Crimean Tatar Exile in Central Asia: A Case Study in Group Destruction and Survival", **Ibid.**, p. 301

²⁶⁰ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, March 23, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: "Qırımtatarları başka çocuklardan biraz farklıydı. Bize Sovyet propagandasının tesiri olmuyordu. Biz esas terbiyemizi evde alıyorduk. Ben size birşey anlatayım. Stalin öldüğü gün, 5 Mart 53'te, radyodan söylediler, babamın birinci kelimesi haberi işittiğinde, geberdi ya köpek idi. Bizim için normal. Okula geldim herkes ağlıyor, çocuklar öğretmenler vs. büyük dahimiz öldü, bakıyorum yalnız Qırımtatar çocukları ağlamıyor. Bizde Reşat ... denen biri vardı, bakıyorum herkes ağlıyor, bizimkiler ağlamıyor. Ağlamak lazım dedi. Çünkü dedi ağlamazsak ve ana babalarımız hapse atarlar. Ben de soğan getirdim, ... Qırımtatarları ise ne bok iyi bir dünyaya gittiğini zaten biliyorlardı, ağlamak yoktu."

²⁶¹ Ayşegül Aydıngün and Erdoğan Yıldırım, "Perception of Homeland among Crimean Tatars: Cases from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Crimea", **Bilig**, No. 54, 2010, p. 31-32

could mean or create for Crimean Tatar kids a privilege or an opportunity that other times they could not think of. A relative of one interviewee visited Crimea as a tourist and in return to Uzbekistan brought a box of cigarette.

It is called *papirus* [a kind of cigarette]. On the top of the box, it was written and pictured Yalta and the sea. He served to everyone, and everybody took one of the cigarettes. I also took one. I was at second or third grade. My mother asked my dad, 'don't you see what this son is doing?' My dad replied, 'it is from Crimea, let him take.' Look! [My father said] It came from Crimea, let him take. Other times I would take a slap. It was possible to take a cigarette because it was from Crimea.²⁶²

As seen, in the family all were about Crimea. It was also the same outside the family, within Crimean Tatar environment such as picnics of the young. These kinds of environments might have helped the circulation of the stories regarding Crimea, deportation and traditions of Tatars, as the way Uehling pointed out.²⁶³ One Crimean Tatar scholar mentioned about regular meetings of the Crimean Tatar youth. "Every Saturday, on a regular basis, we, 40-50 young people in Tashkent, used to meet...and go to picnics by train. The motive was to speak Crimean Tatar, about Crimea or marrying with Crimean Tatar girls. We used to talk about our grandparents' traditional costumes, waistbands or old feasts etc."²⁶⁴ In short, collective memory together with its sustaining elements and external factors enhanced Crimean Tatar identity in exile and kept the return ideal alive. In the next chapter, outer diaspora of Crimean Tatars and some featured topics such as nationality issue, self-

²⁶² Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 1, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: "Ona papüros aytalar...açtı bu qutuyu, qutunıñ üstünde Yalta yazılmış, Yalta ve deñiz. Soñ hepsine böyle bere, hepsi birer tane ala. Men de aldım bir tane. İkcimni üçüncü sınıfqa baram hatırlamayam. Anam babama diy, babası diy bakmazsan bu oğlan ne yapa? Babam, Qırımdan keldi alsın diyi. Baq Qırımdan keldi alsın. İşte eger başqa vaqıt olsa edi bir şamar aşar edim. Qırımdan gelkeni içün papiros da almağa mümkün idi, sigaret de almağa mümkün edi."

²⁶³ Greta Lynn Uehling, *Ibid.*, p. 10

²⁶⁴ Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, February 18, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: "Biz mesela Taşkente her cumaertesi gençler toplaşıyor Taşkente, toplaşma nedeni Qırımtatarca konuşmak, Qırım hakkında konuşmak, Qırımtatar kızına evlenmek. Biz sonra trenlere oturup pikniklere gidiyorduk 40-50 kişi. Devamlı, her cumartesi... kart anababamızın giyimlerini, kuşaklarını, toyumuzu (konuşuyorduk)."

determination, Soviet colonialism and outer diaspora's reaction to détente policies during Cold War will be elaborated basically through their publications *Dergi* and *Emel*.

CHAPTER 4

OUTER DIASPORA IN FREE WORLD

This study bases ‘outer’ diaspora of Crimean Tatar Movement on three Crimean Tatar characters as to their leadership positions and activities in political, social, cultural and scientific life: Cafer Seydahmet Kırımer, Müstecip Ülküsal, and Edige Kırımal. Kırımer (1889-1960) took office during Numan Çelebicihan and Süleyman Sulkiewicz governments in Crimea. Upon leaving Crimea because of Bolshevik occupation of Crimea, he became one of the most respected figures among Crimean Tatars and *de facto* leader of the Movement in the diaspora. He represented the Movement in Prometheus League during the interwar period in Europe and after the WWII in Turkey. Ülküsal (1899-1996), was a Romanian-born Crimean Tatar. He was very active among Crimean Tatars in diaspora. He was the founder of *Emel* Journal in Romania and its lead author in Turkey until early 1980s. After Kırımer died, Ülküsal took his place.²⁶⁵ The third figure, Kırımal (1911-1980), was from Polish Tatars born in Crimea, who was a representative of Crimean Tatars in Europe. During the WWII, Kırımer supported him to work with the Germans. After the War, he became a member of the Institute for the Study of the USSR and his articles on Crimea, Crimean Tatars and Russian rules in Crimea were published in the Institute’s publication, *Dergi*.

4.1 Interwar Period: Prometheus League

After Bolsheviks defeated anti-Red forces and seized the power in Tsardom, people from various nations of Russia had to leave the country. Those who were non-Russians and who settled in Europe mostly cooperated with Poland, which positioned

²⁶⁵ Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p.166

herself against Russia pursuing anti-Soviet policies. There were many Turkic people from Turkestan, Caucasia, Idil-Ural, and Crimea among these émigrés. A Turkish diplomat expressed the general political inclination of these émigrés of Russia at the time, in 1939, to another such émigré from China as follows: “Some outer Turks counted on the English, some on the German, some on the Polish, and some counted on Japan, now.”²⁶⁶ Indeed, as the Turkish diplomat stated, Crimean Tatar émigrés had good relations mostly with the Polish, as others did.

Those Crimean Tatars fled after WWI and Russian Civil War to countries such as Poland, Romania and Turkey, where diaspora Crimean Tatars had been living for some time.²⁶⁷ In the interwar period, Crimean Tatar intellectuals such as Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, Edige Kırimal and Müstecip Ülküsal kept contact with Prometheus Organizations of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR.²⁶⁸ They were also in contact with other Prometheus Organizations throughout Europe. For example, National Centers of Émigrés of the nations of the USSR worked together as part of Prometheus Project in Warsaw. Two examples were Crimean Tatar National Center represented by Kırimer and its Azeri counterpart represented by Mehmet Emin Resulzade.²⁶⁹ As for Paris branch, they worked together in the Journal *Prometheus* (Promethee) published in French by “Turkish nationalists of Azerbaijan, Turkestan,

²⁶⁶ Quotation translated by the author. The original in Turkish in “İsa Yusuf Alptekin, **İsa Yusuf Alptekin’in Mücadele Hatıraları Esir Doğu Türkistan İçin-1**, Berikan Yayınevi, Ankara, 2010, p. 370”

²⁶⁷ Tatars were settled down centuries ago to Poland in the time of Vytautas the Great, Grand Duke of Lithuania, in 1397. They were recruited as qualified soldiers by the Duke and over time they became part of the community which they lived with. Jozef Atnoni Sierzputowski, “Başka Anadan”, **Emel**, no. 23, year 4, Istanbul, 1964, p. 23-38 (It first published in monthly journal ‘Problemy’ in Warsaw in September 1963)

²⁶⁸ Aleksandr Nekrich, **Ibid.**, p. 19. Kırimer carried out leadership of Crimean Tatar movement outside the USSR until he died in 1960 and represented the movement in Prometheus Movement and other organizations. Müstecip Ülküsal, “Kırım Türkleri”, **Türk Dünyası El Kitabı**, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, Ankara, 1976, p. 1153

²⁶⁹ Resulzade was the leader of the party *Musavat* and only president of the independent Azerbaijan between 1918-1920

Idil-Ural and Northern Caucasia.”²⁷⁰ In Berlin, Ayas Ishaki, who were a Kazan Tatar, took part in the Prometheus Movement, publishing underground journals, *Milli Yol* and *Yeni Milli Yol* between 1928 and 1931. Before *Emel*, articles concerned with Crimean Tatars or written by Crimean Tatars appeared in journals such as *Promethee* in Paris, journals of Resulzade and Mirza Bala²⁷¹ and in Ishaki’s journals.²⁷² In Romania, *Emel* was becoming the voice of Crimean Tatar Movement as of 1930. It was published by Müstecip Ülküsal (who was also active in *Emel* when republished in Turkey) and his colleagues, and its inception was very welcomed by Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer. Prior to the war, Romania was a transit country for the passengers who were coming from Turkey and heading to the north, especially to Poland, or vice versa. These passengers, especially émigrés of Prometheus nations, first stopped in Dobruca region to meet Tatars who widely inhabited the region, and then resumed the travel. In addition to émigrés, Polish senators and scholars visited Crimean Tatar region in Romania several times²⁷³ and this traffic continued until the German occupation of Poland. Tatars in Romania also established links with the Polish students through Crimean Tatar students in Warsaw.²⁷⁴ They visited Poland and met other Prometheus nationals.²⁷⁵ All these comings and goings of Tatars and the others from and to Dobruca were made easier both by the existence of Poland-Romania border, which did not exist anymore after the WWII, and by the Romanian authorities’ affirmative attitude toward minorities, Tatars, and their activities.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁰ A. Vahap Yurtsever, “Cafer Beye Dair Hatıralarım/ Memories on Mr. Cafer”, *Emel*, Istanbul, no. 4, year 1, 1961, p. 16; “In Reappearing”, *Emel*, Ankara, no.1, year 1, 1960, p. 4

²⁷¹ Ildeniz Kurtulan, “Ulusal Azerbaycan Yayınlarında ‘Kırım’ Konuları”, *Emel*, no. 7, year 2, Ankara, 1961, p. 18-22

²⁷² Fevzi Altug, *Ibid.*, p. 11-25; Sebastian Cwiklinski, “20. Yüzyılın Sonundan 2. Dünya Savaşı’nın Başlangıcına Kadar Berlin’deki Tatarlar ve Başkurtlar”, *Türkler*, Ankara, vol. 18, 2002, p. 893. The journals which were enumerated were published by diaspora and by persons who engaged with Prometheus movement.

²⁷³ Müstecip Ülküsal, *Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar*, p. 234

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 186-87

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 229-30

²⁷⁶ In the meantime, Bulgarian attitude was the opposite. They were strict. For instance, the Crimean Tatar attempt to establish relations with co-kins from the other side of the border in the south, Tatars in

In interwar period, Poland supported dissident émigrés and their organizations, national committees and governments-in-exile against the USSR. Most were Muslim and Turkic groups from Turkestan to Crimea. There were Ukrainians, Kalmyks and Cossacks among them. Some volunteers from Russia's Muslims such as Azerbaijanis and some Georgian servicemen retreated from Red Army in 1921 and joined the Polish army under authorization given by Pilsudski.²⁷⁷ However, Promethean Movement was not a success story for Poland because the war did not begin where Polish policymakers predicted. Poland was occupied and divided up by Germany and the USSR in cooperation and all plans fell through.²⁷⁸ Moreover, Germans had different objectives than Poland toward the USSR and did not awaken the latter's endeavors as already seen in German occupation section.

4.1.1 *Dergi* and *Emel*

Dr. Edige Kırimal was one of the most, if not the most, leading figures among diaspora Crimean Tatars in Europe during the Cold War years. He was the European representative of Turkish sect of Crimean Tatar National Movement and the editor of *Dergi*, which was published in Turkish by the Munich Institute.²⁷⁹ Kırimal mainly wrote

Bulgaria, was prevented by Bulgarians. Thus, Crimean Tatars could not spread their activities to Bulgaria.

²⁷⁷ Charles Warren Hostler, *Ibid.*, p. 123-125; Andriy Rukkas, "Georgian Servicemen in the Polish Armed Forces (1922–39)", *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, vol. 14, no.3, 2001, p. 123

²⁷⁸ Charles Warren Hostler, *Ibid.*, p. 125

²⁷⁹ Its first issue was published in 1955. Its focus region was the Captive Nations, from Crimea and Caucasia to Yakutia, from Idil-Ural to Pamirs. According to the first issue, the inhabitants of this vast region and the state of the nations were not thoroughly examined and informed. Thus, their first objective was to fill this gap. The journal included articles, news and book reviews on history, language, religion, literature, ideology, industry, population of general Soviet Union and of nations of Turkestan, Caucasus, Idil-Ural and Crimea, as well as the current issues at the time such as colonialism, détente, bilateral relations of the Western and Soviet blocs. *Dergi*, Munich, no.1, year 1, 1955, p. 4. It is the corporation of émigré scientists who left the USSR and/or study on and researched about the USSR. Every scientist regardless of his/her nationality or political opinion could work with the Institute except those who were members of Communist Party or had any inclination to this party. Soviet refugees who had scientific background could also attend to the Institute's studies. *Dergi*, no.1, year 1, Munich, 1955, p. 2. The Institute's mission was to study the USSR's doctrine and practice about political and social order and historical, cultural, economic, national and political problems and to get in contact with scientists who were interested in those issues and to share the results (that were deduced from the

about Crimea and Crimean Tatars. He published articles discussing general Crimean history, Crimean Tatar history, Crimean history during Tsarist Russia and the USSR, Soviet politics of nationality and religion, situation of woman in Crimea and more specific topics about literature.

Crimean Tatars in Turkey gathered around *Emel* in the years that follow. *Emel* was first published by ten young Crimean Tatars under the leadership of Müstecip Ülküsal in Romania in 1930 to be the voice of the Crimean independence movement, and their aim was “to pave the way to the unity in thought and ideal of the Turkic peoples living in distant parts of the world and speaking different Turkish dialects”.²⁸⁰ It was declared that *Emel* would be advocating the Crimean Tatar cause outside Crimea after a few issues were published.²⁸¹ After 11 years of publication, it was closed down because of war time deficiencies in 1940. It started to be republished in Turkey in 1960.

This chapter examines *Dergi* and *Emel*. Since the former was closed down due to financial and political reasons in 1971, it is elaborated only briefly in this study. *Dergi* was included to the research because Kırımlı was an active member of the Movement in Europe. He was also the editor of it. For this reason, it might be claimed that *Dergi* fulfilled a somewhat low-scale and *de facto* role of organ of the Movement in Europe. As for *Emel*, it was the first accepted organ of the Movement in Romania, then in Turkey since 1960. The two journals had some common points. For example, the writers of both journals gave importance to the same issues. These common points are put forward in this section.

studies) with the Democratic Free World. **Dergi**, no.2, year 1, Munich, 1955, p. 130. While émigrés in Europe were hand in hand with the Americans and cooperated with the west and employed in RFE/ RL, the institute and in other publications to study the USSR; the Soviet Union, it seems, was not roaming but in return she too established an institute named as the Institute for the Study of Foreign Countries to study émigré communities. Vic Satzewich, **Ibid.**, p. 174.

²⁸⁰ “In Reappearing”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 1, year 1, 1960, p. 4

²⁸¹ Müstecip Ülküsal, “Kırım Türkleri”, **Ibid.**, p. 1153; Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p. 152

One of the featured topics which these journals focused on was the nationality issue.²⁸² Evaluation of the nationality problem by *Dergi* or *Emel*'s writers was far from the Soviet thesis. The essence of the issue was hostility and distrust among Russians and non-Russians, as Lenin referred to.²⁸³ The nationality problem was one of the top issues that Soviet authorities had focused on-from the beginning different policies were adopted depending on the time and conditions, from flourishing national entities and cultures to pressure. Roughly speaking, the 1920s were the years when non-Russian nationalities flourished. In 1930s, everything was upside down; revitalization of Russian nationalism and culture took place in this period. WWII was an interim period when deportations of some nations resumed. The end of the WWII marked a new epoch symbolized by the toast Stalin proposed after victory over Nazis: "I drink, above all, to the health of the Russian people, for it is the most outstanding nation of all nations forming a part of the Soviet Union."²⁸⁴ The violations that occurred during the Stalinist period were tried to be retrieved during Khrushchev era by rehabilitating and repatriating of some nationalities. Some other un-rehabilitated peoples, specifically Crimean Tatars, used Leninist principles in their rhetoric during their struggle to correct the problem when the Soviet authorities were unresponsive to Crimean Tatar requests denying the existence of such a problem.²⁸⁵

On the other hand, there was a problem for the publications of *Dergi* and *Emel*. The nationalities problem was not only left undealt, but the distrust and hostility continued to exist against Bolshevik Soviet rule. Unlike émigrés in Europe, the Crimean Tatar diaspora in Turkey were more homogenous, and their writings might be considered as more independent. For them, Czarist or Bolshevik Russians were

²⁸² The others were self-determination together with Soviet colonialism and reaction to détente policies during Cold War.

²⁸³ Yuri Slezkine, "The USSR as a Communal Apartment or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism", *Slavic Review*, vol. 53, no.2, 1994, p.420-421

²⁸⁴ Henri Fruchet, "The Use of History The Soviet Historiography of Khan Kenesary Kasimov", *Central Asia Aspects of Transition*, Ed. By. Tom Everett-Heath, New York, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003, p. 140

²⁸⁵ "Sürgündeki Kırımhlılar", *Emel*, İstanbul, no. 64, year 11, 1971, p. 35-37

identical in that both regimes were chauvinist and defended Russian interests, and Crimean Tatars suffered under both regimes.²⁸⁶ Therefore, the evaluation of 1957 and 1967 decrees by the writers of *Dergi* and *Emel* was based on the feelings of distrust and hostility. This is why they interpreted both issues directly related with nationality and policies such as “peaceful coexistence”, *détente* which were developed by the Soviet authorities, with suspicion. Moreover, according to them, the rapprochement and fusion of Soviet nations and the solution to the nationality problem only referred to the assimilation of non-Russian nations to Russian people.²⁸⁷

When the the communist and the capitalist blocs’ relations tended to improve as a result of Soviet and American attempts, diaspora Crimean Tatar National Movement opposed this. In other words, peaceful coexistence in the 1950s, de Gaulle’s own *détente* toward the USSR in 1960s, Federal Germany’s *Ostpolitik* toward Eastern Bloc, the process of Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and *détente* of the USA in the 1970s and Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) were marked as the tough years for diaspora National Movement in Turkey. They criticized such policies in *Emel*. In general they approached such policies and negotiations skeptically and evaluated them as the continuation of the *status quo*.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶ Müstecip Ülküsal, “Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer ve Kırım Davası”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 27, year 5, 1965, p. 2; Müstecip Ülküsal, “Büyük Facianın 23. Yıl Dönümü”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 40, year 7, 1967, p. 1-4; M. Alaç, “Rusların Kırım’da Latin ve Rus Harflerini Kabul Ettirme Sebepleri”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 31, year 11, 1965, p. 19; Müstecip Ülküsal, “Kırımlı Şehit Mustafa Cemiloğlu”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 93, year 16, 1976, p. 7

²⁸⁷ Ramazan Karça, ‘Review-I.P. Tsameryan: Razvitiye Natsionalnih Otnoşeniy v Period Razvernutoyo Stroitelstva Kommunizma’, **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 19, year 6, 1960, p. 100; Tahir Çağatay, “Sovyet Rusya’da Milletler Meselesi Çözölmüş müdür?”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 66, year 11, 1971, p. 7

²⁸⁸ **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 70, year 12, 1972, p. 13, 35; Müstecip Ülküsal, “Avrupa Güvenlik ve İşbirliği Konferansı”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 90, year 15, 1975, p. 1-8; Müstecip Ülküsal, “SALT II İmzalandı, Fakat...”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 113, year 19, 1979, p. 1-6

What they offered and wished to see was a united and strong front against the USSR and communism.²⁸⁹ United front refers to both micro level among émigrés which were fragmented all along and macro level among the free world.²⁹⁰ M. Ülküsal repeatedly expressed his dissatisfaction with the disunity of the Western bloc against the USSR and the peaceful coexistence approach. For instance, he seemed displeased with the policies of de Gaulle when France, led by him, began to follow a more independent policy toward the Soviet Union. Under his leadership, France gradually withdrew her armed forces from the NATO and tried to follow her détente policy with the USSR.²⁹¹ Ülküsal criticized de Gaulle's policy of friendship with the communists on the grounds that it would weaken the unity of the West.²⁹² He also implicitly criticized the USA for wasting their (captive nations of the USSR) time and giving them false hopes on their freedom and independence. On the one hand, the West designated a week for Captive Nations²⁹³ to win the sympathy of world nations and captive nations of the communist bloc. On the other hand, it traded with communists

²⁸⁹ Müstecip Ülküsal, "Silahsızlanma Konferansı ve Esir Milletler", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 10, year 2, 1962, p. 4-5

²⁹⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 5

²⁹¹ Henry Kissenger, **Diplomasi**, Trans. by. İbrahim Kurt, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, p. 712

²⁹² Müstecip Ülküsal, "Doğu ve Batı Blokları", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 21, year 4, 1964, p. 4

²⁹³ The term captive nations refers to the nations of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idil-Ural, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others whose national independence was subjugated by communist imperialism and/or communist Russia. In July 1959, the president of the USA was authorized to proclaim 3rd week of July as Captive Nations Week in each year until they achieved freedom and independence. "Captive Nations Week", Public Law 86-90, July 17, 1959, (available), <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-73/pdf/STATUTE-73-Pg212.pdf>, 03.03.2014; "Captive Nations Week", **Svoboda Ukrainian Weekly**, Saturday, July 22, 1972. Moreover, émigré members of some of these captive nations formed also an assembly (**Assembly of Captive European Nations-ACEN**) whose main motive was to establish democracy throughout captive countries of Europe. "Çanakkale Milletvekili Ahmet Nihat Akay'ın 'Esir Milletler Haftası' ile ilgili yazılı soru önermesine Dışişleri Bakanı Ferudun Cemal Erkin'in cevabı", **Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi**, cilt 16, 1. Dönem, 80. Birleşim, May 13, 1963, p. 666-668, (available) http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanaklar/TUTANAK/MM_/d01/c016/mm__01016080.pdf, 03.03.2014

and made money under peaceful coexistence. Thus, these were not favored by Ülküsal.²⁹⁴

Ülküsal repeated his criticism after the self-immolation of Musa Mamud in Crimea in 1978. Musa Mamud burned himself to protest the local Crimean Soviet authorities' raids to Crimean Tatar properties and re-deportation of Crimean Tatars outside Crimea. The news reached the West by phone and *samizdat*, and Ülküsal summarized the feelings of émigrés in the editorial of *Emel*: (reminding Captive Nations Week) the West neglect captive Turkish Muslim peoples and their causes while they keep preaching about human rights (referring to Helsinki period).²⁹⁵ Criticism was not directed towards only the West but for other Muslim states, governments, international or local human rights organizations, commissions, committees, congresses and so on, too.²⁹⁶

Final featured issue that appeared in the articles of *Emel* and *Dergi* was Soviet colonialism and self-determination of Soviet nations. During the Cold War, decolonization of the colonies in Africa and Asia was an issue in international relations. Colonies of the western states began to get their independence one after another following the war, and decolonization became a propaganda tool for the USSR during the Cold War period. The USSR supported the independence of the colonies of the western states and used it to its own benefit.

While the Soviet Union favored the freedom of colonies and accused the western countries for imperialism, the émigrés turned the same gun against the Soviet Union. That is, the Soviet Union clamored for the independence of even the tiniest islands

²⁹⁴ Müstecip Ülküsal, "Esir Milletler Haftası ve Ötesi", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 23, year 4, 1964, p. 4; "Brejnev Yardım Arıyor!", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 77, year 13, 1973, p. 48

²⁹⁵ Müstecip Ülküsal, "Sovyetler Birliği'nde Polisin Tutuklamak İstedığı Bir Tatar Kendisini Yaktı", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 107, year 18, 1978, p. 4

²⁹⁶ **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 110, year 19, 1979, p. 42

of Oceania in the international arena, but she kept her own colonies in Central Asia, the Caucasus and Europe under strict control.²⁹⁷ Whenever the Soviet Union pushed for a colony's or a minority group's freedom, the émigrés responded likewise and put their kinships' situation and their colonized lands in front of the former. For instance, if the Soviet Union talked about Kurds of Iraq, *Emel* responded to this with the situation of Crimean Tatars in the USSR.²⁹⁸ The western representatives to international institutions reacted similarly. For instance, a western representative to the UN asked the situation of the captive nations in the Soviet Empire when millions of people and tens of nations became independent at the time (in 1962).²⁹⁹ Another representative to the UN compared the British colonies with the Tsarist and Soviet colonies. When Britain occupied Ceylon, Russia invaded Azerbaijan in the 19th century. Ceylon became independent just after the World War II, and the representative inquired when Azerbaijan would become independent. In the same way, he compared the British colonies in Africa and Tsarist Russia's colonies in Central Asia, indicating that African colonies of the British were free then, and asked about the independence of Central Asian republics.³⁰⁰

Self-determination and Soviet colonialism were the concepts the news sections and the articles of *Emel* and *Dergi* covered the most widely at the time.³⁰¹ Crimean Tatar Diaspora in Free World considered Crimea as a colonized land, and just as colonized nations had the right to self-determination, Crimean Tatars had the right to independence from Russia. This was the goal of Diaspora CTNM, first to keep the Crimean cause alive and make Crimea Crimean Tatar homeland again.³⁰²

²⁹⁷ "Muhtıralar", *Emel*, İstanbul, no. 13, year 3, 1962, p. 27-29; Müstecip Ülküsal, "Bir Facianın Yıldönümü", *Emel*, no. 5, year 1, 1961, p. 3

²⁹⁸ "Kürt Meselesi Birleşmiş Milletlerde", *Emel*, no. 17, year 3, 1963, p. 25

²⁹⁹ *Dergi*, no 43, p. 60

³⁰⁰ *Dergi*, no. 43, p. 61; "Basından", *Emel*, no. 15, year 3, 1963, p. 32

³⁰¹ "Haberler", *Emel*, no. 25, year 4, 1964, p. 36

³⁰² Müstecip Ülküsal, "Kırım Türkünün Faciası ve Kurtuluş Davası", *Emel*, no. 11, year 2, 1962, p. 7

4.2 Cold War Years: Émigrés

Soviet émigrés in (and outside of) Europe had different hopes about the future of the USSR after the war. Non-Russian nationalities wished for disintegration of the USSR and establishment of their own national states. Russian émigrés wished for disintegration of Bolshevism in Russia and the continuation of Russian domination throughout Soviet or ex-Tsarist Russian land.

To make their wishes come true, they firstly got organized, despite many internal factions. Getting organized is a step but for sure it is not enough. Next, they, either voluntarily, or desperately, cooperated with the host countries led by the USA, just as some considered the Germans as a vehicle to reach their aims, or to survive just as the case a few years ago. This time, Americans were a hope for the émigrés after the war. Who actually benefited more in this relation depends on whose side the issue is considered. However, Americans used 'émigrés as a vehicle for reaching the people inside'³⁰³ and émigrés considered the enemies of the USSR as friends and tried to fulfil their goals, even if they might comply. They worked where they settled in accordance with priorities or conditions of the host country.

Emigrés were very active in broadcasting and publishing through research centers of their host countries.³⁰⁴ This explains diaspora Crimean Tatars' engagement with *Emel* in Turkey, and limitedly *Dergi* in Europe. This was in fact an American policy. They mostly hired the émigrés in these fields. As stated, USA endeavored 'to reach the

³⁰³ "Office of Policy Coordination History of American Committee for Liberation" August 21, 1951, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWHIP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited Ch1 n60 in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01441005. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114354>

³⁰⁴ **Ibid.**; "American Committee for Liberation's Mission Redefined" July 30, 1954, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWHIP by A. Ross Johnson...CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01434012. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114488>

Russian people in Russia by any means possible'³⁰⁵ or by exploiting émigrés or the committees they found, yet it seems they refrained from setting high expectations from émigrés.³⁰⁶ Instead, they concentrated on radio broadcasting to reach Russian people and on the research institute (publishing) to carry out propaganda and discredit Soviet way of economic development as an option for the Third World.³⁰⁷

After the war, émigrés who had already settled in Europe and Soviet citizens (ex-POWs) who were living in Europe without Soviet soldiers catching them, either left Europe for the USA and for some Muslim countries where their kinships lived, or stayed in Europe. In the years that follow the Cold War, people who stayed in Europe and/or migrated to the USA were holding posts within the institutions of the Western bloc.³⁰⁸ Those who stayed in Europe worked in Munich-based, CIA-supported Institute for the Study of the USSR (henceforth the Munich Institute) or Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL). Like other peoples' representatives such as Azeris, Turkistanis, Idil-Ural Tatars, Crimean Tatars either worked at or had close relations with these institutions.

The Munich Institute was established in 1950. It was supported by the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia³⁰⁹ (AMCOMLIB) and covertly by CIA like RFE/RL until 1971. AMCOMLIB was intended to be 'a center which could

³⁰⁵ "CIA Criticism of American Committee for Liberation Mission Statement" April 12, 1954, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWHIP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01434011. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114479>

³⁰⁶ This is the wording of official records that benefited from and shared here.

³⁰⁷ Charles T. O'Connell, "The Munich Institute for the Study of the USSR", **The Carl Beck Papers**, no. 808, 1990, p. 30-31

³⁰⁸ Some worked in the Western Institutions against the USSR. Edige Kırimal (the Institute), Mirza Bala (the Institute), Hüseyin İkrâm Han (VOA and RL), Ruzi Nazar (CIA), Garip Sultan (RL). Some significant figures opted for defending their course against the USSR independently such as Veli Kayyum Han, Baymirza Hayit, Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer.

³⁰⁹ The committee finally was called as the American Committee for Liberation-AMCOMLIB- after many times renaming. The name of the Committee was derived from Vlasov's Committee for the Liberation of the peoples of Russia (KONR) created under German command during WW2.

speak to the Russians in the name of Russians' with the main interest of 'reaching the people still within the Soviet Union.'³¹⁰ This Committee was a cover organization, which was established as a tool for Americans (for CIA) to organize fragmented émigré organizations (Russians and nationality groups) and to provide funding to support institutions against the USSR such as the Institute and free radios. In this project, 'prime emphasis was placed on the development' of radio broadcasting, and next, research institute in Germany.³¹¹ The Munich Institute's nucleus was a 'Russian library' founded, before 1950s by Boris A. Yakovlev, an ex-POW and a member of ROA of Vlasov.³¹² It supplied information on European issues. Then with the assistance of Americans (Harvard's Russian Research Center), the library was converted into a research institute and was staffed with American officials who had émigré origin.³¹³

4.2.1 Evaluation of the Developments in the USSR by the Diaspora Movement

Diaspora Movement in the Free World informed Crimean Tatars of the events and any development connected to Crimean Tatars and their activities in the USSR. Before *samizdat* publishing became an organized circulation after the end of 1960s, it was accessible by official channels such as newspapers, books, and encyclopedias published in the USSR, or by correspondence. Diaspora in Turkey did not have direct information channels with the USSR, but it was informed mostly through the West. Indeed, until the first direct connection was established between diaspora and the

³¹⁰ "Office of Policy Coordination History of American Committee for Liberation" August 21, 1951, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited Ch1 n60 in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01441005. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114354>

³¹¹ "American Committee for Liberation's Mission Redefined" July 30, 1954, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Referenced Ch1 p.34 in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01434012. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114488>

³¹² Russian Liberation Army (Russkaya Osvoboditel'naya Armiya-ROA)

³¹³ Charles T. O'Connell, *Ibid.*, p. 5-9

Movement in the USSR in the late 1980s, the western links had continued to be intermediary. This might account for the cooperation between *Emel* and *Dergi*, as well as Kırimal factor, and his ethnic affiliations. However, the cooperation was seemingly one-sided. Various *Dergi*-origin news and articles mostly connected with Crimean Tatars and their cause were published in *Emel* since the time its inception in 1960.³¹⁴ There was no organic connection between the two publications but only mutual objectives.³¹⁵

As mentioned above, the interest of Crimean Tatar diaspora in the developments within the USSR was vivid during the Cold War years. This part of the thesis discusses some prominent events in the Crimean Tatar history during the Soviet era such as the developments after the decrees of 1956 and 1967, perestroika/glasnost years and the popularity of Mustafa Cemilev in Turkey, and how these events were evaluated in *Dergi* and *Emel*.

After the Stalinist years and the 20th Party Congress in 1956, a new progress started regarding the deported nationalities in the USSR. First, the 'special settlements' regime was lifted in April 1956; then, for five deported nationalities (Kalmyk, Karachai, Balkar, Chechen and Ingush) decrees restoring and reorganizing national autonomies were issued in 1956-57, and repatriation was set for them.³¹⁶ 'Various news' section in *Dergi*, first, informed about these decrees on national autonomies as published in the USSR. Then, an analysis, which was actually a summary of a press conference held in Munich, was published.³¹⁷ One member of the Munich Institute,

³¹⁴ It was the same manner just as during Prometheus period émigrés opened their publications to other émigrés. In addition to that, there existed cooperation with *Emel* and Azerbaijanis and Idil-Ural Turk émigrés in Manchuria and in Japan during Romania period of *Emel*. Müstecip Ülküsal, **Kırım Yolunda Bir Ömür Hatıralar**, p.175, 187-188

³¹⁵ That is to say, first, return and rehabilitation of punished nations and second, freedom for them.

³¹⁶ Aleksandr Nekrich, **Ibid.**, p. 136

³¹⁷ 'Muhtelif Haberler', **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 8, year 3, 1957, p. 123-124; *Dergi* Correspondent, 'Moskova'nın Sürgün Ettiği ve İmha Ettiği Milletler', **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 9, year 3, 1957, p. 119-124

Garip Sultan³¹⁸ stated that the motive behind the decree[s] was not humanitarian, but a communist propaganda for Muslim countries. The domestic reason behind these decrees was to put an end to stirrings within the national republics of the USSR, which began after 1956 during de-Stalinization period.³¹⁹ One of the issues about the rehabilitation of the deportees was discussed in *Dergi*. The discussion probed why Crimean Tatars and Volga Germans were not rehabilitated and repatriated. Kırimal concluded that it was due to imperialist Russian politics-Crimea without Crimean Tatars.³²⁰

After the Khrushchev era, a new decree was issued on September 5, 1967. This decree lifted accusations on Crimean Tatars, 11 years after collective rehabilitations in 1956 and 3 years after of Volga Germans in 1964. Consequently, they were rehabilitated. However, Crimean Tatars were not allowed to be repatriated, and to establish their previous Autonomous Republic in Crimea. They had the right to settle and live in any place in the USSR except Crimea, as would be experienced by Crimean Tatars.

