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ÖZET
Türk Kültürel Derinliğinin Eston ve Boşnak Tarihindeki Etkileşim ve Paylaşımına Dair Birkaç Değerlendirme

Bosna-Hersek ve Estonya, biri Balkan ülkesi diğeri ise bir Baltık ülkesi olup, farklı dinamikler ve süreçlerde Türk medeniyeti ve tarihi ile etkileşimleri bulunmaktadır.

Kültürlararası ve büyük devletlerarası bir konumda bulunan bu iki ülkenin tarihlerine bakıldığında, göreceli olarak az bir nüfusa ve toprağa sahip olmakla birlikte, derin kültürel izler taşıdıkları dikkat çeken bir durumdur. Her ülkenin de barış yanlısı bakış açılarının olması ayrıca kayda değerdir.


İngilizce sunulacak olan bu bildiriyle ağırlıklı olarak tarihsel olay ve olgu bazında birkaç ön değerlendirme yapmak suretiyle, Türk tarihi ve kültürlünün, Boşnak ve Eston tarihi ile muhtemel etkileşimine dair bazı düşünceler paylaşılacaktır. Bu sayede, mevcut bildirinin de konusu olan hususlarda, akademik ilgi ve meraka katkısı sağlamaktadır.
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ABSTRACT

Both Estonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the Baltics and the Balkans respectively, had to continue to exist in the face of population disputes and the policies of the great European powers. For this reason, they were confronted by policies which, in one sense, excluded them, but which at the same time (during certain periods in history) brought into question the concept of rule.

Despite the fact that both Bosnia and Estonia consist of a fairly small territory and a limited number of inhabitants, they still have a deep and rich cultural inheritance.
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In addition, the peace-loving attitude and characteristics of the population in both countries is quite striking.

Whilst faith/religion played a significant role in the existence of Bosnia, sustaining its cultural characteristics against the passage of time, the popularity and usage of the Estonian language held an important place in Estonian identity and culture. It is also noticeable here that although religion was not exploited in politics, the element of faith was a supporting factor in strengthening political and cultural ties. Fanaticism as an aspect of religion is absent in both societies.

By limiting the amount of issues dealt with in this short paper, the aim is to create an interest for possible future studies; only a few examples of the interaction between the two countries and Turkish history and culture will therefore be discussed.
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**РЕЗЮМЕ**

Оценка роли и влияния турецкого культурного наследования в пределах боснийской и эстонской истории

Эстония в Балтийской области, и Боснии и Герцеговине в Балканах должна была существовать рядом с популяционными спорами и политикой больших государств, главным образом европейских. Поэтому они противостояли доминирующей политике великих держав, которые, в одном смысле, исключили их, но которым в то же самое время, в течение определенных стадий в истории, имели свои интересы для возможности управления в этих государствах.

Несмотря на то, что обе страны имеют довольно небольшие территории и ограниченное число населения, они обладают глубоким и богатым культурным наследием. Кроме того, миролюбивое отношение и особенности населения в обеих странах (Босния и Эстония) весьма поразительны.

Пока вера играла существенную роль в Боснии в пределах ее существования, выдерживая ее уникальную структуру против течения времени, популярность и использование эстонского языка держали важное место в эстонской идентичности и культуре. Также примечательно здесь, что, хотя религия не эксплуатировалась в политике, элемент веры был фактором поддержки в укреплении их политических и культурных связей. Фанатизм как аспект веры отсутствует в обоих обществах.

В работе обсуждены только несколько примеров взаимодействия между этими двумя странами и турецкой историей и культурой. Ограниченнее количество выводов в исследовании ставят задачей привлечь интерес к возможным последующим исследованиям.

**Ключевые Слова:** Турция, Боснийская история, Эстонская история, язык, культура.
INTRODUCTION

This study of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Estonia – both of which are located on the European continent, although quite far apart and situated in different geographical spheres and cultural backgrounds – is based on my experiences during my stay in these two countries. I gave lectures on Turkish history and culture at the Department of Turkish Studies of the Universities of both Tuzla and Zenica in BIH between 2004 and 2006, and then at the Department of Middle Eastern and Asian Studies of the University of Tallinn in Estonia for an academic semester (the winter semester of 2006-2007). At that time I encountered a number of examples of the interaction between Bosnian and Estonian cultures/traditions and Turkish history, in libraries, archives, and also in day-to-day life, over a time span extending from ancient times to the 20th century.

This presentation aims to introduce just a few examples of the interaction between the history of these two countries and Turkish history, and to also raise a few questions in order to encourage further scholarly curiosity. Therefore, I will refrain from drawing complicated conclusions. As will be mentioned later, when considering the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina and that of Estonia – both in their relationship to Turkish history and culture and when assessing their general attributes, their destiny and the similarities/differences between the histories of the two countries – the following points may be underlined:

1. Eurasian Culture and Its Eastern and Western Aspects

Both Estonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the Baltic and the Balkans respectively, had to continue to exist in the face of population disputes and the policies of the larger European powers. They confronted these policies which, in one sense, excluded them, but which also called into question at various times the issue of control. For this reason, the status of both countries has always been vital for European and global stability.

