

Translation as Conveyor: Critical Thought in Turkey in the 1960s

Sehnaz Tahir-Gürçaglar

Periodicals have played a significant role in Turkish intellectual life since they started to appear in the 19th century. They served as a site offering access to innovation and debate, providing a ground for politicians and cultural and literary figures to express their ideas and to challenge the options in the existing cultural and political repertoire.¹ Translations from Western literature and philosophy, which proved to be among the strongest driving forces for change within the cultural system, occupied significant space in political and literary magazines. These magazines reflected the visions of a new Turkey, both in a political and a cultural sense, as imagined and constructed by the intellectual elite of the country. Both in terms of the works selected for translation and the translation strategies adopted, translation served as a means through which these visions were expressed.

Translated fiction and non-fiction served a similar purpose, although fiction and non-fiction could sometimes address different readerships. Western fiction appeared in magazines, often in the form of serialized novels, while works by Western thinkers in Turkish translation were also among material frequently published in magazines. Literary and political magazines often displayed a mixed profile, accommodating both translated and indigenous material. Magazines which exclusively published translations have been rare.

The decision to focus on translations from Western thought and literature was a critical one for editors of periodicals. The choice to publish translations rather than indigenous works implied that the editors noticed some lack in the domestic cultural system that they obviously thought could be compensated for by "importing" foreign texts. The lack to be overcome by translations changed throughout the years, since the intellectual and literary climate also evolved, but translation continued to serve as an instrument of change and a conveyor of ideas.

The first and the most notable example of the magazines focusing more or less exclusively on translations was the journal *Tercüme (Translation)* published between 1940 and 1966 by the

state-sponsored Translation Bureau. As the title suggests, this journal focused on translation and predominantly published translation-related articles, both translated and written by Turkish authors.

Tercume also published translations of Western fiction and philosophical works, with an overwhelming focus on translations of classical works. The publication policy of *Tercume* is indicative of the cultural and educational policy of the state and reflects the shifts that have taken place in them during the two and a half decades of the journal's operation. *Tercume's* publication policy is usually divided into several phases that pretty much correspond to phases in the political and cultural transformation of Turkey (Sauer 38). The journal was published regularly from 1940-46 with the highest number of critical articles and translations coming from Greek and Latin classics, considered to be the founding blocks of Western culture during Turkey's single-party era. With the accession to the multi-party democracy in 1946, *Tercume* started to be published irregularly and lost its critical edge, which can be interpreted as the effect of the backlash towards the cultural policies of the single-party era (to be outlined below). However, *Tercume* did have an enduring impact on the Turkish cultural system and was regarded with great admiration by future generations of intellectuals. Its legacy has been inherited by several short-lived translation journals in the 1980s and 1990s (for a full list of these journals see Berk 276).

The idea underlying *Tercume's* publishing policy, i.e., the transfer of Western culture and thought into the Turkish system via translation, was adopted by two journals in the 1960s: *Yeni Dergi* (or *The New Magazine*, 1964-75) and *Cep Dergisi* (or *The Pocket Magazine*, 1966-69). Unlike *Tercume*, these two journals did not focus only on translation-related subjects. Although they provided room for some translation criticism in their pages, their main concern was to enable Turkish readers to keep abreast of foreign intellectual trends. These two journals distinguished themselves from *Tercume* in the way that they followed contemporary sources and carefully emphasized their role as a conduit for the dissemination of current Western thought and literature. This study focuses on these two journals of the 1960s and problematizes their keenness to follow world trends, especially in terms of their timing. Another literary magazine, *Yeni Ufuklar* (or *New Horizons*, 1952-1976) will also be briefly explored in order to illustrate the shift of focus from domestic to international issues with the dawn of the 1960s. The paper will examine the underlying motives of these journals and the function they intended to serve in the Turkish cultural system by delving into questions such as why they prioritized translations over indigenous texts, why their editors felt the need to focus on contemporary trends, which trends they selected at the expense of which others, which target readership they addressed with which impact, and why they either ceased to be published, or shifted their attention to material produced domestically. The general aim of the study is to explore the interaction between Western intellectual thought in the 1960s and the Turkish cultural system and the role

of translated texts and translators as conveyors of foreign critical theory² into Turkey as it crystallizes in literary magazines.

Although the journals mentioned above presented themselves as mainly literary magazines and refrained from going into issues directly related to ideology and politics, a look at their contents will reveal that they did not merely act as a "conduit" for Western thought. It will become obvious in the following pages that they acted rather courageously in their selection of editorial material and opened their pages to examples of contemporary critical thought which clearly aimed to challenge the current social order.

One needs to have an overview of the political situation in the country to be able to contextualize the concerns and choices of the journals favoring translation to indigenous writing. The transition from the 1950s to the 1960s was a period characterized by pangs of democracy and politicization in Turkey. As the Democrat Party won the elections in 1950 following nearly three decades of single-party rule by the Republican People's Party, Turkey's geo-political position in the world was being re-defined. Turkey became a member of the Council of Europe in 1949 and of NATO in 1951, thus clearly making a choice in favor of the non-communist Western world. Nevertheless, this did not mean that the intellectual climate in Turkey immediately started integrating with contemporary Western philosophy and culture.

The Democrat Party placed heavy emphasis on the economic and material development of the country throughout the 1950s and enjoyed increasingly close ties with the United States in the economic and political sense. Unlike the Republican People's Party, the Democrat Party did not have a clearly pronounced program to educate the nation's citizens in order to give them a background in classical Western thought. Their cultural policies were more geared towards reviving the religious sentiment in the country; steps were taken to re-introduce words of Persian and Arabic origin into Turkish, religious education was re-incorporated into the school curricula, and the call to prayer which had been read out in Turkish during the single-party era started to be read out in Arabic. In the meantime, the government adopted a hard-line attitude against its opponents in the country and a series of repressive measures were introduced including that of press censorship (Zurcher 251). This was by no means a favorable atmosphere for democratic expression and intellectual progress. The last three years of the Democrat rule proved to be a period when intellectuals, students, and some military officers turned to political radicalism (Landau 5). Nevertheless, the political milieu did not allow an open platform for radical ideas and many of the ideas in circulation remained unelaborated and unconnected with international trends in the world. It was mainly in the 1960s that these ideas started to be raised publicly, mainly due to the military coup that took place in 1960 and the new and relatively more liberal constitution ratified in 1961. The developing radicalism of the 1960s made itself felt in the field of publishing mainly through translations of Marxist and socialist works including those by Marx,

Engels, Lenin, Harold J. Laski, John Strachey, Herbert Marcuse and Roger Garaudy (Landau 25-26). Literary and political magazines, likewise, started to increase their translated content and provided more room for international intellectual debates, especially those relating to Marxism and critical thought.

Translation and Westernization in Turkey

Translation in both its literary and technical forms has played a significant role in Turkey's trajectory of Westernization, which started to take shape well over two centuries ago. Translation from Western languages into Ottoman Turkish started in the 18th century with translations of works on geography, medicine, and pharmacology and continued in the 19th century with translations of military books and texts on academic subjects such as mathematics. Western literature only started to be translated in the 19th century and the first two translations from European literature appeared in 1859 (Ulken 320). These were Yusuf Kamil Pasha's version of Abbe Fenelon's *Les Aventures de Telemaque* and a collection of verse translations by Ibrahim Sinasi, including poems by La Fontaine, Lamartine, Gilbert and Racine (Paker 1998, 577). Translated Western, mainly French, literature introduced significant changes into the Ottoman literary system in terms of form, style, and theme (Paker 1991, 18).