Upon arrival of the news about the decree, a program was broadcast in Radio Liberty, hosting Edige Kırimal and a Russian émigré named Y. I. Granov. The decree of September 5th, 1967, was perceived positively, yet it was under Kırimal's expectation.³²¹ Since it did not include the return of Crimean Tatars to Crimea, which

318 A POW of WWII and chief editor of Tatar-Bashkir section and speaker of language programs of Radio Liberty under the pseudonym Fanis Ishimbay. For more, Sabirjan Badretin, **Garip Sultan (1923-2011)**, November 19, 2011 (available) http://www.azatliq.org/content/garip_sultan/24395729.html, 28.09.2013

319 *Dergi* Correspondent, **Ibid.**, p.120. After the April decree of 1956 reached to the West, AMCOMBLIB released an analysis about it and stated that "The decree was motivated not by any humanitarian feelings the Soviet leaders may have by the need to calm the dangerous ferment which has been observed within the country and which is evidence of growing opposition from Soviet peoples towards the central authorities.", "The Meaning of the 'Rehabilitation' of Deported Peoples in the USSR an Analysis by the American Committee for Liberation", **Svoboda Ukrainian Weekly**, Saturday, February 23, 1957

320 **Ibid.**, p.121-123

321 "Mülakat", **Emel**, no. 42, year 7, 1967, p. 13

they prefer to anywhere in the USSR. Besides, since the decree was not published in the major newspapers of the Union, it did not reach the mass public.³²² This actually disclosed the fact that the circulation of news about lifting accusations and materializing rehabilitation was limited for Crimean Tatars, rather than to the general Soviet public. Moreover, according to Kırimal, since Crimean ASSR was not restored and repatriation was not set for Crimean Tatars, all these indicated that Soviet government planned to keep Crimea Russian,³²³ namely *untatarized*.

Diaspora Crimean Tatars in Turkey, specifically Ülküsal, hoped that the Soviet Union would allow Crimean Tatars to return to their homeland.³²⁴ The first information about it was published in *Emel* in the first issue of the year 1968. Though uncertain, Crimean Tatars' individual return and expel from Crimea, was opposite to the expectations. According to the news, the incomers were made to settle in the regions surrounding Crimea such as Ukraine and Caucasia rather than in Crimea by local Crimean authorities.³²⁵ Following the unsuccessful attempts to return, CTNM passed to a new phase. In this phase, the Movement encountered the ex-general Petro Grigorenko, who offered the Movement a vividness and new ways of struggle that actually helped them to pass from a petition period to a protest period. The encounter with the general was on March 1968, and the following month *Chirchik* events broke out in Tashkent.³²⁶ This triggered another protest in Moscow for the events in *Chirchik*. This led to the first encounter of *Emel's* readers with *samizdat*. Thanks to *samizdat* and western correspondents in Moscow, the current news regarding Crimean Tatars in the USSR increasingly appeared in the journal.³²⁷ For instance, an article written by Henry Kamm narrating two Tatar families and their

³²² The decree was only printed in the newspapers of republics where Crimean Tatars mostly inhabited.

³²³ "Mülakat", *Ibid.*, p. 15

³²⁴ Müstecip Ülküsal, "Kırım Kurultay'ının 50. Yıl Dönümü", *Emel*, no. 43, year 8, 1967, p. 11

³²⁵ Müstecip Ülküsal, "Kırım Türklerinin Hakları Meselesi", *Emel*, no. 44, year 8, 1968, p. 3

³²⁶ In these events, hundreds of Crimean Tatars were arrested.

³²⁷ "Sayın Okuyucularımıza", *Emel*, no. 47, year 8, 1968, p. 1; "Moskova'da Yapılan Bir Toplantı", *Emel*, no. 47, year 8, 1968, p. 7; "Sovyet Dökümanlarından", *Emel*, no. 51, year 9, 1969, p. 12-15

experiences was published in *New York Times*. These two families moved to Crimea just after they were informed of the September 5th decree. They arrived at their ex-village before deportation from Crimea but were not allowed to work in *sovhoz* or to accommodate in the guest house or elsewhere. They tried to refuge in ruins and then in tents, but were expelled from both, and finally from Crimea.³²⁸ Such stories or news regarding *Chirchik* events, trials, and the help dissidents provided to Crimean Tatars were printed in western newspapers like *Le Monde*, the *Guardian*, *Newsweek*, and so were they published in *Emel*.³²⁹

As mentioned previously, the news, articles and information that were printed in *Emel* on Crimean Tatars were western-oriented, or the West was holding an intermediary position. After *A Chronicle of Current News*³³⁰ Journal emerged in Moscow and reach the West, diaspora Crimean Tatars became aware of the current events and developments of CTNM in the USSR.³³¹ For instance, articles about Mustafa Cemilev were frequently printed throughout 1970s. Apart from that, the stories of return attempts to Crimea and expel of incomers from Crimea, the news of demonstrations, prosecutions and trials of Crimean Tatars and the news regarding dissidents such as Petro Grigorenko, Alexei Kosterin³³² and Saharov in Moscow appeared in *Emel*.

The end of 1960s and 1970s were *samizdat* years, but 1970s were also stagnation years of the Movement just as Brezhnev years of the Soviet Union. Besides, hunger

³²⁸ “Tatarlar Moskova’ya Karşı Mücadeleye Devam Ediyorlar”, **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 5-7

³²⁹ Alexandre Warsz, “Kırım Tatarlarının Faciası”, **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 13-15; Victor Zorza, “Kırım Tatarları Müdafilerini Kaybettiler”, **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 16-17; “Tatarların Davası”, **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 18-20

³³⁰ In Russian: “Хроника текущих событий”. It was a Journal of the Soviet Human Rights Movement produced bi-monthly in Moscow since 1968. It was translated to English and published by Amnesty International.

³³¹ Because since the first and especially the second issue of the Chronicle CTNM had been referred. Хроника текущих событий, 30 April 1968, 1st issue; 30 June 1968, 2nd issue, <http://www.memo.ru/history/diss/chr/index.htm>, 16.11.2013

³³² Kosterin was ex-Bolshevik who spent 17 years of his life in camps and exile, and supporter of small groups in the USSR. Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 320-21

strikes and trials of Cemilev broke the stagnation in *Emel*. As can be followed in the Journal, his hunger strikes made Cemilev the most famous Crimean Tatar character for the Turkish public. In the second half of the 1970s, some fake news about Mustafa Cemilev's death in a hunger strike hit Turkish public. The news was heard in Turkey in February, 1976 via *samizdat* and announced by Ülküsal to the Turkish public. However, two months later, another news broke negating the previous one. This piece of news was about Cemilev's court which would be in April.³³³ During this period, nationalist-conservatist parts of the public reacted to the incident such as the Associations of Medical Students, University Students, Idealist Workers, Turkish Women, Azerbaijan Culture, and Grey Wolves. A Committee for the Arrangement of Mustafa Cemilev Week was established. News were printed in various newspapers and journals. People went on hunger strikes, held demonstrations, and fasted upon Cemilev's death. Even a senator in the Turkish senate fasted as a reaction to Cemilev's end.³³⁴

4.2.1.1 *Lenin Bayragı*

Diaspora Crimean Tatar Movement also followed the cultural developments of Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan along with their social and political activities in the USSR. After 1956, institutions which were devoted to Crimean Tatar people were established. In the first group in and after 1956, Crimean Tatar radio program, ensemble, Crimean Tatar section within Uzbek Writers Union and a newspaper came to life, and a Crimean Tatar department in the Institute followed after 1967 and finally a journal in 1980. Diaspora in Europe and Turkey via Germany link, were well aware of the developments. Edige Kırimal, to the best of the existing knowledge, was the first person who systematically examined and wrote on Crimean Tatar cultural activities and on these institutions among diaspora. He described these Crimean

³³³ "Mustafa Cemiloğlu Öldü mü, Yaşıyor mu?", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 94, year 16, 1976, p. 33

³³⁴ **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 93, year 16, 1976

Tatar institutions in Uzbekistan in one of his articles in *Dergi*.³³⁵ They were *Kaytarma* (dance and song) Ensemble, Crimean Tatar Publications in Gafur Gulam Publishing House, the Department of Crimean Tatar Language and Literature at the Nizami Tashkent Pedagogical Institute, and the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı*. Kırimal's article refers to *Lenin Bayragı* with a positive tone even though it was an organ of Uzbek SSR.³³⁶ Kırimal claimed that the newspaper was one of the centers where Crimean Tatar intellectuals gathered together with the publishing house. These two institutions would be unchallenged until *Yıldız* Journal began publishing in 1980.³³⁷ Kırimal compared *Lenin Bayragı* with *Tercüman* of Ismail Bey Gaspiralı in terms of its role in Crimean Tatars' national, cultural and social life.³³⁸ After Kırimal, secondly Nadir Devlet assessed *Lenin Bayragı* and other Crimean Tatar institutions in 1983.³³⁹ Both scholars gave revealing information about the institutions considering the era and the limitations. Moreover, he pointed out the special place of the articles on the WWII heros.³⁴⁰ The next chapter narrates the development of the inner diaspora of Crimean Tatars, namely Crimean Tatar National Movement, in the USSR. It focuses on the turning points in the history of the Movement such as ways of struggle, important decrees, and return process. Finally, it includes the current occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation.

³³⁵ Edige Kırimal, "Kırım Türkleri", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 59, year 16, 1970, p. 20

³³⁶ Kırimal knew the latest developments such as unsuccessful attempts of incomers to push for Crimea after 1967, *Chirchik* events in 1968, demonstrations, trials and so on either through *samizdat* or western correspondents in Moscow. However, none of them were printed at the pages of *Lenin Bayragı* at the time because of the Soviet censorship.

³³⁷ Ş. Ramazanov, "Peyda Oluvi Arfesinde", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 11, January 24, 1980, p. 4

³³⁸ Edige Kırimal, "Kırım Türkleri", **Dergi**, p. 16

³³⁹ Nadir Devlet, "Lenin Bayrağı Gazetesi'nin 25. Yılı ve Kırım Türk Kültürünün Bugünkü Durumu", **Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları**, İstanbul, no.22, 1983, p. 82-90

³⁴⁰ **Ibid.**, 88-89

CHAPTER 5

CRIMEAN TATAR NATIONAL MOVEMENT

Crimean Tatar history after the WWII in exile in Uzbekistan may be divided into three, each having its milestones under three different first secretaries of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU). The April 1956 Decree started the Khrushchev period, the September 5th 1967 decree the Brezhnev period, and glasnost-perestroika the Gorbachev period for Crimean Tatar history. The first period began after the Secret Speech of Khrushchev in the 20th Party Congress of CPSU in February, 1956, after which the 'special settlement' regime was lifted with the April Decree. Following the April Decree, some cultural rights were bestowed such as an ensemble, a radio program, a section within Uzbek Writers Union, and a newspaper on behalf of Crimean Tatars.³⁴¹ Crimean Tatar National Movement started its activities approximately around these times due to disappointments the government caused. Whilst some other 'punished peoples' were both rehabilitated and repatriated at the same dates, nothing was done for the Crimean Tatars. Thus, the feeling of injustice led the participants of the Movement to struggle. The decree lifting the special settlement regime and the following cultural developments were the only good made under Khrushchev rule.

The next period started with the September 5th decree in 1967, which was the output of the struggle of CTNM. This was followed once again by cultural compromises such as opening up Crimean Tatar native language classes in selected schools and the Department of Crimean Tatar Language and Literature at the Nizami Tashkent

³⁴¹ The years between 1944 and 1956 were police surveillance years. These years were vegetative state years of Crimean Tatars and excluded from the periodization. If the deportation and after is included to the periodization, then there would be four periods.

Pedagogical Institute in 1968.³⁴² The most significant development during Brezhnev years was that Crimean Tatars individually began to return to Crimea. Besides that, from time to time a few thousand Crimean Tatars migrated under the auspices of Soviet authorities. Nothing favorable happened in the rest of the Brezhnevian stagnation years, except that the publication of a journal named *Yıldız* was allowed to be published in 1980. In contrast, by the end of Brezhnev years in 1982, Soviet authorities issued a plan that would assemble Crimean Tatars in two towns in Uzbekistan and give them autonomy. However, very few Crimean Tatars showed interest and the plan was born dead. Throughout the Brezhnev years, CTNM continued its activities, but it was extensively assumed that the Movement dragged into stagnation in the 1970s due to various reasons.

The final period of Crimean Tatar history during the Soviet era was Gorbachev years. Gorbachev's *glasnost-perestroika* period was the period that Crimean Tatar masses migrated to Crimea. During the *glasnost* era, several commissions were established in order to deter Crimean Tatars from migrating to Crimea or to slow down their return. Authorities in Moscow resumed to manipulate Crimean Tatars with cultural compromises until 1989. This kind of *modus operandi* (progress regarding publication, TV and radio and education) on Crimean Tatar issue was also put into practice in Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras but these were not what Crimean Tatars needed and demanded. Moreover, cultural compromises could not satisfy them at the age of *glasnost* and *perestroika*. One prominent development that gave acceleration to the CTNM was a TASS communique in 1987.³⁴³ After the communique was published, Crimean Tatars in Crimean Tatar institutions who were noncommittal or secretly supportive to the Movement reacted to it, some even organizing boycotts.

³⁴² Ş. Selimov, "Ana Tilge-Ayrıca Emiyet", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 10, January 23, 1988, p. 4. Establishing limited Crimean Tatar institutions in Uzbekistan could be interpreted both as in terms of compromise due to activities of CTNM and that the Soviet Union permanently made Crimean Tatars settled in Uzbekistan and would not let them return back to Crimea. The latter view was supported by most of my interviewees in Crimea.

³⁴³ Since this communique repeated decades-long accusations on Crimean Tatars, it caused a rage among Crimean Tatars.

Lenin Bayragı was an unexpected example of support given to the boycotts due to its affiliation with the state. As an interviewee indicated, “the time was changed, the time was different.” *Glasnost-perestroika* era permitted such a progress.

There are two views among Crimean Tatars regarding the beginning of their National Movement in exile. According to the first view, the National Movement began after the deportation and during the police surveillance years, and for the second view, it began after Stalin died and/or was active on the days following the Secret Speech of Khrushchev in the 20th Congress of the CPSU.³⁴⁴ Advocates of the first view referred to some Crimean Tatars, writers, poets, and so on who wrote letters to central authorities in Moscow about the injustices they experienced. Some, e.g. Idris Asanin and Osman Ebasanov, were arrested in 1951 due to gathering with other deportees and singing counterrevolutionary songs, writing lyric or patriotic poems about Crimea and the return, denigrating and criticizing the nationality policy and the government’s measures on Crimean Tatars.³⁴⁵ As for the advocates of the second view, the more accurate one, they referred to the changes which took place in the USSR after Stalin’s death. For instance, practices of the Soviet government changed, and penalties became milder. Those who had been sentenced to 25 years of hard labor in *gulags* now began to spend fewer years in prison or to be put in the psychiatric hospitals in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years. This confidence spread across all strata of the country over time and Crimean Tatars, as well. This confidence, that gave the knowledge that the outcome of their deeds would not be the capital punishment, encouraged Tatars.

With the death of Stalin in 1953, underground opposition began to revive, and Khrushchev’s de-Stalinization policy gave a momentum to “some measure of criticism

³⁴⁴ Mustafa Cemiloglu, “A History of the Crimean Tatar National Liberation Movement: A Sociopolitical Perspective”, **Crimea: Dynamics, Challenges, and Prospects**, Ed. by. Maria Drohobysky, Boston, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1995, p. 93-94

³⁴⁵ Seityagya Bilyalov, İzzet Hayrov, Adil Seytbekirov and Pevat Ajredinov, “Baş Sözü Yerine” in İdris Asanin, **Adalet Kureşi Saflarında**, Simferopol, vol. 1, Kırım Devlet Neşriyatı, 2002, p. 11-12

and dissent.”³⁴⁶ Oppositional movement in the USSR first appeared as a ‘cultural opposition’ which “was not against the political regime as such but only against its culture.”³⁴⁷ Afterwards, the Cultural Opposition broke the ice for *samizdat*, which finally gave way to a political opposition, called as dissident movement, human rights movement or Democratic Movement in the Soviet Union.³⁴⁸ In accordance with the soul of the Khrushchev era, some progress took place for Crimean Tatars and other ‘punished peoples’ after the Secret Speech. These peoples, according to *Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia*, were resettled ‘in regions of Middle Asia and Kazakhstan’ and ‘in the country’s Easter regions’ ‘as a result of violations of socialist legality’ and ‘Leninist national policy’ in 1943 and 1944.³⁴⁹ As a reinstatement, in the months following the Speech, some of the ‘punished peoples’, those Khrushchev mentioned in the Speech (e.g., Chechens, Kalmyks, Balkars, Karachais and Ingushs) were rehabilitated and repatriated. Those who were excluded from the Speech such as Crimean Tatars, Germans and Ahiska Turks just got rid of special settlement regime.

Subsequent to the Speech, decree of April 28, 1956, released Crimean Tatars from police surveillance regime, and the National Movement broke out. The Movement got organized against injustice and double standard, which Soviet government was practicing. That is to say, on the one hand, the peoples who were subjected to similar accusations with Crimeans were repatriated and their national autonomies were restored. On the other hand, the Soviet government avoided to bestow the same rights to Crimean Tatars. In this context, the feeling of injustice made them bring into

³⁴⁶ Abraham Brumberg, “The Rise of Dissent in the USSR”, *In Quest of Justice*, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 4

³⁴⁷ Andrei Amalrik, *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984*, New York, Harper and Row, 1970, p. 7

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8-10

³⁴⁹ “Kabarda-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, *Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 11, 1976, p. 320; “Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, *Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 11, 1976, p. 365; “Karachai-Cherkess Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, *Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 11, 1976, p. 413

existence their national movement in addition to the conjuncture after Stalin. The interviews showed that they had the moral superiority over the Soviet Union. After all, they were the ones who were treated unfairly by the state. Actually, the feeling of justness made them dare to create organized movement against the government.

5.1 The National Movement's Struggling Methods

As part of their struggle, CTNM began to send petitions, personal and collective letters, telegrams and appeals to the highest party and government bodies of the Soviet Union and to presidiums of various party congresses.³⁵⁰ These were the first steps of a movement. Likewise, the process which triggered the establishment of Committee of Aral, Birlik and Erk in Uzbekistan first emerged in the Uzbek Writers' Union in 1985 and Uzbek writers sent the first letter of complaint to Moscow, Politburo, to the necropolis of complaints.³⁵¹ Thus, the petitions built the way which took the movements to the demonstration phase. This was also the same for dissidents in Moscow in the 1950s.³⁵² In addition to petitions, Crimean Tatars prepared and gathered documents and materials regarding their problem, return to Crimea, in order to show their rightness and to 'enlighten the people' (Crimean Tatars).³⁵³ Moreover, as Ayshe Seytmuratova pointed out they "needed facts not only [to] rectify the slander of the Soviet government, but also to demonstrate to the peoples of the Soviet Union the hostility of the authorities toward a relatively small group of people."³⁵⁴ They sent these documents, appeals and etc., which were signed by Crimean Tatars, to the central authorities in Moscow by Crimean Tatar delegations that were elected and financially supported by the

³⁵⁰ Mustafa Cemiloglu, *Ibid.*, p. 94

³⁵¹ Muhammed Salih, *Ibid.*, p. 79-80

³⁵² Abraham Brumberg, *Ibid.*, p. 6

³⁵³ Ayshe Seytmuratova, "The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections", *Ibid.*, p. 32

³⁵⁴ Ayshe Seytmuratova, *Ibid.*, p. 30

people.³⁵⁵ For instance, they sent an appeal which was signed by 130 thousand people, one of a kind, to the presidium of the 23rd Party Congress in 1966, and 163 volumes of documents to the Central Committee until 1971.³⁵⁶

In addition to sending letters and documents to various Soviet organs, the National Movement resorted to other ways of struggling after October 1964, when Khrushchev was replaced by Brezhnev. For instance, first, the activists started to exist in Moscow permanently and make themselves more visible around Soviet organs. Second, Tatars held demonstrations and appealed to the world public, as well as the Soviet government. Crimean Tatars also established contacts with dissidents and with the human rights movement in Moscow in the Brezhnev era because Brezhnev did not respond to their demands.

In 1964, the Movement began to keep permanent representatives in Moscow. In this period, more than 4 thousand Crimean Tatars rotated within four years.³⁵⁷ Thanks to this permanent existence in Moscow, they got connected with the dissidents in the center, first with Alexei Kosterin and through him with Petro Grigorenko and other dissidents.³⁵⁸ Coming into contact with the dissidents ensured basically two advantages for the Movement, in addition to the safety provided by dissidents' apartments for Crimean Tatars in Moscow.³⁵⁹ Tatars gained a supporting agent, human rights activists, inside the country, and this provided them access to *samizdat*

³⁵⁵“Crimean Tatar initiatives went from door to door to collect the money and each person who was elected to go to Moscow was given around 250 dollars. It was enough to go there, to stay and to return back.” Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, April 19, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

³⁵⁶ “Appeal of the Crimean Tatar People to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to the Soviet Press, to All Communists”, **A Chronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no.19-20 (19), 1971, p. 182

³⁵⁷ Ann Sheehy and Bohdan Nahaylo, **Ibid.**, p. 10

³⁵⁸ As I found out from the interviews, first contact was established by Zampira Asanova, one of the activists who recently died in January 2014.

³⁵⁹ Mustafa Cemiloglu, **Ibid.**, p. 97

and also links with the western correspondents in the capital. This relation also brought popularity to their cause in the West and in Turkey.

Although this part concentrates on the Moscovites' help and its effect on Crimean Tatars' movement, the opposite was also valid. For instance, Crimean Tatar initiative groups formed without leaders, and Tatars' information bulletin served as model for the dissidents. Also, CTNM, as Alekseyeva pointed out, actively experienced democratic struggle for over 10 years in the USSR when they met each other in the second half of the 1960s.³⁶⁰ Moreover, CTNM ensured unprecedented support from Crimean Tatar people, whereas dissidents in Moscow could not get close to such a support. Even so, Moscovite dissidents affected the course of the movement and supported it. Among the dissidents, Grigorenko was the prominent figure, and his historical speech at the birthday celebration of Kosterin on March 17, 1968,³⁶¹ was not ignored by most scholars who wrote on the history of the CTNM. In the speech, Grigorenko stated the deficiencies of the methods used towards the dishonest authorities. He particularly criticized writing conciliatory petitions and naïve manners of the Movement. He suggested that they should adopt a more aggressive form of struggle.³⁶² He advised them to 'stop begging'³⁶³ and "begin to demand. And demand not just parts, pieces, but all that was taken from you unlawfully."³⁶⁴ He also suggested that they should use more powerful means than writing petitions. To this end, he told them, firstly, to get the advantage of what the Soviet Constitution made possible like "the freedom of speech and of the press, of meetings, assemblies, of street marches and demonstrations."³⁶⁵ Secondly, he suggested that they should take

³⁶⁰ Ludmila Alekseyeva, **Soviet Dissent**, Connecticut, Wesleyan University, 1985, p. 147, in Hamdi Mert, **Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu**, Ankara, Bilig Yayınları, 2000, p. 42-43

³⁶¹ "P. G. Grigorenko on Tatar Rights", **In Quest of Justice**, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 208. In his memoirs, Grigorenko mistakenly gave the year as 1967. Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 351.

³⁶² Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 352

³⁶³ Peter J. Potichnyj, **Ibid.**, p. 315

³⁶⁴ Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 353

³⁶⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 353

control of the newspaper (*Lenin Bayragı*) published in Tashkent because, according to him, the newspaper did not support the Movement, and if they failed to take it, they should create their own press.³⁶⁶ Thirdly, he recommended the audience to form contacts with and seek support of the progressive individuals of Soviet nations. Fourthly, he reminded the importance of addressing to the world public and international organizations like United Nations for help.³⁶⁷

This speech took place after the decree of September 5, 1967. In other words, it did so in a period wherein the existence of a Crimean Tatar nationality was denied by the decree, their return to Crimea was avoided, and the struggle with local Crimean authorities to settle in Crimea was continuing. The scene in 1968 showed a national movement which had been active for more than 10 years, countless appeals issued to the Soviet organs,³⁶⁸ and in the end of 10 years, in 1967, what they received was partial rehabilitation. Crimean Tatars had no longer any hope for the future on March 1968 because the thing they had expected from the government was a positive move toward a solution for their matter, but all they found was disappointment. The National Movement was probably in pursuit of a way out, and Grigorenko gave the push they needed. It was probably due to his advice that the first serious of street marches and events broke out in Chirchik in the spring.³⁶⁹ As stated in the previous chapter, this might have passed the movement into protest period.

Chirchik events did not start as a protest or demonstration, but they did finalize as an 'event'. The events broke out the day before Lenin's birthday anniversary. Crimean

³⁶⁶ The newspaper which Grigorenko referred was highly likely *Lenin Bayragı*. "P. G. Grigorenko on Tatar Rights", **In Quest of Justice**, p. 212. In his memoirs, Grigorenko mistakenly wrote that the newspaper was published in Moscow. Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 353.

³⁶⁷ Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 353; Peter Reddaway, "The Crimean Tatar Drive for Repatriation: Some Comparisons with Other Movements of Dissident in the Soviet Union", **The Tatars of Crimea Return to the Homeland**, Ed. by Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1998, p. 231

³⁶⁸ Until 1968, the National Movement sent letters bearing more than 3 million signatures. "An Appeal from Representatives of the Crimean Tatar People to the People of the World", **In Quest of Justice**, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 205

³⁶⁹ Alan Fisher, **The Crimean Tatars**, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1978, p. 185

Tatars gathered in Chirchik to celebrate Lenin's birthday on April 21, 1968, but were not allowed to do so, and hundreds of them were arrested.³⁷⁰ At the following year, five Crimean Tatar activists held a demonstration on Mayakovsky Square in Moscow, on June 6th, to protest Grigorenko's arrest in May 1969. They held placards that read slogans like 'Give the Crimea back to Crimean Tatars' or 'Free General Grigorenko'.³⁷¹ In the meantime, they began to address to the world public and international organizations.³⁷² There are many examples in the *samizdat*. They appealed to the world public (the Secretary General of the United Nations and the International Human Rights Federation) individually or as a group.³⁷³ For instance, Crimean Tatars sent an appeal in 1974 asking the UN "to set up a commission to investigate on the spot the situation of our people, to help us to obtain an end to the discrimination against our people, and to re-establish our rights as a nation and as human beings in our homeland."³⁷⁴

5.1.1 Tone of the Petitions

Since the first generation activists in exile constituted the majority in the National Movement, the tone of the petitions and appeals sent to Moscow clearly reflected the 'Communist spirit.'³⁷⁵ The first and also the old generation of the CTNM, at least in the printed documents sent to the Soviet government, expected the government

³⁷⁰ "An Appeal from Representatives of the Crimean Tatar People to the People of the World", *Ibid.*, p. 205

³⁷¹ "The Crimean Tatars", *Uncensored Russia*, ed.by. Peter Reddaway, New York, American Heritage Press, 1972, p. 254

³⁷² For instance: "An Appeal from Representatives of the Crimean Tatar People to the People of the World", *In Quest of Justice*, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 204-208. This appeal was published first time in the second issue of the Russian version of the '**A Cronicle of Current Events**' (ХРОНИКА ТЕКУЩИХ СОБЫТИЙ) in 30 June 1968. <http://www.memo.ru/history/diss/chr/>, 18.02.2014

³⁷³ "Statements of Crimean Tatars from Crimea", *A Cronicle of Current Events*, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 134-137, 153, 159-160

³⁷⁴ "Appeal to K. Waldheim, Secretary-General of the U N, and the Human Rights Commission", *A Cronicle of Current Events*, Amnesty International Publications, no. 34-36 (34), 1978 (1977), p. 46

³⁷⁵ Mustafa Cemiloglu, *Ibid.*, p. 94

to solve the Crimean Tatar matter, thus tried to comply with the Soviet system without opposing the Soviet rules. For instance, in the 'Appeal of the Crimean Tatar people to the 24th Congress of the Party, to the Soviet Press, and to all Communists', they stated the following: "We believe that the party will solve this question. It is this deep belief in the party of Lenin that makes us appeal to the 24th Congress of the party, to this great forum of the communists of our country, whose loyal sons we are..."³⁷⁶ Moreover, one of the leaders of the Movement, Dzheppar Akimov, stated that he remained a communist and a Leninist after he pointing out the movement's and its appeals' legality in his trial in 1972.³⁷⁷ On the other hand, some of the younger generation members of the Movement such as Mustafa Cemilev was critical about them and their policy. In fact, he criticized the tone of the appeals at the time. The two following citations are from Cemilev, one from his trial in 1970, and one from a journal interview in 1991. In his defense testimony before the court in Tashkent, he told that "the tone of the addresses was utterly loyal and true. A significant part of these appeals was used to express the authors' fidelity to the government and communist way."³⁷⁸ In the interview to Crimean Tatar newspaper, he claimed "it is possible to say that in these appeals there had been spirit of hypocrisy and servility which excessively humiliated national honor."³⁷⁹ However, Cemilev refrains from direct accusations by keeping in mind the policies in Soviet era:

People who lived under the government, which was liar and hypocrite, willingly or unwillingly had to lie and to be hypocrite. There needed quite bravery in that time to sign appeals which (even) indicated sentiment of loyalty to the ruler because there was not any guarantee that other day this person would not be invited

³⁷⁶ "Appeal of the Crimean Tatar People to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to the Soviet Press, to All Communists", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 144

³⁷⁷ "The Trial of Dzheppar Akimov", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 129

³⁷⁸ "Documents: '...Defense Speech of Mustafa Jemilev (1970)'", **Ibid.**, p. 113

³⁷⁹ Quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar in "Yunus Kandımov, "Aydınlık Kerek, Aydınlık...", **Yanı Dünya**, no. 52, December 25, 1991, p. 3"

to the KGB, that his home would not be made upside down or that he would not be put in prison.³⁸⁰

In this early period, namely the early years of the National Movement, the elderly employed a mild policy toward the Soviet government instead of an aggressive one. A Crimean Tatar activist who was involved in the National Movement in the mid-1960s spoke about the elders' policy, criticized by Cemilev for nothing but flattery.

This government was quite treacherous. Everybody was afraid of it. Thus, the elders applied such a policy...(they said) all, the constitution of the government and all the papers of the Party, were good to us. They called democracy, so and so, but democracy for other people not for us. Thus, we will not go against the government. If we do so, they crush us. Therefore, (we should act) by praising and praising...by begging and begging, day after day, month after month, year after year...Water can make the stone shine drop by drop. We (will also do the same) drop by drop, year after year...³⁸¹

5.1.2 The Requests by the Petitions

As stated in the various appeals to the 23rd and 24th Congress of the CPSU and to other higher government bodies, Crimean Tatar nation wanted basically two things from the Soviet government from the beginning of their movement: first, to allow an organized return of the nation to its native land, Crimea. This was the common aim of all Crimean Tatars, regardless of whether they are communists or activists of the Movement or ordinary people. Secondly, they demanded the government to

³⁸⁰ Quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar in “Yunus Kandımov, *Ibid.*, p. 3”

³⁸¹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, April 19, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follow: “Bu hükümet, hükümet pek hıyanet idi. Herkes korkardı ondan. Onun için bu kartlar öyle bir politika ediyorlardı. Bu hükümetin anayasası, bu fırkanın bütün kağıtları bize gelişir, onlar derler demokratya, o bu, no, başka halklar için demokratya var, bizim için yok. Onun için biz hükümete karşı gitmeyik. Eger hükümete karşı biz gitsek ezerler bizi. Onun için maktap maktap... Yalvarıp yalvarıp, gün günden ay aydan yıl yıldan, tamçı tamçı taşı da parlaga su... Ana biz tamçı tamçı yıl yıldan yıl yıldan...”

revitalize the Crimean ASSR, which was formed by Lenin's decree in 1921 and which was transformed into an oblast in 1945.³⁸²

As previously mentioned, the first generation of the CTNM counted on the Soviet system; they were mostly veterans, and they believed that the government would correct the error and send them to Crimea by abandoning the previous big error, the 1944 deportation. The young generation, on the other hand, like Cemilev, opted for more aggressive methods within the system, and openly opposed the government. As Alexeyeva writes, they did not admit the Crimean Tatar matter to be an "error" but "a direct continuation of the imperial czarist policy, only more complete and ruthless."³⁸³ Moreover, having encountered the dissidents in Moscow, unlike the first generation, they linked their question with the problem of democracy in the USSR.³⁸⁴ Starting from the late 1960s, some activists like Mustafa Cemilev and Reshat Cemilev agreed that their problem could not be solved unless democracy (freedom of speech, of demonstration, of press and so on) in the country was established. That is to say, unless the totalitarian system became democratic and the totalitarian leaders were precluded to govern, their national question could not be resolved.³⁸⁵ Furthermore, among the new generation activists represented by Ayshe Seytmuratova and Mustafa Cemilev, positive emphasis on or reference to communism was rare, and they openly criticized the Soviet system in their trials. In contrast to those who cooperated with the dissidents and referred to democracy in 1970s, those old generation Crimean Tatar activists in 1960s hoped that a solution would derive from

³⁸² "Appeal of the Crimean Tatar People to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to the Soviet Press, to All Communists", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 27, 1973, p. 302; "Appeal of the Crimean Tatar people to the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 142; "Persecution of the Crimean Tatars", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no.19-20 (19), 1971, p. 182

³⁸³ Ludmilla Alexeyeva, "Mustafa Jemiloglu, His Character and Convictions", **The Tatars of Crimea Return to the Homeland**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1998, p. 213

³⁸⁴ "Trial of Reshat Dzhemilev", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 131

³⁸⁵ Ludmilla Alexeyeva, "Mustafa Jemiloglu, His Character and Convictions", **Ibid.**, p. 219

Leninist principles³⁸⁶ and refrained from using concepts like democracy. An interviewee told the following: “we, members of the National Movement, had not used words like democracy. (We wanted) whether or not this Soviet government was democratic, they made us return to homeland.”³⁸⁷ They, the first generation activists, must have believed that their continuing and passive ‘water drop’ policy would achieve return.

5.2 The decree of September 5, 1967

In 1967, only Crimean Tatars had remained unrehabilitated among the deported nations, who were officially accused of collaboration with the Germans. Volga Germans had already been rehabilitated in 1964,³⁸⁸ a few months before Khrushchev was removed from his post.

In 1964, after Brezhnev came to power after Khrushchev, Crimean Tatars were filled with expectations regarding their cause; new men, new hopes. As mentioned earlier, they began to keep their representatives permanently in Moscow in 1964. Many groups of delegates, following one another, arrived in Moscow for a fruitless meeting with Brezhnev. In an appeal, probably the first one, addressed to the world public; they disclosed the result of these meetings with Soviet leaders: “On each occasion we were promised a speedy solution of the Crimean Tatar problem, but instead there followed arrests, deportations, dismissals from employment and expulsions from the

³⁸⁶ “Appeal of the Crimean Tatar people to the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union”, *Ibid.*, p. 140

³⁸⁷ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, April 19, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Biz Milli Hareket demokratya memokratya biz bu sözleri kullanmazdik. Biz bu Sovyet hükümetinin demokratyası olsun olmasın bizi vatana kaytarsınlar.”