Estonia and Bosnia, within their respective frameworks, are remarkable for their socio-cultural depth in spite of their relatively small populations. In addition, fanaticism as an aspect of religion is absent in both Estonian and Bosnian societies.

The peace-loving nature of the population in both countries is to be envied. In terms of population and extent of influence, both Bosnians and Estonians have shown resolution in continuing their own cultural traditions within the relative and limited facilities offered by the neighbouring Slavic-German-Latin areas of Europe. Taking into account this determination and spirit of fortitude, both states can in my opinion, be referred to as the ‘small native tulips of European history’ – as a metaphor for soul of endurance of the tulip flower, even when exposed to the rigours of the steppes.
Whilst religion has played a role in Bosnia-Herzegovina towards the sustaining of its identity and cultural distinction, the popularity and usage of the Estonian language occupies an important place in the Estonian people’s ancient cultural heritage.\(^1\) Despite the fact that both countries (Bosnia and Estonia) consist of a fairly small territory and a population that is limited in size, they still have a deep cultural inheritance and past.

In terms of the exploration of ancient life and Eurasian beliefs, it would be useful to examine the historical framework and depth of both countries, ranging from Uralic shamanism to pre-historic Eurasian beliefs etc. Whilst trying to determine the historical background of the specific conditions of both countries, one needs to bear in mind the factor of mysticism (pagan, shamanic) within the context of belief.

2. Historical Ties and Continuity in Relations

The population spread and historical progress of Bosnia and of Estonia are quite different. However, both countries (Bosnia and Estonia) have in one way or another formed close relations with Turkish culture, either in the short- or the long-term in contemporary and past times. In other words, the issue here is the fact that the history of both countries intersects with Turkish history in some respect. The connection of both societies with Turkish history is therefore not only based on the present ‘countries’ (BiH, Estonia); in all probability, it has a deeper relationship – possibly extending way back to a time of tribal or literal interaction (e. g. relating to the Uralo-Altaic speaking tribes) – even outside the modern-day territory of both countries.

When considering the spoken language of the Estonian population, it is apparent that whereas Turkish derives from the Altaic branch of the Uralo-Altaic family of languages, the Estonian language is rooted in the Finno-Ugric group of the Ural

\(^1\) Generally speaking, religion has played a ‘great role’ –as Uzgel put into words– in reinforcing the national identity in the Balkans, and Muslims of non-Turkish origin have developed a distinct culture and life style. They are mostly affected by Islam and to some extent, by Turkish culture. İlhan Uzgel, “Role of Muslim Minorities in Inter-State Relations in the Balkans”, in Ethnicity and Nation-Building in Eastern Europe, (ed. by Shashikant Jha), New Delhi 1998, p. 146. Inhabited by a population not speaking an Indo-European language, disadvantageously located at a point coveted by regional powers, the small nation has been a significant –though underexamined– focal point of European continental history. For centuries the history of Estonia was marked by foreign domination, ranging from Germanic crusaders to Sweden, from the Nazis to Russia, from resurgent Poland-Lithuania to the Soviet Russia. Estonia, however, is linguistically and culturally diverse. Although and the Estonia language was declared the national language with Estonian independence in 1917, Estonian literature flowered in the 19th century with the development of an Estonian national epic poem. Based upon oral tradition, this poem, the Kalevi Poeg, written by Dr. F. R. Kreutzwald from 1857 to 1861, contained some 2,000 Estonian legends and had a tremendous effect upon the national consciousness of the people. In addition, one of the key factors in the upkeep of Estonian culture since the national awakening in the latter part of the 1800s has been the national song festival, the first of which was held in June 1869 in Tartu. Mel Huang, “Estonia”, in Eastern Europe, Vol 1: An Introduction to the People, Lands, and Culture, (ed. by R. Frucht), California 2005, pp. 61,66-67,73; Joyce Moss-George Wilson, Eastern Europe and the Post-Soviet Republics, Detroit 1993, pp. 119, 125, 128.
branch. Perhaps, in an exploration of ancient history\(^2\), the fact of belonging to the same linguistic roots might provide a clue to indicate the possible existence in the distant past of social or cultural contact between a variety of neighbouring nations, including the old Turks of the Volga-Uralic region or on the northern regions of the Black Sea, and the Eston populations.

In the case of Estonia, in other words, it can be considered that Eston tribes populated the region located centuries ago in the wide Finno-Ugric speaking areas (\(e.g\., around the Urals) where they interacted in a variety of ways, forming some degree of influence with many other entities, including the various Turkic-speaking Eurasian populations. Such an interaction surely invites debate and research in order to define the existence/non-existence and extent of this possibility.

Any historical analysis of the geographical region of the Estonian people in their ethnic or tribal past should include their well-known interaction with the Finno-Ugric tribes/language and also their contact with other related or neighbouring cultures prior to the Middle Ages.