Translation continued to serve a formative role in Turkey in the 20th century. After the proclamation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, a series of Western-inspired reforms were carried out in the country which held the education of the citizens as a priority. In this process, translations from Western classics, especially those carried out under the auspices of the Tercume Burosu ("Translation Bureau") founded in 1940, served to reinforce the educational project of the young republic and helped establish a new literary canon for Turkey. Literary translation became an institutionalized state matter and was embedded in a network made up of several cultural institutions, such as the Village Institutes and the People's Houses, both established with the aim of edifying the public, while disseminating the basic tenets of the republican regime (Tahir-Gurcaglar 105-132).

The translation of Western classics into Turkish had been regarded as an important need ever since the Ottoman Empire entered the path of Westernization in the mid 19th century. Ottoman intellectuals who advocated Westernism in arts and culture had been extending calls for a systematic selection and translation of major works constituting the basis of Western thought (for a debate on the importance of translating the classics into Turkish, see Kaplan). These calls resulted in the setting up of the Translation Bureau in 1940 under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. The involvement of the Ministry of Education in publishing and translation is an indication of the fact that education and publishing activity as well as literature were seen as integral and indispensable compo-

nents of the process of nation-building and of placing Turkey on a westward path.

In the 1930s and 1940s, translation was regarded as part and parcel of the efforts to shape a new cultural repertoire in Turkey. It would serve as the channel through which the foundations of a new Turkish literature would be established. In other words, the new Turkish literature would depend upon import. This import was envisaged as a planned and systematic flow of translations of major works belonging to Western literature. Translation of Greek and Latin classics was given special priority in that process, followed by the translation of French, Russian, German, and English classics.

The context set for translation activity was a political and ideological one, where translation was given the significant mission of creating the necessary intellectual and literary background for cultural Westernization. This implied a rather inferior view of Turkish culture and literature, which was found to be deficient vis-à-vis its European counterparts. European or Western literatures, two terms which were used interchangeably, were perceived to be more advanced than Turkish literature and were seen as models that could serve to improve the level of Turkish literature, especially in terms of the themes they tackled. Baha Durder's article published in *Kalem* (or *Pen*) in 1939 constitutes an example of this attitude. Durder wrote that Turkish writers were not of the same caliber as European writers. Like many of his contemporaries, Durder did not specify the shortcomings of Turkish writers but complained about a lack of contact with foreign literatures which resulted in a lack of literary inspiration for the new generation of writers. He also added that if Turks wanted to catch up with European literature they needed to rely on translations (Durder 269).

The establishment of the Translation Bureau and the launch of its journal *Tercume* in 1940 were significant breakthroughs in the field of translation and literature in Turkey. The early 1940s was a period when translation was under intensive discussion. *Tercume* played a significant role in setting the agenda for much of this discourse. Indeed, the discourse on translation throughout the 1940s offers an interesting case where translation became a public issue and a great deal of energy went into outlining the expected roles and strategies of translation. Although the activities of the Translation Bureau and of its journal *Tercume* declined somewhat starting from the mid 1940s, their impact on Turkey's intellectual life has been strong and enduring. The translations published in *Tercume* have been described as "a window opening to the West" (Sauer 47) and as an agent of "cultural and literary innovation" (Erhat 16).

Apart from literary translations and translated and indigenous essays on translation, *Tercume* featured translations of works by renowned Western authors and philosophers such as Francis Bacon (issue #1), Plato (# 4), Friedrich von Schiller (# 5), Arthur Schopenhauer (# 6), Seneca (# 5), Rene Descartes (# 8), G. W. Goethe (# 7, 11) and Montesque (# 7, 12). These translations were overwhelmingly chosen among "classical" writers and little atten-

tion was given to contemporary³ Western thought. The journal's publishing policy gave emphasis to classical works, but was not haphazard and was shaped according to a deliberate effort by the editorial board of *Tercume*. Nurullah Atac, the first chairman of the Translation Bureau and a prominent literary critic, made this explicit when he wrote that the journal's main aim was to "introduce well-known European writers to Turkish readers" (1). *Tercume* maintained this position until its closure in 1966 with small modifications. Contemporary intellectual trends started making their way into the magazine especially after the mid-1940s in a scattered and unsystematic manner. The special issue on Existentialism published in 1946 is a rare but interesting example of *Tercume's* involvement in contemporary critical thought.

During the initial years of *Tercume*, translation did not only emerge as a channel through which foreign ideas, genres, and themes would be imported into the Turkish cultural system. Translation was widely discussed both as a process and a product and *Tercume* provided a platform that witnessed intensive discussions on possible definitions and strategies of translation. Translation appeared as an intellectual tool that stimulated free thought. Critical articles published in *Tercume* demonstrate that there was both conflict and consensus over what translation was and how it could be carried out and that in spite of general agreement over the intended functions of translation there was plenty of disagreement over method and style. Following the downturn in the activities of the Translation Bureau and the growing irregularity of *Tercume* issues, the intensity of the discourse on translation dwindled—only to make a comeback in the 1960s.

The decreasing frequency of articles on translation after 1946 ran parallel to a re-planning process in the field of translated classics carried out during the transition to a multi-party system. When the state's culture planning attempts stagnated and changed direction, and when the function foreseen for translation as an instrument of cultural change started to lose its hold, translation exited the cultural agenda.

Imports of Contemporary Foreign Ideas

During the 50s and 60s, Turkish periodicals were the main sources for readers who wished to keep abreast of international movements. A noteworthy example is the left-wing magazine *Forum*, which was launched in '54. *Forum* was not a literary magazine and it did not have exclusive focus on translated material; however, it proved to be one of the pioneers in importing critical theory into the Turkish system of culture. This magazine was launched with the intention of triggering open debate, hence the name *Forum* (Forum 1-2). In the first issue of the magazine, the editors complained about the lack of a free platform for the airing of different views on politics and society in Turkey and ambitiously presented *Forum* as an instrument through which "an intellectual gap" could be filled (Ibid. 1). It should be borne in mind that

Forum came at a time when Democratic rule was at its strongest and the country's agricultural production thrived, keeping small landowners and tradesmen satisfied with the government. The founding of such a critical magazine indicates that, already in 1954, there was general discontent with the status quo among Turkish intellectuals, discontent that was channeled through a kind of publication that had hitherto not existed. The Democrat Party had come into power on the grounds that it would bring Turkey more democracy. This was a promise that obviously remained unfulfilled for the intellectuals and academics forming the editorial board of *Forum*. The editorial in the first issue clearly put this forward by emphasizing the importance of free debate and by stating that "the shortcomings of freedom can only be overcome by more freedom" (ibid.).

Although its initial mission was to provide ground for a discussion of "national matters" (ibid. 2), *Forum* provided room for translations from Western authors in its pages. These translations were usually of smaller articles taken from foreign newspapers and journals and mainly covered political and economic issues published under the heading "Ne Diyorlar?" ["What Are They Saying?"]. This section included translations from some Western periodicals such as *The Economist* (# 122, 1959), the New York *Herald Tribune* (# 127, 1959), and *The London Times* (# 221, 1964). These articles predominantly covered issues related to Turkey and included, among others, a critique of modern Turkey (# 75, 1957), urbanization in Istanbul (# 127, 1959), developments in Turkish nationalism (# 146, 1960), and Turkish democracy (# 221, 1963). *Forum* also featured translated articles on political and economic developments around the world.