³⁸⁸ Dr. Eric J. Schmaltz, “Our Memory is the Future: The Soviet Experience and Remembrance of the August 1941 Deportation of Volga Germans”, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Alva, Presented at the Commemoration of the German-Russian Holocaust on October 25, 2008, at St. Michael’s Lutheran Church, Portland, Oregon

party.”³⁸⁹ Despite these developments, Tatars’ stubborn resistance to the government made the government take some steps. Therefore, the active movement of Crimean Tatars and their persistent existence in the reception hall and outside of Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow,³⁹⁰ and the volumes of signed documents resulted in the decree of September 5, 1967.

Before that, on July 21, 1967, 20 Crimean Tatar representatives were received by the leaders of some Soviet organs, one of whom was Yuri Andropov, the Chairman of the KGB. They were assured that positive developments regarding their problem would take place.³⁹¹ In a few months, the aforesaid decree, which partially rehabilitated Crimean Tatars, was issued, and on September 9, it was published in the newspapers such as *Lenin Bayragı*, in the territories where they were comonly inhabiting.³⁹²

The decree of September 5 first took the alleged ‘collaboration’ as a *fact*, but it did not agree with the previous accusations on Crimean Tatars *en bloc*. In other words, it was wrong to accuse all Crimean Tatars for the collaboration, and the accusations had to be dropped, because new generations had already emerged and entered the community. Second, it denied the existence of the distinct Crimean Tatar nation by defining them as ‘citizens of Tatar nationality who formerly lived in Crimea’ (*Tatar milletinden olup Kırım’da yaşagan grajdanlar akkında*) or ‘Tatars who formerly lived in Crimea’ (*evelleri Kırım’da yaşagan Tatarlar*).³⁹³ Finally, the decree legalized

³⁸⁹ “The Crimean Tatars”, **Uncensored Russia**, p. 250

³⁹⁰ First note of the article “The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections” of Ayshe Seytmuratova in **Tatars of the Crimea**, p. 365

³⁹¹ Ayshe Seytmuratova, “The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections”, **Ibid.**, p. 36

³⁹² Due to the translation from Russian to Crimean Tatar and the publication day of the newspaper, it was published four days later.

³⁹³ This kind of usage, apparently, was not new and unique for this decree. Early of the year, a book review was published in *Lenin Bayragı*. The book was on ‘the languages of the nations of the USSR’, and the reviewed volume on Turk languages. In this review, Crimean Tatars were called as ‘Tatars who lived in Crimea’ and their population was 445 thousand. B. Umerov and I. Asanin, “Meraklı Bir Kitap”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 24, February 25, 1967, p. 4

Crimean Tatars (Tatars who formerly lived in Crimea) and their families' living anywhere in the USSR.³⁹⁴

Theoretically, the Soviet government allowed Crimean Tatars to inhabit everywhere in the USSR, but in practice, they could live everywhere but in Crimea. That is to say, the deportees did not gain the right to return and to restore the autonomous entity. Moreover, this decree was limitedly published in places where Crimean Tatars inhabited and was not disseminated to larger masses of the Soviet Union just as in the case of Volga Germans.³⁹⁵ In other words, the government did not make any special effort to announce the rehabilitation to the masses, unlike in the case of accusations. After the deportation, for example, some awarded books were 'produced' which were condemning the alleged collaboration of Crimean Tatars with the Germans and were sweeping Crimean Tatar involvement in the partisan movement against the Nazis during the war under the rug. For Finnin, "the negative effect of these post-war novels would be felt for decades."³⁹⁶ Furthermore, prior to arriving in the new settlements in 1944, the locals were informed that the new comers had collaborated with the enemy and they were traitors.³⁹⁷ According to some interviewees,³⁹⁸ the locals were said (by KGB) that the new comers had two horns and one eye in the middle of their faces. Mustafa Cemilev too included this issue in his defense speech in 1970, and spoke as follows: "party agitators and propagandists who travelled around the Uzbek cities and villages... spoke of the Crimean Tatars almost as mythical malefactors with horns and tails, as eaters of

³⁹⁴ "Tatar Milletinden Olıp Kırım'da Yaşagan Grajdıanlar Akkında", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 108, September 9, 1967, p. 1

³⁹⁵ Dr. Eric J. Schmaltz, **Ibid.**

³⁹⁶ Rory Finnin, "Forgetting Nothing, Forgetting No One: Boris Chichibabin, Viktor Nekipelov, and the Deportation of the Crimean Tatars", **The Modern Language Review**, Vol. 106, No. 4, 2011, p. 1097

³⁹⁷ Emil Amit, "Dyadya Volodya", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 79, July 8, 1989, p. 4

³⁹⁸ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 16, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol; Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, April 5, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol; Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, February 15, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol; Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, February 20, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol

children.”³⁹⁹ When they arrived in Uzbekistan, for instance, they were first badly treated, there were even cases small children being murdered because of hostile behaviors. However, for a while later, local Uzbeks, according to testimonials, realized that the government was wrong and Tatars were discriminated.⁴⁰⁰

In short, the Soviet government made every effort to vilify Crimean Tatars and complicate their status in special settlements. Besides, it should not be expected from a decree to erase the perception that Crimean Tatar is synonym of ‘traitor’⁴⁰¹ and to reverse all the negative images previously created. The seeds of prejudice which were planted in the 1940s and the 1950s blossomed and took root within the Soviet community, and naturally a decree could not clean all these. What had to be done in order to get rid of prejudice within the society was to be engaged in more systematic efforts towards this cause, just as in case of the 1940s and the 1950s.

Having been aware of the decree, Crimean Tatars officially applauded the issue of the decree. For weeks, thank you letters sent by Crimean Tatars were published in *Lenin Bayragı*. The translated decree was printed in the 108th number of the newspaper, in 1967. In the following issues, ‘sincere thanks’ to the Communist Party and the Soviet government regarding issuing the decree were printed, and the ‘thanks’ continued to be printed.⁴⁰² On the other hand, it unofficially disappointed the people. An occasion that took place when the decree in Russian arrived in *Lenin Bayragı* better clarifies this point. Some elderly people who were responsible for translation in the newspaper were translating the decree from Russian to Crimean Tatar in a room, and others were waiting for the result outside.

Everybody is sitting next to the door. They are translating inside.
What kind of a decree? How is it? Is there a word that will let the

³⁹⁹ “Documents: ‘...Defense Speech of Mustafa Jemilev(1970)’”, **Tatars of the Crimea Their Struggle for Survival**, p. 125

⁴⁰⁰ Emil Amit, **Ibid.**

⁴⁰¹ Emil Amit, **Ibid.**

⁴⁰² “Samimiy Teşekkür”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 109, September 12, 1967, p. 1.

Crimean Tatars return to Crimea? We are pacing [nervously] in the hall, looking at each other. The faces all pale. Anxiety. Heart beating. Our hearts are booming. [We are hoping that] they will come out and say: “Congratulations, Children, congratulations, we are returning to Crimea.” The door opened, the elderly came out. They said, there is nothing for us, there is not goodness. Tatars who formerly lived in Crimea, it does not say Crimean Tatars nor Crimeans. Tatars who live in Crimea! Namely, Tatars who live in Tatarstan, Tatars who live in Leningrad, Tatars who live in Moscow, Tatars who live in Uzbekistan. These are Tatars who lived in Crimea, they say. We all collapsed. Our eyes filled with tears. We slowly went back to our rooms. After a while, the redactor [Abselyam Islamov] called us to his room and said, there is not, there will not be goodness for us, not in this decree. There may be some freedom for us to breathe. However, it is impossible to return to homeland. It is possible to breathe [only].⁴⁰³

Crimean Tatars’ initial reply to the government’s move, i.e. to the decree, was the beginning of individual returns. In fact, an additional decree printed at the same column in the newspaper, which amended the second article of the decree of April 28, 1956, allowed them, namely, ‘to have the right to live all the territory of the Soviet Union, in accordance with laws of work and passport regime.’⁴⁰⁴

As referred, some Crimean Tatars in exile in Uzbekistan evaluated the September 5th decree positively and on the days following the decree, they individually began to head to Crimea. Obviously, they were not welcomed by the local Crimean authorities,

⁴⁰³ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Herkes kapının yanında oturur. İçerde tercüme ediyorlar. Nasıl karar? Nasıl var onda? Qırımtatarları Qırıma dönsün diyen söz var mı? Salon içinde volta atıyoruz, birbirimize bakıyoruz. Herkesin çehresi bembeyaz. Heyecan. Yürek vuruyor. Böyle bakıyoruz kalbimiz güm güm. İçerde çıkacaklar ve diyecekler göz aydın: Balalar göz aydın Qırıma dönüyoruz. (diyecekler diye umuyoruz) Kapı açıldı, çıktılar içerden kartlar, dediler ki bizim için bir şey yok. Yahşılık yok. Tatar olup Qırımda yaşayanlar, Qırımtatarları demiyor, Qırımlılar da demiyor, Tatar olup Qırımda yaşayanlar. Yani Tatar olup Tataristan’da yaşayan, Tatar olup Leningradda yaşayan, Tatar olup Moskovada yaşayan, Tatar olup Özbekistanda yaşayan, bunlar Tatar olup Qırımda yaşayan diye söylüyorlar. Balalar bir türlü yahşılık yok. Bizim epimiz çöktük. Böyle bir gözlerimiz yaşlandı. Hepimiz yavaş yavaş odalarımıza dağıldık. Biraz vakit geçtikten sonra bizi redaktör odasına topladı ve dedi, yoktur, bizim için yahşılık olmayacak. Bu kararda yoktur. Bizim için açık serbestlik olacak herhalde, nefes almak için. Ama vatana dönmek mümkün değil. Nefes almak mümkün.”

⁴⁰⁴ “Tatar Milletinden Olıp Kırım’da Yaşagan Grajdanlar Akkında”, **Lenin Bayragı**, p. 1

and the decades-long struggle to settle down in Crimea began. Struggle between the people and the authorities over the return caused many family tragedies in Crimea. Crimean Tatar families who returned to Crimea were banished with police raids. They were evicted; their belongings were taken, and houses were bulldozed.⁴⁰⁵ The case of Musa Mamut was one of the most tragic incidents that took place during expulsions. Since he could not tolerate police attempts to expel his family out of Crimea, he burned himself with gasoline in 1978.⁴⁰⁶

In general, those Crimean Tatars were forcefully expelled out of the peninsula. The ones who could achieve to stay were rare and exceptional. Some could illegally stay, being unregistered. Indeed, there were three types of Crimean Tatars in Crimea following the September 5th decree. The first group could achieve to get *propiska* (residence permit) after long struggles and then legally settle in Crimea. The second group were the ones who illegally lived in Crimea, thus were subject to police raids. Local Crimean authorities developed solutions in order to prevent Crimean Tatar families from settling down in Crimea. For instance, they demanded Crimean Tatars to have an estate and the transaction of it be approved by notary. On the other hand, the notary demanded *propiska* to approve it. The new incomers could not possibly break this vicious circle. Because of the residence permit problem, they could not find regular jobs.⁴⁰⁷ Those who could not stay in Crimea inhabited regions next to Crimea, like South of Ukraine, Kherson, and Caucasias, Krasnodar.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁵ “Persecution of Crimean Tatars”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 51, 1979, p. 114-120; “Persecution of Crimean Tatars”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 52, 1980, p. 80-87

⁴⁰⁶ “Persecution of Crimean Tatars”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 51, 1979, p. 120

⁴⁰⁷ “Kırım’a Dönmekte Olan Kırım Türkleri’nin Durumu”, **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 63, year 17, 1971, p. 55-72

⁴⁰⁸ Mustafa Cemiloglu, **Ibid.**, p. 99

The final group seemed to be the luckiest. They were repatriated to Crimea by the Soviet state,⁴⁰⁹ ‘under the organized worker recruitment system’.⁴¹⁰ Those were carefully selected and made to migrate to the least inhabited parts and the steppe region of Crimea rather than to coastline. “Families with little education and parents with small children were picked, so that children would be easily assimilated. Rather than people whose professions were related to social sciences, builders, gardeners and so on were preferred.”⁴¹¹ For some interviewees, the Soviet government used them for propaganda to show that the return to Crimea was not forbidden; on the contrary, Crimean Tatars were happy to live in Uzbekistan, and only a handful of them wished to move to Crimea. The following words of a National Movement activist depicts a far different picture:

(They were encouraged to migrate) not to solve the national problem but to create factions among us. Some of the repatriates were KGB agents. After they stayed a few months in Crimea, they used to come back to Uzbekistan, and propagate that there was nothing in Crimea and Uzbekistan was better to live.⁴¹²

Crimean Tatars’ return attempts pervaded the Brezhnev years. Between the years 1968 and 1979, approximately 15 thousand Crimean Tatars, one way or another, got residence permit and settled in Crimea.⁴¹³ Alongside the return attempts, the National Movements’ activities were basically held in courts in the 1970s. These years are recalled as frozen years of the Movement since many activists like Dzheppar

⁴⁰⁹ V. Stanley Vardys, “The Case of the Crimean Tartars”, **Russian Review**, Vol. 30, No. 2, Apr., 1971, p. 105

⁴¹⁰ Amnesty, no 47, p. 65

⁴¹¹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 1, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Koranta başları ana babalar bu ne okulları bitirilmemiş soyları olsun, bilgileri olmasın...yetişmiş balaları olmasın, çünkü bu balalar gelecekte asimilasyon olsun...kendileri de böyle cemaatlıkken ya da sosyoloji böyle siyasete bağlı zenaatlerde hiç olmasınlar, kurucular olsunlar, bahçeciler olsunlar”

⁴¹² Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, March 23, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Mahsus sorunu çözmek için değil de, Milli Hareketimizi, aramızda ayrılık çıkarmak için (getirildiler.) Onların arasında KGB ajanları da vardı. Onları Qırıma getiriyorlardı, son birkaç aydan sonar geri geliyorlardı onlar, Qırımda hiçbirşey yok, burası daha iyi gibi propaganda yapıyorlardı.”

⁴¹³ Pavel Polian, **Ibid.**, p. 212

Akimov, Reshat Cemilev, Enver Memetov, Yurii Osmanov, Ayshe Seytmuratova, and Mustafa Cemilev were prosecuted, sentenced, banished from the party, and labeled as nationalist-extremist.⁴¹⁴

Prior to the Gorbachev era, the Soviet government issued a plan which designated two raions, Mubarek and Baharistan, for Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan's remote and uninhabited regions. People were encouraged to settle there. In addition to skilled workers and farmers, Crimean Tatar graduates from the Nizami Institute of Tashkent were obliged to go and work there. However, Crimean Tatar people mostly refrained from inhabiting there despite encouragement and pressure. One of my interviewees claimed that the plan was not offered by the Center but by Sharof Rashidov, the first Secretary of Uzbek Communist Party at the time, in order to swindle money from the Center. He went to Moscow and offered a plan which was welcomed by Moscow and took substantial amount of funds. Since he knew that Crimean Tatars would not settle down in Mubarek, he directed the funds to other construction projects in Uzbekistan.

5.3 The Gorbachev Era

The Gorbachev era in the USSR, on the one hand, marked the dissolution of the Soviet Empire and, on the other, the accomplishment of Crimean Tatars' decades-long return struggle. In 1987, when the Gorbachev reforms reached Uzbekistan, Crimean Tatar National Movement's activities boomed. The first Initiative Group Meeting of the National Movement was held on April 11-12, 1987, in Tashkent.⁴¹⁵ This was followed by the second meeting on June 13-14, during which Crimean Tatars' July protests were planned.⁴¹⁶ In the next month, on July 6 and 23, Crimean Tatars held

⁴¹⁴ Ayshe Seytmuratova, "The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections", **Ibid.**, p. 47; Y. Tsavro and I. Gofman, "Deklaratsiyadan-Areketke", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 153, December 28, 1989, p. 4

⁴¹⁵ "Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi'nin Teşebbüs Gruplarının 11-12 Nisan 1987 Tarihinde Taşkent'te Yapmış Oldukları Toplantı Hakkındaki Açıklaması", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 163, year 27, 1987, p. 3

⁴¹⁶ "Sovyetler Birliği'ndeki Kırım Tatarları İnisiyatif Gruplarının 13-14 Haziran 1987'de Taşkent'teki İkinci Toplantıları Hakkında Yaptıkları Açıklama", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 161, year 27, 1987, p. 43

demonstrations in the Red Square of Moscow.⁴¹⁷ Some Crimean Tatar activists were admitted to Politburo and were told that their demands would be taken care of in a month and were advised to stop the protests and to return to Uzbekistan.⁴¹⁸ However, on July 23 a TASS communique (*сообщение*) was broadcast. This caused ‘an unprecedented rise in the National Movement’⁴¹⁹ since it repeated the alleged accusations on Crimean Tatars.⁴²⁰ Crimean Tatars reacted to this communique by sending letters to Moscow. Moreover, strikes took place where Crimean Tatars inhabited and worked. *Lenin Bayragı*, too, joined the strike (*забастовка*) and did not print the TASS announcement.⁴²¹ “In 1987, this strike was the first time in the history of Soviet publication. Journalists went on strike and did not work for one week. The newspaper was not printed.”⁴²² Another informant described the strike as follows:

The communique was brought to the redaction, to *Lenin Bayragı*. Ponder! On the one side the nation, on the other side the government, and Lenin Bayragı in the middle, between two fires. They, the workers in the newspaper, went on strike for one week. They came to work at 9, sat down before the typewriter, put the paper, sat and waited. They were forced to translate (the communique) but they resisted. People came from the Central Committee (ЦК) of Uzbekistan and threatened to fire them and hire others... This [strike] spread across Uzbekistan.⁴²³

⁴¹⁷ “Moskova’daki Kırım Tatar Temsilcilerinin 6 Temmuz’da Kızıl Meydan’da Yaptıkları Gösteri ile İlgili açıklama”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 161, year 27, 1987, p. 55

⁴¹⁸ **Ibid.**, 56-57

⁴¹⁹ Mustafa Cemiloglu, **Ibid.**, p. 101

⁴²⁰ (**Russkaya Misl**, Paris, no 3684, 31 July 1987, p. 5) in **Emel**, Ankara, no. 162, year 27, 1987, p. 5-10

⁴²¹ Zafer Karatay, “Kırım Türklerinin Moskova Gösterileri Nasıl Başladı-Nasıl Cerayan Etti”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 161, year 27, 1987, p. 19

⁴²² Interview (I) with a Crimean Tatar journalist, February 14, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “87 senesinde, bu USSR matbuat tarihinde birinci defa olan şeydi. Gazeteciler iş bıraktılar. Zabastofka diyorler, iş bıraktılar, ve bir hafta çalışmadılar. Gazete çıkmadı.”

⁴²³ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Sabşeniyeni getirdiler redaksiyaya, *Lenin Bayragına*. Tasavvur edin. Bir yanda halk bir yanda hükümet *Lenin Bayragı* ortada ateş içinde. Bir hafta iş taşladılar. 9’da geliyor maşına başına oturuyor, kağıt koyuyor oturuyor. Varalar saabşeniyayı tercüme edin, yok. Bir kimse yapmıyor. Özbekistan SEKAdan geliyor, hepinizi işten kovacağız, başka adamları alacağız... Bütün Özbekistana yayıldı.”

However, despite the strike, the communique was printed in *Lenin Bayragı* by some other people. Later, strikers resumed work. With the communique, 'committees' period' in the Crimean Tatar issue began. It was declared that a committee led by Andrei A. Gromyko, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, would deal with Crimean Tatars' problem.⁴²⁴

The committee began to work to resolve the Crimean Tatars' problems in the summer of 1987, and it disclosed its decisions in the summer of 1988. The State Committee chaired by Gromyko agreed that due to demographic reasons in Crimea, Crimean Tatars' mass and organized return to Crimea and Crimean ASRR's re-establishment were impossible. The Committee advised that cultural and social necessities of Crimean Tatars in the places they already settled should be improved.⁴²⁵ The Soviet government did not intend to plan the mass return of Crimean Tatars, but instead, only a few hundred families were scheduled to move back every year.⁴²⁶

Even at this very late time, the central authorities appealed to distract Crimean Tatar people with delaying tactics by giving them cultural rights about publishing books and new newspapers, and allotting more time on the radio and TV. None of these were new to Crimean Tatars. They had already had these since 1950s and 1960s. Apparently, with Gromyko Committee's decisions, the Soviet government did not prefer to give rights different from the ones that were already in circulation since 1956-57. However, it would be naïve to expect that all these tactics would appease Crimean Tatar National Movement, whose main goal was to repatriate to Crimea, but an outcome other than this would not satisfy the Movement, either. While the Soviet government appealed to slow down the return, and old delaying tactics, Crimean

⁴²⁴ "TASS Bildirüvü", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 88, July 25, 1987, p. 2

⁴²⁵ "Kırım Türklerinin Taleplerini İncelemek İçin Oluşturulan Devlet Komisyonunun Bildirisi", *Emel*, Ankara, no. 166, year 28, 1988, p. 33

⁴²⁶ "Vatan Kırım'a Öncelikle Döndürülecek Olan Kırım Tatarları", *Emel*, Ankara, no. 166, year 28, 1988, p. 39

Tatars' response to the Gromyko's move was speeding up the individual returns, new demonstrations, meetings and strikes in Uzbekistan, Moscow and Crimea.⁴²⁷

5.4 Organization of the Crimean Tatar National Movement and the Return

The National Movement of Crimean Tatars got organized and acted as initiative groups until 1989 at places where Crimean Tatar people inhabited. In order to resolve their national problem, they sent letters, petitions and documents, as well as representatives to Moscow. Between April 29 and May 2, 1989, in Yangiyul, Uzbekistan, a new phase began in the history of the National Movement. The Organization of the Crimean Tatar National Movement (OCNM-OKND) was formed in order to make the political struggle more efficient and organized.⁴²⁸ The OCNM might resemble a political party, and in addition to that, there were some other groups in the National Movement.⁴²⁹

The Central Committee of the Organization's first meeting was held in Bahcesarai on June 11-12, 1989, one week after the Fergana pogroms in Uzbekistan. Even if Ahıska (Meskhetian) Turks fundamentally suffered from these events and those in Fergana were transferred by the Soviet state to Russia, and many of them left Uzbekistan and migrated to the different places of the USSR; some Crimean Tatars, too, had suffered, and the events in Fergana, meanwhile, accelerated Crimean Tatars' return to Crimea.⁴³⁰ The OCNM put the issue of Crimean Tatars' resettlement in Crimea onto

⁴²⁷ Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu, "Kırım Tatarlarının Anavatanlarına Dönüşlerindeki Dikenli Yol", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 175, year 29, 1989, p. 5-6; Mustafa Cemiloglu, **Ibid.**, p. 101; "Taşkent'te Protesto Gösterileri" **Emel**, Ankara, no. 167, year 28, 1988, p. 45; "Haberler", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 166, year 28, 1988, p. 41-42; "Haberler", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 169, year 28, 1988, p. 40

⁴²⁸ "Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 172, year 29, 1989, p. 3-15

⁴²⁹ This organization would be the basis of *Kurultay*, the parliament, and *Mejlis*, the government, in 1991.

⁴³⁰ Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu, **Ibid.**, p. 6

their agenda. In other words, they planned establishing tent sites around cities,⁴³¹ and the first one was built in Bahcesarai.⁴³²

Since Crimean Tatars' move speeded up, and they squatted and parceled the abandoned villages and built tent sites all around Crimea, the tension and the struggle between them and local Crimean authorities that started in 1967 also escalated. The difference was that the events, police raids to tent sites, fights between the local Russians and the new comers, attacks to and burning of Crimean Tatar tents became a part of everyday life of Crimea and Tatars. For instance, locals of Yalta, approximately 1500 people, attacked the newcomers' settlement. In Bahcesarai, interethnic fights took place in September 1989. Within the same month militia attacked Crimean Tatars and expelled them from the lands around Simferopol. Another incident happened in Karasubazar, again in September 1989, and Crimean Tatars were beaten, gassed and their sites were bulldozed. Moreover, Crimean Tatar settlements in Değirmenköy experienced the same fate, namely, attacking, fighting and expelling.⁴³³ On the one hand, the local authority caused difficulties for Crimean Tatars; on the other hand, they encouraged Slavic citizens' migration to Crimea.⁴³⁴ Thus, the OCNM hastened to parcel unoccupied lands, and until May 1, 1989, 40 thousand Crimean Tatars were registered in Crimea.⁴³⁵

While all these struggles over Crimea were taking place in Crimea, another committee was already formed and became active. The month after the Fergana pogroms, the

⁴³¹ "Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Merkez Şurası'nın İlk Toplantısının Tutanağı", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 174, year 29, 1989, p. 12

⁴³² "Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Birinci Yılı Faaliyet Raporu", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 179, year 29, 1990, p. 26

⁴³³ Reşat Gafaroğlu Cemilev, "Kırım Tatar Milli Meselesinin Son Durumuna Bir Bakış", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 176, year 30, 1990, p. 4; "KTMH Teşebbüsçüleri Kırım Bölgesi Toplantısına Katılanların Duyurusu", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 175, year 29, 1989, p. 37; Ş. Selim ve Y. Kandımov, "Yalta'da Neler Oluyor", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 180, year 30, 1990, p. 12; "Vatan Kırım'ın Bahçesaray Şehrinde Kırım Türkleri ile Ruslar Arasındaki Gerginlik Sürüyor", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 174, year 29, 1989, p. 37; **Emel**, Ankara, no. 176, year 30, 1990, p. 43-49

⁴³⁴ "Sovyetler Birliği Halklarına Müracat", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 172, year 29, 1989, p. 27

⁴³⁵ "Gayrıdan Kuruv ve Milletlərara Münasebetler", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 63, May 30, 1989, p. 3

Committee chaired by Gennady Yanayev was formed by Nationalities Soviet of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, on July 12, 1989, for Crimean Tatars' Problems.⁴³⁶ Since Gromyko Committee's recommendations, which lacked a positive solution, did not satisfy Crimean Tatar people, became useless, and the returns continued, this committee was essential. Crimean Tatars' demands from the Committee were the same as the ones they demanded since 1950s: Crimean Tatars' organized and mass return to Crimea, restoration of Crimean ASSR and rehabilitation of the people.⁴³⁷

Yanayev Committee held meetings and personal conversations with the representatives of CTNM, with the leaders of local party and Soviet organs, and with Crimean Tatars and other native groups in Crimea, Krasnodar, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.⁴³⁸ After the meetings, personal conversations with people and investigations of previous acts and Committees' offers, it announced its recommendations, and unlike the Gromyko Committee, it advised repatriation of Crimean Tatars and restoration of Crimean ASSR.⁴³⁹ The Committee also recommended that moral, psychological and political background of the return need to be built. In other words, public opinion in Crimea should be prepared for Crimean Tatars' return and it also needed to be demonstrated that the return would not be against other ethnic groups.⁴⁴⁰

In accordance with the recommendations, Supreme Soviet of the USSR issued a decree in late 1989 stating that deportations were unlawful.⁴⁴¹ With this decree, illegal acts of Stalinism were blamed and condemned, and all necessary legislative

⁴³⁶ G. Yanayev, "KırımTatar Halkının Problemleri Boyunca Komissiyasının Hulasaları ve Teklifleri", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 13, January 30, 1990, p. 2

⁴³⁷ "Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Merke Şurası'nın 1 Ağustos 1989 Tarihli Kararı", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 173, year 29, 1989, p. 9; "Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Merke Şurası'nın II. Toplantısının Tutanağı", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 176, year 30, 1990, p. 19

⁴³⁸ G. Yanayev, **Ibid.**, p. 2

⁴³⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 2

⁴⁴⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 2

⁴⁴¹ "Kurultay'ın Kırım Tatar Halkı'na Müracaatı", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 185, year 31, 1991, p. 5

measures for the reinstatement of the peoples were to be put into practice.⁴⁴² Other committees focusing on the Crimean Tatar problem were formed, not to prevent Crimean Tatars from returning to Crimea but to organize and to facilitate it.⁴⁴³ Subsequent to the Yanayev Committee, another one was formed to deal with repatriation of Crimean Tatars,⁴⁴⁴ and Rifat Çubarov (Refat Chubarov) currently the head of *Mejlis*, became a member of this committee at the time.

In 1990, the return to Crimea was no longer officially unlawful. Already 50 thousand people had moved back, but the problems and difficulties were the same; acquiring *propiska*, finding jobs and the struggles around parceling lands.⁴⁴⁵ The vicious circle, depicted above, remained until the very last moment: Crimean Tatars were not hired without *propiska*, and since they were not hired they cannot get *propiska*.⁴⁴⁶

In 1990, according to Cemilev, rumors like ‘Crimea should be part of Russia’ began circulating in Crimea,⁴⁴⁷ just as it did after the Kiev crisis, which turned to be unpleasant for Russia in early 2014. Next year, on July 20, 1991, a referendum was held in the Crimean Oblast to establish Crimean Autonomous SSR, and more than 90 percent of the participants voted for ‘the restoration of the Crimean ASSR as a subject of the USSR and as a party to the Union Treaty.’⁴⁴⁸ On the following month, on 12 February, Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR approved the Crimean referendum. However, the OCNM opposed to the referendum and to the newly established

⁴⁴² “Haberler”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 175, year 29, 1989, p. 48-51

⁴⁴³ Kemal Özcan, “Kırım Türklerinin Sürgünü ve Vatana Dönüş için Milli Mücadele Hareketi (1944-1990)”, Doctoral Thesis, İstanbul University, İstanbul, 2001, p. 211-213

⁴⁴⁴ “Devlet Komisyonu ile İlgili Tavr”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 178, year 30, 1990, p. 7

⁴⁴⁵ S. Gafarova “Halk Takdirinin Buruluş Noktasında”, **Lenin Bayrağı**, no. 18, February 10, 1990, p. 3

⁴⁴⁶ Venera Yakupova, “Ya Vatan ya Ölüm”, **Lenin Bayrağı**, no. 15, February 3, 1990, p. 3

⁴⁴⁷ “Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu ile Yapılan bir Konuşma”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 181, year 30, 1990, p. 3

⁴⁴⁸ Susan Stewart, “The Tatar Dimension”, **RFE/RL Research Report**, no.19, vol. 3, 1994, p. 27

entity.⁴⁴⁹ They opposed to the establishment of the Crimean ASSR, the restoration of which they had struggled since 1950s because they strove to restore the Crimean ASSR, which was established in 1921 and was abolished in 1945, and which they were one of the constitutive components of. Yet, the newly established entity would not be the same as the one formed in 1921, but would reflect the current *status quo*. This meant that the new autonomous entity was not built considering the nationality problem and was not based on one titular nationality like other autonomous republics in the USSR, instead it would represent Russian majority in the peninsula. Moreover, the meaning of the new entity was that Crimean Tatars would not be represented in the administration, and also Crimean Tatar national institutions, which were supposed to improve Crimean Tatar culture, language and society, would not be established or would be at stake due to the minority situation of Crimean Tatars.

Crimean Tatars' response to the January 20 referendum, and the autonomous entity was to assemble *Kurultay*, National Congress of Crimean Tatars, on 26-30 June, 1991, for the second time since 1917.⁴⁵⁰ *Kurultay*, 226 delegates at the time, elected 33 members of the *Mejlis*, executive organ, and Mustafa Cemilev was elected as the Chairman of *Mejlis*, and Rifat Çubarov as vice-Chairman.⁴⁵¹ In the 2nd *Kurultay*, Crimean Tatars appealed to Soviet organs that their national autonomous state would be formed in accordance with the establishment of the Crimean ASSR on October 18, 1921, and *Kurultay* be recognized as the sole authorized organ for the protection of Crimean Tatar people's rights.⁴⁵² In this *Kurultay*, national anthem and

⁴⁴⁹ "KTMHT Merkez Şurası'nın Kırım Muhtar Sovyet Sosyalist Cumhuriyeti'nin Yeniden Teşkiline Dair Ukrayna SSC Kanunu Hakkında Açıklaması", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 182-183, year 31, 1991, p. 10-11

⁴⁵⁰ *Kurultay* resembles to the Party Congresses of the USSR which assembled at regular intervals and which elected Central Committee, İK(tse-ka), of the USSR, and *Mejlis* resembles to İK itself. *Mejlis* forms its presidium.

⁴⁵¹ In the 6th *Kurultay*, on October 26-27, 2013, after two decades Cemilev retired and R. Çubarov was elected as Chairman of *Mejlis*.

⁴⁵² "Kırım Tatar Milli Kurultayı'nın SSCB Başkanına, SSCB Yüksek Sovyetine, Ukrayna SCB Yüksek Sovyetine Müracaatı", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 185, year 31, 1991, p. 9

flag (*tarak tamga*) were identified, and a decision was taken for the script shift for Latin.

5.5 Russian Occupation of Crimea (2014)

During the time of field research for three months, the situation in the peninsula was stable and calm. Interviewed Crimean Tatar elites pointed to education and language as their acute problems, but in March 2014, all turned upside down. Crimean Tatars have been passing through the toughest times since the dissolution of the USSR due to the occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation. The events which triggered the occupation of Crimea started in Kiev, and spread to other regions, mostly to the eastern ones, where ethnic Russians constitute the majority. Subsequent to the abandonment of a trade agreement with the European Union by the Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovich, demonstrations and protests against the government began in Kiev in late November, 2013, escalated by mid-February, 2014, and entered into a new phase when 88 people were killed.⁴⁵³ After Viktor Yanukovich fled to Russia, pro-European protesters installed an interim government in Kiev. Russia's response to the government reshuffle in Kiev was to use it as a pretext to occupy Crimea.