A better understanding of the ‘Eston’ cultural profile may also be obtained through not only a study of the migratory history of the Eston tribal past even outside of contemporary Estonia, but also the beliefs and religious practices of native Estonians in today’s Estonia and those of the Baltic people in general. In this regard, one of the multi-religious themes in the Baltics may be ‘Islam and the contemporary religious scene’ in Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland as well as the settlement of Qipchaq (\(Kıpçak/Kuman\); generally known as being Christian in faith) and the Turkic-speaking Karaims, who are Jewish in faith, in Belarus, Lithuania and Poland.\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) There is no consensus regarding the exact origins of the Paleolithic (ca. 7500-4000) inhabitants of Estonia, though most believe they originated from somewhere in the South. Closer in origin to modern-day Estonians were the inhabitants in the Neolithic period (ca. 4000-2500). Neolithic man is classified by two separate groups. The first group, believed to be from the east, is described as the comb-pottery culture. These settlers are also thought to have brought with them among other things the Finno-Ugric language, the precursor of languages like Estonian and Finnish. The second group, arriving in the late Neolithic period, is called the boat-axe people, items related to whom are found further to the south; and they are believed to be the primary ancestors of modern-day Balts, Latvians and Lithuanians. Mel Huang, “Estonia”, in Eastern Europe, Vol 1: An Introduction to the People, Lands, and Culture, (ed. by R. Frucht), California 2005, p. 68. For the prehistoric development of culture of Estonia, see Marija Gimbutas, “The Prehistory of Eastern Europe”, Part. I, Bulletin No. 20 by American School of Prehistoric Research (ed. by H. Hencken), Cambridge, Massachusetts 1956; and for foreign (Swedish, Russian, Lettish) phonetic influences in Estonian, see Valter Tauli, “Phonological Tendencies in Estonian”, Dan. Hist. Filol. Medd-36 (Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser), no. 1, Kobenhavn 1956, pp. 199-204. For cultural and environmental heritage of Estonia, see the proceedings about “Estonia: Nature, Man and Cultural Heritage” in PACT. 37, (ed. by T. Hackens, V. Lang, U. Miller), Strasbourg (Council of Europe), 1992; see also “Coastal Estonia” in PACT. 51, (ed. by T. Hackens, S. Hicks, V. Lang, U. Miller, L. Saarse), Rixensart (Council of Europe) 1996.

Regarding the close relationship of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Turkish culture, on the other hand, the place of the Turks and the traditional values shared with the Bosnian and Herzegovinian population for many centuries through Ottoman history have been present in many forms ranging from folk poems and epics to vocabulary and stories.\(^4\) As is already known, cultural dynamism and intellectual stimulation flourished in the newly organised administrative units. This included the towns of Bosnia with multi-religious harmony, which had increased in number after the Ottoman Turkish conquest. \(^5\) Both Bosnia and Herzegovina were conquered during the time of Sultan Mehmet II (the Conqueror) over a period of almost twenty years starting from 1463, achieving such a broad territorial area that the Ottoman Bosnian province’s border was almost equivalent to those of the 20th century former Yugoslavia.

As a detailed study of possible contact between Bosnian and Turkish factors in pre-Ottoman times has yet to be carried out, and taking into account general historical and cultural data and folklore, it can be stated that the existence of such a relationship seems worth investigating further.

In Bosnia’s past, the historical issues which overlap with both nations’ cultural wealth are so important and complex that, to take one example, the mid-fifteenth century Ottoman conquest of Bosnia which resulted in “Bogomilism” or “gnostic practice and related beliefs in the Balkans” should be re-assessed in terms of dualism and mysticism. In this regard, for example, the “mysticism of Islam” or “Bogomilism in Christianity” with a special emphasis on the historical significance and the possible joint contribution at this juncture of the Bogomil-influenced Bosnians should be considered. In addition to this, besides the Bosnian Church and its heresy,\(^6\) the Bogomil sect’s differences of certain religious rituals and its

\[^4\] As clearly indicated by Professor Bayraktarević, without any religious discrimination, Turkish cultural influences throughout the Balkans were quite strong and can be reviewed under three headings: the period of Turkish rule; the era beginning from the retreat of the Turks until World War I; the years following the war and the era of Yugoslavia. “The Turks had constructed many new cities, contributing bridges, reservoirs, roads, public baths, fountains, mosques, schools, libraries and many other cultural establishments. Thenceforth, they had extreme influence over the development of various crafts, folk costume, food, house construction and division, furniture, kitchen utensils and cutlery etc… This means that the Turks had an especial influence over social and city life in the Balkans.” According to Bayraktarević, however, Turkish influence on the domestic life of the Balkan people was less than on that of the “material culture”: because, in principle, the Turks did not interfere in their family and religious lives. Despite this, one needs to refer to a certain degree to Turkish influence on the ‘legal regime’. Fehim Bayraktarević, “Türk-Yugoslav Kültür Münaşebetleri”, Second Congress of Turkish History - İstanbul September 20-25, 1937: Congress Studies, Papers Presented at the Congress, İstanbul 1943, pp. 962-963.

\[^5\] About the Muslim life and tradition in Bosnia-Herzegovina after 1463, see Antun Hangi, Zivot i Običaji Muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1906, pp. 9-242. for a sound summary about the situation of Yugoslavian Muslims, political parties and socio-cultural organizations, see Atif Purivatra, Nacionalni i Politicki Razvitak Muslimana, Sarajevo 1972, pp. 9-275.

\[^6\] See, for instance, Anto Babic, Bosanski heretici, Sarajevo 1963, pp. 125-160.
influence on anti-feudalistic issues should also be analysed in terms of its positive contribution to small and medium-sized towns which were in a period of growth as a result of increased trade, as well as in its inclusion in the military and administrative mechanism of the state and socio-cultural organizations.