Although *Forum* defined itself as a "bi-weekly neutral political, economic and cultural magazine," its cultural aspect remained limited to national topics such as Turkish literature, arts, and music throughout the 1950s. Its profile started changing in the late 1950s and the magazine started to inform readers of international cultural events. Throughout the 1960s, *Forum* published a range of articles written by Turkish writers composing reviews and surveys of international trends in thought such as existentialism (# 244, 1964; # 264, 1965), psychoanalysis (# 312, 1967), and Marxism (# 312, 1967; # 356, 1969). This interest in international cultural trends also led *Forum* to publish a serialized translation of György Lukács's "Aesthetic Writings of Marx and Engels" (# 353-358, 1968-69).

The increasing involvement of *Forum* in international cultural issues should not be assessed as an isolated and arbitrary move. A general shift of interest towards international events and ideas seems to have come about among the educated sections of the Turkish public with the turn of the decade. An article published in *Forum* in 1962 heralds a general increase of interest among the public in international arts. Mehmet Metin Nigar, the writer of the article, explains the extraordinary interest shown by Turkish visitors and art critics in two foreign-sponsored exhibitions in Turkey. These were the Italian Cultural Board's exhibition of Ravenna

mosaics and the French Cultural Centre's exhibition of French decorative arts (21).

This surge of interest was also partly due to a general concern in understanding Turkey's place in the world. As the Turkish historian Zafer Toprak maintains, "In the 1950s, Turkey tried to get to know herself, whereas in the 1960s she was mainly interested in getting to know the world." This definitely had to do with the general socio-political context in the country. A military coup took place in Turkey in 1960 and put an end to the Democrat Party government which had been in power since 1950. The new regime introduced a new constitution in 1961 that was rather different from the first Republican constitution. It provided unprecedented rights and liberties to the people and provided ground for radical politics whereby the intellectuals and workers, two groups who were tightly controlled during the Democrat Party regime, could question the establishment (Ahmad 186). The new freedoms promised by the constitution led to a flourishing of leftist thought in Turkey. The translation of political and especially left-wing writings and their publication in cheap editions played an important role in this: "The isolation of Turkey came to an end and the country became more aware of the world around it" (Ibid. 139). The 1960 military coup may have originated from the specific conditions of the country, but the politicization it led to in the society was certainly connected to larger trends in the world. These trends made their way into Turkey in a host of political magazines, including, among others, *Forum* and *Yön*, which provided the stage for lively debate among intellectuals and academics about various kinds of political and social issues (Zurcher 267). These debates were mainly created and maintained by academics who "began to see themselves as the moving force of the society" as the producers of the new constitution (Ibid. 268). This fit in perfectly with the earlier Republican image of the intellectuals as torchbearers in the society.

This was the background against which several literary magazines operated in Turkey in the 1960s, importing foreign intellectual trends into the Turkish cultural system. Unlike political magazines, these journals avoided making strong political statements and concentrated on providing an intellectual infrastructure for Turkish readers who had thus far received little exposure to the critical and intellectual dimensions of the literary, cultural, and political developments in Western society. However, it should also be remembered that these magazines and their editors were operating in a highly politicized and volatile environment. Turkey witnessed an increasingly hotter political climate in the 1960s. Radical political inclinations culminated in violent clashes between supporters of leftist and rightist ideologies, especially among university youth in the late 1960s. The journals which will be taken up in this paper seemed to make a conscious choice to appear apolitical, unlike the political magazines of the time, yet clearly made a political choice by specifically focusing on critical theory, which would no doubt challenge the status quo. Among these critical literary magazines

I will dwell upon three that played a significant role not only in the field of literature and translation, but also in the cultural system as a whole. These are *Yeni Ufuklar*, *Yeni Dergi*, and *Cep Dergisi*. *Yeni Dergi* will be held in special focus due to its unique and pioneering position in the Turkish history of culture and translation.

Literary Magazines as Planners of Culture in the 1960s

Literary magazines have played an important role in Turkey's cultural life since the 19th century; they are sites that reflect the shifting positions of intellectuals and writers in a constantly changing state systems and cultural repertoires (Gunyol 23). As the state's role and intervention in the cultural system declined in the multi-party era starting in 1946, the role of literary magazines became even more significant, becoming instruments of "culture planning."⁴ This was also the case for *Tercume* in the 1940s; however, as a periodical sponsored by the government, *Tercume* largely duplicated the "official" view of translation and literature. This view not only included the educational function closely attributed to translation in the single-party era but also covered specific ways of defining and doing translations. For instance, both *Tercume* and the translations carried out by the Translation Bureau put emphasis on textual integrity and were meticulous about indicating the names of the source author and source text on the translation. These were points not taken into much consideration in previous translations.

The relatively free intellectual environment created by the 1961 constitution opened up the path for more involvement by literary magazines in culture planning. New literary magazines were launched in the 1960s with growing focus on critical essays that were largely translations of foreign sources (Erdal Dogan 11). In other words, just like the government in the early 40s, independent literary magazines continued to rely on translation as an instrument of conveying new ideas into Turkish and therefore of giving a certain direction to cultural debates. The first journal I would like to briefly examine is *Yeni Ufuklar*. Unlike the other two, *Yeni Ufuklar* was launched in the 50s and the transformation in its publication policy is indicative of change in the country's intellectual climate.

Yeni Ufuklar

Yeni Ufuklar (1952-1976) was launched by a group of intellectuals who had formerly served at the Translation Bureau and were frustrated with the cultural policies of the multi-party era in the 50s, which aimed to reverse some of the republican reforms previously carried out and dissolve some of the cultural and educational institutions founded during the single-party government.⁵ As indicated earlier, the Democrat government did not have the same emphasis on education as the Republican People's Party, and the pivotal role granted to translation vis-à-vis the modernization efforts of the state disappeared in the 50s.

Yeni Ufuklar carried on the intellectual attitude of the single-party era and propagated humanism and the importance of Western cultural sources for the development of Turkish culture and literature. The journal never had the same focus on translated material as *Yeni Dergi* and *Cep Dergisi*, but modified its profile to serve a similar function in the 60s. Vedat Gunyol and Sabahattin Eyuboglu, who had been involved with the journal since its establishment, shifted its focus from literature and fiction to critical essays in the late 50s, which they thought were largely lacking in Turkey (Erdal Dogan 63). Moreover, Gunyol, who was the editor of *Yeni Ufuklar*, established Çan publications in the early 60s in order to translate works which shaped the contemporary intellectual climate in the West, such as works by Jean Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Bertrand Russell, and the first professional revolutionary Noel "Gracchus" Babeuf (Ibid.).

While *Yeni Ufuklar* focused on the translations of classical works in the 1950s, it started combining classical translations with translations of contemporary works in the 1960s. For instance, the 132nd issue of the journal published in 1963 included translations of works by both Denis Diderot and Roget Garaudy. This trend became especially pronounced after 1964, and the journal started following international periodicals such as *Le Monde*, *Encounter*, and *Courier* and offering translations of articles from those. The journal provided room for introducing contemporary intellectual trends and, among others, published an interview with Sartre (# 146, 1964), an interview with Claude Lèvi-Strauss, two articles on the *nouvelle roman* (No.s 158, 1965 and 170, 1966), and an essay on neo-realism (# 167, 1966). This indicates that *Yeni Ufuklar* became part of the efforts to reflect contemporary trends in Turkey. Its changing profile in the 60s shows that readers were no longer content with discussions of domestic matters or translations of Western classics. Instead, they wished to become a part of the intellectual debates that were taking place in Europe and the United States. The only means available for readers to follow these debates was translation.