A referendum was organized in the Crimean peninsula on March 16, 2014, and according to official results, 97% of participants voted for the joining Russia.⁴⁵⁴ Two days after the voting, on March 18, Putin, the president of the Russian Federation, referred to Crimean Tatars in his address on the ceremony of signing of the

⁴⁵³ "Ukraine Crisis Timeline", **BBC**, March 21, 2014 (Available), <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26248275>, 22.03.2014

⁴⁵⁴ According to Jemilev, the voter turnout was only 34% rather than 83% as Crimean authorities pointed out. "Jemilev possesses information on real results of Crimean referendum", March 25, 2014, (available) <http://qha.com.ua/jemilev-possesses-information-on-real-results-of-crimean-referendum-130982en.html>, 29.03.2014

Agreement on the annexation of the autonomous Republic of Crimea to the Russian Federation. Refraining from marginalization of them, he stated the following:

...there was a time when Crimean Tatars were treated unfairly, just as a number of other peoples in the USSR...Crimean Tatars returned to their homeland. I believe we should make all the necessary political and legislative decisions to finalize the rehabilitation of Crimean Tatars, restore them in their rights and clear their good name... for Crimea to have three equal national languages: Russian, Ukrainian and Tatar.⁴⁵⁵

However, in contrast to what he stated in his address,⁴⁵⁶ Crimean Tatars struggled for a Crimea that is a part of Ukraine from the beginning of the Crimean turmoil. Moreover, Crimean Tatars, led by *Mejlis*, did not participate in and recognize the referendum in Crimea. Prior to the referendum, *Mejlis* appealed to the legislative organ of Ukraine, *Verkhovna Rada*, and whole Ukrainian people. In that appeal, *Mejlis*, as supreme executive representative body of the Crimean Tatar people, confirmed Ukraine's existing borders, condemned the Russian Federation's invasion plans of Crimea and did not "recognize the Crimean referendum...aimed at changing the territorial belonging of Crimea, as it is not legitimate..."⁴⁵⁷

Ukraine's new interim government responded to Putin's move toward Crimean Tatars, who paid attention to Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity during the Crimean turmoil, by adopting a resolution. The resolution recognized "the status of the Crimean Tatar people as indigenous people of Ukraine", but not specifically of Crimea, and acknowledged "the *Mejlis* of the Crimean Tatar people, executive

⁴⁵⁵ "Address by President of the Russian Federation", **President of Russia**, March 18, 2014, (available), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/6889>, 18.03.2014

⁴⁵⁶ He said in the same speech, "Crimean Tatars, who, as the referendum has shown, also lean towards Russia"

⁴⁵⁷ "APPEAL of the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, whole Ukrainian people - citizens of Ukraine of all nationalities", **Mejlis**, March 15, 2014, (available), <http://qtm.org/en/news/4297-appeal-of-the-mejlis-of-the-crimean-tatar-people-to-the-verkhovna-rada-of-ukraine-whole-ukrainian-people-citizens-of-ukraine-of-all-nationalities>, 22.03.2014

body *Kurultay* of the Crimean Tatar people as a competent authority of the Crimean Tatar people.”⁴⁵⁸

The Russian Federation’s one-sided action over Crimea was mostly condemned by other states in the international arena, and only a few states, such as Kazakhstan, recognized the referendum held in Crimea.⁴⁵⁹ Western states led by the USA and the littoral states to Black Sea, except Russia, described the referendum as illegitimate and refused to recognize the *status quo* created by the Russian Federation.⁴⁶⁰ Moreover, the General Assembly of the United Nation adopted a resolution,⁴⁶¹ no. A/RES/68/262, for ‘the territorial integrity of Ukraine’,

⁴⁵⁸ “The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Resolution ‘On Statement of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine reguarantees of rights of the Crimean Tatar people as a part of the State of Ukraine’”, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, March 20, 2014, (available) <http://portal.rada.gov.ua/en/news/page/news/News/News/89899.html>, 28.03.2014

⁴⁵⁹ “The referendum held in Crimea is seen in Kazakhstan as a free expression of will of the Autonomous Republic's population while the decision of the Russian Federation under the existing circumstances is regarded with understanding.” “**Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan on the referendum in Crimea**”, MFA Republic of Kazakhstan, March 18, 2014, (available), <http://mfa.gov.kz/en/#!/news/article/13803>, 29.03.2014

⁴⁶⁰ “The referendum conducted in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea on 16 March violated the international law and the constitution of Ukraine and therefore the Republic of Bulgaria does not recognize its results.” “Opinion and proposals of the Consultative Council for National Security regarding the risks posed to Bulgaria arising from the development of the crisis in Ukraine”, **MFA The Republic of Bulgaria**, March 25, 2014, (available) <http://www.mfa.bg/en/events/6/1/1358/index.html>, 29.03.2014; “The Government of Georgia does not recognize the so-called referendum of Crimea along with the rest of the international community; it does not recognize the results of this unlawful referendum and supports sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine.” “The Statement of the President of Georgia Regarding the So-Called Referendum Conducted in Crimea”, **The President of Georgia**, March 17, 2014, (available), <https://www.president.gov.ge/en/PressOffice/News?8710>, 29.03.2014; “This (*annexation of Crimea and of the city of Sevastopol*) is an illegitimate act and runs counter to the fundamental principles of international law, infringing particularly on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring Ukraine. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs unequivocally states that...Romania will not recognize the act of annexing the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, an integral part of the state of Ukraine” “Press release on non-recognition of the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and of the city of Sevastopol by the Russian Federation”, **MFA Romania**, March 18, 2014, (available), <http://www.mae.ro/en/node/25488>, 29.03.2014; “The result of the unlawful and illegitimate “referendum” held in Crimea on Sunday, 16 March 2014, and the de facto situation that will prevail following the steps that will be taken in conjunction with this referendum will not bear any legal validity for Turkey and will not be recognized.” “No: 86, 17 March 2014, Press Release Regarding the Referendum held in Crimea”, **MFA Republic of Turkey**, March 17, 2014, (available), http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-86_-17-march-2014_-press-release-regarding-the-referendum-held-in-crimea.en.mfa, 29.03.2014

⁴⁶¹ 100 countries voted in favour, 11 against and 58 abstained for the text on Ukraine. “Meeting Record-A/68/PV.80”, **The General Assembly**, March 24, 2014, (available) <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs//2014/ga11493.doc.htm>, 29.03.2014

calling upon all States, international organizations and specialized agencies not to recognize any alteration of the status of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol on the basis of the... referendum and to refrain from any action or dealing that might be interpreted as recognizing any such altered status.⁴⁶²

The invasion of Crimea came a very unpleasant development for Crimean Tatars. Crimean Tatars have not forgotten any of the “losses, humiliations, deprivations and repressions that the Crimean Tatar people suffered” under two hundred years of Russian domination, and Russian invasion of the peninsula might mean for Crimean Tatars repetition of two hundred years of sufferings.⁴⁶³ Moreover, the presence of Crimean Tatar institutions like *Kurultay*, *Mejlis* and others would be jeopardized, if not be destroyed.

However, being a small nation before the Russian Federation, Crimean Tatars could not resist the current annexation of Crimea how hard they tried. Crimean Tatar National Movement has never appealed to armed struggle for their rights; they know that they are small, and this would be suicide for them. In the end, they will also comply with the current *status quo* as they did after 1991.⁴⁶⁴ However, they would resort to “the traditional methods of non-violent fighting for their rights”⁴⁶⁵ until the end. The following chapter discusses the outcome of the documentary research and the interviews on *Lenin Bayragı*. It elaborates the newspaper’s role in keeping the

⁴⁶²“The Draft Resolution- A/68/L.39 & Add.1-The Territorial Integrity of Ukraine”, **The General Assembly**, March 24, 2014, (available) http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/68/L.39, 29.03.2014

⁴⁶³ “APPEAL ...”, **Ibid.**

⁴⁶⁴ Rifat Çubarov, head of *Mejlis*, in a meeting with the representatives of civil organizations noted that “Crimean Tatars should not reject Russian passports...This is reality. We don’t choose it, we just live in it. The Russian Federation will give you Russian passports, but Ukraine still considers you Ukrainian citizens”. “Crimean Tatars shouldn’t reject Russian passports: Chubarov”, **Crimean News Agency**, March 26, 2014, (available) <http://qha.com.ua/crimean-tatars-shouldn-t-reject-russian-passports-chubarov-130995en.html>, 28.03.2014

⁴⁶⁵ “APPEAL ...”, **Ibid.**

Crimean ideal alive and illustrating its importance of it for Crimean Tatar people in exile.

CHAPTER 6

LENIN BAYRAGI: 'BETWEEN TWO FIRES'

This chapter discusses the results of the documentary research conducted on the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı*, henceforth *Bayrak*,⁴⁶⁶ and interviews carried out about it in Crimea. The newspaper's importance derives from its uniqueness as a publication. Indeed, during its lifetime, *Lenin Bayragı* fulfilled important missions for Crimean Tatar people. First, it became a kind of school for Crimean Tatar writers, poets, journalists, as well as ordinary people, just as Gaspıralı's *Tercüman* did in Tsarist Russia.⁴⁶⁷ Second, similar to *Tercüman*, *Bayrak* tried to enlighten people on what actually happened in the Patriotic War with biographies of Crimean Tatar participants in the war. Moreover, it protected the written Crimean Tatar language in exile whilst there was no education in Crimean Tatar language and schools. Similar to Gaspıralı,⁴⁶⁸ due to strict censorship on the issues of Crimea, some writers in *Bayrak* appealed to implicit methods such as metaphors and allegories in order to keep Crimean ideal and people's consciousness vital.

Lenin Bayragı was the successor of *Yeni Dünya*,⁴⁶⁹ first published in 1918, and of *Kızıl Kırım*, in 1938.⁴⁷⁰ The first issue of *Bayrak* was printed in the International Workers'

⁴⁶⁶ *Lenin Bayragı* was shortly called as *Bayrak*, banner, by Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan. "33 Yıl", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 154, 29 Aralık 1990, s. 1. In this chapter both *Lenin Bayragı* and *Bayrak* will be used.

⁴⁶⁷ Hakan Kırımlı, **Kırım Tatarlarında Milli Kimlik ve Milli Hareketler (1905-1916)**, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2010, p. 41

⁴⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 44

⁴⁶⁹ Its editor was renowned Turkish communist Mustafa Suphi. It was established in Moscow, and moved to Crimea in 1919.

⁴⁷⁰ Eşref Şemizade, 'Mustafa Suphi', **Lenin Bayragı**, no.11, February 6, 1958, p. 4; İsmail Kerimov, "Bizler Artık Kene Eski 'Yeni Dünya'mız", **Yeni Dünya**, no.1, January 3, 1991, p. 3

Day of 1957, and it was published under this name for 33 years and 8 months, in a total of 4990 issues. It was published twice a week in compact (tabloid) newspaper format until 1965, after that year it was published three times a week in broadsheet format.⁴⁷¹ Its name was altered to *Yanı Dünya* (New World) with its first issue in 1991 in Tashkent, and was moved to Crimea by the end of the year.⁴⁷² It is still published in Crimea under the name *Yanı Dünya*.

Upon the lifting of special settlement regime, some cultural institutions for Crimean Tatars were established, and one of them was the newspaper, *Lenin Bayrağı*. Before its foundation, Crimean Tatar song program on Uzbek radio had come to life in the spring of 1956, which was followed by the inception of a Crimean Tatar section within Uzbek Writers Union in September of the same year.⁴⁷³ Subsequently, Crimean Tatar dance and song ensemble was formed within the Uzbek state theatre.⁴⁷⁴ According to Islamov, with the meeting of Central Committee of Uzbek Communist Party on March 1, 1957, he was appointed as editor-in-chief and personally gathered Crimean Tatars who would work in the newspaper.⁴⁷⁵ One interviewee who joined the newspaper in 1965 confirmed this:

Well, they gathered all, the communists, [for instance] Şamil Aladdin, Islamov. Abselyam Islamov was a commander who participated in the war. He had nothing to do with writing, he was that kind of a communist. They [rulers] gathered and formed [the newspaper], and appointed Islamov as redactor. He brought the others together, [for example] Dermenci, Tinçerov, those old writers...⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷¹ I. Usmanov, 'Matbuatımız Osüv Yolunda', *Lenin Bayrağı*, no. 35, May 1, 1965, p. 2

⁴⁷² "Yolumuz Vatanga", *Yanı Dünya*, no. 52, December 25, 1991, s. 2; Ablaziz Veliev, "Meraba, Vatan!", *Yanı Dünya*, no. 1, January 1, 1992, s. 2; "33 Yıl", *Lenin Bayrağı*, p. 1; "Bizler Artık Kene Eski 'Yanı Dünya'mız", *Ibid.*, p. 3

⁴⁷³ Şamil Aladin, "Yazıcılarımız Uzbekistan Edebiyatı ve Sanatı Dekadasında", *Lenin Bayrağı*, no. 1, May 1, 1957, p. 4; Gani Muratov, "Bir Kaç Teklif", *Lenin Bayrağı*, no. 5, May 16, 1957, p. 4

⁴⁷⁴ R. Eldar, "Kırım Tatar Milli Estrada Ansambli", *Lenin Bayrağı*, no. 1, May 1, 1957, p. 4

⁴⁷⁵ Abselyam Islamov, *Yıllar ve Yollar*, Tashkent, Gafur Gulam Publishing House, 1985, p. 182-183

⁴⁷⁶ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, March 6, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "...Endi her kesin olar taptılar komunistleri, kimler bar Şamil Aladdin bar, taptılar İslamov'u. Abselyam İslamov degen o frontta cenkte olğan

Lenin Bayragı was formed as one of the organs of the Central Committee of Uzbek Communist Party, Supreme Soviet of Uzbek SSR and Ministries Soviet of Uzbek SSR. Since it came to life as one of the organs of the aforementioned entities, its main duty was, as the newspaper's decades-long redactor Islamov wrote in his memoirs, to propagate the ideal of Communism and to indoctrinate workers in accordance with it.⁴⁷⁷ In the newspaper, different types of news were published. Alongside the official news such as party decrees, government decisions, texts of plenums of the Communist Party, which sometimes covered all the pages of *Bayrak*, there were also news on cotton monoculture of Uzbekistan,⁴⁷⁸ on Crimean Tatars' life in exile, mostly success stories of Crimean Tatar workers (e.g., about how much they fulfilled their quotas at work), and stories about Crimean Tatar heroes in the Patriotic War.

There are two possible answers to the question of why the Soviet government allowed *Bayrak* to be printed in 1957. The first view argued that the elderly Crimean Tatar intelligentsia struggled for its establishment along with other institutions in order to protect Crimean Tatar literature, language and culture. For this, they demanded that a newspaper, a journal, an ensemble would be formed, as in the case of the National Movement writing and sending letters to Central Committee, to Moscow. According to the advocates of this view, this also meant that Crimean Tatar people wanted these institutions as explained by a journalist:

The elderly appealed to the government. [They said] our people came here, [but] it does not have a newspaper, book, ensemble, literature, and institute. That means the people must die. Thus, [the elderly like] Şamil Aladdin repeatedly wrote letters to Central Committee. [They wrote that] allow [to form these cultural

kamandır olğan, öyle yazıcılıqnen alıp bereceği yoq, öyle bir komunist adam. Olar tapıştırıp teşkil ettiler, İslamov'ı redaktör tayin ettiler, voot, o qalğanları tapdı. Dermenci, Tinçerov bar edi, şu qart yazcılar...”

⁴⁷⁷ Abselyam Islamov, *Ibid.*, p. 186; “Muim İş”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 117, September 30, 1967, p. 1

⁴⁷⁸ Even though I only focused on some other issues, this newspaper was pretty much a newspaper for cotton due to cotton's importance for Uzbekistan. During planting cotton and the harvest season, the news for encourage people in order to meet the cotton quota increased. After the harvests, then the success, achieving the plan/quota, was announced: “Report to the Homeland: Plan succeeded” “Vatanga Raport: Plan Toldurıldı”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 100, December 14, 1958, p. 1

elements], the people need to learn their own language. Then, the government had to do something in 1957 due to the elderly's pressure.⁴⁷⁹

The second view is held by some groups mostly within the National Movement. They claimed that institutions along with the newspaper were established in order to keep Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan forever. In addition, they stated that they did not need any newspaper, ensemble and so on in Uzbekistan, but they needed them in Crimea. Thus, they boycotted the newspaper and urged people to do the same.⁴⁸⁰ One informant from the National Movement expressed his feelings as follows:

You know, we realized that this newspaper, theatre, Crimean ensemble... then faculty was established in Crimean Tatar language, 20-25 people were admitted [every year]. We understood that they were trying to keep us here [Uzbekistan] with these. Thus, we stated that we did not need these, here [in exile]. Do you know why? Today, they would give us 20 thousand newspapers [quotas], tomorrow 30 performers, and theatre etc. Then, they would say that they [Crimean Tatars] had cultural institutions. We told that our cultural institutions would be in Crimea.⁴⁸¹

6.1 A School and a Teacher

As mentioned above, eight years after the inception of *Bayrak*, the newspaper began to be published in broadsheet format in 1965. According to some, this was also

⁴⁷⁹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Yaşlılarımız hükümete hücum ettiler, halkımız mında keldi, gazetası yoq, kitabı yoq, ansambli yoq, edebiyatı yoq, institütü yoq. Demek halk ölmek kerek deyip Şamil Aladdinler toqtamadan SEKA’ya mektuplar yazdılar. Beriñiz, halqñıñ tilini öğrenmesi kerek. ‘57 senesinde qartların basqısından hükümet mecbur oldı birşeyler yapmağa.”

⁴⁸⁰ “33 Yıl”, *Ibid.*, p. 1; Kyazım Ametov, “Mektüpler, Mektüpler, Mektüpler”, *Lenin Bayrağı*, no. 104, September 6, 1988, p. 4

⁴⁸¹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, April 16, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Bilesiñiz mi, belledik ki bizler, bu gazeta, tiyatr, Qırım estradı, ansambli yazıcılarınñ nesi oldı, fakültet açtılar Kırımtatar tilinde, 20-25 adam aldılar. Onlarnen bizni bu yerde qaldırmağa çalışqanlarını añladık. Onun için dedik biz, bunlar kerekmiy bizge, mında bizge kerekmiy dedik. Biz onun için çıqtıq ayttıq neden deseniz, olar bugün gazeta 20 biñ berecek, yarın 30 tane artis olacak, yarın tiyatroy berecek, bizlerge. Soñ olarnıñ hepsi kulturası bar deyecek. Biz dedik bizim kulturamız Qırımda olacak.”

materialized, like its inception in 1957, by the Crimean Tatar people's initiative and effort. That means the people wanted it, and the intellectuals pursued it. This shift created the necessity to employ more Crimean Tatars in the establishment. Unlike the first generation of the newspaper, namely, the founding elders who got their education in Crimea and began their writing business prior to the WWII, the young who were raised in exile and joined *Bayrak* were trained by the elderly and received language education in the newspaper. The younger generation became writers and poets by the help of the elders and with their own efforts.⁴⁸² As explained by one interviewee who participated in the newspaper in 1965:

The young were included in 1965, more than 10 young people came to the newspaper, for instance, Ervin Umerov, Safter Nagayev, Refat Ahtemov, Bilal Mambet, Uriye Edemova, Rıza Fazıl... The elderly saw that energy came to the newspaper, but the young had no power, they did not have [proficiency in Crimean Tatar] language. One did write in Uzbek, other in Russian. They [the elderly] gradually taught us [how to write in Crimean Tatar language] over the course of a year. They worked day and night. We wrote, they corrected. [They said] write like this, like that. They practiced with us for one year, and after one year, we slowly reached their level. This was an extremely significant business. The elderly made this happen.⁴⁸³

Moreover, those Crimean Tatar cadres who first started their career in the newspaper also worked in the Gafur Gulam publishing house in the ensuing period and in the journal, *Yıldız*, which was established in 1980.⁴⁸⁴ They had their first poems, stories

⁴⁸² Cemil Seydahmet, **Abdulla Dermenci**, Tashkent, Gafur Gulam Publishing House, 1981, p. 88; C. Ametov, "Abdulla Dermenci", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 46, April 15, 1980, p. 3; Safter Nagayev, "yaratıcılık Yolu", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 4, January 9, 1988, p. 4

⁴⁸³ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Şimdi 65'te yaşları aldılar... Ervin Umerov, Safter Nagayev, Refat Ahtemov, Bilal Mambet, Uriye Edemova, Rıza Fazıl, ondan ziyade gençler keldi, gazetağa, birinciden qartlar baqtılar, gazetağa kuç keldi. Amma gençlerniñ kuçu yoq, tili yoq. Birisi Özbekçe yazar birisi Rusça yazar. Yoq tili yoq. Yavaş yavaş bir yıl devamında bizlerni olar öğrettiler. Olar gece gündüz çalıştılar. Biz yazamız onlar tüzülteler. Öyle yazmaq kerek böyle yazmaq kerek, bizlennen bir yıl işlediler. Bir yıldan soñra yavaş yavaş başladıq olarnıñ safına alıştık. Bu pek büyük bir iş edi. Şu qartlarımız şu işni yapıp kettiler."

⁴⁸⁴ Abselyam Islamov, **Ibid.**, p. 192

and articles published in *Bayrak*.⁴⁸⁵ One informant who both worked in *Bayrak* and *Yanı Dünya* pointed out its importance for writers as follows:

Take any [Crimean Tatar] writer and poet in Crimea, none of them was ever unattached to *Lenin Bayragı*. All of them graduated from the school of *Lenin Bayragı*. Most of them, 90 percent, became writers and poets within the newspaper. The rest published their works first in *Lenin Bayragı* because there was no other publication. That was the only newspaper in Crimean Tatar language in the world.⁴⁸⁶

This group of young Crimean Tatar literati was not just a part of the newspaper; on the contrary, they were greater in number, and some were not organically a part of the establishment. Those who were not part of it constituted the outer circle of the newspaper. The physical environment of *Lenin Bayragı* was a gathering place for Crimean Tatar intelligentsia. In addition to *Lenin Bayragı*'s becoming a place where the new generation of Crimean Tatar literati were raised and educated, it became a school and/or a teacher for regular Crimean Tatar readers. It should be kept in mind that there were no Crimean Tatar schools and education in Crimean Tatar at the time. The generations who were raised after the war in exile learnt their own written Crimean Tatar by reading and studying *Bayrak*.⁴⁸⁷ A scholar from KIPU explained the newspaper's importance for them with the following words:

⁴⁸⁵ Şakir Selim, **Kırımname II. Tamçılar**, Akmesit, Tarpan, 2008, p. 162; Eşref Şemizade, **Halk Hizmetinde**, p. 10-11

⁴⁸⁶ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, February 15, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "...Qırımda olğan bütün yazarlarını her bir şair yazıcını alıñ, olardan hiç birisi yoq ki Lenin Bayragı ile alaqaşı olmasın. Hepsı Lenin Bayragının mektebini keçken insanlar edi. Çoqları 90 faizi, bu gazetanıñ içinde yazıcı şair olaraq şekillendiler. Qalğanları ise eserlerini birinci nevbette Lenin Bayragında bastılar. Çünkü başka neşir de yoq edi başqa türlü bir neşir yoq edi. Dünyada yegâne gazeta edi Qırımtatar tilinde."

⁴⁸⁷ One interviewee from *Bayrak* expressed how he improved his Crimean Tatar after the newspaper began to be published, "I grabed just after the newspaper was published in 1957, went home but did not know [Crimean Tatar] very well. We used to talk [Crimean Tatar] at home, [but before we came to Uzbekistan somewhere in Russia] we talked with Russians over 9 years. I studied with Russians for 8 years. Later, I started to read, there were many unknown words to me. I took a thick notebook, divided it into letters and made a dictionary on my own. I read [but] I did not understand articles in Crimean Tatar. There, in Samarkand, was a newspaper in Russian, *Leninskiy Put* (ленинский путь-Lenin's path). Reports and others were both printed in the former and in the latter, in the former, *Bayrak*, they were printed after translation. I read, understand and found, [for instance], *istisal* (istihsal-production). I barely understand *istisal*, and I look at the latter *istisal* is *proizvodstvo* (производство), then I wrote

In exile, it was impossible to conserve one's language in any other environment but family, only family. Within family there was *Lenin Bayragı* to conserve [native] language. *Lenin Bayragı* was a schoolbook to us, a real schoolbook because we did not study our native language for [even] one hour at school therefore it was a schoolbook.⁴⁸⁸

This is the most prominent characteristic of the newspaper, functioning as a school/teacher for Crimean Tatar readers. This feature was repeatedly emphasized by the informants during the interviews. Even one of the top persons of the National Movement said, "I used to read [it]. I used to read all because it is necessary to read in order to know the enemy well...it [*Bayrak*] helped to some extent...it helped me...to improve my own native language...because there were no schools, no books, but only *Lenin Bayragı* and novels of the time."⁴⁸⁹

Moreover, Crimean Tatar readers at the time sent many letters to the newspaper saying that it became a school/teacher for them and they learnt written Crimean Tatar by reading the newspaper.⁴⁹⁰ For instance, a reader's observations on younger

istisal to the *I* [page of the dictionary]." Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, March 6, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "57'de gazete çıkanman gazeteye yapıştım, eve gittim de bilmiyim yahşı. Bizde evde laf edediyyidik anda [Özbekistan'a gelmeden önce zorunlu yerleştirildikleri Ural bölgesinde bir yer] Ruslarnen laf ettik 9 yıl boyunca. Oqup 8 yıl hepsi Ruslarnen. Soñ başladım men oqumağa çoq añlamağan sözlerim bar. Men aldım bir qalın defter harflere böldüm özüme luğat tizdim. Oqıyım tatarca makalelerni añlamayım. Anda Semarkantta vilayet gazetesi çıqa edi Rusça, Leninskiy put, Lenin Yolu. Doklatlar (доклад) neler bütün yazılğan şeyler anda da mında da, mında tercüme etip basıla. Men oqup añlam taram, ahaa no bizde Arap sözleri... sizde istisal yok, baqam istisal. Anlayım qararnen neygen no, baqam bunda praizvostvo, istisal, ben i harfine yazam istisal."

⁴⁸⁸ Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, February 21, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Sürgünde aileden başka bir yerde tilini qorumak mümkün değil edi, yalnız aile. Onun için ailede tilini qorumak için *Lenin Bayragı* bar edi. *Lenin Bayragı* bizim için hem derslik oldu hem en esas derslik, çünkü biz mektepte oqullarda bir saat ana tilimizni öğrenemedik onun için o derslikti."

⁴⁸⁹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, March 23, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Ben okurdum. Ben hepsini okurdum çünkü düşmanı iyi bilmek için okumaq lazım... belli derecede faydası vardı çünkü onu oquğan insanlar... bana da faydası oldu çünkü ben kendi ana tilimi geliştirmege... çünkü ne oqullar var ne kitaplar var yalnız *Lenin Bayragı* ve o zaman çıqqan romanlar..."

⁴⁹⁰ Ablyamit Ametov, "Akılı Talaplar", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 12, June 9, 1957, p. 4; E. Abducemilev, "Avesliknen Okuyar", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 102, December 21, 1958, p. 4; Nariman Ramazanov, "Okuyucularımızın İstekleri", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 49, June 18, 1961, p. 3; Ç. Ametov, "Yurekte Olsa-Elde Olur", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 2, January 5, 1961, p. 4; Zekiye Velişayeva, "Omürimiznin Kuzgüsü",

Crimean Tatars' attitudes to native language triggered other Crimean Tatar readers to express their thoughts on the same matter. Nuri, a student in the Institute of Agriculture in Tashkent, points out that he learnt his native language (Tatar in the text) by reading the newspaper. He criticizes the young generation who say they cannot read the newspaper because they cannot understand it. He claims if they take it once in a blue moon, they cannot read and get it. However, the young should learn and not forget the native language.⁴⁹¹ After Nuri's complaints were printed in *Bayrak*, other readers began sending letters on this issue. One of them was Arsen Alçikov. Also stating that *Bayrak* and books in Tatar became schools in learning literary Tatar language, Alçikov agrees with Nuri's concerns that Crimean Tatar (as *Tatar* in the text) youth is not able to read their native language. He advises them to subscribe to the newspaper and read it.⁴⁹² İzzet Hayırov, also a student, criticizes those people, and gives the example of a friend, who is an expert on Hindi but does not read/understand his native language.⁴⁹³ Finally, D. Çelebi, an engineer, joins the debate. He also finds those youngsters' excuses groundless. Even though he was educated in Russian schools, he endeavored to read the newspaper, and like others,⁴⁹⁴ he managed to learn reading.⁴⁹⁵ An analysis of the texts hints that younger Crimean Tatar generations' current problems on the native language were valid in the 1960s, and Crimean Tatars were as worried about the newer generations as present intelligentsia, just as my interviewees, currently are. Crimean Tatars' deficiency on the native language was worsening because they did not receive education in Crimean Tatar, and there were no Crimean Tatar schools in places exile.⁴⁹⁶ As to the letters, the readers do not refer to the real reasons but put the blame on the young

Lenin Bayragı, no. 124, October 17, 1967, p. 4; M. Abdulkadir, "Tilimizni Ogrenemiz", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 149, December 14, 1967, p. 4

⁴⁹¹ Nuri Abdullayev, "Studentlernin Dikkatına", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 54, June 15, 1965, p. 3

⁴⁹² Arsen Alçikov, "Nuri Dogrusını Yazdı", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 69, July 20, 1965, p. 4

⁴⁹³ İzzet Hayırov, "Gazetanı Epimiz Okumalıımız", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 64, July 8, 1965, p. 3

⁴⁹⁴ Urmus İsmailova, "Gazetanı Epimiz Okumalıımız", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 64, July 8, 1965, p. 3

⁴⁹⁵ Celal Çelebi, "Bu ne? Sebep mi? Manaçık mı?", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 113, 1965, p. 4

⁴⁹⁶ Except Crimean Tatar language classes in some of schools in Uzbekistan.

who live in an Uzbek and Russian environment and go to Uzbek and Russian schools. Only Alçikov might have referred to the reasons, but his text is probably distorted because there are traces of inconsistency in his style.⁴⁹⁷

Being the only newspaper of its kind, *Bayrak* turned out to be something more than a newspaper for some people. In fact, subscribing to it was a mission, it was a sacred paper; like a religious text for some readers.⁴⁹⁸ One informant expressed what it meant to them as such:

Subscribing to *Lenin Bayragı*, *Yıldız* meant, how should I say, both keeping Crimea alive in the family, and also supporting national press, that much important...It was as if Crimea was experienced in each family. We, our relatives and other families used to collect *Lenin Bayragı* yearly, because it was something, not sacred but, precious which kept Crimea alive.⁴⁹⁹

One can wonder how a newspaper could keep the memory of Crimea alive or make the readers experience Crimea when strict censorship was applied on matters about Crimea. This was probably possible through metaphors in the poems, and articles on Crimean Tatar participants in the war. Readers used to read, for examples, articles or life stories and war-time experiences of these heroes but what they read was distinct from the themes they listened to in the family. First, they could never encounter any

⁴⁹⁷ Arsen Alçikov, *Ibid.*, p. 4

⁴⁹⁸ “There was only one newspaper. Both my mother and father were nationalist persons. In those times, one was in need of this. There was no internet, nothing but only newspaper. It had 50-60 thousand circulation. (In fact, the highest circulation number was 27 thousand.) There was only that newspaper to receive information about Crimean Tatars, their literature, history and so on. There was not university, no books or too few, 5-6 in a year. Therefore, people considered that (subscribing to the newspaper) as a must.” Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, February 18, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Tek bir gazete bar edi, anam milliyetçi bir insan edi, babam da. O zamanlar insan buna muhtaç, internet yoq bir şey yoq. Sadece gazeta bar. 50 mi 60 biñ tirajı bar edi gazetaniñ. O zaman gazeta Qırımtatarlarından, edebiyatından tarihinden haber almak için tek o bar edi. Üniversitet yoq, kitaplar yoq veya çoq az. Yılda 5-6 tane. O yüzden insanlar onu borç saya edi, o yüzden mutlaqqa gazete olacak diye.”

⁴⁹⁹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, February 21, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “*Lenin Bayragına*, *Yıldız*’a yazılmak nasıl diyeyim sanki Qırımı yaşatmaktı ailelerde, o kadar mühim, hem milli matbaaya destek. Sanki her bir ailede Qırım yaşandı. Yani ben annemde kalıyordum bütün ailelerde bizim akrabalarımızda annememin evinde teyzemin evinde bizim evimizde *Lenin Bayragını* senelere göre toplardık. Evet, o çünkü o gerçekten bize Qırım’ı yaşatan bir değerli bir kutsal demeyeyim de...”

narration of the deportation in *Bayrak*. That was always skipped and censored. Second, they could not read about such topics as the beauty of the peninsula or nostalgia on Crimea about which they often heard in the family, either. The gap in the texts surely was completed by the recollections of parents.

Just as the family functioned as a site where recollections about the homeland Crimea and the deportation were circulated and/or transformed to the newer generations, and the collective memory was created, the family for some Crimean Tatars also became a setting where *Bayrak* was read, collected and cared. Indeed, family/home was a crucial site. The letters sent to *Bayrak* provided clues to the fact that some Crimean Tatars began learning written Crimean Tatar with the help of family members, older generation, who already were capable of reading in Crimean Tatar. New learners listened to them, and they gradually developed proficiency on the native language. Some others learnt it by reading the paper aloud at home. As can be seen clearly above, for some, *Bayrak* helped conserve the Crimean Tatars' native language in exile.⁵⁰⁰

However, there are also people who disagree with this claim. One interviewee for example stated the following:

⁵⁰⁰ "I asked this question. [I said] there was nothing to read in that newspaper, why did you buy that newspaper? They replied that they read it because it was in Crimean Tatar and in order to learn language and not to forget Crimean Tatar. I, myself, studied in a Russian school and a university, and I learnt our native language through *Lenin Bayragı*. There were no schools and books [in Crimean Tatar]. I learnt Crimean Tatar reading it aloud, and many other hundreds of Crimean Tatars did the same. It helped very much. I think, from this point of view, it can be considered as a national movement. It conserved our nation's folklore, culture, literature, and most importantly language. *Lenin Bayragı* succeeded in protecting our language so that it was not destroyed." Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, February 15, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Baqın ki men ... bu sualrı soradım. O gazetada oqumağa bir şey yoq edi neden aldınız siz bu gazetanı? Olar dediler ki, til öğrenmek için Qırımtatarca olğanı için ve Qırımtatar tilini unutmamaq için o gazetanı alıp okuy edik. Kendim de Rus mektebinde oqudum, üniversitetinde oqudum ve ana tilimizni edebi tilimizni men *Lenin Bayragı*ndan öğrendim. Çünkü mektep yoq kitap yoq. O gazetanı alıp oqup sesimi çıkarıp oqup öyle öğrendim ve daha yüzlerce Qırımtatarları *Lenin Bayragı* sayesinde ana tilini öğrendiler. Gazete bilesiñizmi çoq büyük hizmet yaptı. Men bellesem onu bu cihetten de Milli Hareket hizmeti saymak mümkün. Halkımıznıñ folklorunu, medeniyetini, edebiyatını saqladı, en mühimi tilimizni saqlap qaldı. Tilimizni yoq olmaması için.... ana tilimizni qorçalap qalmak (korumak) vazifesini beceribildi *Lenin Bayragı*."

I suppose this newspaper's importance was quite sensible [maybe translated as effective]. For some it could be big which is true to say. However, whoever say that this newspaper conserved our language, culture there in exile, that would be an exaggeration. It is exaggeration because only one family out of 5-6 used to buy it, maybe less. I know, some bought and said in a quotation 'conditionally this is our national newspaper and I help them by subscribing to it.' Subscription was very cheap in that time: 3 rubles 12 kopeck. That equaled to 15-16 piece of bread. That was cheap but they were not used to read it. [For instance] my dad did not use to read it.⁵⁰¹

I think, the existence of a newspaper (along with other published materials) in Crimean Tatar became basically useful for current Crimean Tatar intelligentsia, and to some extent for ordinary Crimean Tatars. All the Crimean Tatar elites and experts interviewed in the study had a link with *Bayrak*; they either worked in it or published their works in it or read and collected it as a valuable material. Activists only read it even though they were not fond of it. *Bayrak's* effect on ordinary people however remains to be researched.