It is also possible in Bosnia’s case to take into consideration “external factors” in the movement, change and migration of many tribes (including the Turco-Hunnic-Tartar tribes from Central Asia into Europe) – for instance that which occurred from the north of the Black Sea and from the Balkans towards Europe, continuing for many centuries, including as a further example the Migration of Nations which occurred as two major movements during the 4th and 5th centuries AD, or the Eurasian Avar migration which partly influenced the migration (and settlement) of the Serbs, Croats and Slavs in the Balkans and Central Europe in the 6th and 7th centuries. I also consider that more in-depth research of this kind is justified in order to resolve questions relative to how the Ógurs (Bulgars) in and the Pecheneks spread into the Balkans (along with the effects of this movement in many spheres, and the spread and influence of Bogomilism in Europe).

3. Traces of Cultural Memories Beyond Borders

It should be noted here that the vast Turkish lands, embroidered with equally rich cultural values, from Central Asia in the East up to Austria in the West were for centuries blended with and moderated by life realities, ideas, ideals and spirituality.

Perhaps this is partly the reason why for centuries items of Turkish folklore with the subheading “Turkish story”, or more often with the subheading “Oriental story”, appeared in the periodicals of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as in some other parts of former Yugoslavia. Publication of this particular kind of folklore intensified with the appearance of “Behar (1900-1911)”; this first literary magazine of the Bosnian Muslims printed local folk-poems and tales and a number of items from Oriental folklore, i.e. a small collection of twenty-five Turkish proverbs entitled “Turske poslovice (1904-1905)”, by Edhem Mulabdić - one of the editors of “Behar”. The Muslim papers “Gajret (1907-1914)” and “Biser (1912-1918)” continued the tradition of “Behar” and gave more space to local folklore.7

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Bosniac “Gajret”, Serbian “Prosvjeta”, Croatian “Napredak” and Jewish “La Benevolencija” organisations played an important role in the socio-cultural activities and publications of Bosnia-Herzegovina.8 At this point, reference should be also made to “Biser (=pearl)” for

8 “Gajret: Muslimansko Kulturno i Prosvjetno društvo (1921-1941)”, analiticki inventar, Sarajevo 2004, p. VI. For the cultural development of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878-1918 in a variety of sources –such as daily press and periodicals, literary, scientific and specialized
Bosnian Muslims; in this context, one also needs to emphasize the early twentieth-century poet Musa Cazim Catić with respect to his contribution to Turkish-Bosnian-Islamic literature. Apart from Musa Cazim Catić’s translations of the Turkish poets at the beginning of the 20th century and his story “Moji doživljaji u Carigradu” (My Adventures in Istanbul) about his stay in Istanbul in 1898-1899, similar traces of Turkish folklore in Bosnia-Herzegovina can also be found in the title of an anthology of original poems by Safvet Basagić –“Asiklije”– and in the same title of a collection of poems by Osman Dikić. In addition to this, anthologies such as those of Mehmed Kapetanovic Ljubusak were of great importance for the more intensive publication of Turkish and “Oriental” folktales in Bosnian and Muslim periodicals. The importance of Ljubusak’s anthology is reflected in its name, “Folk Treasure (Sarajevo, 1887)”; it includes examples of proverbs, wise sayings, stories, journals– as well as the cultural-educational societies named “Prosvjeta”, “Gajret”, “Napredak”, and “La Benevolentia”, see Risto Besarović, “Kulturni Razvitak Bosne i Hercegovine 1878-1918” Prilozi za Istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine: II (Contributions to the History of Bosnia and Hercegovina-II), ed. by E. Redžić, Vol. 18, Sarajevo 1987, pp. 368-402. Revival of literary life in Bosnia and Herzegovina after World War I was linked– among other things- with the publication of a series of periodicals and newspapers. The first among them was Novo djelo (1918-1919), and then immediately after followed a series of others: Buducnost, Novi vijek, Gajret, and others. Progressive ideas manifested themselves especially in the Jugoslovenska revija (1930), Brazda (1935-1936), Putokaz (1937-1939), as well as in Pregled (1927-1941). About literary journals and newspapers in Bosnia-Herzegovina between the world wars, see Branko Milanovic,”Knjizevni Casopisi i Listovi Bosne i Hercegovine između Dva Svjetska Rata (1918-1941)”, Godisnjak III-IV, 1974-5. Literary life developed in Bosnia-Herzegovina between the wars due to enthusiasm of the writers, who started newspapers and journals (listovi i casopisi), such as Novo djelo/Sarajevo 1919-1920, Delo/Mostar 1921, Kritika/Sarajevo 1922, Rad/Tuzla 1923, Knjizevna kritika/Sarajevo 1923, Knjizevni pregled/Sarajevo 1923, Sredina/Tuzla 1925-1930, Knjizevni pregled Male biblioteke/Sarajevo 1925, Novi knjizevni jug/Sarajevo 1925; those published by national cultural societies: Prosvjeta/Sarajevo 1919-1941, Gajret/Sarajevo 1921-1941, Napredak/1921-1945; those by Bosnian-Muslims: Buducnost/Sarajevo 1919-1920, Novi vijek/Sarajevo 1920, Novi Behar/Sarajevo 1927-1945, Literarna stampa/Sarajevo 1930, Putokaz/Zagreb 1937-1939; those (konfesionalno-nacionalnih zajednica) after 1927: Pregled/Sarajevo 1927-1941, Zora/Mostar 1927, Zmijanje/Banja Luka 1927, Mlada Bosna/Sarajevo 1928, Nova knjiznjava revija “Mlada Bosna”/Sarajevo 1930-1931, Jugoslovenska revija/Sarajevo 1930, Knjizevna krajina/Banja Luka 1931-1932, Razvitak/Banja Luka 1935-1941, Brazda/Sarajevo 1935-1936, Kulturni kurir/Sarajevo 1936, Baklja/Sarajevo 1939; Catholic newspapers: Ruza/Sarajevo 1928-1934), Stopama otaca/Sarajevo 1934-1935, Dragomir Gajevic, “Kulturni i Knjizevni Zivot u Bosni i Hercegovini između Dva Svjetska Rata”, Godisnjak XIX (1990), pp. 155-172.