Yeni Dergi

Yeni Dergi was launched by De Publications in 1964. *Yeni Dergi* had a radical agenda through which it obviously intended to fill a large gap in the Turkish cultural system by providing translations of contemporary critical theory from the West. The aim was to change the profile of Turkish readers by providing a rich and international intellectual perspective. The journal further aimed to "publish essential reading material, in-depth studies, and pieces which would shed light upon topical issues and trends in vogue" (Gursoy and Mollamustafaoglu 12). Although the editors of *Yeni Dergi* never pronounced this openly, another likely aim of the journal appears to have been to offer alternative and critical modes of thinking about culture and society in order to challenge the established cultural system in Turkey.

De Publications, *Yeni Dergi's* parent company, started operating in '59 and reflected the rising interest in modern international trends in Turkey. The company had overwhelming emphasis on foreign sources. By 1964 it had published a total of 40 books under six separate series; only 7 (17.5 per cent) of those were by Turkish authors. Art criticism and theory occupied a significant portion of De's publications of non-fiction. Among 13 books published under two series ("Information" and "Criticism, Essay, Analysis"), four were on existentialism, two on surrealism, and one on Bertolt Brecht's theory of Epic Theater (as shown on the back cover of the first issue of *Yeni Dergi*). *Yeni Dergi* should be assessed as an extension of the same publication policy. Memet Fuat, the owner and editor of both De and *Yeni Dergi*, has pointed out that the publishing house and the journal should not be thought of as separate entities and that their aims and policies were identical (Ibid. 11).

Yeni Dergi's first issue, appearing in October 1964, introduced the journal's aim as "translating the arts and intellectual debates in other languages into our own" (Memet Fuat 1964, 2). This first issue introduced *Yeni Dergi* as a planned and programmatic publication and stated that the journal would not consist of an arbitrary collection of different writings but would comprise commissioned essays which would be prepared according to preliminary studies (Ibid.). The journal also announced its academic connections in the first issue and mentioned that "scholars" would be contributing to the journal (Ibid.). *Yeni Dergi* was unique both in the way that it focused on translated articles and emphasized the need to present a planned and informed approach to the material it published. Memet Fuat stated that the public needed to base their knowledge on books rather than on cursory information spreading with the word of mouth, which in turn indicates that he was concerned with the rise of popular movements that seemed to lack the kind of technical and intellectual sophistication he believed was necessary to critical thought. People had to have "direct and unmediated" access to foreign works (Memet Fuat 1965a, 51). Elsewhere, he stated that his aim in both publishing the books and *Yeni Dergi* was to offer translations of in-depth studies that would enlighten the readers about contemporary problems and popular intellectual trends and replace ungrounded and superficial debate (Gursoy and Mollamustafaoglu 12). He pointed out that he adopted a multifaceted and non-judgmental approach while he selected the contents of the journal and that he gave weight to topical material (Ibid. 15).

Yeni Dergi's focus on translations continued until '69, when the journal started to prioritize domestic over translated material. The average rate of translated material within the total (in terms of the number of pages) from 1964 to '68 was 52%, while this decreased to 18.8% during 1969-75 (Kabakçioğlu 1997a, 33). This may indicate that the journal had a certain goal that appears to have been fulfilled towards the late 1960s. The domestic essays that started replacing translations was of two kinds: literary and critical. Turkish poets and short story writers started appearing in the jour-

nal more often in the late 1960s, while critical essays on, especially, art and society written by Turkish writers also appeared more frequently in *Yeni Dergi* in the same period.

Yurdanur Salman, who worked as assistant editor for *Yeni Dergi*, interprets this intention as the raising of a new generation well versed in theory and translation and the establishment of an intellectual infrastructure upon which domestic ideas and intellectual debates could flourish. Salman maintains that a major goal of the journal was to create sound criteria for literary and art criticism. Indeed, critical reviews of both specific works and artists written by Turkish authors started appearing in *Yeni Dergi* more often in the late 60s, which indicates that the journal first attempted to lay the grounds of such criticism first through translation and then through publishing indigenous pieces which conformed to the principles advocated in the translations.

Salman's interpretation seems to be on target, as Memet Fuat himself wrote in 1967 that *Yeni Dergi* was decreasing its translated portion and increasing indigenous articles simply because the quality of articles written by Turkish authors was becoming better and better (1967a, 2). The fact that he provided more room for contemporary Turkish poets and writers after that date thus meant that he sensed an improvement in the quality of domestic literature.

Thus, *Yeni Dergi* not only served as a platform for the transfer and dissemination of foreign intellectual trends but also acted as a "school" which trained young critics and translators. The names seen on the pages of *Yeni Dergi* in the 60s are today among the most eminent and prolific translators and intellectuals in the country (Kabakcioglu 1997a, 37). Salman gives an account of her visits to the premises of the journal where a number of young translators were given advice and provided guidance in terms of their translation strategies. She remembers how she spent time with her younger colleagues revising their translations.

A look at the tables of contents of *Yeni Dergi* confirms that the journal published works from a diversity of authors and trends, but mainly critical thought and literary criticism. A quantitative analysis of its eleven-year history shows that *Yeni Dergi* published translations covering a number of fields such as critical theory, philosophy, aesthetics, politics, psychology, and literature. Just over 60% of the translations featured by the journal have been associated with critical thought (Kabakcioglu 1997a, 35). Existentialism was a favorite topic: the journal featured 6 translated pieces by Jean-Paul Sartre (*ibid.*) as well as a number of translated and indigenous pieces written on Sartre and existentialism including those by Claude Simone (# 1, 1964), Bernard Pingaud (# 2, 1964), and Demir Ozlu (# 6 and 7, 1965). Albert Camus was also a name that repeatedly appeared in the journal both in translation and as a subject of essays. The journal followed existentialist literature quite closely. For instance, an interview with Sartre published in *Le Monde* on political commitment in art was published in the same year by the journal (# 1, 1964) and Sartre's "Questions on Realism"

was published only with a few months of delay in *Yeni Dergi* (# 5, 1965). One of the reasons why *Yeni Dergi* was so engaged with existentialism may have originated from the fact that French was still the dominant language among Turkish writers and intellectuals during the 60s as it had been for the past century or so, and that writers and intellectuals had easier access to material printed in French. In fact, *Yeni Dergi* was not alone in its emphasis on existentialism. This philosophy may be considered the most popular and widespread foreign intellectual trend in Turkey throughout the 50s and 60s.

Marxist criticism occupied a significant place in *Yeni Dergi's* repertoire, as well. The journal not only published a special issue on Marxist criticism (# 44, which was interestingly published in May 1968), but also published individual articles on the topic, among them essays by Christopher Caudwell (# 9, 1965), Edmund Wilson (# 25, 1966), and Herbert Marcuse (# 48, 1968). *Yeni Dergi* published a total of 15 special issues in 1964-1968 and 12 of these consisted of translations. These special issues covered such issues as stream-of-consciousness writing (# 8, 1965), the *nouvelle roman* (# 14, 1965), modern Chinese poetry (# 32, 1967), and William Faulkner (# 38, 1967), who attracted a great deal of interest in the 50s and 60s.

