

Bayir Derya (2013): *Minorities and Nationalism in Turkish Law*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd. p/bk 302. ISBN 978-1-4094-2007-1.

JAROSLAV DVORAK¹

In her first book *Minorities and Nationalism in Turkish Law*, Turkish scholar Derya Bayir provides a critical, diligent, and encyclopedic account of the rights of Turkish minorities. This book is especially topical in the context of the contemporary international politics as post-Maidan manifestations of nationalism in Ukraine caused separatism in the country and the loss of Crimea. The fear of direct Russian aggression stirred *the status quo* of national minority policy in many post-communist states.

In her six-chapter book, Derya Bayir has diligently revealed the uniqueness of the Turkish case and the dominant crossovers, stimuli, and consequences of minority policy, which had influence on nationalist reforms. The present review discusses three chapters of the book in greater detail.

In the first chapter of the book, the author has carried out a retrospective reconstruction of the Turkish case, starting with the description of the Ottoman pluralist system and ending with concrete cases of nationalism (linguistic or economic). Bayir has described the millet system in great detail, which, according to the author, “was not a minority protection system in contemporary terms; it was an organizational structure which managed the issues of non-Muslim diversity” (p. 27). It becomes clear that the non-standard state management structure was successfully used in resolving the questions related to minorities. However, standardized administration and centralization leads to the limitation of minority rights. When reading this chapter, one gets an impression that Turkey was the Promised Land of Muslims, Arabs, and non-Muslims. Nevertheless, the evidence provided shows that the non-Muslim community was in constant anxiety about its position. The revolution in 1908 strengthened the position of the political organization “Committee of Union and Progress” and reformatted the diversity management in Turkey to linguistic and economic nationalism.

In the second chapter, the author maintains that the main factor, influencing the development of nationalism, was Turkish national fights for the realization

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jaroslav Dvorak works at Klaipėda University at the Dept. Public Administration and Law. jaroslav.dvorak@ku.lt.

of the national state in 1919–1923 rather than fear for national security, which is usually considered to be the influence on nationalism. The evidence provided by the author demonstrates that the appearance of the nationalist discourse transferred the *minority* concept to legal documents. On the other hand, nationalists directed their attention towards fights with Christians, who became minorities in the new Turkish state. However, Turkish discourses are interesting not only because of the relationship with Christians. In the formation of the new Turkish identity, the question of non-Turks Muslims arose. There were attempts to join this religious group with the Turks, changing the concept of Turkish nationalism by alternative concepts, e.g. national groups, Ottomans, or Islam. As the largest Turkish Muslim community was the Kurds, the author does not refer to this community as a minority most probably deliberately. Naturally, nationalists were afraid of Kurdish separatist ideas and developed the discourse of brotherhood and solidarity, considering autonomy. Bayir analyses the Kurdish question and discusses the local administration discourse in the Constitution of 1921. This Constitution was constructed for the new administrative structure of the country (p. 75). Nevertheless, it is admitted that these ideas were not fulfilled, and the Constitution of 1924 strengthened centralization. The book describes one more aspect, i.e. exchange of citizens between Turkey and Greece, which reveals the extremes of nationalism, moving towards a national state. As noted by Bayir, this affected 1,700,000 people (p. 82). The selection criterion of this post-human action was religion, disregarding loyalty, merits, or language.

In the third chapter of the book, the author analyses the diversity management of the Turkish state in 1923–1960. The title of this chapter softens the ideas developed because the reader can understand diversity management as the attempts of the Turkish authorities to match the interests of the stakeholders successfully. However, the research results show authoritarian ways of the Turkish nationalist government in destroying the ethno-cultural diversity in the country. Cultural nationalism is manifested in limiting the use of other languages. In order to be a Turk, one had to speak Turkish; the use of other languages was considered to be a crime, and sanctions were imposed. Not only minorities, but also the Turks were pressed as they were ordered to reject dialects and international words; the status of the Turkish language was stipulated in the constitution, education in other languages was forbidden, surnames and place-names were changed, and the history of Turkey was rewritten. Turkification in economics was very painful, as the minorities were replaced by the Turks in economic relations: the enterprises had to change non-Turk employees into the Turks, Turks were also encouraged to work in the banking and financing sector, and the representatives of minorities were forbidden to work in civil service. The tax system was also used in implementing the Turkish dominance, as high taxes were imposed on the representatives of minorities. The author states that assimilation policy was directed towards transforming Kurds into

Turks. The regime disseminated a discourse that the Kurds do not have history, language, and traditions, and attempted to destroy the Kurdish nation.

In conclusion, it can be maintained that the topic under the present investigation is popular, and various multicultural aspects are analysed in great detail; however, this particular research is focused on the case of Turkey. I would consider the author's conception to describe the questions of minorities and nationalism as diversity management ungrounded because the issues described in the book are related to the formation and implementation of religious-national minority policy, while diversity management is a narrower concept. Despite this, the book provides us with substantial evidence to construct more knowledge about the case of Turkey and to consider new possibilities of thought, language, and implementation of practical multiculturalism policy.