9 For a short account of Catic’s works about Turkish literature see “Biser: Knjizevno Historijska Monografija i Bibliografija”, ed. by Dr. Enes Kujundzić, published by the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina, (strane knjizevnosti-turska, pp. 147-151), (na turske knjige, pp. 160-161).

fairy-tales, comparisons between Bosnian and Turkish folklore and an “Oriental Collection” (Turkish, Arabic and Persian folkloric material).\(^\text{11}\)

While “Gajret” strove to meet the diverse needs relating the “vakıf administration (vakufska uprava)” and the socio-religious and educational issues of Bosnian Muslims, Serbian and Croatian cultural societies/communities and their publications, “Prosvjeta” and “Napredak”, were also an important source of intellectualism in Bosnia-Herzegovina. It is possible for example to find historical information in “Napretkova” under the heading “Proklamacija Kraljevske vlade o smrti kralja Aleksandra i stupanju kralja Petra II” on the ascension of Peter II to the throne at a very early age following the death of King Alexander of Yugoslavia (October 9, 1934/VII-274), as well as in Rudolf Zaplata’s article entitled “Velika kuga u Sarajevu 1862. godine” (The Great Plague of 1862 in Sarajevo/VII-223) published in the Jugoslavenski list on January 13, 1933.\(^\text{12}\)

With regard to the Yugoslav era, according to the prominent Yugoslav philologist and orientalist Professor Fehim Bayraktarević’s presentation at the Second Congress of Turkish History, “the Yugoslavs owed the origin of their most beautiful epic poems to the contacts they formed and struggles they undertook with the Turks.” Taken together with the influence of Turkish folk literature over Yugoslav poems, stories, riddles and proverbs, we also see that prose forms in Turkish literature strongly influenced islamised Yugoslavians sometime in the distant past. With their origins in the Turkish word “sevdalı (lover)”, the love songs known as “sevdalinke” also contained Eastern influences.\(^\text{13}\) In addition to this, many Bosnian Muslims from the 15th century onwards composed works in Turkish, Arabic and Persian; at this point, Nergisi, Sabit and the Herzegovinian Arif Hikmet—all well-known poets in Turkish literature—should be introduced. Amongst Yugoslav scholars, Sudi (for


\(^{13}\) Fehim Bayraktarević, “Türk-Yugoslav Kültür Münasebetleri”, Second Congress of Turkish History- İstanbul September 20-25, 1937: Congress Studies, papers presented at the Congress, İstanbul 1943, p. 964. On the other hand, another Yugoslavian professor, Rizvić thought that whilst the national folk-tale of Bosnian Muslims had some stream of influence in both directions with “Oriental stories”; however, the folk-epic poetry of the Bosnian Muslims does not indicate any connection with the Turkish destan-poems, nor can the Turkish folk-lyrical poetry be compared with the Bosnian-Muslim song ‘sevdalinka’ and its poetic feeling and sensibility. Muhsin Rizvić, “Turkish Folklore in the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Periodicals and Anthologies, and Its Traces in the Works of Some Bosnian Moslem Writers”, 1. Uluslararası Türk Folklor Kongresi Bildirileri-I (Proceedings of the First International Congress of Turkish Folklore), Ankara 1976, p. 224.
Persian classics) and the eminent historian Peçevi were famous in Turkey. Even the Bosnian Muslims who re-wrote literature in their own language used the “Arabic alphabet” as well as many words of eastern origin, and this shows approval of both Turkish education and characteristics equivalent to the ‘Aljamiade’ of the Iberian Peninsula.”