Yeni Dergi was mainly concerned with the imports of critical theory and establishing a basis for Turkish literary criticism (Salman); however, this did not mean that it paid no attention to other arts. It published a series of articles on trends in visual and performing arts including Pop and Op art (# 7, 1965), Jacques Demy as a filmmaker (# 7, 1965), and modern Italian cinema (# 44, 1968). Many translated articles in *Yeni Dergi* were taken from international magazines published either in English or in French such as *Encounter*, *Le Monde*, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, *The Paris Review*, and *Cahiers du Cinema*. Salman recalls subscribing to *Encounter* and spending time in the library of the British Council in Istanbul to follow international magazines and to find articles for translation to appear in *Yeni Dergi*.

This focus on contemporary material was not an imposition on the part of the editors of the journal. The readers of the journal demanded it. In a letter he sent to the editor, one reader, Gunel Altintas, demanded that the journal publish significant articles from international periodicals with "a delay of maximum one month." He wrote, "I would like to find out what is being written and discussed in France, England, Germany, Italy, America, Russia and the less developed countries today." This demonstrates the appetite shown for contemporary non-fiction and the popular drive behind Memet Fuat's decision to launch a magazine with mainly translated content. However, Memet Fuat did not design *Yeni Dergi* to appeal to the general public. With its intellectual profile and translations that still remained inaccessible to the layperson, *Yeni Dergi* sold a maximum of 3,000 copies, its average circulation being around 1,500 (Memet Fuat 1968, 461). In an assessment of the first four years of the journal, Memet Fuat writes that a considerable

number of the initial readers stopped reading *Yeni Dergi* while new readers joined over time. People stopped reading the journal because “some have a difficult time reading *Yeni Dergi*. They find the pieces too long and heavy. Furthermore, there is a linguistic challenge for the readers which has more to do with terms and concepts” (Ibid.).

It is quite obvious that *Yeni Dergi* had an intellectual agenda. Its main ideological stance was to appear not to be ideologically driven. Memet Fuat carefully emphasized this in his editorial articles in the journal. He wrote that he refused to make the journal a mouthpiece for specific ideas or people (Memet Fuat 1965a: 51) and that he would publish the works of all authors who have gained respect beyond a certain degree (Memet Fuat 1968: 462). He also pointed out that this attitude lost the journal many readers but that he would not compromise (Memet Fuat 1968: 462). This approach placed *Yeni Dergi* in a difficult, yet distinctive position within the cultural system and is probably one of the reasons why the journal is still regarded very highly over two decades after its closure (Mehmet H. Dogan 1997; Kabakcioglu 1997a, 1997b). Nevertheless, in retrospect, the general profile of the journal associates it with Marxism and Marxist critical theory.

Through *Yeni Dergi* Memet Fuat and his associates offered the readers a new intellectual repertoire whose options were largely shaped by translation. *Yeni Dergi* appeared to fill a gap in the Turkish cultural system by offering monolingual Turkish readers access to contemporary international trends. Its editors and writers emerged as “culture planners” as they sought to shape the Turkish system of culture through the imports of foreign texts and ideas. This was not a novel idea, but what was new, and what made Memet Fuat a pioneer in the field of culture planning, was that for the first time there were systematic efforts shown to bring the Turkish system of culture abreast with international trends. Unlike his predecessors in *Tercume* during the single-party era who clearly foregrounded classical humanism over other intellectual paths, Memet Fuat offered his readers alternative and contemporary perspectives which did not always make up an integral and holistic worldview. However, the editors, writers, and translators of *Yeni Dergi* did transmit a uniform signal to their readers: the importance of being informed and critical individuals.

***Yeni Dergi*: A Translation Planner**

Yeni Dergi was involved in translation planning as much as it was involved in culture planning. *Yeni Dergi* was not a translation journal in the sense that *Tercume* was; however, it almost owed its existence to translation, especially during its first few years. The large translated content of the journal obliged Memet Fuat to take translation seriously and to ponder on ways to improve the quality of translation practice. Memet Fuat was a translator himself and had come to deal with translational issues since the establishment of De publications; however, his involvement in translation appears

to have been more than an obligation. In the second issue of *Yeni Dergi*, he announced to the readers that one of the future issues of the journal would be devoted to “translation perspectives” (1964b: 51). This promise remained undelivered, but *Yeni Dergi* allocated considerable space to discussion of translation criticism (# 44, 1968) and translations of Franz Kafka’s works (# 26, 1966; 30, 1967; 34, 1967; 43, 1968) and of *The Great Gatsby* (# 33, 1967). *Yeni Dergi*’s biggest endeavour in the field of translation was the organization of a series of seminars on translation in order to “regulate the translation efforts that have been developing around De publications and *Yeni Dergi*” (*Yeni Dergi*), to develop a new understanding of translation and to train new translators (advertisement published in 1967 in *Yeni Dergi*, 4: 39, 394). These seminars mainly aimed at university students. The current stock of the journal’s translators also consisted of undergraduate and graduate university students such as Murat Belge, Nedim Gursel, Onay Sozer, Nur Deris, and Cevat Capan who are all prominent writers and translators today. The translation seminars were never realized due to a lack of interest by the public. An announcement in *Yeni Dergi* expressed the lament felt in this and read “our hopes at training new translators will have to continue to lie with irregular, arbitrary and idealistic efforts” (announcement published in 1968 in *Yeni Dergi*, 4: 40, 457). It is clear from the idea of organizing translation seminars that *Yeni Dergi* had a certain vision of translation it intended to impart to young translators-to-be. The seminars would involve not only an analysis of the styles of famous writers and translators, but also a study on “the basic principles of an exemplary translation perspective” (advertisement published in 1967 in *Yeni Dergi*, 4: 39, 394). *Yeni Dergi* also saw it as its mission to plan translation activity in a certain manner, firstly in terms of the selection of titles to be translated through the options that it offered for the cultural repertoire, and secondly in terms of the translation strategies to be observed by translators.

The translation strategies that are employed and recommended in the various translations published in the journal distinguish themselves from earlier ones in radical ways. The best example of the new approach to translation fostered by the journal was a series of articles on translation criticism. These articles appeared in *Yeni Dergi* in 1966 and ‘67 and explicitly called for close adherence to the author’s style, condemning “free” translations (see Ozlu, Sozer, Sipal, Sozer, and Deris). This was an approach that polarized translation strategies and largely favored the pole of “fidelity.” Throughout the early Republican period, right up to the 60s, those who wrote on translation strategies usually recommended a balanced mix of “fidelity” and “freedom.”⁶ Fluency appeared as the most salient expectation from a good translation (Hizir 488, Ay 77, Unsel 10), but extreme forms of domestication were criticized and warned against (Tuncel 21, Delilbsi 467).