If the claim that *Bayrak* helped to conserve Crimean Tatar language in exile and that people learnt their native language thanks to it is true, then why Crimean Tatars, especially newer generations, cannot speak in their mother language must be explained. Today, young generations of Crimean Tatars have an acute and serious language problem. They cannot acquire their mother language in the family through 'mothers'. Only 15 national schools, *milli mektep*, exist in Crimean Tatar, which is not sufficient. Crimean Tatar is not spoken anywhere whatsoever. They inhabit Russian-speaking environments and attend Russian schools. If they wish to learn it, they do it

⁵⁰¹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, March 5, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Men bellesem bu gazetanın onun ehemmiyeti haqiqaten de sezerli oldu, sezerli. Belki bazıları büyük diyerler. Belki bazıları büyük der, öyle de aytmak mümkün. Amma eger de kim dese bu gazeta anda sürgünlükte bizim tilimizi saqladı, medeniyetimizi saqladı, o işte biraz büyükleştirmek. Böyle değil. Büyükleştirmek çünkü onun hepsi bir, men aytam da, 5-6 aileden belki biri ala edi, belki ondan da azı. Bazıları, men bilem, ala edi, ayta ediler, 'bu bizim milli gazeta degen şartlı sürette, tırnaq içinde olsa da men olarğa yardım etem, abone olam.' Zaten o zaman abone olmak çoq ucuz edi. 3 kümüş 12 kapık. Bu şimdi men sizge denkleştireyim. O vaqıt ekmek 20 kapık olsa. 5, 15, 16 ekmek. Öyle fiyatda edi. Ucuz edi. 1 yıl sen alasıñ. Haftada 3 kere. Ama okumay ediler. Menim babam gazetanı oqumay edi."

as a second and a foreign language. In short, *Bayrak*'s and other publications' effect seems to be limited mostly to intelligentsia and other elites.

6.2 *Lenin Bayragı* and the National Movement

Crimean Tatar people had various views on *Bayrak* since its inception. Some groups in the National Movement, as stated above, negatively evaluated the establishment of the newspaper and boycotted it. The boycott of these Crimean Tatars was expressed in a poem-verse form printed in the newspaper. Remzi Burnaş wrote: "Why do some stay away rather than subscribing to the newspaper? All my people are celebrating it in its native language, I wonder, how do their hearts beat?"⁵⁰² For people around *Bayrak*, this attitude against the newspaper was wrong: otherwise, without *Bayrak*, Crimean Tatar literature and language would disappear, and the younger generation of literati would not exist. A poet from the outer circle of *Bayrak* indicated the following in the interview:

Nation, the people, the majority never choose the wrong. They [people who boycotted *Bayrak*] chose the wrong, but never the people...That has become true. We, literati who began literature in the 60s and the 70s, were called as 'war children' since we were children in the war time. We would not exist, if these books were not published in native language, and the newspaper was not established, the ensemble was not formed, [and] -then Crimean Tatar program in the faculty was opened- that program was not established. Our literature would stop. Until we returned to homeland, people would forget their language. Therefore, I myself calculate that their opinions at that time were wrong.⁵⁰³

⁵⁰² Quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar in "Remzi Burnaş, "Gazetamız, Sensin Menim Ana Tilim!", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 138, November 18, 1967, p. 4"

⁵⁰³ Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, March 27, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Millet halk çoqluk hiç bir vaqıt yañlışmay. Olar yañlış qaldılar amma halk millet bir vaqıt yañlışmay. Ana doğru olup çıktı. Bizler mına 60. 70. yıllarda edebiyatqa kirgen biz kibi edipler, cenk balaları dep adlaylar bizlerni, çünki biz cenk vaqtında bala edik. Bizler eğer şu gazetağa, bu kitaplar, neşriyat ana tilinde çıqmağan olsa gazeta çıqamağan olsa, ansmabl olmağan olsa, soñ, üniversitet qarşında Kırımtatar tilindeki fakültet açıldı, o olmağan olsa bizler de yoq edik. Şu edebiyatımız da toqtacaq edi. Haçan biz vatanğa kelgencik tilini unutacak edi adamlar. Onun içün, o vaqıtta şu şeyler olarnıñ o fikri yañlış edi men özüm hesaplayım."

For the National Movement, *Lenin Bayragı* was not a national publication and did not 'reflect the interest of the people'.⁵⁰⁴ As already mentioned, Griogorenko's advice to members of National Movement is another example of how some people at the time considered *Bayrak*.⁵⁰⁵ Some nationalist groups in the Movement had a negative attitude toward it because no news about the people's struggle appeared in the newspaper. On the contrary, negative news about the movement, its activities and its initiators such as Mustafa Cemilev was sometimes printed.⁵⁰⁶ Moreover, when the first serious events in *Chirchik*, Uzbekistan, broke out in 1968, and 300 people were

⁵⁰⁴ "Documents: '...Defense Speech of Mustafa Cemilev (1970)'" **Tatars of the Crimea Their Struggle for Survival**, p. 122

⁵⁰⁵ He advised Crimean Tatars to take control of *Lenin Bayragı* which does not support the National Movement. Petro G. Grigorenko, **Ibid.**, p. 353.

⁵⁰⁶ In an article published in *Bayrak*, Cemilev was accused of collaboration with foreigners, Radio Liberty etc. and being bootlicking of them. The text declared that he broke with the people. R. Valiyev, "Halktan Ayırılğan, ya da İftiracı Kimge Hizmet Ete Edi", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 23, February 18, 1984, p. 4; In May of the same year, 1984, another article which included letters from people was printed. In letters Cemilev was criticized again that he broke with the people and passed to enemy's front. They ask who chose Cemilev, this 'traitor', representative of the people, because 'people' does not believe that he represented herself. "Halktan Ayırılğanga Berilgen Tazir", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 55, May 5, 1984, p. 4; Two years later, an article was published about two activists who were declared by the writer, Ş. İskenderov, as Cemilev's assistants. Rişat Ablayev and Sinaver Kadirov, too, were accused of collaboration with foreigners, centers of anti-Sovietism, Radio Liberty and so on, and sending materials which vilifying the USSR to these centers. Their activities in the institute where Crimean Tatars studied and internal and external connections were explained in the text. Ş. İskenderov, "Halktan Ayırılğannın Yardımcıları", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 43, April 1, 1986, p. 4; Following this article, another criticizing article was printed about Ablayev and Kadirov. İ Bilyalov, "Men Siz Tutkan Yolını Ukyüm Etem", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 12, January 27, 1987, p. 3. These articles above, except the third one, was first published in another newspaper like Pravda Vostoka and Leninabadsкая Pravda, and afterwards in *Bayrak*. In 1987, when CTNM increased its activities, meetings and demonstrations, and became more visible in Moscow and Uzbekistan, slanderous news on the National Movement and its activists such as Reshat and Mustafa Cemilev increased, too. "TASS Bildirüvü", **Lenin Bayragı**, p. 2; V. Ponomarev, "Dalga Kopüksiz Olmey", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 91, August 1, 1987, p. 4 (first appeared in Izvestia in July 30, 1987); "Kırım Tatarlarının Vekillerinen Ameliy Korüşüv", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 92, August 4, 1987, p. 1; "Sokak Numayışları, Miting", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 120, October 10, 1987, p. 4 (first appeared in Pravda Vostoka in October 8, 1987). For instance, A. Grigoryev labelled the activists as extremists, and M. Cemilev as the head of the extremists, Reshat Cemilev as the closest assistant of the former. He also criticized the deeds of others such as Sabriye Seutova and B. Umerov. A. Grigoryev, "Halk Menfaatlarına Kim Hainlik Yapa?" **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 121, October 13, 1987, p. 3. Moreover, the Soviet government took a step more and formed a workers' commission which was consisted of 11 "accepted" representatives of Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan. These representatives one by one were introduced to Crimean Tatar people by the titles "proper representatives" in *Bayrak*, and these news were produced by UzTAG. "Kırım Tatarlarının Vekillerinen Ameliy Korüşüv", **Ibid.**, p. 1; "Munasip Vekiller", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 93, August 6, 1987, p. 1; "Munasip Vekiller", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 94, August 8, 1987, p. 1; "Munasip Vekiller", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 95, August 11, 1987, p. 4.

arrested, *Bayrak* was silent. The reason is surely understandable: censorship. Censorship was a fact of Soviet life, as well as the writers of the newspaper.

Crimean Tatar journalists and writers in *Bayrak* were probably in a difficult dilemma: on one side the people, on the other side the government, which the newspaper was responsible for. The people, the National Movement and the activists who were in an open struggle with the government and paying a price were on one side, and the government which were inhibiting the National Movement and its activities was on the other side. *Bayrak*, however, was caught in the middle. Some people saw them as ‘traitors’, or one interviewee, a journalist, who did not become part of the newspaper likened them to captive rowers in the ships of old times. However, they had to act within the accepted limits of the Party.

The narration below illustrates the trapped situation of at least some of these Crimean Tatar writers. A dozen of Crimean Tatar journalists-writers were received by Sharof Rashidov. One of them was a senior writer, Yusuf Bolat, born in 1909, whose hands shook with anxiety when he spoke to Rashidov during the meeting. My interviewee, who was an eyewitness, asked him why he was so nervous. As the interviewee reported Bolat answered as follows:

You know, how could I not get nervous? Ahead is Padishah [referring to Rashidov], behind is the people, we are in the middle. There was the need to speak less but to say more. There was the need to indicate the people’s demand and wish to Padishah by the opportunity. I had to think of some useful words to say on behalf of my people within a few minutes, and I got nervous.⁵⁰⁷

During the interviews, the informants from the newspaper consistently referred to *Bayrak’s* indirect assistance to the people and to the National Movement. This

⁵⁰⁷ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Bilesinmi, nasıl heyecanlanmayayım, dedi, önde padişah, ardımda halk dedi. Biz ortadamız dedi. Az laf etmek çok şey söylemek gerek dedi. Halkın yüreğini, isteğini bu fırsattan faydalanıp padişaha bildirmek gerek dedi. Onu tüşüne tüşüne, bir iki daqqa aytsam da halqım için nasıl faydalı laflar aytabilirim, hep bularnı tüşünüp men heyecanlandım, dedi.”

assistance was not open and political, but passive, mostly showing the defamations on Crimean Tatars as unrealistic. In other words, they emphasized that they cannot be out of the National Movement. In fact, they, the people affiliated with the newspaper and the academics from KIPU, define the National Movement broader than its activists. For them, a concert of Crimean Tatar ensemble, a native song on radio, an article and a poem printed in the newspaper, or anything reminds Crimean Tatars Crimea meant national movement. Instead of an active political struggle, they could only follow different paths within the Soviet system under strict censorship.

6.3 The Methods – Paths Used by Crimean Tatar Literati

In the times of repression, writers, poets and literati, in general intelligentsia, express what they want to tell by hiding behind allegories, Aesop language, and sophisticated sentences instead of explicitly giving their messages. This also applied to Crimean Tatar reformist Ismail Bey Gaspiralı in the Tsarist era, and also his exiled descendants in Uzbekistan. Nationalist Uzbek writers, poets, contemporaries of Crimean Tatars, too, followed these methods. They disclosed their views to the public, veiling them under many sheets.⁵⁰⁸

Crimean Tatar literati either resorted to metaphors, allegories and Aesop language in poems, or they put Lenin and his quotes to the front line in order to pass the ‘blue pencil’ of the censor. Moreover, the honour of the Crimean Tatar nation was indirectly protected by articles and pages dedicated to Crimean Tatar heroes, soldiers, partisans and common people, who fought and participated in the Patriotic War.

Some Crimean Tatar writers, poets and others tried to maintain the Crimean ideal by such implicit methods in the newspaper. They translated and printed poems about

⁵⁰⁸ Muhammed Salih, **Ibid**, p. 37-38

homelands of other nations. For instance, Palestinian Mahmoud Darwish's poems about his homeland, Palestine, and Palestinians' expulsion were published. A Crimean Tatar journalist explained this as follows:

We used to utilize such methods no one knows. It was not possible to write about Crimean Tatar national cause, about Crimea. We published works of other nations, such as International Lotus Prize winner Palestinian Mahmoud Darwish's poems. He has a poem on homeland. I translated it; 'Hang me on palm tree, but I do not betray our homeland, these lands, where my blood from the umbilical cord dropped, are mine.'⁵⁰⁹ Every Crimean Tatar who read it ascribed it to himself. They understood that this was not about Palestine, [interpreter's name] was at the bottom. That means he chose such a poem that this land is mine, mine. I do not betray homeland. Crimea was our homeland, we will never betray it. This land is mine, my blood from the umbilical cord dropped on it.

⁵⁰⁹ Crimean Tatar version of the poem was translated from Russian, but I could not find it on pages I searched in *Lenin Bayragı*. I counted on interviewee's statement. The verses below are English translation.

Suspend me on the tresses of a date palm
Hang me I shall not betray the palm.
This land is mine and long ago
In good mood and in bad, I'd milk camels.
My homeland is no bundle of legends.
It is not a memory, not a field of crescent moons.
My homeland is not some story or anthem,
Nor light on the boughs of some jasmine bush.
My homeland is the anger of the exile at being made to grieve.
A child wanting festivities and a kiss.
And winds confined within a prison cell.
An old man mourning his sons, his field.
This land is the skin on my bones,
And my heart
Flies above its grasses like a bee.
Suspend me on the tresses of a date palm.
Hang me I shall not betray the palm. (DJ-D)

English version of Mahmoud Darwish's 'Homeland' poem in "Peggy Hutchison, Palestinian Resistance Poetry and the Historical Struggle for Liberation, A Master of Arts thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Department of Oriental Studies in the Graduate College The University of Arizona, 1991, p. 46, (Available) http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/278065/1/azu_td_1346743_sip1_m.pdf, 07.05.2014."

На пальме меня повесьте —
Я не предаю ее.
Эта земля — моя.
Это поле — мое. (П. Казаковой)

This is only first four verses of the poem in Russian. For the full Russian translation, find in the web-site; <http://amalggrad.ru/viewtopic.php?id=53&p=2>

Where was I born? I was born in Crimea. If I was born in Crimea, where would my blood from the umbilical cord drop? We tried to indoctrinate national movement, national consciousness and honor to people by using such methods, [and] printing works of other nations' poets...We used to utilize all kinds of ways of struggle. Censor would not know this. [Laughs] He was not able to realize it.⁵¹⁰

Another example is Lesya Ukrainka's poem, *Hope*, about return to and longing for homeland, Ukraine.⁵¹¹ According to Arsen Ishchuk, this poem was written as a

⁵¹⁰ Interview (I) with a Crimean Tatar journalist, February 14, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Biz böyle bir usul qullana edik onun daha kimse sırrını bilmiy. Qırımtatar milli davası haqqında yazmak mümkün degil, Qırım haqqında yazmak mümkün degil. Biz, başka milletlerniñ olsun, Filistin şairi, Mahmud Derviş, uluslararası nilufer mükâfatınıñ sahibi, onun icadından numuneler bastıq. Onun vatan şiiri bar edi. Men onu tercüme ettim. 'Palma ağacına asınız meni, lakin hıyanetlik etmem vatanımıza, bu topraqlar benim, ki benim burada damlamış göbek qanlarım.' Onu her bir oquğan Qırımtatar kendine çeke. Anlay edi ki bu Filistin haqqında değil, bunun túbünde... tura. Demek öyle şiirini saylap almış ki, bu topraqlar benimki, benim, hıyanetlik etmem vatana, biz de işte öyle. Qırım bizim vatanımız edi, biz ona hiç bir vaqıt hıyanetlik yapmayacağız. Bu topraqlar benimki, benim göbek qanlarım damlamış ona. Men qayda doğdım? Qırımda doğdım. Ya, Qırımda doğsam benim göbek qanlarım qayerge damlayacaq? İşte öyle usullernen biz başka halqlarınıñ şairlerini eserlerini berdik. Öyle edip Milli Hareketi, milli benliğı milli ğururu aşılamağa çalışa edik adamlarğa... Yani küreşin herhangi yollarında faydalanmağa çalışa edik, her hangi yollarından. Bunu sensör de bilmez edi. (Gülüşler) Onun aqlı yetmez edi."

⁵¹¹ Crimean Tatar version was translated by Çerkez Ali, and published in *Lenin Bayragı* in 1971.

Umüt
Takdirim erkinlik payımını algan,
Mana tek umütle yaşamak kalgan:
Korseymen men kene Ukrainamını
Arz etken şeyni, tuvgan yakımını.
Dneprge bakıp iç kanmaz edim,
Son anda olsem de iç yanmaz edim.
Bayırlar, çöllerde tikilip baksam,
Ateşli oylarnen elvidalaşsam...
Takdirim erkinlik payımını algan,
Mana tek umütle yaşamak kalgan.

Lesya Ukrainka, "Umüt", *Lenin Bayragı*, Trans. by. Çerkez Ali, no. 21, February 16, 1971, p. 3.

Hope

"No freedom have I, my good fortune has flown,
A lone hope is left, the one thing that I own.
The hope of returning one more to Ukraine,
To feast longing eyes on my homeland again,
To feast longing eyes on the Dnieper's rich blues,
And there live or perish, whatever ensues;
Feast my eyes on the steppe and the grave mounds I love,
Recall ardent thoughts and the dreams I once wove.
No freedom have I, my good fortune has flown,
A lone hope is left, the one thing that I own." Luts, 1880.

response to Ukrainka's aunt's exile to Siberia by Tzardom in 1880.⁵¹² These poems and others,⁵¹³ though sometimes prevented by *Uzlit*, was not random, but purposeful choices. Darwish, Ukrainka, and Shevchenko, see below, experienced expulsion from their homelands, and passionately grew a longing for their homelands. The feelings fed articulate Crimean Tatars' feelings about Crimea. Thus, Crimean Tatar literati resorted to these 'accepted' poems that escape censorship of Soviet authorities. Another account of this tactic is as follows:

If there was any trace of allegory [in the writing], the journalists were called to Party, and told off. They were warned; 'what is this? What is your aim? What kind of allegory is this? What do you mean with these words about sea, or mountains?' and so on. Everybody had [ideal of Crimea] at their heart, and they endeavored [with such methods]. If one put [or printed his works in the publication] by appealing allegoric ways, some call it Aesop language, and no one realized in the [Central] Committee, everybody would rejoice, [and] consider it great mastership.⁵¹⁴

English version from "Lesya Ukrainka, **Hope**, Trans. by. Gladys Evans, Dnipro Publishers, 1975, p. 12-13"

⁵¹² Lesya Ukrainka, **Hope**, p. 8

⁵¹³ In that time, the word Crimea was not allowed to be printed, the name of the homeland was not pronounced. It was forbidden in the Soviet era. In the publication, radio, nowhere it is allowed to be pronounced, as if Crimea did not exist for us. We were called as Tatar. We were Crimean Tatars but they called Tatar. Which Tatar? Kazan Tatar? Volga Tatar? Bolgar Tatar? I will say that in that time we used to resort to symbols and veiled references. For instance, there is a poem called 'Çağala Olurum' (Seagull), there is no referring to Crimea in it. It says 'You tenderly step on beaches, Crimea looks like my heart'. Crimean map looks like heart. 'Crimea looks like to my heart, you tenderly step on beaches, you are on the top of heart.' It says 'You walk but you walk on my heart, tenderly step so that I do not feel pain. I turn to a seagull.' That means seagull explains (discloses) our sorrow. We used to write such allegoric poems and our friends used to read and understand this. Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, March 27, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "O maaledge Qırım degen söz yazdırmay ediler, vatan adı ayılmay edi. Yasaq edi. Sovet rejimi devrinde. Matbuatta, radyoda bir yerde ayılmay edi. Dersinki Qırım yoq bizler için, bizler için, Qırımtatarlar ayılmay Qırım dep. Tatar ayta ediler bizge. Biz Qırımtatarımız ama Tatar ayta ediler ama nasıl Tatar? Kazan Tatarını Volga boyu başka bir Tatarını? Bulgar Tatarlarını? Aytacağım, o maaledge biz hareket ete edik simbollernen, öyle bir remizlernen bildirmege. Mesela 'Çağala Olurum' degen bir şiir bar, Çağala Olurum denen şiirde ... Qırım ayılmay. 'Yavaşça basınız sahillere siz, Qırım yüreğime benziy' ayıla anda. Qırım kartası böyle yüreğe benzep tura. 'Qırım yüreğime benziy, siz yavaşça basınız sahillerge siz yürek üstündesiz.' O adamlarğa ayıla. 'Siz yüresiñiz amma benim yüregimniñ üstünde yüresiñiz, yavaşça basınız benim canım ağrımazın. Ben çağala olurum' ayıla. Demek çağala da bizim derdimizni ayta. Böyle böyle etip remzi manalarda ayıp şiirler yaza edik ve onu bizim dostlarımız okup bu şeyi añlay ediler olar."

⁵¹⁴ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, March 5, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Eğer de bir yerde azcık bir kinaye olaraq neytse idi, çağıra edi, söge edi. Yani fırqanın, kamiteti bar. Muharrirni anda çağıra ediler. Ona anda

However, passing the censor was not taken for granted, and *Uzlit*⁵¹⁵ was usually more rigorous on the writings which were produced by Crimean Tatars for the first time. For example, a poet wanders in mountains and picks a tulip in his trip. But, the tulip fades and loses its petals on the way back. In the end, the poet gets angry with himself and regrets having picked the tulip, and writes a poem about it. An interviewee said *Uzlit* did not allow it to be printed because they thought that the poem referred to the removal of Crimean Tatars from their homeland, Crimea. The matter was even brought before Rashidov, decades-long first secretary of Communist Party of Uzbekistan.⁵¹⁶ Another example is the poem ‘thoughts of mine’ (1947) of Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet, as one informant reported:

There is a Ukrainian poet, Ukrainians’ Emre [refers to Yunus Emre of Turks]... It [poem] was not [allowed to be] printed in the newspaper, because there were such verses in it [...⁵¹⁷] They said

tembihley ediler. ‘Bu nasıl şey. Bu nasıl, siz neni közde tutasınız. Sen ne isteysiñ. Bu nasıl bir kinaye? Bu nasıl bir, bu deñiz haqqında bu nasıl laflar, ya da dağlar, bilmeyim..ne demek isteysiñ?’ Öyle işlarni kestire ediler. Her kesniñ yüreginde bar, lakin her kes böyle tırışa edi. Eger böyle kinayeli yolnen, ezop tili diyeler bazıları, öyle böyle şeyi, kirsetse, ve onu anda komitette sezmeseler her kes quvana edi, büyük ustalık sayıla edi.”

⁵¹⁵ *Uzlit* was Uzbek Branch of *Glavlit*, General Directorate for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press. It was primary censorship organ in Uzbekistan.

⁵¹⁶ According to Muhammed Salih, he remained so long as first secretary of Communist Party of Uzbekistan, he became one of the symbols of emblem of the Uzbek SSR along with cotton and wheat. (Muhammed Salih, *Ibid.*, p. 49)

⁵¹⁷ The English translation of the verses which the informant referred to.

Thoughts of mine, thoughts of mine,
You are all that is left for me,
Don't you desert me, too,
In this troubling time.
Come fly to me my gray-winged
Doves,
From beyond the wide Dniro
To wander in the steppes
With the poor Kirghiz.
They already are destitute
And naked But they still pray
To God in freedom.
Fly here, my dear ones.
With peaceful words
I'll welcome you like children,
And we'll weep together.
(1847, Orsk Fortress)

you call people to Ukraine, Crimea was a part of Ukraine, and therefore, it is impossible to publish it. They did not allow. This took place in 1964.⁵¹⁸

Censorship and its practices became so strict from time to time that, let alone naming the Crimean nation and its language, according to interviewees, some words such as sky, cloud, mountain, sea, Black Sea were censored because they might remind Crimea. A Crimean Tatar, who worked at *Lenin Bayragı* stated the following:

It was not possible to write the word Crimea, Black Sea. It was not possible anything to write about Crimea, only about cotton, people who work in cotton fields and mining factory. There was *ustak*.⁵¹⁹ *Ustak* reads after me. If there is something political, he gives me a call, Madam..., and says there is something in such and such pages, such and such material, that is not going to be printed, just omit it. Then, I omitted paragraphs, because it was impossible to keep something that reminds Crimea, Çatırdağ... They did not let a single word go.⁵²⁰

Taras Shevchenko, **Selections**, Translated by Michael M. Naydan, Ukrainian Literature A Journal of Translations, vol. 1, 2004 (available) http://www.utoronto.ca/elul/Ukr_Lit/Vol01/01-04.html, 09.05.2014.

⁵¹⁸ Interview (II) with a Crimean Tatar journalist, March 28, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Ukrain bir şair bar. Ukrainlerin Emresi... Onu çıqartmadılar gazetağa. Çünki onda öyle satırlar bar edi. Yani siz Ukrainağa çekesiñiz halqı, Qırım Ukraina terkibinde edi, onun içün onu basmak olmaz dediler. Çıqarmadılar. 64 senesinde oldu bu.”

⁵¹⁹ *UzTAG* was an affiliate of *TASS* (The Telegraph Agency of Soviet Union), like *Uzlit* of Glavlit. “Telegraph Agency of Soviet Union”, **Wikipedia**, (available) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telegraph_Agency_of_the_Soviet_Union, 31.05. 2014. However, the informant might be wrong and it is not *UzTAG* which controlled the newspaper but *Uzlit*. Moreover, she was the only informant who referred to *UzTAG*.

⁵²⁰ Interview with a Crimean Tatar worker in *Lenin Bayragı*, April 24, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “O vakıtta Qırım söznı yazmağa, Qaradenizi yazmağa mümkün degil edi. Bir şey bir şey Qırım haqqında yazmağa mümkün degil edi. Tolka pamuq tarlaları, pamuqta çalışqanlar, vot öyle şeyin, metazavod, madenciler zavodunda çalışqan adamlar. Bizge ustak bar edi. Menden soñ ustak oquy, bar bir siyasi bir şey ketmedimi, soñ alıp mana zvanıt yapa (arıyor), ...hanım, böyle böyle sayfada böyle böyle materyalde böyle şey bar keçmecek, abizatelna, brosay. (muhakkak çıkart) Maña öyle keledi, abzastları(paragraf) alıp alıp taşılay edim. Patamuştı (çünkü) Qırım’ı andırğan bir şey olmağa mümkün degil, Çatırdağı anmaq mümkün degil edi...Pek ciddi yanaşa ediler bizge.”

To recap, ‘the blue pencil’ of the censor mattered a lot. At this point, censorship and its practices can be analyzed within the external factors (namely, discriminatory policies of the state) of constructivist theory. I claim that external factors and collective memory of the common trauma, the 1944 deportation, and the memory of homeland, Crimea, shaped and strengthened the post-war Crimean Tatar national identity. State repression in the form of censorship may be one of the factors which kept Crimean Tatar consciousness alive in exile. One interviewee from Bayrak pointed out what she felt regarding the *Uzlit*’s repression and censorship: “[By coming and going to *Uzlit*’s office] I used to sweat from trouble and my eyes and hands became wet...That was so. They never made us forget... every minute and every second we were made to remember that we were Crimean Tatars.”⁵²¹

However, the interviewees’ perceptions regarding the censorship and the reality in the newspaper discourse do not always overlap. That is to say, the censored words mentioned by the interviewees can be occasionally seen in the newspaper texts.⁵²² Apparently, Soviet policy of censorship did not remain the same, but it zigzagged and moved back and forth. For instance, sometimes the words such as Crimea and Crimean Tatars were used together, but, in general, they were rarely put side by side in the coming years of *Bayrak*. However, perception of Crimean Tatar informants does not zigzag. They kept saying in the interviews that using the word Crimean Tatar, and words like sky, mountain, sea, and cloud were forbidden to use in *Bayrak*, as if they do not exist in Uzbekistan. They strongly believed that they were forbidden because *Uzlit* regarded them as referents of Crimea. Below is an informant-journalist’s account of it:

It was not possible to write [the words] ‘Black Sea’, ‘homeland Crimea’. [For instance] cupressus, which is a scene of Crimea, were put on a book’s cover. [The Censor asks] why do you put cupressus

⁵²¹ The full quotation can be found in the ‘collective memory’ section.

⁵²² Reşid Memiş, “Ak Kanatlar”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 105, September 2, 1980, p. 4; Enver Selyamet, “Canlı Dağlar”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 20, September 2, 1975, p. 3; Amet Ozenbaşlı, “Deniz Sevdası”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 56, May 11, 1967, p. 3; R. Eldar, *Lenin Bayragı*, p. 4; K. Camanaklı, “Amethan Sultan”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 78, September 28, 1958, p. 3

and provoke the people? Therefore, we were between the two fires. The people, on the one hand, said ‘You work in the Communist newspaper, we do not need newspaper here’, the government, on the other hand, repressed, between the two fires like that.⁵²³

Most of the time, words Crimea and Tatar were hardly adjoined in the newspaper and in Crimean Tatar books. The nation was Tatar, for Crimean Tatar was not in the nationality list of the Soviet Union, and its art, language, literature, writers, music and songs were also Tatar rather than Crimean Tatar. To prevent confusion, other Tatar groups were named as Kazan and Ufa Tatars in the Crimean Tatar articles. Nevertheless, calling Crimean Tatar people as Tatar caused misunderstandings. An interviewee explained this in the following way:

For instance, our [Crimean Tatar] ‘*Kaytarma*’ dance and song ensemble arrived in Tatarstan [or] in a city in Far East to give a concert. Posters were put up; ‘*Kaytarma* Tatar ensemble’ performs. All Tatars who lived there came...the hall was full, they [performers] appeared at the stage, and began to sing. They [audience] did not understand anything. [They said] excuse us, in what language do you sing, we paid and came here since you are Tatar but we do not understand what you say. [The performers said] we are Crimean Tatar ensemble, excuse us we are not allowed to write [Crimean Tatar on posters].⁵²⁴

However, from time to time, the restrictions apparently loosened, and the banned words were used. Concerning censorship, first, chronology should be kept in mind, and second, it should be noticed that it was not implemented fully. For instance, a few years following the newspaper’s inception and the 1967 decree, ‘blue pencil’ of

⁵²³ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, March 6, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Qaradeniz, vatan Qırım dep yazmaq olmay. Kitapnıñ qabında selvileri yapqanlar, selviler Qırımğa ait bir körünüş. Ne içün selvilerni yapasınıñız, halqı bozaltasınıñız? Onun içün şöyle biz iki ateş arasında. Halq bir taraftan ‘aa siz komunist gazetasında çalışasınıñız, gazeta kerekmiy bizge mında’ dep, diğər taraftan hükümet sıqa, böyle eki ateş arasında.”

⁵²⁴ Interview (I) with a Crimean Tatar journalist, February 14, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Mesela bizim Qaytarma oyun ve yır ansambılımız Tatarstanğa ketti konsert bermege, ve uzak şarktaki bir şehre bardılar. Afişler yapqan ekenler. ‘Qaytarma Tatar ansambılı’ konsert bere. Anda yaşığan bütün Tatarlar kelgen ediler...bardılar, zal tolu, olar çıqalar sahneye, başlaylar söylemege. Olar (seyirciler) birşey añlamaylar. Affedin siz hangi tilde yırlaysınıñız, biz tatar deyip sizniñ konsertinizge para berdik, ha biz añlamaymız sizniñ dediklerinizni. Biz Qırımtatar ansambılız (diyorlar). Neden yazmadınıñız o zaman? Affedin bizge yazdırmaylar.”

the censor was loose, but it tightened afterwards. On the other hand, Crimean Tatars' perception tells us something different, and it does not allow zigzags.

In the Gorbachev period, the reforms, which altered the course of the whole country, also changed the censorship policies, and "previously unprintable works about the deportation of national minorities accused of cooperation with the Germans" began to appear in 1987.⁵²⁵ For Crimean Tatars, the change came slowly, and the real break took place with the publication of TASS communique in July, 1987.⁵²⁶ This communique was forced to print in *Bayrak* because of the National Movement's accelerated activities, e.g., demonstrations, in Moscow, and should be considered as a response to them. As stated above, the communique caused a reaction among the Crimean Tatar people. It evoked the people because it repeated the decades-long accusations which justified the deportation. As to its significance for *Bayrak*, it indirectly lifted the censorship regarding the 1944 deportation in the paper. Though rarely printed in the paper before, after the communique, the offensive and slanderous news, mostly written by non-Tatars, UzTAG and anonymous, about the National Movement and its activists increased in the second half of 1987 and in the first half of 1988.⁵²⁷ In the second part of 1988, articles and letters of Crimean Tatars about the homeland, the deportation and the return began to appear.⁵²⁸ In other words, previously silent Crimean Tatars about the incidents in 1944 began to be written.

⁵²⁵ Herman Ermolaev, *Censorship in Soviet Literature 1917-1991*, Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield, 1997, p. 248

⁵²⁶ "TASS Bildirüvü", *Lenin Bayragı*, p. 2

⁵²⁷ V. Ponomarev, "Dalga Kopüksiz Olmey", *Lenin Bayragı*, p. 4; "Sokak Numayışları, Miting", *Lenin Bayragı*, p. 4; A. Grigoryev, "Halk Menfaatlarına Kim Hainlik Yapa?" *Lenin Bayragı*, p. 3; "Sokur Yol Kosterici Kayda Alıp Bara", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 122, October 15, 1987, p. 4 (first appeared in Sovetskaya Kuban in October 6, 1987); "Provokatsiyanın Ogü Alındı" *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 123, October 17, 1987, p. 4 (first appeared in Sovetskaya Kuban in October 9, 1987); "Kırım Tatarlarına Mensup Bir Gruppa Şahsların Subet", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 129, October 31, 1987, p. 4

⁵²⁸ İ. Hatipov, "Ana Yurtuna", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 75, June 28, 1988, p. 3; İzzet Emirov and Şevket Asanov, "Beşterek Dervizasında", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 112, September 24, 1988, p. 4, Yunus Kandımov, "Tarih ve Biz", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 116, October 4, 1988, p. 3; B. Bekirov, "Otmek-Zenginligimiz", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 120, October 15, 1988, p. 4

6.4 'Cesaret' (Bravery)

Crimean Tatar writers in *Lenin Bayragı* kept writing about Crimean Tatar participants to the Patriotic War from the very beginning.⁵²⁹ For instance, they wrote about Amethan Sultan,⁵³⁰ who earned the title of Hero of the Soviet Union twice, or Seitnafe Seitveliev,⁵³¹ who earned it once, and about their deeds and successes. In fact, post-war Crimean Tatar literature in exile was founded on the defense of the people against the accusations. One of the informants stated that "Crimean Tatar literature, since the time in Uzbekistan in exile until now [Crimea] has focused on exonerating the [nation]. There is no such thing in any other literature."⁵³²

Indeed, throughout the years, when Crimean Tatars were not even partially rehabilitated, and still were accused of alleged collaboration with the enemy during the Patriotic War, and still were humiliated in the streets and discriminated in educational institutions, they published articles on these Crimean Tatars, i.e. soldiers, partisans, regular people who struggled for the Soviet motherland, and on people who were captured as *ostarbeiters* to Germany. This is in a sense wish of the regular people.⁵³³ These articles in *Bayrak* were basically saying that 'although you, the Soviet Union, accused us for betraying against motherland, this is not true, not at all. On the

⁵²⁹ V. D. Lavrinenko, 'Yakın Dostum', *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 3, May 9, 1957, p. 2; Reşid Murad, 'Karaman', *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 3, May 9, 1957, p. 2

⁵³⁰ Şamil Alyadin, 'Koryüşüv', *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 16, February 23, 1958, p. 4; K. Camanaklı, *Ibid.*, p. 3; 'Amethan Sultan', *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 29, April 11, 1965, p. 4; "Kanatlı Omür", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 24, February 23, 1971, p. 3; A. Emirov, "Yaroslav Şeerinin Fahriy Grajdanı", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 42, April 5, 1980, p. 3

⁵³¹ M. Telerman, "Karamannın Hatırlav Akşamında", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 16, February 23, 1958, p. 3; Adham Rahmat, "Karaman", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 16, February 23, 1961, p. 2; Ervin Umerov, "Karaman", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 31, March 14, 1967, p. 4

⁵³² Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, April 24, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Bütün edebiyat, şu Özbekistanda sürgün olan devrinden son bugünkü güne kadar şu nede çalışıp qelmekte özünü aqlamak için bakın hiç bir edebiyatta öyle şey olgan yok."