In this context, Bayraktarević successfully establishes the role of expression in communicating miscellaneous surplus material and technical culture within this interaction. In order to give a clear understanding of the existence of Turkish cultural influence and its continuation during the time Bosnia Herzegovina was under Ottoman rule, Bayraktarević gives very good specific examples:

As evidence of the great interest of the Yugoslavs (especially as regards those who were Muslims) in Turkish literature and education before the First World War, aside from many literary works, there are many notes concerning Turkish works as well as religious, medical, educational articles translated from Turkish into Serbo-Croatian.

Some of the literary works translated into the Yugoslavian language are: Namık Kemal’s Zavallı Çocuk (Poor Child), Cezmi, Vatan yahut Silistire (Homeland or Silistra), Rüya (The Dream); Ahmet Mithat’s novel Esrar (Mystery); Fatma Aliye’s Muhaddarat (Virtuous Women) and Udi (Lutanist); among the short stories: Uşakizade Halit Ziya’s Ferdi ve Şürekası (Ferdi and His Partners), Alinear Arabası (Ali’s Car), Bir İzdivacın Tarihi (the History of a Marriage), Osmann Gazasi (the Holy War of Osman). Also included are some lyrical poems: Abdülhak Hamit’s Tarık (the Conquest of Andalusia); Şemsettin Sami’s Besa (Pledge of Honour); and many others, not specifically mentioned, like Ayyar Hamza. Ten poems by Tevfik Fikret were translated. Furthermore, a single or several pieces of verse by the following poets were translated: Nef’i, Fuzuli, Nigar, Mihrûnnisa, Muallim Naci, Cenap Şehabettin, Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem, İsmil Safa, Süleyman Nesip, Esat Necip, Celal Sahir, Rıza Tevfik, Dr. Abdullah Cevdet and Şekip Akif. Authors whose stories have been translated into Serbo-Croatian are as follows: Hüseyin Cahit, Makbule Leman, Ahmet Ihsan, Halide Edip, Ahmet Hikmet, Ayşe Cavıt, Mahmutzade Mehmet Cemal, İbni Ganem, Mehmet Celal, Rüşdü Necdet, F. Rasihe, Raife Binnaz, etc.

Prior to the Great War, Bosnian authors generally based the subject of their work on life during the Turkish era, as is clearly seen in the dramas of Başağıc’s Abdullah Paşa and (Ozi) Oziya Ovası Muharebesi (The Oziya Battle). One of the authors mentioned above wrote Türk Hakimiyeti Altında Bosna-Hersek Tarihi (1463’ten 1850’ye Kadar), (The History of Bosnia Herzegovina under Turkish Rule from 1463 to 1850), whilst two other authors (M. Spaho and Truhelka) wrote about the famous 16th century Turkish Governor of Bosnia Gazi Hüsrev-beg.

Amongst the examples of Turkish influence on the Muslims before the Great War, we see that while the family journal “Behar” (Sarajevo) was published in the Serbo-Croatian language for six years, in its seventh year half was published in Serbo-Croatian whilst the other half was in Turkish. Likewise, some of the articles, to be found in the annals of the Muslim Society—known as ‘Gajret’—were in Turkish. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to state that the Muslims were the only ones to show interest in Turkish language and literature.

The Great War brought about many changes in the world, in Turkey as well as in Yugoslavia. The Turkish nation, under a great and exceptional leader, fought heroically and obtained its full independence, simultaneously getting rid of all the old chains which had prevented her from progressing. The Yugoslavs showed great interest in the era following Turkish National Struggle and the establishment of the Turkish Republic, and their interest was increased concerning the history of Yugoslavian cities and provinces under Turkish rule. In this regard, in addition to the Serbo-Croatian translations, Evliya Çelebi’s Seyahatname and Ahmet Refik’s novel entitled Sokullu can also be mentioned. Still more monuments and documents concerning the Turks were studied, translated and subsequently published in 1930’s.15

In recent years, it is easier to notice that the Ottoman Empire’s expulsion from the Balkans—as comprehensively covered in Safet Bandžović’s article “Ratovi i Demografska De-osmanizacija Balkana 1912-1941 (Wars and Demographic De-Ottomanisation of the Balkans)”—was in a way brought about by wars and demographic events.16

---

15 Details in Fehim Bayraktarević, “Türk-Yugoslav Kültür Münasebetleri”, Second Congress of Turkish History-Istanbul September 20-25, 1937: Congress Studies, papers presented at the Congress, Istanbul 1943, pp. 964-970. It should be noted here that there are an enormous number of important Bosnian intellectuals who make reference to the Ottoman period and its aftermath in their valuable works, among them the historian Hamdija Kresevljaković (1888-1959) occupies a special place. About his work, for instance, see Hamdija Kresevljaković, Sarajevo za Vrijeme Austrougarske Uprave (1878-1918), Arhiv Grada Sarajeva-posebno izdanje, Sarajevo 1969.