The series of articles on translation published in *Yeni Dergi* started with a review of translations of Kafka’s *The Castle* into Turkish by Demir Ozlu. In his review, Ozlu praised the translation carried

out by Kâmuran Sıpal and pointed out that the Turkish translation was better in reflecting “the world of Kafka” (404). However, another review published in the same issue, this time by Onay Sozer, criticized the translation for being too free and distorting the style of the text (Sozer 411). Sozer extracted an example from the translation and compared it with the source paragraph, concluding that there were “disturbing deviations” from the source text. He offered his own translation, which was in turn criticized for being “word for word” by Sıpal in his response to Sozer’s review (214-15). A few months later, another review appeared in *Yeni Dergi*. This was a critique by Nur Deris of the translation of *The Great Gatsby*. In her critique, Deris suggested that a translator should fully adopt the way of expression of the writer and that s/he should restrain her/his creativity (459-61). In ‘68, a review of the Turkish translation of Kafka’s *America* was published in *Yeni Dergi*. This piece was not any different than those by Sozer and Deris. Ender Erenel, the writer of the review, accused Arif Gelen’s translation of not being loyal to the source text and failing to render the style of the author (Erenel 1968a, 240). Erenel also referred to a common trope: the need to produce “transparent” translations and noted that the more transparent a translation was, the more successful it would be (ibid. 239). The next issue published an article by Erenel where he suggested that translation criticism should pay attention to whether the translator has succeeded in transferring the style of the author into Turkish (1968b, 288). This was indeed in line with Memet Fuat’s ideas on the topic. Memet Fuat advocated the concept of “stylistic correspondence” in translation in *Yeni Dergi* and deliberately encouraged young translators to adopt this approach (1967b, 2). He retained the same view in later years of his career although he never explicitly explained what he exactly meant by “style” (Gursoy and Mollamustafaoglu 19-21).

Although *Yeni Dergi* was not a translation journal, it is quite evident that its editor, writers, and translators held a certain concept of translation which they openly propagated in the pages of the journal. Their view of translation was very much source oriented and clearly advocated the supremacy of the author over the translator’s personal style. Oddly enough, *Yeni Dergi*’s careful treatment of the source text and source authors in translation is a continuation of the practices of the Translation Bureau. Both always cited the titles of the foreign texts which served as a source for translation as well as the names of their authors. This was a part of their effort to create awareness about the source texts. This part of their planning project became a success and set an example for private publishers involved in canonical literature in the 50s (Tahir-Gurcaglar 280). In this regard, *Yeni Dergi* was essentially a continuation of cultural planning processes launched in the 40s; however, the more subtle aspects of the strategies it propagated indicate that Memet Fuat and his associates were nevertheless trying to create a paradigm shift toward “full fidelity.” Although the mode and the strategies preferred changed somewhat, *Yeni Dergi* is also notable for continuing a tradition largely developed during the sin-

gle-party era: the use of translation as an instrument of culture planning (translation as planning) and deliberate effort to plan translation in specific ways both in terms of content and strategy (translation planning).

Although the Translation Bureau and *Tercüme* were careful about underlining the foreign origins of translations, they displayed a mixed approach in terms of translation strategies. While “fidelity” to the source text was an important issue, the translator’s creativity and linguistic fluency were also granted a significant position. Strict adherence to the norms of the source text was by no means appreciated. In that sense, the Translation Bureau appeared to advocate a mid-way between “fidelity” and “freedom” in translation. Why did Memet Fuat, having adopted the approach of the Translation Bureau in terms of positioning translation as a significant tool of culture planning, opt for the extreme of full fidelity? I suggest that this has to do with Memet Fuat’s emphasis on the importance of penetrating the meaning and style of the material being translated and using it to create an in-depth knowledge of the ideas being expressed. His attitude in guiding and encouraging the readers into acquiring a new reading habit is very telling in this respect. For instance in his introduction to the translation of Sartre’s “Questions on Realism,” Memet Fuat warned readers that they should not be disheartened when challenged by the philosophical discourse and the terminology used in the translation. He advised them to pay extra attention and, if necessary, to underline parts of it (1965b, 2). Ironically, strict adherence to the norms of the source text in translation created the opposite effect in the readers and put the reader’s comprehension of the target text at risk, as stated elsewhere in the paper. Another reason for Memet Fuat and his associates’ efforts to create “transparent” translations may have stemmed from the fact that they regarded Turkish intellectual discourse and literature as inferior to Western ones since they constantly positioned translations as being necessarily subservient to their source texts.

Cep Dergisi

Cep Dergisi was the second journal that focused on translated material launched in the 60s. It was published by Varlik, one of the largest and oldest publishing houses in Turkey.⁷ Varlik also published a literary magazine under the same name. *Varlik* (or *Wealth*) is still published after almost seventy years, had more focus on Turkish literature, and published mainly indigenous writing. Yasar Nabi Nayir, who was the editor of both the publishing house and the literary magazine, was the figure behind the decision to launch a translation journal. In his editorial in the first issue of *Cep Dergisi*, he explained the motives behind his decision to produce the journal:

I come across many interesting, thought-provoking and enlightening articles, ideas, and information in foreign periodicals and books. I noticed that very few of those

were translated for the Turkish readers. I developed the impression that our citizens who did not speak foreign languages or those intellectuals who did not have access to these publications were stuck in the twilight of culture and science ... I felt an irresistible urge to launch this journal (1-3).

In the same editorial, Nayir offered clues as to why he launched *Cep Dergisi* despite the existence of *Yeni Dergi* which was of a similar profile, stating that the existing journals and books published translations remained inaccessible to the readers due to their difficult and unreadable translation style (Ibid. 2).

Nayir's editorial suggested that the journal would not publish anything on national issues, arts, or literature and would focus on foreign issues and sources. Indeed, this became the general policy of *Cep Dergisi* and throughout its 29 issues, translations of fiction and non-fiction occupied up to 80% of the contents of the journal. The pieces by Turkish authors appearing in the journal were all non-fiction and treated issues about contemporary international literary, artistic, and philosophical trends. This was evident in the slogan that appeared on the cover pages of all issues of the journal: "The window opening up to the world." Moreover, the journal described itself as "a magazine which follows artistic and intellectual trends in the world."

Like *Yeni Dergi*, *Cep Dergisi* did not subscribe to a specific intellectual or ideological trend. It tried to reflect the host of issues and debates that took place in the West. It is therefore no coincidence that the first issue started with the translation of an essay by André Maurois titled "Living our Age" on which Maurois wrote about the rapid technological changes that the world had gone through during the past 50 years and invited readers to contemplate on the future of the society. Maurois was a favorite in the journal and was translated and published frequently, especially during the journal's first two years.

The trends represented in *Cep Dergisi* were similar to those tackled by *Yeni Dergi*. Existentialism (# 2, 1966; # 3, 1967; # 6, 1967; # 25, 1968; # 26, 1968), the *nouvelle roman* (# 12, 1967; # 15, 1968; # 19, 1968), and Kafka and his works (# 5, 1967; # 8, 1967; # 9, 1967; # 16, 1968) were among the common topics taken up by the two journals. However, *Cep Dergisi* did not have the same focus on Marxist criticism as *Yeni Dergi* and preferred to concentrate on structuralism, publishing three articles by Roland Barthes (# 2, 1966; 8, 1967; 13, 1967) and one by Claude Lèvi-Strauss (# 16, 1968).⁸

Cep Dergisi attached a similar function to translation as *Yeni Dergi* and regarded it as a significant instrument for the transfer of certain ideas into the Turkish system of culture. As an experienced publisher, Nayir already held the tools to affect changes in the cultural and literary repertoire of the country by offering it different options in the form of indigenous and translated books and articles. However, he saw it as his duty to launch a separate publication that would focus on contemporary intellectual trends only and which

would mainly operate through translation. Once more, translation was being positioned as a conveyor of ideas. In the editorial he wrote for the first issue, he problematized current translation practice as it appeared in books and periodicals and implied that his journal would set out to improve it (Nayir 2). Nevertheless, another editorial he wrote in the thirteenth issue of the journal suggests that the translations published in *Cep Dergisi* also suffered from the same problems as the translations Nayir initially criticized and that the “pure Turkish” used by the translators of the journal was difficult to understand for some readers. Another problem was that readers found some of the critical pieces published in the journal too “heavy” to follow (1967: 131). Despite these comments, there is no concrete evidence in *Cep Dergisi* suggesting that it set out to form a new paradigm for translation like *Yeni Dergi* or that it had the aim of improving on poor translations or training new translators.