⁵³³ Abduraman Usein, "Yazıcılarımızga Talabımız", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 12, June 9, 1957, p. 4

contrary, we defended this country and these people are the live proofs.’⁵³⁴ A journalist-informant pointed out the following:

A page named *Cesaret* was printed. There was information on Crimean Tatars who participated in the war, how many Crimean Tatars, officers and generals went to war. This was principally a significant situation. They [the government] steadily called the people traitor, but the newspaper steadily said *cesaret*.⁵³⁵

If there was space left from the official and cotton news, Crimean Tatars could publish articles about Crimean Tatar war participants throughout years. There were individual articles in the paper, and the ones systematically printed under the titles (pages) of ‘*Cesaret*’⁵³⁶, ‘nothing is forgotten, no one is forgotten’⁵³⁷, and ‘Remember, Friend!’⁵³⁸. They published countless of them, only *Cesaret* pages were more than 3 hundred. The articles were published throughout the year in the newspaper. However, they increased at the anniversaries of the turning points of the Patriotic War, on important days and occasions in the Soviet calendar such as February 23, Red Army Day, May 9, Victory Day, June 22, the day Nazis attacked to the USSR in 1941, September 14, Day of Tankers.

These wartime stories and biographies of Crimean Tatars were written after painstaking and long research. I found out some traces of information in the articles which are referring to the research Crimean Tatars did. For instance, Suleyman

⁵³⁴ Memet Moloçnikov, “Unutulmaz Kunler”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 32, April 22, 1965, p. 4

⁵³⁵ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 11, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “...Soñdan çıqtı Cesaret degen bir sayfa çıqtı. Cenk vaqtında Qırımtatarları savaştı nasıl iştirak ettiler... ne qadar Qırımtatarlar savaştı iştirak etti, ne qadar ofiserler, genaral bar, olar haqqında bilgiler bar edi. Bunun özü de büyük şey. Halqı olar toqtamayıp satqın diyler, ama gazeta toqtamayıp cesaret diy.”

⁵³⁶ *Cesaret* page was probably printed for the first time in March, 1975. “Hatırla Arkadaş!”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 27, March 4, 1975, p. 3

⁵³⁷ “Kimse Unutulmadı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 34, March 21, 1968, p. 3; “İç Bir Kimse Unutulmadı, İç Bir Şey Unutulmadı-Karaman Ölmey”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 103, August 30, 1969, p. 4; “İç Kimse Unutulmadı, İç Bir Şey Unutulmadı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 10, January 23, 1975, p. 4; “İç Kimse Unutulmadı, İç Bir Şey Unutulmadı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 58, May 9, 1986, p. 2-3.

⁵³⁸ “Hatırla Arkadaş!”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 39, April 1, 1975, p. 3; “Hatırla Arkadaş!”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 41, April 5, 1975, p. 3

Asanov was one of the Crimean Tatar researchers who dedicated himself to discover Crimean Tatars' involvement in the war. Since he worked in the State Medals Department of Ministry of Defence of the USSR, he had access to the Ministry's archives. He researched documents about Tatars who participated in the Patriotic War, and identified many Tatars who earned, but could not receive, medals.⁵³⁹ According to Asanin, he uncovered some partisans' identity like Anya of Kerch (Alime Abdennanova), and Mishka Tatar (Umer Akmolla Adamonov),⁵⁴⁰ commander of Kotovsky partisan detachment in Poland. Mishka Tatar's real name and national affiliation were unknown for some time. As in the case of Dyadya Volodya, his ethnic affiliation probably was covered and he was claimed to be someone else other than a Crimean Tatar, say under the disguise of Mihail S. Atamanov, born in Yelabuga, Tatarstan ASSR, in 1912. Even when his real name and birthplace were discovered, no reference to his ethnic affiliation was seen in the text.⁵⁴¹ According to an article in *Bayrak*, Historian N. A. Prokopiuk found out with the help of Crimean Tatars that Mishka Tatar was actually Umer A. Adamanov, who was born in Yalta in 1915 and died at a gun battle against Nazis in Poland in 1943.

Since these articles on Crimean Tatar participants in the war were numerous and had a similar content, two more is selected and mentioned; one from 1975 and one from 1965. Fazıl Azizov, 27, was probably a Crimean Tatar. There is no reference to his nationality in the text. He first fought in the Stalingrad front when the Patriotic War broke out. Then he participated in the campaign of Crimea in April 1944, and awarded with the order of the Red Banner. Whilst his kinsmen were deported from Crimea, he was in the hospital due to incidents which brought him the order. After he was out of hospital, he finally joined the liberation campaign of Hungary and Yugoslavia,

⁵³⁹ “İç Kimse Unutulmadı, İç Bir Şey Unutulmadı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 10, January 23, 1975, p. 4

⁵⁴⁰ İdris Asanin, **Adalet Kureşi Saflarında**, vol. 1, p. 151

⁵⁴¹ N. A. Prokopiuk, “Yaltalı ‘Mişka Tatar’-Zamoyşiznanın [Zamojszczyzna] Karamanı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 134, November 12, 1968, p. 4

where he died. His grave with 27 roses was in the cemetery of Vršac (in today's Serbia).⁵⁴²

In 1965, an article appeared in *Bayrak*. It was about a partisan leader called Dyadya Volodya (Uncle Volodya), who struggled against the Nazis in Crimea until he was captured and killed in 1943. The text presented the result of long research which involved meeting with his sister in Samarkand and one of his friends in Kazan: Uncle Volodya was the Russian nickname of Abdulla Dagcı, born to Seydahmet Dagcı's family in 1902, in Aluşta, Crimea.⁵⁴³ In accordance with the spirit of the age, the text only refers to Ekaterina Shamko's and Ivan Kozlov's books, which declare Crimean Tatars as 'traitors' and conceals their contribution in the war,⁵⁴⁴ but does not refer to his nationality and why Dagcı was called as Volodya. The text was important because Crimean Tatars indirectly (without mentioning alleged accusations, but in a legal and accepted frame) tried to show their own participation in the war and to exonerate themselves of the accusations, even though Russian books Russified Crimean Tatars and covered their participation in the Patriotic War. The story does not end here. Twenty-four years later, another article, which also includes Dagcı, was published. This time, in accordance with the spirit of the time -*perestroika* and *glasnost* era- the writer refers freely to the accusations that put Crimean Tatars' back and focuses on de-Crimean Tatarization of Crimea and Russification and/or covering of Crimean Tatars' involvement and suffering in the war.⁵⁴⁵ He includes to the text other Uncle Volodyas such as Umer Adamanov and Alime Abdennanova, whose names were Russified, contribution was ignored and misery was disregarded.

⁵⁴² Suleyman Asanov, "Karamannın Kabiri Ustündeki Guller", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 7, January 16, 1975, p. 3

⁵⁴³ Bekir Umerov, "Dyadya Volodya", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 38, May 9, 1965, p. 4

⁵⁴⁴ Rory Finnin, *Ibid.*, 1097; Greta Lynn Uehling, *Ibid.*, p. 60

⁵⁴⁵ Emil Amit, *Ibid.*

By the help of the indirect messages conveyed through *Cesaret* pages and other individual articles with the same content in *Bayrak*, Crimean Tatar writers endeavored to enlighten people about their contribution in the war, and preserve the collective memory on the deportation and on Crimea. These articles in *Lenin Bayragı* had similar content. Life stories/biographies of these heroes (war participants in general) begin on the soil of Crimea, and the story progresses; the hero goes to school, faculty, army etc. For a while later, the war begins, and the character attends the war either in Crimea, or in some other fronts. Subsequent to the Patriotic War, the hero suddenly appears somewhere in Central Asia, mostly in Uzbekistan, or very rarely in some different parts of the USSR, and the story ends.⁵⁴⁶ That is to say, our heroes/heroines come to life within the territory of Crimea, but unless the reader is familiar with the topography of the peninsula, he/she can hardly notice it because there is no explicit mention of Crimea. Needless to say, the nationality of the hero is rarely mentioned.⁵⁴⁷ Here, the names of the heroes serve as clues. Another hint is the newspaper itself. It is Crimean Tatar newspaper, so the reader can indirectly figure out the heroes' nationality. Otherwise, it is very hard, if not impossible.

In these articles, the 1944 deportation is consistently censored.⁵⁴⁸ In general, the texts refer to the transition from the war and to the newly settled places with these words and phrases: after the war, following the demobilization, now, he/she went to and/or lives in Fergana, Namangan, Tashkent, and Samarkand and so on. Probably the most creative transition sentence was of Rıza Halid. He writes his informant's life

⁵⁴⁶Yusuf Bolat, "Uç Korüşüv", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 15, February 20, 1958, p. 4; İzzet Emirov, "Uruş Yollarından 1417 Kun ve Gece", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 33, April 25, 1965, p. 3

⁵⁴⁷ A. Dermenci, "Olarnı Unutmamız", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 30, April 15, 1965, p. 3; M. Telerman, *Ibid.*, p. 3; Adham Rahmat, *Ibid.*, p. 2

⁵⁴⁸ F. Akim, "Topçılarnın Korandası", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 70, December 29, 1957, p. 4; Y. Zaredinov, "Urmetli Ekim", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 19, March 6, 1958, p. 3; Z. Murtazayev, "20 Yıldan Son", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 50, June 22, 1961, p. 3; İ. Minkin, "Eki Cebenin Karamanı", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 73, July 29, 1965, p. 3; Ş. Selimov, "Kamış-Burundan Drezdengece", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 3, January 9, 1975, p. 3; In *Cesaret* page "Safer Nagayev, "Acımuşkay Batırları", *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 4, January 8, 1980, p. 3"

story with these words: In 1944, *destiny* took me to this *sovhoz* (in Fergana).⁵⁴⁹ Somebody who is uninformed on the fate of Crimean Tatars and accidentally read such articles will suspect that something lies between the words, but cannot comprehend it. It is no doubt that some questions will hang in the air: Where did the character was actually born? Where is this place? Why did he go to Uzbekistan after the war ended? Why is his/her family in Uzbekistan? All of these are obscure. For these reasons, it can be concluded that these stories were produced for the use of Crimean Tatar readers who are familiar with the matter. Furthermore, due to the newspaper's language, these articles, which exonerate the Crimean Tatar people, could not reach the mass Soviet public, but only a group of Crimean Tatars. To put it differently, the articles exonerated Crimean Tatar people for Crimean Tatar readers.

As stated before, discriminatory policies of the Soviet state, namely, censorship on the deportation, on the shared trauma, and on expression of Crimean Tatars' own nationality, in short intense censorship, might have strengthened the Crimean Tatar readers' national consciousness. After all, Crimea was their homeland, and they used to live there; they were forcefully deported from there, but the Soviet government pretended it never took place and prevented its existence in the paper. More importantly, they did not allow them to return. Besides, in addition to the ban on Crimea, sometimes villages were thrown away from the texts. However, readers wanted to see and read them. A journalist from Bayrak pointed out this: "writing the word Crimea was not possible. We used to write 'he/she was born in such and such a village'. Where is the village, what kind of a village? We could not write that it was in Crimea."⁵⁵⁰ He also told about a criticism made by a Crimean Tatar 'hero' on the wording of the articles. He said the following during the interview:

⁵⁴⁹ In this article, it referred to the heroine's birth-place, Crimea. Rıza Halid, "Pakizenin Anası", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 21, February 18, 1975, p. 2

⁵⁵⁰ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 6, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: "Qırım sözünü aytmğa, yazmağa olmay edi. Biz ayta edik falanca köyde doğğanda dep ayta edik. Köyniñ adı, qayerdedir, nasıl köy? Ama Qırım dep onu adını qaydetmey edik."

‘[The hero criticized] they do not write from which village [he was]. They write irrelevant things but do not write from which village he was.’ If it was not written from which village they were, they would grieve, they wanted to [see] it. It would be better to include the village.⁵⁵¹

In short, even though *Lenin Bayragı* was under strict pressure and even some were convinced communists, most Crimean Tatar writers in *Bayrak* struggled against the accusations and replied them by their own methods, utilizing indirect and allegoric ways.

⁵⁵¹ Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, March 6, 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author. The original in Crimean Tatar is as follows: “Hikâyede qaysı köyden olduğanını yazmağanlar, olmayacaq şeyler yazıp turalar ama qaysı köyden olğanını yazmay ediler. Qaysı köyden iken yazmağanını canı ağıra ediler, istey ediler onu. Köyniñ yazğanı olsa hep kene.”

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This thesis analyzes the Crimean Tatar National Movement through publications which were printed in Uzbekistan, *Lenin Bayragı*, in Turkey, *Emel*, and in the West, *Dergi*.⁵⁵² However, one cannot help asking to what extent these publications became Crimean Tatars' voice and defended their rights. Certain features are necessary for a publication to be a Crimean Tatar publication. Being published in Crimean Tatar language by Crimean Tatars may not be fulfilling, and serving to the CTNM may be considered as much more essential. *Bayrak* was the only newspaper printed in their native language during the Cold War years. Since its affiliations with the Soviet state, it was only a Crimean Tatar newspaper with some reservations. However, my findings indicate that it was more than a newspaper that just broadcast the translated official news in Crimean Tatar. In fact, the hardest part of the study was probably the analysis of *Bayrak*. That is, evaluating it and its staff, and reflecting them to the reader in the best way possible was a challenge. Because, for some informants, *Bayrak* has positive connotations; it is part of their personal history, and *Bayrak's* staff are their heroes because they struggled with the state agents under tough conditions. For the activists, basically, *Bayrak* and people affiliated to it do not have a positive image. In other words, one cannot be considered within the National Movement, and a supporter of the people while he was taking part in the government's newspaper. To put it differently, activists do not want to share the stake.

⁵⁵² *Dergi*, published in Munich, was included to the study because of Kırımal, even though it was not completely a Crimean Tatar publication.

It is understandable that people affiliated with *Bayrak* might try to justify their existence in the newspaper, and also apprehend that the activists attempted to underestimate their efforts during the interviews. At this point, the academics appear to play an impartial role in putting forward *Bayrak*'s positive role, for in the absence of Crimean Tatar institutions like radio, ensemble, newspaper in Uzbekistan, there were not any other alternative. Even if they were communists in essence, they preserved the national form. They broadcast, printed and sang in Crimean Tatar. Moreover, I tried to pursue a neutral tone in the writing process and unbiased approach toward the people who represented *Bayrak* and the Movement. I also refrained from creating a heroism out of *Bayrak*, and a new version of the history of the CTNM.

The study is composed of two principal parts: an evolution of CTNM, and the research on *Lenin Bayragı*. The former part focuses on the development of the National Movement, which is also divided into two as inner and outer national movements and/or diasporas. For the outer part, primary sources were *Emel* and *Dergi* journals. In chapter 4, the outer diaspora is analyzed through some leading Crimean Tatar figures like Kırımer, Ülküsal and Kırımal. Moreover, it intends to show how they evaluated the developments regarding its counterpart in the USSR.

The aforementioned representatives of Crimean Tatars in the West apparently acted in accordance with the motto "the enemy of my enemy is my friend". First, the Crimean Tatar National Movement in the interwar period was firmly connected with the Promethean Movement initiated and supported by Poland against the USSR. Kırımer represented Crimean Tatars in this project. In WWII, after Poland was occupied by her century-old enemies, some members of the outer diaspora approached Nazi Germany. This time, not Kırımer but mostly Edige Kırımal and Müstecip Ülküsal tried to contact with the Germans. After the war, Nazi Germany was defeated; this time the enemy's enemy turned out to be the Western governments such as the USA and West Germany. One of the leading figures of the

National Movement was still Kırımal, who was active around the Institute for the Study of the USSR. That is to say, the members of diaspora Crimean Tatars cooperated with states and blocs which positioned themselves against the Soviet Union. They first cooperated with Poland, then with Germany, and after WWII, with the West and states such as Turkey, West Germany and the USA.

The second principal part of the thesis concentrated on the Crimean Tatars' only newspaper *Lenin Bayragı* which was published in exile in their native language, as well as on its uniqueness and significance. In the research process, I tried to elaborate *Bayrak's* possible contribution to Crimean Tatar collective memory. For this, I focused on what *Bayrak* meant for the permanent Crimean Tatar readers at the time. Interviews demonstrate that *Bayrak* had a mainly positive place in the current Tatar intellectuals' memory, though it depends on the person addressed. For instance, activists' perception of it is more or less negative. Moreover, this memory was fed by the indirect methods Crimean Tatar literati used in the newspaper, and *Cesaret* pages and other discourse with similar content in the newspaper. However, I hesitate to expand my remarks to the ordinary Crimean Tatars, whose relations with *Bayrak* need to be studied in further research. The main findings indicate that *Bayrak* had a significant function for the Crimean Tatar culture, literature and written language, so did other Crimean Tatar institutions. Current Crimean Tatar cadres were in one way or another affiliated or connected with these institutions.

Throughout the thesis, two groups of terms/concepts related to internal and external dynamics are utilized to elaborate the Crimean Tatar experience in exile. In other words, concepts such as diaspora, chosen trauma, homeland, family and collective memory are about internal dynamics of the Crimean Tatar community; whereas, the impact of the state and the nature of interethnic relations determined the group's identification. Recollections on the deportation, chosen trauma, and the homeland Crimea were essential elements which enhanced Crimean Tatariness and/or ethnic/national group consciousness in exile, and the Crimean Tatar collective memory was based on these elements.

Along with the 1944 deportation, the homeland Crimea was in the centre of conversations, narratives, and their daily life; food, music on radio and of the ensemble, and the newspaper despite the censorship. The interviews show that the family/family visits was a crucial site where recollections on the aforesaid independently circulated and transferred to children and younger generations, who either never experienced the 'trauma' or were not old enough to remember it. Moreover, the Crimean Tatar environment outside the family such as *toys*, *dua* ceremonies, the youths' picnics, and the national movement meetings might be accepted to add to the centrality of Crimea.

As to diaspora concept, that is necessary for us to differentiate the Crimean Tatar community from other immigrant or deportee communities which did not take part in the diasporization process. That is to say, what made the Crimean Tatar community distinct from other deportee groups in the Soviet Union was its organizational success and ability to carry out oppositional process in spite of harsh Soviet pressure. Obviously, not all deported communities, e.g. Koreans and Germans, succeeded in developing and organized opposition for return. The ones who dared such as Ahıska Turks could not promote and maintain in-group solidarity as much as Crimean Tatars did.

In addition to the internal dynamics, external factors such as interethnic relations (of Tatars with locals) and discriminatory policies of the Soviet state were focused on as the additional elements enhancing the Crimean Tatar identity in exile. In this context, censorship might be evaluated as a form of state policy which banned the use of specific words and concepts reminding Crimean Tatars of Crimea in *Bayrak*. This led some of Crimean Tatar writers to use indirect/allegoric methods in their writings referring to Crimea and problematic topics such as accusations. In fact, in spite of censorship, the articles about Crimean Tatar participants in the war, which were purposeful writings, were *Bayrak's* most significant output during its lifetime. For sure, cadres raised in *Bayrak* and Crimean Tatar literature and written language sustained thanks to it and literati affiliated to it. These cannot be underestimated.

However, the findings of my research indicate that *cesaret* pages/articles, which endeavored to clear Tatar people's name from the accusations, made the paper distinctive. Unfortunately, since it was published in the native language, those printed in it were limited to and circulated only among Crimean Tatar people, not reaching the mass Soviet people.

While studying a group from a constructivist approach, one needs to focus on the interaction between the external and internal factors that shape the identity of the diaspora community. The fieldwork data has shown that the 1944 deportation caused the formation of Crimean Tatar diasporas. It has also shown that the deportation and the discriminatory policies which followed the deportation including the special settlement regime and its afterwards shaped and strengthened the diaspora identity (the Crimean Tatar national identity), and the strategies adopted by the elite for returning to the homeland, and keeping the Crimean Tatar identity alive.

The documentary research has revealed that, under different conditions, Crimean Tatar diasporas struggled for their identity and homeland Crimea in different ways. These conditions were again determined by the state policies. For example, when we compare *Dergi* and *Emel* with *Bayrak*, we see that there are major differences as to their rhetoric and styl. Since the periodicals, *Emel* and *Dergi*, in the West were published uncensored, they were able to defend the Crimean cause openly. For instance, from the very beginning, *Emel* declared that it was the organ of the National Movement of the Crimean Tatars, while *Bayrak* had no such mission and even hardly mentioned about Crimea. Besides, since the representatives of the outer Crimean Tatar diaspora were also the writers in *Emel*, they determined the periodical's rhetoric. *Emel* and *Dergi*'s rhetoric and references were mostly anti-Soviet and Russian and anti-communist while *Bayrak*'s discourse was the opposite, anti-capitalist and anti-West, with references were on Leninism.

Moreover, *Emel* and *Dergi* put forward some topics such as the nationality issue of the USSR, self-determination of captured nations of the Soviet colonialism, and the

détente policies of the Cold War in accordance with the direction of the outer diaspora. For instance, the outer diaspora of the Movement in *Emel* struggled and advocated a free Crimea colonized by the USSR, while *Bayrak* was defending the freedom of the colonized nations by the West in the international arena. Furthermore, the times when the relationship among the Western and Soviet blocs tended to improve, were painful for the outer diaspora. They opposed such tendencies and policies within the Western bloc, and they indicated in *Emel* that they wished to see a united and strong front against the USSR and communism. The outer diaspora in *Emel* had a chance to mention and support the inner diaspora and its organization in the USSR.

Bayrak, due to its affiliations with the Uzbek state and censorship, had no traces of open and political support for the National Movement. All it did was sustain the Crimean Tatar language if possible. However, *Bayrak*'s staff resorted to some veiled ways as referred to many times. Thus, interviewees apart from activists evaluated anything recalling the homeland Crimea as national movement such as a folk song triggering national feelings, a dance reminding old feasts, a performance, an article about a Crimean Tatar historical figure, or a poem.

However, a deeper analysis sheds light onto the fact that, although differently, under different conditions, the two publications, *Bayrak* and *Emel*,⁵⁵³ contributed to keep alive the national consciousness and the desire to return to the homeland by reminding Crimea in every means possible. Thus, the major common point of these publications is their dedication to keeping the image of Crimea vivid in the minds of the Crimean Tatars, and this may be considered as an important contribution to the Crimean Tatar National Movement. Although *Emel* and *Dergi* are not as intensively studied in this thesis as is *Lenin Bayragı*, it was possible to compare what the outer diaspora of Crimean Tatars did for giving support to the National Movement and the

⁵⁵³ As stated before, *Dergi* was not staffed only by Crimean Tatar, and published for them. Please find footnotes 9 and 552. It could only contribute for the Crimean Tatar elite consciousness in the West and Turkey.

way they contributed to the movement. Comparing *Dergi* and *Emel* with *Bayrak* sheds light also onto the repressive and totalitarian nature of the Soviet regime and the pressure on the inner diaspora of the Crimean Tatars.

Even though Crimean Tatar literati who were affiliated with a communist newspaper sometimes had to print articles, blackening the activists, in the paper, they were Tatars living with their cokin, joining national movement meetings under the disguise of *toys* and *duas*. Only they did not struggle and suffered as much as their co-kin activists. Some of them appealed to other non-political ways of struggle, as there were convinced communists among them. In fact, *Bayrak's* staff are aware of that, on one side, there are activists who struggled for the return to Crimea and suffered because of it, and on the other side, there were those who worked in a newspaper organically part of the Uzbek state and forced to print articles slandering the activists. Probably for this reason, they tend to consider the national movement not only limited by political struggle but broader, including their deeds. However, activists seemingly do not esteem what they referred to. At least, activists do not consider the activities around *Bayrak* as the national movement.

In 1950s, the Crimean Tatar National Movement emerged with the aim of achieving the repatriation of the Crimean Tatar people to Crimea, the restoration of Crimean ASSR, and the rehabilitation of the people. After a half-century struggle, the Movement could only achieve the repatriation to Crimea; that is, according to Cengiz Dağcı, it remade Crimea homeland again.⁵⁵⁴ In spite of decrees regarding the rehabilitation issue, all attempts could not go beyond paperwork and could not clear people's name. As for the restoration of the Crimean ASSR, an autonomous entity came to life in the early 1990s. However, that was not the one Crimean Tatars struggled to create because they were not its co-founder.

⁵⁵⁴ Celal İçten, "Cengiz Dağcı Anavatanına Kavuştu", **Bahçesaray**, no. 68, 2011, p. 3

More than two decades after the Soviet Union disintegrated, the Russian Federation completed Crimea's integration, which she could not achieve in 1990s due to its powerless state and the turmoil she got through. However, the *Mejlis* opposed to the referendum held in Crimea and the invasion in March, 2014, that is, a Russian future. People affiliated with *Mejlis* declared that Crimean Tatars' future relied on Ukraine. They knew that invasion of Crimea by Russia did mean dark news for their own people. The occasions which took place since March, 2014, such as the cancellation of commemorating the 70th anniversary of the 1944 deportation, the ban of Cemilev's entering to Crimea for five years, the harassment of Crimean Tatar representatives and journalists by armed men, so-called Crimean self-defense, and the pressures against the *Mejlis* by the local authority and Crimea's prosecutor general appointed by Moscow are clues to what is coming for Crimean Tatars in the following period. A recent report submitted by the UN Human Rights Office already states that the "leaders and activists of the indigenous Crimean Tatar people face prosecution and limitations on the enjoyment of their cultural rights."⁵⁵⁵ Moreover, although it is not an *en masse* migration, already a few thousand Crimean Tatars responded to the Russian invasion by fleeing Crimea, and settling in Ukraine's safer regions.

The process, that is, invasion of Crimea and possible secession of Ukraine due to the incidents in the eastern regions since the February and March, 2014, showed that Ukrainian people's attachment and loyalty to the Ukrainian state and people's Ukrainian consciousness were loose. For instance, some Ukrainian soldiers surrendered and left their garrisons, and some even deserted to the Russian side. However, a few hundred thousand Crimean Tatars proved that they, at least in Crimean territory, were more loyal to Ukraine than any other ethnic group in Ukraine, probably more than Ukrainians.

⁵⁵⁵ "Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine", **Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**, June 15, 2014, (available) <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/UA/HRMMUReport15June2014.pdf>, 19.06.2014

While the research was carried out in Simferopol from February to May of 2013, Crimea was part of Ukraine, and no one would anticipate such turmoil in the peninsula. Whilst the field research, the relation among the Crimean Tatar *Mejlis* and the Crimean Autonomous entity was of course tense, but not as it is now, and the situation in the peninsula was still. Lenin square of Simferopol, which witnessed demonstrations and celebrations of pro-Russian groups in February and March, 2014, had been most of the time still, except for organizing one or two meetings of Crimean Tatars. Moreover, according to the most of the Crimean Tatar informants, their most urgent problem was education, e.g., Crimean Tatar schools, and language. However, when the year turned to 2014, currently the most urgent problem has become the survival of the Crimean Tatar nation and its political institutions under Russian rule.

To sum up, the Russian invasion of Crimea in 2014 means the second Russian invasion of the peninsula since 1783, hence new developments and new possibilities to research for researchers. After the events settled down, if they find a safer and peaceful Crimea and Ukraine just as they did before these events, the researchers will focus on the current state. The Russian invasion might possibly have revived the old fears for Crimean Tatars, together with some questions: Would the Russian invasion cause the anxiety of loosening homeland? Would the deportation reoccur? Would the Crimean Tatar people experience the same struggle for survival? Would this trigger a new trauma for them? Will it be possible to carry out ethnographic/field research on Crimean Tatars in the peninsula?

REFERENCES

Lenin Bayragı and Yanı Dünya (Primary Sources)

‘Amethan Sultan’, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 29, April 11, 1965, p. 4

“33 Yıl”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 154, 29 Aralık 1990, s. 1

“Gayrıdan Kuruv ve Milletlarara Münasebetler””, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 63, May 30, 1989, p. 3

“Halktan Ayırılğanga Berilgen Tazir”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 55, May 5, 1984, p. 4

“Hatırla Arkadaş!”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 27, March 4, 1975, p. 3

“Hatırla Arkadaş!”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 39, April 1, 1975, p. 3

“Hatırla Arkadaş!”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 41, April 5, 1975, p. 3

“İç Kimse Unutılmadı, İç Bir Şey Unutılmadı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 58, May 9, 1986, p. 2-3.

“Kanatlı Omür”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 24, February 23, 1971, p. 3;

“Kırım Tatarlarına Mensup Bir Gruppa Şahslarnen Subet”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 129, October 31, 1987, p. 4

“Kırım Tatarlarının Vekillerinen Ameliy Korüşüv”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 92, August 4, 1987, p. 1

“Muim İş”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 117, September 30, 1967, p. 1

“Munasip Vekiller”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 93, August 6, 1987, p. 1

“Munasip Vekiller”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 94, August 8, 1987, p. 1

“Munasip Vekiller”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 95, August 11, 1987, p. 4.

“Provokatsiyanın Ogü Alındı” **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 123, October 17, 1987, p. 4

“Samimiy Teşekkür”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 109, September 12, 1967, p. 1.

“Sokak Numayışları, Miting”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 120, October 10, 1987, p. 4

“Sokur Yol Kosterici Kayda Alıp Bara”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 122, October 15, 1987, p. 4

“TASS Bildirüvü”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 88, July 25, 1987, p. 2

“Tatar Milletinden Olıp Kırım’da Yaşagan Grajdanlar Akkında”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 108, September 9, 1967, p. 1

“Vatanga Raport: Plan Toldurıldı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 100, December 14, 1958, p. 1

“Yolumız Vatanga”, **Yanı Dünya**, no. 52, December 25, 1991, s. 2

Abducemilev, E.: “Avesliknen Okuylar”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 102, December 21, 1958, p. 4

Abdulkadir, M.: “Tilimizni Ogrenemiz”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 149, December 14, 1967, p. 4

Abdullayev, Nuri: “Studentlernin Dikkatına”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 54, June 15, 1965, p. 3

Akim, F.: “Topçılarnın Korandası”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 70, December 29, 1957, p. 4

Aladin, Şamil: “Yazıcılarımız Uzbekistan Edebiyatı ve Sanatı Dekadasında”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 1, May 1, 1957, p. 4

Alçikov, Arsen: “Nuri Dogrusını Yazdı”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 69, July 20, 1965, p. 4

Alyadin, Şamil: 'Koryüşüv', **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 16, February 23, 1958, p. 4

Ametov, Ablyamit: “Aklı Talaplar”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 12, June 9, 1957, p. 4

Ametov, C.: “Abdulla Dermenci”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 46, April 15, 1980, p. 3

Ametov, Ç.: “Yurekte Olsa-Elde Olur”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 2, January 5, 1961, p. 4

Ametov, Kyazım: “Mektüpler, Mektüpler, Mektüpler”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 104, September 6, 1988, p. 4

Amit, Emil: “Dyadya Volodya”, **Lenin Bayragi**, no. 79, July 8, 1989, p. 4

Asanov, Suleyman: "Karamannın Kabiri Ustündeki Guller", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 7, January 16, 1975, p. 3

Bekirov, B.: "Otmek-Zenginligimiz", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 120, October 15, 1988, p. 4

Bilyalov, İ.: "Men Siz Tutkan Yolını Ukyüm Etem", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 12, January 27, 1987, p. 3

Bolat, Yusuf: "Uç Korüşüv", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 15, February 20, 1958, p. 4

Burnaş, Remzi: "Gazetamız, Sensin Menim Ana Tilim!", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 138, November 18, 1967, p. 4

Camanaklı, K.: 'Amethan Sultan', **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 78, September 28, 1958, p. 3

Çelebi, Celal: "Bu ne? Sebep mi? Manaçık mı?", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 113, 1965, p. 4

Dermenci, A.: "Olarnı Unutmamız", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 30, April 15, 1965, p. 3

Eldar, R.: "Kırım Tatar Milli Estrada Ansambli", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 1, May 1, 1957, p. 4

Emirov, A.: "Yaroslav Şeerinin Fahriy Grajdanı", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 42, April 5, 1980, p. 3

Emirov, İzzet and Şevket Asanov, "Beşterek Dervizasında", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 112, September 24, 1988, p. 4

Emirov, İzzet: "Uruş Yollarından 1417 Kun ve Gece", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 33, April 25, 1965, p. 3

Emirova, Adile: "Vatan Asreti", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 14, February 1, 1990, p. 4

Gafarova, S.: "Halk Takdirinin Buruluş Noktasında", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 18, February 10, 1990, p. 3

Grigoryev, A.: **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 121, October 13, 1987, p. 3

Halid, Rıza: "Pakizenin Anası", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 21, February 18, 1975, p. 2

Hatipov, İ.: "Ana Yurtuna", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 75, June 28, 1988, p. 3

Hayırov, İzzet: "Gazetanı Epimiz Okumalımız", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 64, July 8, 1965, p. 3

Ismailova, Urmus: "Gazetanı Epimiz Okumalımız", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 64, July 8, 1965, p. 3

İskenderov, Ş.: "Halktan Ayırılığannın Yardımcıları", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 43, April 1, 1986, p. 4

Kandımov, Yunus: "Aydınlık Kerek, Aydınlık...", **Yanı Dünya**, no. 52, December 25, 1991, p. 3

Kandımov, Yunus: "Tarih ve Biz", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 116, October 4, 1988, p. 3

Kerimov, İsmail: "Bizler Artık Kene Eski 'Yanı Dünya'mız", **Yanı Dünya**, no.1, January 3, 1991, p. 3

Lavrinenko, V. D.: 'Yakın Dostum', **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 3, May 9, 1957, p. 2

Memiş, Reşid: “Ak Kanatlar”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 105, September 2, 1980, p. 4

Minkin, İ.: “Eki Cebenin Karamanı”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 73, July 29, 1965, p. 3

Moloçnikov, Memet: “Unutulmaz Kunler”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 32, April 22, 1965, p. 4

Murad, Reşid: ‘Karaman’, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 3, May 9, 1957, p. 2

Muratov, Gani: “Bir Kaç Teklif”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 5, May 16, 1957, p. 4

Murtazayev, Z.: “20 Yıldan Son”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 50, June 22, 1961, p. 3

Nagayev, Safter: “Acımuşkay Batırları”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 4, January 8, 1980, p. 3

Nagayev, Safter: “yaratıcılık Yolu”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 4, January 9, 1988, p. 4

Ozenbaşlı, Amet: “Deniz Sevdası”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 56, May 11, 1967, p. 3

Ponomarev, V.: “Dalga Kopüksiz Olmey”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 91, August 1, 1987, p. 4

Rahmat, Adham: “Karaman”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 16, February 23, 1961, p. 2

Ramazanov, Nariman: “Okuyucularımızın İstekleri”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 49, June 18, 1961, p. 3

Ramazanov, Ş.: “Peyda Oluvi Arfesinde”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 11, January 24, 1980, p. 4

Selimov, Ş.: “Ana Tilge-Ayrıca Emiyet”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 10, January 23, 1988, p. 4

Selimov, Ş.: “Kamış-Burundan Drezdengece”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 3, January 9, 1975, p. 3

Selyamet, Enver: “Canlı Dağlar”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 20, September 2, 1975, p. 3

Şemizade, Eşref: 'Mustafa Suphi', **Lenin Bayragı**, no.11, February 6, 1958, p. 4

Telerman, M.: “Karamannın Hatırlav Akşamında”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 16, February 23, 1958, p. 3

Tsavro, Y., and Gofman, I.: “Deklaratsiyadan-Areketke”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 153, December 28, 1989, p. 4

Ukrainka, Lesya: “Umüt”, **Lenin Bayragı**, Trans. by. Çerkez Ali, no. 21, February 16, 1971, p. 3.