16 Bandzović made use of many sources in his article, which consists of fifty pages, relating relevant developments between 1912 and 1941; besides Bosnian sources, he also included a few studies by Turkish writers’, e. g. B. Şimsir’s Turkish Emigrations from the Balkans-I (Ankara 1989) and K. Karpat’s The Ottoman Population 1830-1914 (Vol. I, Madison 1985). He drew attention to the process of “demographic de-Ottomanisation” that had already begun following the 1878 Berlin Congress and was continued by significant changes in the ethnic and religious structure of the Balkans and the expulsions and emigration of the Muslim population during the Balkan Wars of 1912-3. He also touched on the Balkan Pact signed between Yugoslavia, Turkey, Greece and Romania in Athens in 1934 as well as on the effects the Settlement Code of June 1934 had on Balkan emigrants. Moreover, the author, in addition to the war and the emigration process, also examined the multi-faceted aspects of the formation of the Turkish Republic after 1923 with regard to this change. See Safet Bandžović, “Ratovi i demografska deosmanizacija Balkana (1912.-1941.)”, Prilozi, 32, Sarajevo 2003, pp. 179-229. For the migration movements of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian emigrants across Serbia at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century, see “Migracioni Pokreti Bosanskohercegovackih muhadzira preko Srbije Krajem XIX i pocetkom XX stoljeca”, Novopazarski Zbornik, 27/2003, pp. 177-211.
In spite of all these wars and demographic changes, it should be noted here that cultural memories, deeply rooted in history, between Turkey and the Balkans were at all times of more value historically than realities and difficulties.

4. Confronting Great Power Politics

Both Bosnia and Estonia witnessed a turning point in 1918. In this context, Bosnia became part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (the Kingdom of SHS) which was proclaimed on October 1918 and became the newly formed “Kingdom of Yugoslavia” in 1929.\(^{17}\) The new title (SHS) asserted that the Serbs, Slovenes and Croats were the founding nations of the state. Therefore, the status and rights of Bosnia remained questionable and dissatisfying for many years.\(^{18}\)

During the Neo-Colonial era (1914-1945), Estonia, too, was operating under extraordinary conditions due to the shadow of the political designs of the colonial powers of the time.\(^{19}\) Estonia declared its independence in February 1918, i.e.

\(^{17}\) The 1908 Austrian annexation of the centuries-old “Bosnian province” of the Ottoman State heralded hard times for Bosnia’s future. The defeat of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of World War I made a complex situation even more complicated. The newly established ‘Kingdom of SHS’ filled the void following the first 30 years of Austro-Hungarian control (1878-1908). However, settlement and political influences in the region, together with a large amount of immigration towards Turkey and other parts of the world, had long-term effects, both in terms of human issues and in terms of politics. For the era 1908-1918, and also for “Mlada Bosna” (Young Bosna, a Serbian revolutionary movement formed in Bosnia-Herzegovina before the Great War), see Fuad Silipicevic, Bosna i Hercegovina od Berlinskog Kongresa do Kraja Prvog Svjetskog Rata (1878-1918), Zagreb 1954, pp. 66-103; and also see a very useful “Glossary and Explanatory Notes (objasnjenja)” about the names/events related to 1878-1918, pp. 104-116.

\(^{18}\) With the creation of SHS in 1918, later renamed Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Bosnia-Herzegovina had initially obtained a kind of provincial autonomy. But after the royalist (Serbian) coup in 1929, Yugoslavia was reorganized under new administrative regional units. Bosnia-Herzegovina was partitioned among four such regions, Bosnian Muslims being a minority in each region. The 1946 Yugoslav Constitution, on the other hand, established six constituent republics within a federal state, including that of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which was formed as an ethnically mixed unit. During World War II, the Partisan communist forces under the leadership of Tito sought to balance Yugoslavia’s various national units and to promote the growth of a common “Yugoslav” identity as well as a multi-ethnic “Bosnian” consciousness within Bosnia-Herzegovina (see Janusz Bugajski, Ethnic Politics in Eastern Europe: A Guide to Nationality Policies, Organizations, and Parties, Armonk 1994, pp. 6-7). Meanwhile, Bosnian Muslims had to live with the possibility that the actions of Croatia’s Ustasa regime and the Serbian nationalist Cetnik forces could at any time have dire repercussions on them (the Muslims). In other words, in spite of Yugoslavia’s successful resistance to enemy invasion in different ways, a certain uneasiness and level of risk would still remain in Bosnia-Herzegovina’s history following such a prolonged war and the resulting devastation.