Both *Yeni Dergi* and *Cep Dergisi* continued the vision of translation which came about in early republican Turkey. This vision is closely related to three others: the reliance on “imports” rather than indigenous creation in the setting up of a sound intellectual infrastructure in Turkey, a continued admiration of Western cultural products and a wish to import these into the Turkish cultural system and a specific vision of the “intellectual” as someone who assumes the role of a leader for cultural/intellectual progress. This last vision is embodied in the persons of Memet Fuat, Yasar Nabi Nayir, Vedat Gunyol, and similar publishers who chose rather challenging material to publish in their journals, insisting that those be read and absorbed to the point of inviting the reader to “underline parts of the texts.” Although political conditions changed dramatically between the 1930s and the 1960s, the role assumed by the intellectual remained an invariant in the Turkish cultural system as writers, publishers, translators, and other groups of intellectuals strove to lead people out of “the twilight of culture and science.” In this struggle, translation, in its various forms and strategies, remained a major conveyor.

Concluding Remarks: Publishers as Agents of a Political and Intellectual Shift

As the three journals included in this paper illustrate, the 1960s witnessed a new intellectual climate in Turkey which was by and large more critical towards politics, culture, and society when compared to previous decades. Why did this shift occur at that point in time? The military coup and the new constitution it led to originated from Turkey’s specific conditions, but is it safe to assume that Turkey remained immune to the developing global consciousness in the 50s and 60s? The military coup was also an act of planning that was geared towards giving a certain direction to Turkish society. The new constitution drafted after the coup prepared the background against which this direction could be taken by the institutions and citizens of the country. Most Turkish intellectuals

clearly favored the creation of a more outward-looking cultural system, and the new interest in contemporary intellectual trends in the world is a part of this attitude. The imports of intellectual trends into Turkey via translation fostered a more critical atmosphere which had repercussions in the fields of culture and politics. The more the cultural system became exposed to foreign contemporary trends, the higher became the awareness about the importance of keeping in touch with the world. In this process, publishers of literary magazines played a significant role in establishing the channels through which these trends flowed into Turkey and thus became active agents of change within the domestic cultural system. Memet Fuat, Gunyol, and Nayir shaped the pace and structure of this change through their journals by their decisions to open up their publications to international influences, by the fact that they chose to transfer foreign ideas into the Turkish system via translation rather than indigenous writing, and by their selection of the trends to be transferred. We should also bear in mind that their cultural activities were not confined to magazine publishing. All three journals analyzed existed within a network of a larger intellectual effort which was complemented with publishing houses, namely De, Varlik, and Can.

Both Gunyol and Nayir also operated within the single-party cultural environment. Gunyol translated for the Translation Bureau in its initial humanist stage and played a significant role in the cultural system in carrying on the same perspective in the 50s in *Yeni Ufuklar*. Nayir had been a major literary figure since the 30s. Their decision to turn to contemporary foreign intellectual influences in the 60s cannot be explained away as individual choices, but rather points at the presence of a collective drift towards these influences. In turn, this drift needs to be assessed both vis-à-vis the internal political transformation of Turkey as a centrifugal force and the global rise in radical and critical consciousness which served as a centripetal force for Turkish intellectuals.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the intellectual transformation in Turkey towards a more culture-critical stance was not a mass movement. The statements published in the three journals included in this study clearly suggest that they were geared towards an intellectual audience. As indicated earlier, the circulation of *Yeni Dergi*, the most prolific of the three, was an average of 1,500 copies. Furthermore, even those readers who bought the journal had a difficult time reading it due to the fact that the concepts and language used in the translations were largely inaccessible.

On the other hand, socialist and Marxist literature was largely translated and read and, as Zafer Toprak points out, the 1960s became "an age of enlightenment" for Turkish intellectuals and youth in developing class-consciousness (158). Political radicalism and the rise of left-wing movements did affect all sections of the society and the citizens of the country were obliged to take a favoring or opposing stance. University students were most vulnerable to the new political influences and the 1968 student events around the world had a direct impact on student movements in Turkey

(Ibid.). These movements led to considerable violence in the country, which turned out to be one of the reasons for the military communiqué issued in 1971 restricting some of the rights and liberties granted by the 1961 constitution. It then becomes evident that in the 1960s translation not only served as a conveyor for Western critical thought which had an impact on a small intellectual coterie, but also as an instrument of political activism that had ramifications for the whole society.

Notes

¹The concept of repertoire has been defined as “the aggregate of options utilized by a group of people, and by the individual members of the group, for the organization of life” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 355).

²In this article I use the terms “critical thought” and “critical theory” interchangeably. I do not use these in the narrow sense, referring only to the Frankfurt School, its members, and its products. In this study, “critical theory” is used to refer to research and theorizing that aims to generate self-reflexive criticism and emancipatory social change.

³By “contemporary works,” I mean the intellectual and artistic production of the 20th century and not necessarily only of the 1950s and 60s.

⁴Itamar Even-Zohar defines culture planning as “a deliberate act of intervention, either by power holders or by ‘free agents’ into an extant or crystallizing repertoire” (1997a: 2).

⁵Among these institutions were the Village Institutes and the People’s Houses which were both set up in the 1930s as a part of the state’s efforts to reinforce a sense of nationhood, to educate the public, and to spread the republican ideology.

⁶For a critical analysis of the discourse on translation strategies in early republican Turkey, see Tahir-Gurcaglar 2001.

⁷Varlik was the first publishing house to introduce the pocket book format in Turkey, which proved to be a great success. The title of *Cep Dergisi* was probably chosen in order to associate the journal with books published by Varlik. The journal itself was also published in the form of a pocket book and looked more like a book than a periodical.

⁸For a detailed account of Roland Barthes’ entry into the Turkish cultural system via translations, see Susam-Sarajeva.