Umerov, B., and Asanin, I.: “Meraklı Bir Kitap”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 24, February 25, 1967, p. 4

Umerov, Bekir: “Dyadya Volodya”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 38, May 9, 1965, p. 4

Umerov, Ervin: “Karaman”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 31, March 14, 1967, p. 4

Usein, Abduraman: “Yazıcılarımızga Talabımız”, **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 12, June 9, 1957, p. 4

Usmanov, I.: 'Matbuatımız Osüv Yolunda', **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 35, May 1, 1965, p. 2

Valiyev, R.: "Halktan Ayırılğan, ya da İftiracı Kimge Hizmet Ete Edi", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 23, February 18, 1984, p. 4

Veliev, Ablaziz: "Meraba, Vatan!", **Yanı Dünya**, no. 1, January 1, 1992, s. 2

Veliev, Ablyaziz: "Oylarım, Siz, Menim Oylarım..." **Yanı Dünya**, August 22, 1998, p. 3

Velişayeva, Zekiye: "Omürimiznin Kuzgüsü", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 124, October 17, 1967, p. 4

Yakupova, Venera: "Ya Vatan ya Ölüm", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 15, February 3, 1990, p. 3

Yanayev, G.: "KırımTatar Halkının Problemaları Boyunca Komissiyasının Hulasaları ve Teklifleri", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 13, January 30, 1990, p. 2

Zaredinov, Y.: "Urmetli Ekim", **Lenin Bayragı**, no. 19, March 6, 1958, p. 3

Dergi and Emel

(**Russkaya Misl**, Paris, no 3684, 31 July 1987, p. 5) in **Emel**, Ankara, no. 162, year 27, 1987, p. 5-10

'Muhtelif Haberler', **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 8, year 3, 1957, p. 123-124

"Basından", **Emel**, no. 15, year 3, 1963, p. 32

"Brejnev Yardım Arıyor!", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 77, year 13, 1973, p. 48

“Devlet Komisyonu ile İlgili Tavır”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 178, year 30, 1990, p. 7

“Haberler”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 166, year 28, 1988, p. 41-42

“Haberler”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 169, year 28, 1988, p. 40

“Haberler”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 175, year 29, 1989, p. 48-51

“Haberler”, **Emel**, no. 25, year 4, 1964, p. 36

“In Reappearing”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 1, year 1, 1960, p. 4

“In Reappearing”, **Emel**, Ankara, no.1, year 1, 1960, p. 4

“Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Birinci Yılı Faaliyet Raporu”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 179, year 29, 1990, p. 26

“Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Merke Şurası’nın 1 Ağustos 1989 Tarihli Kararı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 173, year 29, 1989, p. 9

“Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Merke Şurası’nın II. Toplantısının Tutanağı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 176, year 30, 1990, p. 19

“Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı Merkez Şurası’nın İlk Toplantısının Tutanağı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 174, year 29, 1989, p. 12

“Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi Teşkilatı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 172, year 29, 1989, p. 3-15

“Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi’nin Teşebbüs Gruplarının 11-12 Nisan 1987 Tarihinde Taşkent’te Yapmış Oldukları Toplantı Hakkındaki Açıklaması”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 163, year 27, 1987, p. 3

“Kırım Tatar Milli Kurultayı’nın SSCB Başkanına, SSCB Yüksek Sovyetine, Ukrayna SCB Yüksek Sovyetine Müracaatı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 185, year 31, 1991, p. 9

“Kırım Türklerinin Taleplerini İncelemek İçin Oluşturulan Devlet Komisyonunun Bildirisi”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 166, year 28, 1988, p. 33

“Kırım’a Dönmekte Olan Kırım Türkleri’nin Durumu”, **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 63, year 17, 1971, p. 55-72

“KTMH Teşebbüsçüleri Kırım Bölgesi Toplantısına Katılanların Duyurusu”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 175, year 29, 1989, p. 37

“KTMHT Merkez Şurası’nın Kırım Muhtar Sovyet Sosyalist Cumhuriyeti’nin Yeniden Teşkiline Dair Ukrayna SSC Kanunu Hakkında Açıklaması”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 182-183, year 31, 1991, p. 10-11

“Kürt Meselesi Birleşmiş Milletlerde”, **Emel**, no. 17, year 3, 1963, p. 25

“Kurultay’ın Kırım Tatar Halkı’na Müracaatı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 185, year 31, 1991, p. 5

“Moskova’da Yapılan Bir Toplantı”, **Emel**, no. 47, year 8, 1968, p. 7

“Moskova’daki Kırım Tatar Temsilcilerinin 6 Temmuz’da Kızıl Meydan’da Yaptıkları Gösteri ile İlgili açıklama”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 161, year 27, 1987, p. 55

“Muhtıralar”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 13, year 3, 1962, p. 27-29

“Mülakat”, **Emel**, no. 42, year 7, 1967, p. 13

“Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırimoğlu ile Yapılan bir Konuşma”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 181, year 30, 1990, p. 3

“Mustafa Cemiloğlu Öldü mü, Yaşıyor mu?”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 94, year 16, 1976, p. 33

“Sayın Okuyucularımıza”, **Emel**, no. 47, year 8, 1968, p. 1

“Sovyet Dökümanlarından”, **Emel**, no. 51, year 9, 1969, p. 12-15

“Sovyetler Birliği Halklarına Müracat”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 172, year 29, 1989, p. 27

“Sovyetler Birliği’ndeki Kırım Tatarları İnisiyatif Gruplarının 13-14 Haziran 1987’de Taşkent’teki İkinci Toplantıları Hakkında Yaptıkları Açıklama”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 161, year 27, 1987, p. 43

“Sürgündeki Kırımlılar”, **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 64, year 11, 1971, p. 35-37

“Taşkent’te Protesto Gösterileri” **Emel**, Ankara, no. 167, year 28, 1988, p. 45

“Tatarlar Moskova’ya Karşı Mücadeleye Devam Ediyorlar”, **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 5-7

“Tatarların Davası”, **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 18-20

“Vatan Kırım’a Öncelikle Döndürülecek Olan Kırım Tatarları”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 166, year 28, 1988, p. 39

“Vatan Kırım’ın Bahesaray ehrinde Kırım Trkleri ile Ruslar Arasındaki Gerginlik Sryor”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 174, year 29, 1989, p. 37

Ala, M.: “Kırım’da Salomon Krym Hkmeti”, **Emel**, no. 27, year 5, Istanbul, 1965, p. 10-15

Ala, M.: “Kırım’da Sleyman Sulkiewicz Hkmeti”, **Emel**, no. 11, year 2, Ankara, 1962, p. 14-17

Ala, M.: “Kırım’ı Boleviklerin Birinci İgali”, **Emel**, no. 7, year 2, Ankara, 1961, p. 10-12

Ala, M.: “Rusların Kırım’da Latin ve Rus Harflerini Kabul Ettirme Sebepleri”, **Emel**, Istanbul, no. 31, year 11, 1965, p. 19

Badrettdin, Sabirjan: Garip Sultan, aatay, Tahir: “Sovyet Rusya’da Milletler Meselesi zlms mdr?”, **Emel**, Istanbul, no. 66, year 11, 1971, p. 7

Cemilev, Reat Gafarolu: “Kırım Tatar Milli Meselesinin Son Durumuna Bir Bakı”, **Emel**, Ankara, no. 176, year 30, 1990, p. 4

Dergi Correspondent, ‘Moskova’nın Srgn Ettiėi ve İmha Ettiėi Milletler’, **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliėini Öğrenme Enstits, Munich, no. 9, year 3, 1957, p. 119-124

Dergi, no.1, year 1, Munich, 1955, p. 2.

Dergi, no.2, year 1, Munich, 1955, p. 130

Emel, Ankara, no. 176, year 30, 1990, p. 43-49

Emel, İstanbul, no. 110, year 19, 1979, p. 42

Emel, İstanbul, no. 70, year 12, 1972, p. 13, 35

Emel, İstanbul, no. 93, year 16, 1976

Sierzputowski, Jozef Attoni: "Başka Anadan", **Emel**, no. 23, year 4, İstanbul, 1964, p. 23-38

Karatay, Zafer: "Kırım Türklerinin Moskova Gösterileri Nasıl Başladı-Nasıl Cerayan Etti", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 161, year 27, 1987, p. 19

Karça, Ramazan: 'Review-I.P. Tsameryan: Razvitiye Natsionalnih Otnosheniy v Period Razvernutoyo Stroitelstva Kommunizma', **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 19, year 6, 1960, p. 100

Kırımal, Edige: "Kırım Türkleri", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, no. 59, year 16, 1970, p. 20

Kırımal, Edige: "Kırım'da Sovyetlerin Din siyaseti", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 1, no. 1, 1955, p. 57-58

Kırımal, Edige: "Kırım'da Topyekûn Tehcir ve Katliam", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 2, no. 5, 1956, p. 13-34

Kırımal, Edige: "Moskova'nın Sürgün ve İmha Ettiği Milletler" **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 3, no. 9, 1957, p. 119-124

Kırımal, Edige: "Sovyet Rusya Hâkimiyeti Altında Kırım", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliğini Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 13, no. 49, 1967, p. 59-66

Kırımoğlu, Mustafa Abdülcemil: "Kırım Tatarlarının Anavatanlarına Dönüşlerindeki Dikenli Yol", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 175, year 29, 1989, p. 5-6

Kurtulan, İldeniz: "Ulusal Azerbaycan Yayınlarında 'Kırım' Konuları", **Emel**, no. 7, year 2, Ankara, 1961, p. 18-22

Ortaylı, Kemal: "Bir Sovyet Müellifinin Kırım Türkleri ve Mazileri Hakkında İftiraları", **Dergi**, Sovyetler Birliği Öğrenme Enstitüsü, Munich, year 9, no. 34, 1963, p. 62

Selim, Ş. ve Kandımov, Y.: "Yalta'da Neler Oluyor", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 180, year 30, 1990, p. 12

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Avrupa Güvenlik ve İşbirliği Konferansı", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 90, year 15, 1975, p. 1-8

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Bir Facianın Yıldönümü", **Emel**, no. 5, year 1, 1961, p. 3

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Büyük Facianın 23. Yıl Dönümü", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 40, year 7, 1967, p. 1-4

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer ve Kırım Davası", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 27, year 5, 1965, p. 2

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Doğu ve Batı Blokları", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 21, year 4, 1964, p. 4

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Esir Milletler Haftası ve Ötesi", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 23, year 4, 1964, p. 4

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Kırım Kurultay'ının 50. Yıl Dönümü", **Emel**, no. 43, year 8, 1967, p. 11

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Kırım Türklerinin Hakları Meselesi", **Emel**, no. 44, year 8, 1968, p. 3

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Kırım Türkünün Faciası ve Kurtuluş Davası", **Emel**, no. 11, year 2, 1962, p. 7

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Kırımlı Şehit Mustafa Cemiloğlu", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 93, year 16, 1976, p. 7

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "SALT II İmzalandı, Fakat...", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 113, year 19, 1979, p. 1-6

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Silahsızlanma Konferansı ve Esir Milletler", **Emel**, Ankara, no. 10, year 2, 1962, p. 4-5

Ülküsal, Müstecip: "Sovyetler Birliği'nde Polisin Tutuklamak İstedığı Bir Tatar Kensini Yaktı", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 107, year 18, 1978, p. 4

Warsz, Alexandre: "Kırım Tatarlarının Faciası", **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 13-15

Yurtsever, A. Vahap: "Cafer Beye Dair Hatıralarım/ Memories on Mr. Cafer", **Emel**, İstanbul, no. 4, year 1, 1961, p. 16

Zorza, Victor: "Kırım Tatarları Müdafilerini Kaybettiler", **Emel**, no. 52, year 9, 1969, p. 16-17

Other Sources

"American Committee for Liberation's Mission Redefined" July 30, 1954, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWHIP by A. Ross Johnson. Referenced Ch1 p34 in his book Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, CIA

mandatory declassification review document number C01434012. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114488>

"American Committee for Liberation's Mission Redefined" July 30, 1954, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Referenced Ch1 p34 in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01434012. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114488>

"CIA Criticism of American Committee for Liberation Mission Statement" April 12, 1954, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01434011. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114479>

"Office of Policy Coordination History of American Committee for Liberation" August 21, 1951, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited Ch1 n60 in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01441005. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114354>

"Office of Policy Coordination History of American Committee for Liberation" August 21, 1951, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited Ch1 n60 in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, CIA mandatory declassification review document number C01441005. <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114354>

"An Appeal from Representatives of the Crimean Tatar People to the People of the World", **In Quest of Justice**, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 205

"Appeal of the Crimean Tatar people to the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", **A Chronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 142

"Appeal of the Crimean Tatar People to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to the Soviet Press, to All Communists", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no.19-20 (19), 1971, p. 182

"Appeal of the Crimean Tatar People to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to the Soviet Press, to All Communists", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 144

"Appeal of the Crimean Tatar People to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to the Soviet Press, to All Communists", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 27, 1973, p. 302

"Appeal to K. Waldheim, Secretary-General of the U N, and the Human Rights Commission", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 34-36 (34), 1978 (1977), p. 46

"Çanakkale Milletvekili Ahmet Nihat Akay'ın 'Esir Milletler Haftası' ile ilgili yazılı soru önergesine Dışişleri Bakanı Ferudun Cemal Erkin'in cevabı", **Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi**, cilt 16, 1. Dönem, 80. Birleşim, May 13, 1963, p. 666-668, (available) <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanaklar/TUTANAK/MM/d01/c016/mm01016080.pdf>, 03.03.2014

"Captive Nations Week", Public Law 86-90, July 17, 1959, (available),<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-73/pdf/STATUTE-73-Pg212.pdf>, 03.03.2014

"Captive Nations Week", **Svoboda Ukrainian Weekly**, Saturday, July22, 1972

"Crimea", **Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), p. 226

"Crimean Operation of 1944", **Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 13, 1976, p. 231

“Crimean Tatar”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 13, 1976, p. 231

“Documents: ‘...Defense Speech of Mustafa Jemilev (1970)’”, **Tatars of the Crimea Their Struggle for Survival**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1988, p.

“Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union of 1941-1945”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia**(Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 4, 1974, p. 336

“Kabarda-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 11, 1976, p. 320

“Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 11, 1976, p. 365

“Karachai-Cherkess Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, **Bol’shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopedia** (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), New York, Macmillan, translation of 3rd edition, vol. 11, 1976, p. 413

“Ludmila Alekseyeva, **Soviet Dissent**, Connecticut, Weslean University, 1985, p. 147” in Hamdi Mert, **Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu**, Ankara, Bilig Yayınları, 2000, p. 42-43

“P. G. Grigorenko on Tatar Rights”, **In Quest of Justice**, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 208

“Persecution of Crimean Tatars”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 51, 1979, p. 114-120

“Persecution of Crimean Tatars”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 52, 1980, p. 80-87

“Persecution of the Crimean Tatars”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no.19-20 (19), 1971, p. 182

“Statements of Crimean Tatars from Crimea”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 134-137, 153, 159-160

“The Crimean Tatars”, **Uncensored Russia**, ed.by. Peter Reddaway, New York, American Heritage Press, 1972, p. 254

“The Meaning of the 'Rehabilitation' of Deported Peoples in the USSR an Analysis by the American Committee for Liberation”, **Svoboda Ukrainian Weekly**, Saturday, February 23, 1957

“The Trial of Dzheppar Akimov”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 129

“Trial of Reshat Dzhemilev”, **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 28-31 (31), 1975 (1974), p. 131

Ağanoğlu, H. Yıldırım: **Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyete Balkanlar’ın Makus Talihi Göç**, İstanbul, Kum Saati, 2011

Alexeyeva, Ludmilla: “Mustafa Jemiloglu, His Character and Convictions”, **The Tatars of Crimea Return to the Homeland**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1998, p. 213

Aliyev, Şeryan: **Çağala: Şiirler ve Poema**, Tashkent, Edebiyat ve Sanat Neşriyatı, 1981

Alptekin, İsa Yusuf: **İsa Yusuf Alptekin'in Mücadele Hatıraları Esir Doğu Türkistan İçin-1**, Berikan Yayınevi, Ankara, 2010

Altug, Fevzi: **Thornbush: Memoirs of a Crimean Tatar Nationalist and Educator Relating to the Russian Civil War and the Famine of 1921-1922**, trans. by. Inci A. Bowman, the Isis Press, Istanbul, 2004

Amalrik, Andrei: **Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984**, New York, Harper and Row, 1970

Andreyev, Catherine: **Vlasov and the Russian Liberation Movement: Soviet Reality and Emigré Theories**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2004

Aydingün, Ismail, and Aydingün, Ayşegül: "Crimean Tatars Return Home: Identity and Cultural Revival", **Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies**, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2007, p. 113-128

Aydingün, Ayşegül, and Yıldırım, Erdoğan: "Perception of Homeland among Crimean Tatars: Cases from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Crimea", **Bilig**, No. 54, 2010, p. 21-44

Berkhoff, Karel C.: **Harvest of Despair**, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004

Bilyalov, Seityagya, İzzet Hayrov, Adil Seytbekirov and Ajredinov, Pevat: "Baş Sözü Yerine" in İdris Asanin, **Adalet Kureşi Saflarında**, Simferopol, Kırım Devlet Neşriyatı, 2002, p. 11-12

Boiter, Albert: "Samizdat: Primary Source Material in the Study of Current Soviet Affairs", **Russian Review**, Vol. 31, No. 3, July, 1972

Bray, Zoe: "Ethnographic Approaches", **Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences**, Ed. by. Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 296-315

Brazier, Jana Evans, and Mannur, Anita: "Nation, Migration, Globalization: Points of Contention in Diaspora Studies", **Theorizing Diaspora A Reader**, Ed. by. Jana Evans Brazier and Anita Mannur, Malden, Blackwell Publishing, 2005, p. 1-22

Brumberg, Abraham: "The Rise of Dissent in the USSR", **In Quest of Justice**, Ed. by. Abraham Brumberg, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970, p. 3-14

Bryman, Alan: **Social Research Methods**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004

Butler, Kim D.: "Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse", *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2001, p. 189-219

Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, **Bazı Hatıralar**, Emel Vakfı, İstanbul, 1993

Cemiloglu, Mustafa: "A History of the Crimean Tatar National Liberation Movement: A Sociopolitical Perspective", **Crimea: Dynamics, Challenges, and Prospects**, Ed. by. Maria Drohobysky, Boston, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1995, p. 87-105

Clifford, James: "Diasporas", **Cultural Anthropology**, vol.9, no.3, 1994, p.302- 338

Conquest, Robert: **The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities**, London, Macmillan, 1960

Cwiklinski, Sebastian: "20. Yüzyılın Sonundan 2. Dünya Savaşı'nın Başlangıcına Kadar Berlin'deki Tatarlar ve Başkurtlar", **Türkler**, Ankara, vol. 18, 2002, p. 886-897

Dağcı, Cengiz: **Hatıralarda Cengi Dağcı**, İstanbul, Ötüken, 1998, p. 48

David, Matthew, and Sutton, Carole D.: **Social Research**, Oxford, Sage, 2004

Davies, Sarah: "Us against Them": Social Identity in Soviet Russia, 1934-41", **Russian Review**, Vol. 56, No. 1, 1997

Devlet, Nadir: "Kırım Tatarlarında Çağdaş Kültürel Gelişmeler" **Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Dergisi**, İstanbul, Aralık 2008, no. 57, p. 1-16

Devlet, Nadir: "Lenin Bayrağı Gazetesi'nin 25. Yılı ve Kırım Türk Kültürünün Bugünkü Durumu", **Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları**, İstanbul, no.22, 1983, p. 82-90

Ermolaev, Herman: **Censorship in Soviet Literature 1917-1991**, Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield, 1997

Feldbrugge, F.J.M.: **Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union**, Netherlands, A.W. Sijthoff International Publishing Company, 1975

Finnin, Rory: "Forgetting Nothing, Forgetting No One: Boris Chichibabin, Viktor Nekipelov, and the Deportation of the Crimean Tatars", **The Modern Language Review**, Vol. 106, No. 4, 2011, p. 1091-1124

Fischer, George: **Soviet Opposition a Case Study in World War II**, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1970 (first published in 1952)

Fisher, Alan: **The Crimean Tatars**, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1978

Fitzpatrick, Sheila: **Everyday Stalinism**, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 57

Fox, Michael S.: "Glavlit, Censorship and the Problem of Party Policy in Cultural Affairs, 1922-28", **Soviet Studies**, Vol. 44, No. 6, 1992, p. 1045-1068

Fruchet, Henri: "The Use of History the Soviet Historiography of Khan Kenesary Kasimov", **Central Asia Aspects of Transition**, Ed. By. Tom Everett-Heath, New York, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003, p. 132- 145

Furr, Grover: **Khrushchev Lied**, Erythros Press and Media LLC, Ohio, 2011

Gelb, Michael: "An Early Soviet Ethnic Deportation: The Far-Eastern Koreans", **Russian Review**, Vol. 54, No. 3, Jul., 1995, p. 389-412

Grigorenko, Petro G.: **Memoirs**, Trans. by. Thomas P. Whitney, London, Harvill Press, 1983

Gündüz, Tufan: **Alahimanet Bosna: Boşnakların Osmanlı Topraklarına Göçü 1879-1912**, Istanbul, Yeditepe, 2012

Halbwachs, Maurice: **On Collective Memory**, Ed. and trans. by. Lewis A. Coser, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1992

Han, Hüseyin Ikram: **Bir Türkistanlının İkinci Dünya Savaşı Hatıraları**, Istanbul, Bedir, 1999

Harris, Celia B., Paterson, Helen M., and Kemp, Richard I.: "Collaborative Recall and Collective Memory: What Happens When We Remember Together?", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 213-230

Hessler, Julie: "Zoloto dlia industrializatsii: TORGSIN (review)", **Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History**, Vol. 12, No. 2, Spring 2011, p. 518-522

Hirst, William, and Manier, David: "Remembering as Communication: A Family Recounts its Past", **Remembering Our Past**, Ed. by. David C. Rubin, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 271-290

Hirst, William, and Manier, David: "Towards a Psychology of Collective Memory", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 183-200

Hostler, Charles Warren: **The Turks of Central Asia**, Praeger, Westport, 1993

Hutchison, Peggy: Palestinian Resistance Poetry and the Historical Struggle for Liberation, A Master of Arts thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Department of Oriental Studies in the Graduate College The University of Arizona, 1991, p. 46, (Available) http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/278065/1/azutd1346743_sip1_m.pdf, 07.05. 2014.

İçten, Celal: "Cengiz Dağcı Anavatanına Kavuştu", **Bahçesaray**, no. 68, 2011, p. 3

Islamov, Abselyam: **Yıllar ve Yollar**, Tashkent, Gafur Gulam Publishing House, 1985

Jacobs, J. U.: "Diasporic Identity in Contemporary South African Fiction", **English in Africa**, vol. 33, no. 2, 2006, p.

Jacques Vallin, France Meslé, Sergei Adamets and *Serhii* Pyrozhkov, "The Crisis of the 1930s", **Mortality and causes of death in 20th-century Ukraine**, Ed. By. F. Meslé, J. Vallin, London, Springer, 2012, p. 13-38

Kırımal, Edige: **Kırım'da Türk Katliamı**, Trans. by. Kemal V. Gül, İstanbul, Toprak Yayınları, 1962.

Kırımlı, Hakan: "Emigrations from the Crimea to the Ottoman Empire during the Crimean War", **Middle East Studies**, 44:5, 2008, p. 751-773

Kırımlı, Hakan: "Kırım: Rus İdaresi Dönemi", **DİA**, Ankara, cilt 25, 2002, p. 458-465

Kırımlı, Hakan: **Kırım Tatarlarında Milli Kimlik ve Milli Hareketler (1905-1916)**, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2010

Kissenger, Henry: **Diplomasi**, Trans. by. İbrahim Kurt, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006

Kolarz, Walter: **Russia and Her Colonies**, London, George Philip and Son Limited, 1953

Kreindler, Isabelle: "The Soviet Deported Nationalities: A Summary and an Update", **Soviet Studies**, vol. 38, no. 3, 1986, p. 387-405

Lenin Bayragı, **Uzbek Sovet Ensiklopediyasi**, Tashkent, 1975, vol. 6, p. 327.

Lerski, George Jan: **Historical Dictionary of Poland, 966-1945**, Greenwood Press, The USA, 1996

Marshall, Alex: **The Caucasus Under Soviet Rule**, Taylor & Francis Group, New York, 2010

Mert, Hamdi: **Mustafa Abdülcemil Kırımoğlu**, Ankara, Bilig Yayınları, 2000

Miner, Steven Merritt: **Stalin's Holy War: Religion, Nationalism, and Alliance Politics, 1941-1945**, London, The University of North Carolina Press, 2003

Mühlen, Patrik von zur: **Gamalı Haç ile Kızılyıldız Arasında**, Mavi Yayınlar, Ankara, 1984

Nekrich, Aleksandr: **The Punished Peoples**, Trans. By. George Saunders, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1978

O'Connell, Charles T.: "The Munich Institute for the Study of the USSR", **The Carl Beck Papers**, no. 808, 1990

Özcan, Kemal: "Kırım Türklerinin Sürgünü ve Vatana Dönüş için Milli Mücadele Hareketi (1944-1990)", Doctoral Thesis, Istanbul University, İstanbul, 2001

"Persecution of Crimean Tatars", **A Cronicle of Current Events**, Amnesty International Publications, no. 51, 1979, p. 120

Pianciola, Niccolo: "Famine in the Steppe The Collectivization of Agriculture and the Kazak Herdsmen 1928- 1934", **Cahiers du Monde Russe**, vol. 45, no.1, 2004

Pinson, Mark: "From the Danube to the Crimea and Back: The Bulgarian Migration of 1861-1862 in Recent Bulgarian Historiography", **Harvard Ukrainian Studies**, 3/4:2 (1979/1980), p. 662-674

Pinson, Mark: "Russian Policy and the Emigration of the Crimean Tatars to the Ottoman Empire, 1854-1862", p. 105 (Available)<http://www.iudergi.com/tr/index.php/guneydogu/article/viewFile/14589/13805>, 23.12.2012

Pohl, J. Otto: "Stalin's genocide against the 'Repressed Peoples'", **Journal of Genocide Research**, vol. 2, no.2, 2000, p. 267-293

Polian, Pavel: **Against their Will: the History and Geography of Forced Migrations in the USSR**, Budapest, Central European University Press, 2004, p. 60-92

Potichnyj, Peter J.: "The Struggle of the Crimean Tatars", **Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes**, 17:2/3, 1975, p. 302-319

Privratsky, Bruce G.: **Muslim Turkistan**, Great Britain, Curzon Press, 2001

Reddaway, Peter: "The Crimean Tatar Drive for Repatriation: Some Comparisons with Other Movements of Dissident in the Soviet Union", **The Tatars of Crimea Return to the Homeland**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1998, p. 226-236

Reese, Elaine, and Fivush, Robyn: "The Development of Collective Remembering", **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 201-212

Rukkas, Andriy: "Georgian Servicemen in the Polish Armed Forces (1922–39)", **The Journal of Slavic Military Studies**, vol. 14, no.3, 2001, p. 93-106

Safran, William: "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return", **Diaspora**, 1991, 83-99

Sahdra, Baljinder, and Ross, Michael: "Group Identification and Historical Memory", **Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin**, vol. 33, no. 3, 2007, p. 384-395

Salih, Muhammed: **Yolname Özgürlük Mücadelesi**, İstanbul, Ötüken, 2002

Sasse, Gwendolyn: **The Crimea Question: Identity, Transition, and Conflict**, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2007

Satzewich, Vic: **The Ukrainian Diaspora**, New York, Routledge, 2002

Schmaltz, Eric J.: "Our Memory is the Future: The Soviet Experience and Remembrance of the August 1941 Deportation of Volga Germans", Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Alva, Presented at the Commemoration of the German-Russian Holocaust on October 25, 2008, at St. Michael's Lutheran Church, Portland, Oregon

Selim, Şakir: **Kırımname II. Tamçılar**, Akmesic, Tarpan, 2008

Şemizade, Eşref: **Halk Hizmetinde**, Tashkent, Gafur Gulam Publishing House, 1977

Serbyn, Roman: "The Ukrainian Famine of 1932-1933 as Genocide in the Light of the UN Convention of 1948", **The Ukrainian Quarterly**, Vol. LXII, No. 2, 2006

Seydahmet, Cafer: "Famine in Crimea", Emel, Romania, no. 9, 1931, (available) <http://www.iccri.me.org/historical/famine1931.html>, 02.03.2014

Seydahmet, Cemil: **Abdulla Dermenci**, Tashkent, Gafur Gulam Publishing House, 1981

Seytmuratova, Ayshe: "The elders of the New National Movement: Recollections", **Tatars of the Crimea Their Struggle for Survival**, Ed. by. Edward Allworth, the USA, Duke University Press, 1988, p.

Seytmuratove, Ayşe: "Prof. Fazlur Rahman'ın 'Rusya'daki Müslümanlara Karşı Sovyet Politikasının Gelişimi (1917-1965)' adlı Makalesi Hakkında", **Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları**, no.23, 1983, p. p. 167-173

Shaffer, Gabriel: **Diaspora Politics At Home Abroad**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003

Shayakhmetov, Mukhamet: **The Silent Steppe The Story of a Kazakh Nomad under Stalin**, Trans. By. Jan Butler, London, Stacey International, 2006

Sheehy, Ann, and Nahaylo, Bohdan: "The Crimean Tatars, Volga Germans and Meskhetians: Soviet Treatment of Some National Minorities", **Minority Rights Group**, Report no. 6, 1980 (first in 1971)

Shuval, Judith T.: "Diaspora Migration: Definitional Ambiguities and a Theoretical Paradigm", **International Migration**, vol. 38 (5), 2000, p. 41-55

Slezkine, Yuri: "The USSR as a Communal Apartment or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism", **Slavic Review**, vol. 53, no.2, 1994, p. 414-452

Smith, Anthony D.: "Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism" **International Affairs**, Vol. 72, No. 3, 1996, p. 445-458

Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice, Ed. by. Robert Conquest, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1967

Spicer, Edward H.: "Persistent Cultural Systems", **Science**, Vol. 174, No. 4011, 1971, p. 795-800

Steiner, Peter: "Introduction: On Samizdat, Tamizdat, Magnitizdat, and Other Strange Words That Are Difficult to Pronounce", **Poetics Today**, 29:4, Winter 2008, p.613-628

Subtelny, Orest: **Ukraine: A History**, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005

Susan Stewart, "The Tatar Dimension", **RFE/RL Research Report**, no.19, vol. 3, 1994, p. 27

Thayer, Charles W.: "MVD Man's Declaration of Independence," **Life**, 5 Jul. 1954

The US Congress, **Report of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression against Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Russia and the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.** Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session, Under Authority of H. Res. 846 and H. Res. 438, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1954

Tölölyan, Khachig: "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment", **Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies**, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1996

Uehling, Greta Lynn: **Beyond Memory**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004

Ukrainka, Lesya: **Hope**, Trans. by. Gladys Evans, Dnipro Publishers, 1975

Ülküsal, Müstecip: “Kırım Türkleri”, **Türk Dünyası El Kitabı**, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, Ankara, 1976, p. 1140-1153

Vardys, V. Stanley: “The Case of the Crimean Tartars”, **Russian Review**, Vol. 30, No. 2, Apr., 1971

Volkan, Vamik: **Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism**, Colorado, Westview Press, 1998

Vozgrin, Valeri: “Bolşevik İhtilalinden Sonra Kırım”, **Türkler**, Ankara, vol. 18, 2002, p. 760-774

Vozgrin, Valeri: “Crimea After the Bolshevik Revolution”, **The Turks**, Ankara, vol. 5, 2002, p. 914-927

Vozgrin, Valeri: “The Turkish National Movement in Crimea during the Tsarist Period”, **The Turks**, Ankara, vol. 5, 2002, p. 764-777

Wang, Qi: “On the Cultural Constitution of Collective Memory”, **Memory**, vol. 16, no. 3, 2008, p. 305-317

Williams, Brian Glyn: “A Community Reimagined. The Role of ‘Homeland’ in the Forging of National Identity: the Case of the Crimean Tatars”, **Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs**, vol. 17, no. 2, 1997, p. 225-252

Williams, Brian Glyn: “Commemorating ‘the Deportation’ in Post-Soviet Chechnya”, **History & Memory**, Vol. 12, Issue 1, 2000, p. 101-134

Williams, Brian Glyn: "The Crimean Tatar exile in Central Asia: A case study in group destruction and survival", **Central Asian Survey**, vol.17, no.2, 1998, p. 285-317

Williams, Brian Glyn: "The Hidden Ethnic Cleansing of Muslims in the Soviet Union: The Exile and Repatriation of the Crimean Tatars", **Journal of Contemporary History**, Vol. 37, No. 3, Jul., 2002, p. 323-347

Williams, Brian Glyn: **The Crimean Tatars: the diaspora experience and the forging of a nation**, Leiden, Brill, 2001

Internet Sources

"Jemilev possesses information on real results of Crimean referendum", **Crimean News Agency**, March 25, 2014, (available)<http://qha.com.ua/jemilev-possesses-information-on-real-results-of-crimean-referendum-130982en.html>, 29.03.2014

"Crimean Tatars shouldn't reject Russian passports: Chubarov", **Crimean News Agency**, March 26, 2014, (available)"<http://qha.com.ua/crimean-tatars-shouldn-t-reject-russian-passports-chubarov-130995en.html>, 28.03.2014

"Meeting Record- A/68/PV.80", **The General Assembly**, March 24, 2014, (available) <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs//2014/ga11493.doc.htm>, 29.03.2014

"No: 86, 17 March 2014, Press Release Regarding the Referendum held in Crimea", **MFA Republic of Turkey**, March 17, 2014, (available), http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-86_-17-march-2014_-press-release-regarding-the-referendum-held-in-crimea.en.mfa, 29.03.2014

"Opinion and proposals of the Consultative Council for National Security regarding the risks posed to Bulgaria arising from the development of the crisis in Ukraine", **MFA The Republic of Bulgaria**, March 25, 2014, (available) <http://www.mfa.bg/en/vents/6/1/1358/index.html>, 29.03.2014

"APPEAL of the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, whole Ukrainian people - citizens of Ukraine of all nationalities", **Mejlis**, March 15, 2014, (available), <http://qtm.org/en/news/4297-appeal-of-the-mejlis-of-the-crimean-tatar-people-to-the-verkhovna-rada-of-ukraine-whole-ukrainian-people-citizens-of-ukraine-of-all-nationalities>, 22.03.2014

"Press release on non-recognition of the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and of the city of Sevastopol by the Russian Federation", **MFA Romania**, March 18, 2014, (available), <http://www.mae.ro/en/node/25488>, 29.03.2014;

"Speech to 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.", (available) <http://www.marxists.org/archive/khrushchev/1956/02/24.htm>, 31.12.2012

"Address by President of the Russian Federation", **President of Russia**, March 18, 2014, (available), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/6889>, 18.03.2014

"The Draft Resolution- A/68/L.39 & Add.1-The Territorial Integrity of Ukraine", **The General Assembly**, March 24, 2014, (available) <http://www.un.org/ga/search/viewdoc.asp?symbol=A/68/L.39>, 29.03.2014

"The Statement of the President of Georgia Regarding the So-Called Referendum Conducted in Crimea", **The President of Georgia**, March 17, 2014, (available), <https://www.president.gov.ge/en/PressOffice/News?8710>, 29.03.2014

"The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Resolution 'On Statement of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine re guarantees of rights of the Crimean Tatar people as a part of the State of Ukraine'", **Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine**, March 20, 2014, (available) <http://portal.rada.gov.ua/en/news/page/news/News/News/89899.html>, 28.03.2014

Shevchenko, Taras: Selections, Translated by Michael M. Naydan, Ukrainian Literature A Journal of Translations, vol. 1, 2004 (available) http://www.utoronto.ca/elul/Ukr_Lit/Vol01/01-04.html, 09.05.2014

“Telegraph Agency of Soviet Union”, **Wikipedia**, (available) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telegraph_Agency_of_the_Soviet_Union, 31.05. 2014

“Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan on the referendum in Crimea”, **MFA Republic of Kazakhstan**, March 18, 2014, (available), <http://mfa.gov.kz/en/#!/news/article/13803>, 29.03.2014

“Ukraine Crisis Timeline”, **BBC**, March 21, 2014 (Available), <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26248275>, 22.03.2014

Brainerd, Elizabeth: **Uncounted Costs of World War II: The Effect of Changing Sex Ratios on Marriage and Fertility of Russian Women**, Williams College, 2007, (available) <http://web.williams.edu/Economics/faculty/brainerd-rfwomen.pdf>, 20.01.2013

Sabirjan Badretdin, **Garip Sultan (1923-2011)**, November 19, 2011 (available) http://www.azatliq.org/content/garip_sultan/24395729.html, 28.09.2013

Lotus, Adele: “The Sound of Silence”, **Committee to Protect Journalists**, 2001, (available) <http://cpj.org/reports/2001/07/uzbek.php>, 15.01.2014

“Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine”, **Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**, June 15, 2014, (available) <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/UA/HRMMUReport15June2014.pdf>, 19.06.2014

Turkish Summary

Kırım Tatarları, 1944 yılının 18 Mayıs'ında -bu tarih Kırım Tatar tarihinde Kara Gün olarak bilinir- Almanlarla işbirliği yaptıkları gerekçesiyle Kırım'dan Sovyetler Birliği'nin çeşitli cumhuriyetlerine sürülmüş, büyük çoğunluğu Orta Asya cumhuriyetlerine ve özellikle Özbekistan'a gönderilmişlerdir. 13 yıl boyunca 'Özel Yerleşim'de resmi makamların gözetimi altında yaşamış, 'Özel Yerleşim' rejimi 1956'da sürgün edilmiş diğer halklarla birlikte Kırım Tatarları için de kaldırılmıştır. Ne var ki Kırım Tatarları, Volga Almanları ve Ahıska Türkleri dışında göç ettirilmiş diğer halklara eski topraklarına, vatanlarına dönme ve daha önce lağvedilmiş muhtar cumhuriyetlerini yeniden kurma hakkı verilirken, bu üç halka eski topraklarına dönme hakkı verilmemiş, bulundukları yerlerde yaşamaya devam etmeleri tavsiye edilmiştir.