Works Cited

- Advertisement. *Yeni Dergi* 39 (1967): 394.
 Ahmad, Feroz. *The Making of Modern Turkey*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

- _____. *The Turkish Experiment in Democracy, 1950-1975*. London: C. Hurst & Company, 1977.
- Akan, Ali Rauf. "Tercume Dergisinin Özel Sayisi." *Tercume* 7.38 (1946): 85-86.
- Altintas, Gunel. "En Cok Bir Ay," *Yeni Dergi* 2 (1965): 14.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Announcement. *Yeni Dergi*, 40 (1968): 457.
- Atac, Nurullah. "Ceviri Uzerine." *Ulku* 2.13 (1948): 3-4.
- _____. "Ikinci Yila Girerken." *Tercume* 2.7 (1941): 1-2.
- Ay, Lutfi. "Degirmenimden Mektuplar Tercumeleri," *Tercume* 4.19 (1943): 72-79.
- Berk, Ozlem. Translation and Westernisation in Turkey (from the 1840s to the 1980s). Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Centre for British & Comparative Cultural Studies, U of Warwick, June 1999).
- Burian, Orhan. "Tercume ve Bizim Icin Manasi Uzerine." *Ulku* 7.75 (1944): 17-18.
- Delilbasi, Ali Suha. "Cimri Tercumesi Dolayisiyla." *Tercume* 4.24 (1944): 461-68.
- Deris, Nur. "Muhtesem Gatsby ve Bir Ceviri Anlayisi Uzerine." *Yeni Dergi* 3.33 (1967): 459-64.
- Dogan, Erdal. *Edebiyatimizda Dergiler*. Istanbul: Baglam, 1997.
- Dogan, Mehmet H. "Yeni Dergi: Cagdasliga Acilan Pencere." *Kuram* 13 (1997): 25-27.
- Durder, Baha. "Cift Tercumeler." *Kalem* 6 (1938): 269-270.
- Erener, Ender. "Amerika, Dava, Sato ve Iki Ceviri Anlayisi." *Yeni Dergi* 4.43 (1968a), 236-40.
- _____. "Hikaye – Elestiri Cevirisi." *Yeni Dergi* 4.44 (1968b): 283-88.
- Erhat, Azra. "Tercume Burosu." *Yeni Ufuklar*, 21.247 (1974): 8-16.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Culture Planning and Cultural Resistance in the Making and Maintaining of Entities." Paper delivered at "Relocation of Languages and Cultures," Duke U, 6-11 May 1997a.
- _____. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer." *Target* 9.2 (1997b): 355-363.
- Forum, "Forum'un Davasi.," *Forum* 1:1 (1954): 1-2.1
- Gunyol, Vedat. *Sanat ve Edebiyat Dergileri*. Istanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1983.
- Gursoy, Muge and Levent Mollamustafaoglu. "Memet Fuat'la Soylesi." *Metis Ceviri* 1 (1987): 11-21.
- Hizir, N. and N. "Bir Shakespeare Tercumesi Munasebetiyle." *Tercume* 1.5 (1941): 488-89.
- Kabakcioglu, Ozcan. "Yeni Dergi: Bir Derginin Anatomisi I." *Kuram* 13 (1997a): 23-37.
- _____. "Yeni Dergi: Bir Derginin Anatomisi II." *Kuram*, # 14 (1997b), 6-10.
- Kaplan, Ramazan. *Klasikler Tartismasi*. Ankara: Atatürk Kultur Merkezi Baskanligi Yayinlari, 1998.
- Landau, Jacob M. *Radical Politics in Modern Turkey*. Leiden: E. J.

- Brill, 1974.
- Memet Fuat, "Bu Sayı." *Yeni Dergi* 1.1 (1964a): 2.
- _____. Untitled. *Yeni Dergi* 1.2 (1964b): 2, 51.
- _____. Untitled. *Yeni Dergi* 1.4 (1965a): 51.
- _____. Untitled. *Yeni Dergi* 1.5 (1965b): 2.
- _____. Untitled. *Yeni Dergi* 3.36 (1967a): 2.
- _____. Untitled. *Yeni Dergi*, 3.30 (1967b): 2.
- _____. "Yeni Dergi'nin Yeni Düzeni Üstüne." *Yeni Dergi* 5.51 (1968): 461-64.
- Nayir, Yasar Nabi "İkinci Yıla Baslarken." *Cep Dergisi* 13 (1967): 131.
- Nigar, Mehmet Metin. "Masa ile tutulan sanat." *Forum* 198 (1962): 21-22.
- Ozlu, Demir. "Sato Cevirisi Üzerine Bir Çıkma." *Yeni Dergi* 3.26 (1966): 402-04.
- Paker, Saliha. "The Age of Translation and Adaptation, 1850-1914: Turkey." *Modern Literature in the Near and Middle East 1850-1970*. Ed. Robin Ostle. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.
- _____. "Turkish Tradition." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Salman, Yurdanur. Personal interview. 20 May 2002.
- Sauer, Jutta. "Türkiye'de İlk Çeviri Dergisi: Tercüme." *Kebikec* 5 (1997): 35-49.
- Sinanoglu, Suat. "Protogoras'ın Tercümesi Hakkında." *Tercüme* 1.5 (1941): 485-87.
- Sipal, Kâmuran. "Dava ve Sato Çevirileri Üzerine." *Yeni Dergi* 3.30 (1967): 212-25.
- Sozer, Onay. "Kafka'dan İki Roman." *Yeni Dergi* 3.26 (1966): 405-12.
- _____. "Kafka'dan 'Dava' ve 'Sato' Çevirileri." *Yeni Dergi* 3.34 (1967): 61-64.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Sebnem. *Translation and Travelling Theory*. Unpublished dissertation. U College London, 2002.
- Tahir-Gurcaglar, Sehnaz. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Unpublished dissertation. Bogaziçi U, Istanbul, Turkey, 2001.
- Toprak, Zafer. "1968'i Yargılamak ya da 68 Kusagina Mersiye." *Cogito* 14 (1998): 154-59.
- _____. Personal interview. 30 April 2002.
- Tuncel, Bedrettin. "Tercüme Meselesi." *Tercüme* 1.1 (1940): 79-83.
- _____. "Antigone Temsili." *Ulku* 1.11 (1942): 20-21.
- Ulken, Hilmi Ziya. *Uyanis Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü*. Istanbul: Ulken Yayinlari, 1997.
- Unsel, Kemal Edip. "Klasiklerden Faydalanma Davasi." *Ulku* 1.7 (1947): 9-10.
- Yasar Nabi. "Bu Dergi Üstüne." *Cep Dergisi* 1 (1966): 1-3.
- Zurcher, Erik J. *Turkey, A Modern History*. London and New York: I.B. Taurus, 1993.



G . D . W H I T E

INSTITUTION:

Department of Drama, Theatre,
and Performance Studies,
University of Surrey, Roehampton, London, UK

———— **FIELDS:** ————

Post-World War II British Drama and Culture,
Theatre and Everyday Life, Radio Drama,
Performance Writing, State/Television/Radio Writing

RECENT PUBLICATIONS:

“Digging For Apples, Reappraising the Influence of
Situationist Theory on the Theatre of the English
Counter-Culture.” *Theatre Survey* 42.2 (Fall 2001).
The Aerodrome. Adap. from Rex Warner, BBC Radio 4.
4 September 2001.
The Trial of the Angry Brigade. BBC Radio 4. London. 3
August 2002.

———— **ABSTRACT:** ————

Examines the construction of “subversive” Left activism
by Right commentators in the UK immediately follow-
ing the crises of 1968. In the course of this examina-
tion, it is demonstrated that the Right suffered a variety
of conceptual blocks in their efforts to “translate” the
crisis into manageable terms, resulting in an inaccurate
but no less effective understanding of the Left as a man-
ifestation of foreign agents and hysterical females.

The 1960s (pronounced "nineteen-sixties", shortened to "the '60s") was a decade of the Gregorian calendar that began on 1 January 1960, and ended on 31 December 1969. The term "1960s" also refers to an era more often called the Sixties, denoting the complex of inter-related cultural and political trends around the globe. This "cultural decade" is more loosely defined than the actual decade, beginning around 1963 with the John F. Kennedy assassination and ending around 1974 with the Watergate scandal.