Bu dönemde ortaya çıkmaya başlayan Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi'nin (KTMH) İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonraki tarihini hangi yıldan başlatmak gerektiği konusunda farklı görüşler vardır. Bir kısım Kırım Tatarı Milli Hareketi 1944'teki sürgün sonrasına tarihlerken, Mustafa Cemilev'in dediği gibi bazıları 1956 sonrasını referans alırlar. Gerçek anlamda bir Milli Hareketin gelişmesi 1950'lerin ortalarından sonra mümkün olabiliyor. Yani 20. Kongre'de Kruşçev'in Stalin dönemi politikalarını, sürgün-deportatsiya dahil, eleştirmesi sonrasında sürgün edilmiş halklara çeşitli düzeylerde, birbiriyle eşit olmamak üzere, haklar verilmeye başlanıyor. Kırım Tatarlarına ise yaşadıkları yerlerde entegrasyonlarını kolaylaştırmak için, uzun yıllar tabi oldukları 'Özel Yerleşim' rejiminin kaldırılmasından sonra, Özbek Radyosu içinde Tatar Şarkı ve Müziği Radyo konserleri programı başlatılmış, ayrıca Kırım Tatar Oyun ve Şarkı Topluluğu ile Özbek Yazarlar Birliği'nde bir Kırım Tatarları bölümü kurulmuştur (1956). Bir yıl sonra da, 1 Mayıs 1957'de *Lenin Bayragı* gazetesi çıkmaya başlamıştır.

Gazetenin çıkarılmasına ve Taşkent Üniversitesi'nde Kırım Tatar Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü (1968) gibi kurumların kurulmasına neden müsaade edildiği meselesi iki

açından değerlendirilebilir. Birincisi, Sovyet Hükümetinin Kırım Tatarlarının Özbekistan'da kalıcı olmasını istemesidir. Genel olarak mülakat yapılan Kırım Tatarları, bu kurumların kendilerinin buraya yerleşmelerini sağlamak için kurulduğunu söylemişlerdir. O dönemde bu görüşün, Kırım Tatarlarını ebedi olarak sürgünde tutma tezinin yaygın olduğunu gazetenin *Lenin Bayragı* olarak çıkan son nüshasından da öğreniyoruz.⁵⁵⁶ Gazetenin çıkışına karşı bu görüşü savunanlar bir zamanlar gazeteye karşı boykot da ilan etmişlerdir. İkincisi ise, Sovyet Hükümetinin isteğinden ve planından bağımsız olarak bir kısım Kırım Tatar yazıcılarının ve entelektüellerinin bu kurumları istemiş, bunların kurulması için mücadele etmiş olduğudur. Bu entelektüeller, Kırım Tatar halkının edebi dilini, edebiyatını, milli kültürünü, müziğini korumak ve halkın bu dilde okuyup yazmasını unutturmamak için bu kurumların kurulmasına öncülük etmişlerdir. Bu araştırma Kırım Tatarlarının sürgündeki yegâne gazetesi *Lenin Bayragı*⁵⁵⁷ ve Kırım Tatar Milli Hareketi üzerine yapılmıştır. Araştırma belge inceleme ve derinlemesine mülakatlardan oluşmaktadır.⁵⁵⁸ Araştırmanın belge inceleme (documentary research) kısmı *Lenin Bayragı*'nın tüm nüshalarını bulunduran Kırım'daki birkaç kurumdan biri olan İsmail Gaspıralı Kütüphanesi'nde yürütülürken, mülakatlar ise eş zamanlı olarak gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Kırım'daki (Simferopol) araştırma belge araştırması ve mülakatlar olmak üzere iki koldan sürdürülmüştür: Araştırmanın birinci kısmı *Lenin Bayragı* gazetesi üzerine belge araştırması yani gazete nüshalarının taranması şeklinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Belge araştırması sadece *Lenin Bayragı* gazetesinin KTMH'ye, hareket iştirakçilerine bakışı, bu hareketle olan ilişkisi ile sınırlı tutulmamıştır. Yalnızca bu konu üzerine

⁵⁵⁶ “33 Yıl”, *Lenin Bayragı*, no. 154, 29 Aralık 1990, s. 1; “Yolumuz Vatanga”, *Yanı Dünya*, no. 52, 25 Aralık 1991, s. 2

⁵⁵⁷ Sürgündeki Kırım Tatar halkı *Lenin Bayragı*'na kısaca *Bayrak* olarak seslenmiştir. “33 Yıl”, a.g.y., s. 1. Yazının ilerleyen bölümlerinde *Lenin Bayragı* yerine kısaca yer yer *Bayrak* kullanılmıştır.

⁵⁵⁸ 33 yıl 8 ay boyunca, 4990 sayı olarak çıkan *Lenin Bayragı* 3 Ocak 1991 baskısında adını değiştirip *Yanı Dünya* olmuştur. Gazete 1957, 1 Mayıs'ından 1965 yılının 1 Mayısına kadar küçük formatta (compact- tabloid format) haftada 2 kere (Pazar ve Cuma akşamı) çıkmıştır. Bu dönemde bazen büyük formatta da basılmıştır. Mayıs 1965'ten itibaren büyük formatta (broadsheet format), yani Pravda gazetesi formatında ve haftada 3 kere çıkmaya başlamıştır.

yoğunlaşmak çalışma açısından verimsiz bir sonuç doğuracaktır. Bunun en önemli nedeni iki oluşum arasında doğrudan ve pozitif bir bağlantının olmamasıdır. Gazete, Özbekistan Komünist Partisinin yayın organıdır ve yaptığı yayınlar da bu ekseninde olmuştur. Bu yüzden salt Milli Hareket ile olan ilişkisine değil -çünkü *Bayrak*, Milli Harekete dolaylı olarak hizmet etmiştir- ayrıca, uzun yıllar boyunca Kırım Tatar halkının kendi dilinde çıkardığı yegâne yayın organı olan gazetenin Kırım Tatar halkının dilini, kültürünü korumasına ve gelişmesine yaptığı katkı üzerine yoğunlaşmıştır. Çalışmanın bu şekilde evrilmesi arşiv çalışmasının ve süregelen mülakatların bir sonucudur. Araştırmanın ikinci kısmı ise derinlemesine mülakatlardır. Mülakatlarla da bir yandan Milli Hareket ve iştirakçilerinin gazeteye, diğer yandan *Lenin Bayrağı* ve çalışanlarının da Milli Harekete olan bakışı araştırılmıştır.

Belge araştırması gazetenin ilk sayısının çıktığı 1957 senesi ile 1991 arasında sınırlandırılmıştır. Bu dönemin sonu, yani 1987 ile 1991-1992, Kırım Tatarlarının sürgünlüğünün bitip ana yurtlarına tekrar geri döndükleri tarihtir. Araştırmanın esas olarak soğuk savaş dönemi ile sınırlandırılması uygun görülmüştür, ayrıca *Lenin Bayrağı* da 1991 yılından sonra yeni bir adla, *Yanı Dünya* olarak, yayın hayatına devam etmiştir.⁵⁵⁹ Olayların aydınlatılması açısından gerek görüldüğünde, eski *Bayrak* çalışanlarının daha özgür bir ortamda -*Yanı Dünya*'da- *Bayrak* hakkında yazdıkları sonraki yıllarda çıkan yazılardan (1992, 1993, 2013) da faydalanılmıştır.

Esas olarak araştırmaya konu olan 33 yıllık yayın döneminin de tamamı araştırılmamış, belli yıllar seçilerek ve daha sonra mülakatlar ve gazetenin yayın hayatındaki süreklilik

⁵⁵⁹ Yeni yılın ilk sayısından itibaren, yani 3 Ocak 1991'den başlayarak *Lenin Bayrağı*, *Yanı Dünya* adı ile çıkmaya başlar. *Yanı Dünya*'nın ilk üç sayısında, *Lenin Bayrağı*'nın 4990 sayı boyunca kullandığı ismi ve ufak değişikliklere uğrayan bayraklı Lenin amblemi, baş sayfanın altında saklanır ve dördüncü sayıdan itibaren o da kalkar. *Yanı Dünya*'nın yeni amblemi Kırım'ı ve Kırım Tatarlarını simgeleyen öğelerle süslenir. Kırım Hanlığı'nın tarak sembolünü geleneksel kıyafetleri ile bir kadın ve erkek yukarı kaldırır şekilde resmedilir, ikisinin arasında Kırım yarım adasının resmi ve onun da üstünde bir üzüm salkımı. Amblemde Özgürlük, adalet ve birlik kelimeleri bir şeridin üzerine yazılır. Üçüncü sayıdan itibaren gazetenin tarihinde bir ilk olmak üzere, 'din ve örf adetlerimiz' başlığında bir sayfa çıkmaya başlar.

ile Kırım Tatarlarının hayatlarında meydana gelen değişiklikler de değerlendirilerek bu yıllar genişletilmiştir. 1957 ve 1958 yılından sonra 1961 yılı incelenmiş, sonrasında da beşer yıllık dönemler halinde devam edilmiştir. 1965'ten sonra, 1971, 1975 ve 1980 yılları incelenmiştir. 1967 yılı Kırım Tatarları üzerindeki işbirliği, hain gibi suçlamaların kaldırıldığı yıl olması nedeniyle önemlidir ve bu dönem ve sonraki yıllardaki değişiklikleri görmek açısından 1967'yi izleyen birkaç yıl da gözden geçirilmiştir. Gorbaçov'un iktidara gelmesi ve sonrasındaki reformların gazeteye yansıyan etkilerini görmek açısından 1985-1990 yıllarının tamamı incelenmiştir. Bu araştırma sonunda *Lenin Bayragı*'nın yayın hayatında bir dönemselleştirmeye gidilebilmesi planlanmaktadır.

Araştırmanın bu şekilde dönemlere ayrılmasındaki asıl gerekçesi gazetenin yayın hayatındaki ve haberlerin muhteviyatındaki sürekli benzerliktir ve bu sürekli aynılık gazetenin 33 yıllık yayın hayatının değişmez unsurudur. Bunun da en önemli nedeni *Lenin Bayragı*'nın Özbekistan Komünist Partisi'nin yayın organlarından birisi olmasıdır.⁵⁶⁰ Gazetecilerin Komünist Parti (KP)'nin belli şablon ve kurallarının dışına çıkması, o şablon ve kurallar bizzat KP tarafından esnetilmedikçe veya değiştirilmedikçe mümkün olamamıştır. Belli dönemlerde Kırım Tatarlarına verilen müsaadeler açısından ve Moskova'nın ve/veya Taşkent'in onlarla ilgili aldığı kararlar nedeniyle dalgalanmalar yaşanmış ama gazetenin genel muhtevası sürekliliğini korunmuştur. 1957 ve sonrasında nasılsa, 1980'li yıllarda da pamuk haberleri veya hükümet haberleri yerlerinden bir şey kaybetmemiştir.⁵⁶¹

Saha araştırmasında uzman-elit mülakatları gerçekleştirilmiştir. Buna göre kütüphanedeki bu araştırma devam ederken aynı zamanda Kırım Tatar akademisyenleri, yazıları *Lenin Bayragı*'nda yayınlanmış ve bir zamanlar bu gazetede

⁵⁶⁰ Diğerleri Özbekçe çıkan *Sovyet Uzbekistanı*, Rusça basılan *Pravda Vastoka* ve Taçikçe *Hakikati Ozbekistan*.

⁵⁶¹ Gazetenin hemen her sayısında pamuk-pamukçuluk çok önemli bir yer tutar. Pamukçuluk ile alakalı haberler eğer daha önemli bir olay yoksa, mesela devrimin 40. yılı gibi, hemen her sayıda yer alır. Özellikle hasad mevsimi yaklaşırken, yani ağustos ayında kotanın doldurulmasını vaaz eden haberler artmaya başlar.

çalışmış Kırım Tatar yazarları-şairleri ve KTMH iştirakçileri ile mülakatlar yapılmaya başlanmıştır. Gazetenin Taşkent'te çıktığı yıllarda *Bayrak*'ta ve/veya Kırım'a taşındığı dönemde *Yarı Dünya*'da çalışmış gazeteciler, yazarlar ve şairler ile görüşme yapılmıştır. KTMH'de bulunmuş ve hala faal olarak çalışan ve/veya hareketin önderliğini yapan milli hareket iştirakçileri ve akademisyen grubundan ise *de facto* Kırım Tatar üniversitesi olan Kırım Mühendislik ve Pedagoji Üniversitesi'nin (KIPU) öğretim üyeleri ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır.⁵⁶²

Yarı yapılandırılmış mülakat yönteminin esnek yapısından faydalanarak mülakatlara önceden belirlenen sorular ile başlanmış, mülakat süresince ek sorular da kendiliğinden, gerektiğinde sorulmuştur. Mülakat yapılan kişiler üç grup (akademisyenler, *Bayrak* çalışanları ve KTMH iştirakçileri) halinde sınıflandırıldığından sorular da farklılaşmıştır. Çekirdek ve her gruba sorulan soruların yanında *Bayrak* hadimlerine-çalışanlarına gazete üzerindeki belge araştırması devam ettikçe, nüshalar tarandıkça soruların hacmi bu grup için artmış, farklı sorular sorulmuş ve gerektiğinde ikinci mülakatlar da yapılmıştır.

Mülakatlarda genel olarak üç tema altında toplanabilecek sorular yöneltmiştir. Birinci grup, *Lenin Bayrağı* ile KTMH arasındaki ilişkiye dair sorular; bu sorular hedef kitlemizi oluşturan üç gruba da sorulmuştur. Örneğin, *Bayrak* çalışanlarına, Milli Hareketin gazetede nasıl yansıtıldığını, bunun dışında kendilerinin bu harekete nasıl baktıklarını, gazetenin Kırım Tatar halkının sürgünlükteki yaşantısındaki önemini

⁵⁶² Kırım'daki Kırım Tatar toplumunun bir kısmı çok aktif olarak faaliyetler düzenlemektedir. Bu faaliyetler, buluşmalar, toplantılar, konferanslar, anma törenleri genel olarak üç Kırım Tatar kurumunun, yani Gaspıralı Kütüphanesi'nin, KIPU'nun (%50 Kırım Tatar %50 diğer etnik gruplar) ve Kırım Tatar Meclisi'nin düzenlediği faaliyetlerden oluşur. Buna Kırım Tatar gençlerinin faaliyetleri de eklenebilir. Bu faaliyetlerin, özellikle Kütüphane ve Üniversitedekiler, herhangi birine katılarak Kırım Tatar toplumunun içine girmeyi kolaylaştıracak 'bağlantılarla', 'kapı açıcılarla' (gatekeepers) tanışmak saha araştırması yürüten bir araştırmacı için en uygun yöntemdir. Daha önceden bir tanıdıklar-bağlantılar listesi mevcut olsa bile bu toplantılar daha fazlasına ulaşmak için en elverişli ortamlardır. Alan Bryman, *Ibid.*, p. 297-298. Kırım Tatarları ile ilgili saha araştırması yürüten araştırmacının işini en kolaylaştıran unsurlardan biri Kırım Tatarlarının, bu araştırmada uzman-elitler, kendileri hakkında yazılıp çizilmesine sıcak bakması ve bu konuda ellerinden gelen yardımı göstermesidir. Bir araştırmacı çoğunlukla, neden sorusuna (neden Kırım Tatarlarını, bizi, çalışıyorsun?) değil de, hangi sorusuna (hangi konuda çalışıyorsun?) muhatap olacaktır.

öğrenmek amacıyla sorular yöneltilmiştir. Benzer sorular Milli Hareket iştirakçilerine de sorulmuştur. Onların *Lenin Bayragı* ile olan tecrübe ve görüşleri öğrenilmeye çalışılmıştır. İkinci grup sorular, bunlar çoğunlukla KTMH'ye ve akademisyenlere yöneltilmiştir, Milli Hareket'in yurtdışı ve Moskova'daki muhalefet ile olan bağlantıları üzerine olmuştur. Son grupta ise sürgünlükten sonraki duruma dair sorular yer almaktadır.

Araştırma sonucunda görülmüştür ki, *Bayrak* hadimlerinin gazeteye bakışı ile Milli Hareket'in *Lenin Bayragı*'na bakışı birbirinden son derece farklıdır ve bu fark Özbekistan sınırlarında yaşamış kişilerde -Kırım Tatarları Sovyetler Birliği'nin çeşitli bölgelerine dağılmıştır- daha da keskinleşmektedir. Ayrıca, Milli Hareket'in yasaklı, gazetenin ise hükümet organı olması ve zaman zaman Milli Hareket iştirakçileri hakkında karalayıcı haberlerin yapılması *Lenin Bayragı*'na olan bakışı menfi olarak şekillendirmiştir. Hangi gruptan olursa olsun, herkesin üzerinde mutabakata vardığı yegâne konu, en önemli Milli Hareket iştirakçileri dâhil, *Lenin Bayragı*'nın Kırım Tatarlarının dillerini korumadaki müspet etkisidir. *Bayrak*, Kırım Tatarlarının kendi dillerinde okuyup yazmalarına bir ders kitabı işlevi görerek yardımcı olmuştur.⁵⁶³ Mülakat yapılan birçok kişi *Bayrak*'ın kendi hayatlarının önemli bir parçası olduğunu, bazıları ise kutsal bir metin olarak görüldüğünü söylemiştir. Bazıları dilini *Lenin Bayragı*'ndan öğrenmiş ya da dilini onu okuyarak korumuştur. Bunun dışında sürgünlükte Kırım Tatar edebiyatının gelişmesinde *Bayrak*'ın etkisi yadsınamaz. Günümüzün ünlü (*belli*) ve yaşlı (*kart*) Kırım Tatar yazıcıları *Lenin Bayragı*'nda yetişmişlerdir.⁵⁶⁴ Örneğin, Ablyaziz Veliev, Uriye Edemova, Rıza Fazıl, Şeryan Ali ve diğerleri...⁵⁶⁵ 1960lı yıllarda *Bayrak*'ın, tabloid gazete formatından geniş Pravda formatına değişmesiyle gazeteye giren veya onun rahle-i tedrisatından geçip yetişen

⁵⁶³ “Ablyaziz Veliev'nin Çıkışı”, *Yanı Dünya*, no. 8, 20 Şubat 1991, s. 6

⁵⁶⁴ Eşref Şemizade, *Halk Hizmetinde*, Taşkent, Gafur Gulam Neşriyatı, 1977, s. 10-11; Abselyam İslamov, *Yıllar ve Yollar*, Taşkent, Gafur Gulam Neşriyatı, 1985, s. 192

⁵⁶⁵ Abselyam İslamov, *a.g.e.*, s. 196

savaş sonrası kuşak ilk şiirlerini, hikâyelerini ve yazılarını burada yayınlamış, hatta Kırım Tatarca yazmasını yaşlıların desteğiyle burada öğrenmiştir.⁵⁶⁶

Bayrak hadimleri kendilerini Milli Hareketten kesinlikle uzak görmemekte hatta Milli Harekete gizli, alttan alta destek verdiklerini söylemişlerdir. Meğerki Milli Hareket iştirakçilerinin bazı en önemlileri bunun aksini savunuyor olsunlar. Bir grup mülakat veren, genel olarak çalışanları ve akademisyenler, Milli Hareketi daha geniş olarak telakki etmektedirler. Yani, siyasi mücadelenin yanında, onunla sınırlı olmamak kaydıyla, Kırım Tatarca bir konser, radyoda anadilde çalınan bir şarkı, gazetede anadilde basılan bir yazı, Kırım Tatarlarına Kırım'ı hatırlatacak herhangi bir unsur milli harekettir. *Lenin Bayragı* uzun yıllar boyunca farklı metotlar izleyerek (Ezop dili, metaforlar kullanarak) Kırım Tatarlarını eğitmiş ve dolaylı olarak Milli Harekete destek olmuştur. Destek kesinlikle açıktan ve siyasi olmamış, fakat Kırım Tatarlarına atılan iftiraların gerçek dışılığını göstermek amacıyla pasif bir şekilde gerçekleşmiştir.

Bu pasif desteğin belki de en göze çarpan unsuru İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndaki Kırım Tatar iştirakçilerinin hikâyeleridir.⁵⁶⁷ Vatanseverlerin Büyük Savaşı olarak adlandırılan ve faşizme karşı ortak mücadelenin sembolü olan bu savaş ve anıları Sovyet halklarının ortak hafızasındaki en 'ortak' unsurdur. Tüm halklar buna, ortak hafızaya, 'katılmıştır' ve bunun bir parçasıdır. Kırım Tatarları da sansürden geçmesi en kolay olabilecek bu savaşa katılmışların hikâyelerini sadece 23 Şubat veya 9 Mayıs'ta değil yıl boyu yayınlamışlardır. Pek tabi ki gazetede bunların basılmasının Kırım Tatarları açısından en önemli amacı Kırım Tatar halkının rehabilitasyonunu sağlamaktır. Rehabilitasyon hala güncelliğini koruyan ve hallolmamış bir konudur. Rusya Federasyonu Başkanı Putin, Kırım Tatarlarını kendi yanına çekebilmek için -Kırım Tatarlarının bam teline dokunarak- 18 Martta Kırım'ın Rusya'ya ilhakı dolayısıyla yaptığı konuşmada bu

⁵⁶⁶ Zera Bekirova, "Onı Okup Ana Tilimizni Ogrendik", *Yanı Dünya*, no. 46, 23 Kasım 2012, s. 1, 5

⁵⁶⁷ Abselyam İslamov, *a.g.e.*, s. 193

meseleye de atıf yapmıştır ve rehabilitasyonun sağlanması yönünde gerekli adımların atılacağını vadetmiştir.⁵⁶⁸

Yazılara dönersek, ne yazık ki bu yazılar Kırım Tatarca ve sadece Kırım Tatarlarına yönelik olmuş, geniş halk kitlelerine ulaşmamıştır. Buna rağmen Kırım Tatar halkı bunları duymak, okumak ve öğrenmek istemiştir. Sürekli olarak ve yıl boyunca gazetede basılan bu yazıların en önemli özellikleri; çoğunlukla hikâye kahramanlarının milliyetlerine ve kesinlikle 1944 sürgünlüğüne atıf olmamasıdır. Savaş iştirakçilerinin özgeçmişlerinin anlatıldığı bu hikâyelerde kahramanlar Kırım'ın farklı yerlerinde doğmuş, büyümüş, okumuş, savaşa katılmış ve mücadele etmişlerdir. Ne var ki savaş sonrasında hudayinabit gibi aniden Özbekistan'ın vilayetlerinde bitmişlerdir. Bu değişmez bir tekrardır ve uzun yıllar sürmüştür.

Sansür Sovyet basınının bir gerçeğidir ve *Bayrak* çalışanları da Kırım, Kırım Tatar, deniz, gökyüzü, bulut gibi bazı kelimelere olan sansüre işaret etmişler, Kırım ve onu hatırlatacak konularda bir yasağın olduğunu söylemişlerdir. Bu belli ölçüde doğrudur ama kronolojik olarak konumlandırmaya muhtaçtır. Yani sansür her zaman katı olarak uygulanmamıştır, bazen hafiflemiş bazen sertleşmiştir. Bir baskı vardır ama bu baskı dönem dönem artmış dönem dönem azalmıştır çünkü yapılan belge araştırmasında en başından beri (1957) Kırım ve Kırım Tatar ifadelerine gazetede rastlanılmıştır. Sovyet tarihi gelişler gidişler, dalgalanmalar tarihidir ve bunu gazetenin yayın hayatında da rastlıyoruz. 1957'den sonra bir dönem bu ifadeler rahatlıkla kullanılmıştır, ne var ki sonraki sayılarda üslup değişmeye başlamış ve Kırım Tatarı ifadesi yerini çoğunlukla Tatar'a bırakmış, veya 'tuvgan dilimiz, muzikamız' denmeye başlanmıştır. Şu yargıya varılabilir, ilk birkaç sayıdan sonra Kırım ve Kırım Tatar kelimeleri yan yana getirilmemeye başlanıyor, halkın adı, sanatı, dili, edebiyatı, güreşi, müzikleri, şarkıları Tatar ile karşılanmaya başlanıyor. Kırım ifadesi tamamen

⁵⁶⁸ "Address by President of the Russian Federation", *President of Russia*, 18 March 2014, <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/6889>, (accessed 18 March 2014)

yasaklanmış değildir, Kırım'ın şehirlerinden bahsediliyor ama ilk sayılarda rastlanılan üslup terkediliyor. Anlaşıyor ki rahat rahat kullanılamıyor, çünkü kullanılması gereken yerlerde kaçınılıyor ve sadece Tatar deniliyor. Bir mülakat verenin anlatımına göre ilk resmi mücadele 1982'den sonra mümkün olmuştur.⁵⁶⁹ Bu dalgalanmalarda ortak bir sabit vardır o da, Gorbaçev'in politikalarına kadar 1944 sürgününe atıf kesinlikle yoktur. Sürgünün ve sürgün acılarının *Bayrak*'ta yer bulması Gorbaçev reformlarının Özbekistan'a ulaşmasından sonra yani 1987 sonrasında mümkün olmuştur.

Lenin Bayrağı üzerine olan araştırmaya ek olarak KTMH'nin Sovyetler Birliği sınırları dışındaki temsilcilerinin Türkiye'de ve Münih'te çıkardıkları veya parçası oldukları, sırasıyla *Emel* ve *Dergi*, mecmuaları üzerine de belge araştırması yapıldı. Böylece her iki yayın üzerinden SSCB dışındaki KTMH'nin soğuk savaş boyunca öne çıkardıkları, milliyetler meselesi, self-determinasyon ve kutuplararası yumuşama gibi bazı kavramları ve kullandıkları söylemleri görme olanağımız oldu ve Batı'daki diasporanın gözünden Milli Hareket anlatıldı. *Dergi* ve *Emel*, *Bayrak*'a nazaran daha özgür bir ortamda faaliyet gösterip doğrudan Kırım davasının müdafiliğini yapabilmişken *Bayrak* sansür nedeniyle bunu dolaylı yollara başvurarak Kırım idealini canlı tutmaya ve Kırım Tatarlarına atılan iftiraları temizlemeye çalışmıştır.

Tezin teorik ve kavramsal çerçevesini oluşturan ve Kırım'daki mülakatlar süresince ortaya çıkan kolektif hafıza, travma, anavatan, diaspora, aile, devlet politikaları ve etnisitelerarası ilişki ve karşılaşmalar gibi kavramlar sürgündeki Kırım Tatarlarının

⁵⁶⁹ Mülakat-Kırım Tatar gazeteci, Şubat 14, 2013, Akmesit/Simferopol: “Moskova’da KPSS Merkezi Komitelin sekreterlerinden birisi Ligaçov denen adam Taşkent’e gelmiş, ve bizim o vakit müharririmiz T.D., sağ salım bugün de burda, o 40 sayfeli bir mektup yazıp esaslandırdı bu şeyi; “O kadar yıldan beri bizim dilimizde gazete çıkıyor, kitaplar çıkıyor, bizim ansamblimiz var, oyun ve şarkı ansamblı...bugün de Kırım Tatarlarının var olduğuna kimse inkar edemez, rica ederiz Kırım Tatarlarının adını gazetede yazmaya izin veriniz” diye. O (T.D.) Ligaçov'a vardı. O [Ligaçov] izin verdi de ondan sonra, O [T.D.] KPSS Özbekistan İdaresi Merkezi Komitetinden bana çağrı açıyor: A.V. gözün aydın. Ne oldu dedim? Şimdi varsam söylerim, dedi. Ben belledim bizim mesele çözüldü, biz Kırım'a döneceğiz. O da olsa, Kırım Tatar sözünü yazmaya izin vermişler, ona da sevindim. Çünkü nihayet kendi adımızı bulduk. ‘82 senesi olsa gerek. İşte o vakitte biz yazmaya başladık Kırım Tatar dilinde, Kırım Tatar halkı, edbiyatı ve diğerleri...”

Kırım ile kurdukları ilişkinin açıklanmasında yararlanılabilecek uygun araçlar olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Sürgüne ve Kırım'a dayalı anlatılarla şekillenen, canlı tutulan Kırım Tatar kolektif hafızası sürgündeki Kırım Tatar bilincini-kimliğini güçlendiren en önemli öğelerden biridir. Yani savaş sonrası Kırım Tatar kimliği sürgün ve Kırım mevhumları olmadan düşünülemez. Kolektif hafıza aynı zamanda Kırım'a dönüş idealini canlı tutan bir araç işlevi de görmüştür.

Tezin ilgili kısmında yer verilen Diaspora kavramı Safran'ın altı kalemden oluşan tanımına dayandırıldı. Yani, asıl bir merkezden -Kırım gibi- birçok yabancı bölgeye, çeşitli Orta Asya cumhuriyetleri ve Rusya'ya, sürülen, nesillerarası anlatılar yoluyla anavatanlarına dair bir kolektif hafızayı sürdüren, göç ettirildikleri ülkeye çeşitli nedenlerle -eğitim kurumlarında ayrımcılık ve gündelik hayatta aşağılanma- tam olarak yerleşemeyen ve yerli halklarla ilişkilerinde sorunlar olan, geri dönüş idealini her zaman canlı tutan ve göç ettirildikleri toprağı, Kırım'ı, kendi asıl vatanları olarak gören ve Kırım'ın lağvedilen siyasi yapılarını yeniden kurma hedefinde olan ve son olarak kolektif -Kırım Tatar- kimliğini bu süreçte anavatan ile özdeşleştiren Kırım Tatarları diaspora kavramı içinde ele alındı. Böylece diaspora kavramı ile bağlantılı kolektif hafıza ve buna zemin hazırlayan zorunlu göç-travma gibi kavramlarla da ilişki kuruldu.

Diaspora, Butler'ın ifadesiyle –sürgün gibi- aşırı travmatik durumlardan ortaya çıkar. Sürgün, zorunlu göç türünden yerinden edilmeler bazan grup kimliğinin kaybını tetikleyebileceğı gibi, kimi durumlarda ise kolektif kimliği ve grup içi dayanışmayı kuvvetlendirir. İki durum arasındaki farkı oluşturan, yani kolektif bilinci oluşturan ve grup içi dayanışmayı teşvik eden faktör örgütlenme, muhalefet veya karşı koyma sürecine girme ile diasporalaşma olarak adlandırılabilir. Kırım Tatarları için Milli Hareket, Kırım Tatarlarının yaşadığı bölgelerde oluşturulan teşebbüs grupları buna örnektir.

1944'teki Kırım Tatar sürgünü, *seçilmiş travma*, ve anavatan Kırım üzerine oluşturulan nesillerarası anlatılar Kırım Tatar kolektif hafızasını oluşturur. Kolektif hafıza, bir grubun tamamı için anlamlı olaylara dayanır, Kırım Tatarları için 1944 sürgünü bu kabîldendir. Kolektif hafıza kişilerin deneyimlerine ek olarak anlatılar, nesillerarası transfer, tartışmalar, tecrübelerin dolaşımı yollarıyla da edinilebilir ve yeni nesillere aktarılır. Bu, tüm grup üyeleri için anlamlı ve onlar tarafından paylaşılır, bu, özellikle de acılar, trajik bir tarih ve travma, aynı zamanda grup içi uyumu sağlamaya ve kolektif kimliği oluşturmaya katkı sağlar. Sürgüne ve Kırım'a dair ailede gelecek nesillere aktarılan bu kolektif hafıza Kırım Tatar kimliğinin önemli bir unsurunu oluşturmaktadır.