\(^{19}\) In 1914 the Great War was declared, and by September 1917 lots of things had changed for Estonia. When a united force of German army and naval units occupied the Baltic islands of Saarema (Oesel, Özel in Turkish), Muhu (Mohn, Muhi in Turkish), and Hiiumaa (Dago, Dagu in Turkish), the Germans reached Estonian territory. On the other hand, with the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, the Estonian Bolsheviks held their first legally-constituted conference in Tallinn, and from then their influence grew steadily. After the October Bolshevik Revolution, power passed to the councils in the Baltic provinces. There was no open resistance to the Bolsheviks in Estonia. Actually, at the time it was generally expected that Germany would occupy the whole of Estonia;
five years before the announcement of the Turkish Republic in 1923. It should be remembered that the Turkish Republic, which emerged in 1923 as successor to the vast Ottoman State, had succeeded in waging a National Struggle between 1919-1922 against the Allied invasion and imperialistic designs of the great colonial powers of the era. Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), leader of the Turkish National Struggle and subsequently first President of the Turkish Republic in 1923, resisted “Neo-Colonialism under the shadow of mandates”. During the Turkish National Struggle, the Turkish Grand National Assembly (GNA, 1920-1923) in Ankara under the presidency of Mustafa Kemal advocated ‘full independence’ by refusing so-called ‘independence’ through the mysterious means of ‘mandate or colony’; he thus founded the Republic of Turkey by emphasizing the republican and democratic aspects of the full independent state mechanism. He also knew how to maintain a peaceful country which existed in harmony with other countries. His sensitivity towards the independence of the new states primarily served this important purpose. Atatürk’s Turkey was one of the first countries to recognize (in 1924) Estonia’s 1918 declaration of independence.20

During Atatürk’s presidency (1923-1938), diplomacy, trade, science and even sports was effective channel of growing interest between the two countries.21 In 1932 Hüseyin Ragip (Baydur), the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow, was appointed on 18 May 1932 by the Turkish administration as the Turkish envoy to Litvanian, Latvian and Estonian republics.22 In relation to the opening of the first Turkish Embassy to Tallinn in September 1935, İsmet İnönü’s government decided on 8 August 1935 to

Estonia therefore proclaimed her independence before this happened. However, from February onwards, Estonia was in the hands of German army. When German troops were leaving Estonia in late 1918, the Soviet Red Army attacked Narva in Estonia in November, which actually marked the beginning of the Estonian War of Independence. This time, Estonia turned Germano-Soviet rivalry to its own advantage in declaring her independence. Georg von Rauch, The Baltic States: The Years of Independence 1917-1940, London 1974, pp. 30-39. For the Estonian Army and its military preparation in 1917-1918, see Finlandiya, Estoniya, Letonya, Littvanya Orduları 1929-1930, Ankara 1931, pp. 2-10.

20 For various correspondence about the Turkish recognition of Estonian indepence and the promotion of friendship between the two countries, see the documents from the Archive of TITE (the Institute of Turkish Revolution History at Ankara University) K.18/B.23 (15 February 1920), K.18/B.72 (23 February 1920), K.19/B99 (20 February 1920). See also the documents from the Turkish Prime Minisitral Archive: BOA/HR.SYS.2729/34 (18.9.1922); BOA/HR.HMŞ.ISO.123/14 (14.A.1338/1922), BOA/MV.224/105 (24.M.1341/1925), BOA/BE0.4720/353980 (25.M.1341); BCA 30-18-1-1/12.75.5 (7.2.1341); BOA/HR.IM.158/3 (8.9.1925).

21 In 1928-9 Turkey and Estonia were engaged in negotiating and signing a variety of treaties, protocols and clearing agreements- e.g. the Convention of Commerce and Navigation. For instance, in February 1928 Otto Strandman, the Estonian envoy to Warsaw, was sent to İstanbul to sign a trade agreement with Turkey. BOA/HR.IM.225/65 (9.2.1928); BOA/HR.IM.225/71 (11.2.1928); BOA/HR.IM.225/72 (11.2.1928). Zekai (Apaydın), deputy, ex-Minister and Ambassador, and Numan Rifat, the Turkish Under-Secretary to the Foreign Minister, were appointed on 16 September 1929 for the task to sign the Convention on Commerce and Navigation which was concluded in 1929. BCA 30-18-1-2/5.46.20; see also BCA 30-18-1-1/28.24.3; BCA 30-18-1-1/28.16.4.

appoint Nuri Batu (who worked in Riga as a Minister Plenipotentiary at that time) also for the duty of “Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary” to Estonia (and Lithuania).\textsuperscript{23} Starting from September 19, 1935, as newly appointed diplomat, Nuri Batu increased the level of cooperation. Between the two republics, a renewed version of the Clearing (Kliring) Agreement dated 13 March 1935 was signed in 1937.\textsuperscript{24} During Celal Bayar’s Government, on August 29, 1938, the Trade Protocol between two countries came into force. As a way to promote cultural relations and cooperation on sport, the Turkish National Wrestling Team was sent to Estonia to participate in the European Wrestling Competitions which took place in April 1938 in Tallinn.\textsuperscript{25}

Early in 1929, with the Litvinov Protocol, the Baltic States south of the Gulf of Finland –together with Romania, Turkey and Persia– renounced war. Three years later, Finland, Latvia and Estonia successively concluded mutual pacts of non-aggression with the Soviet. Meanwhile the Great Economic Depression of 1929 unsettled every Baltic state and other European states as well. In January 1933 the Nazi party gained control of Germany. Concerning World War II, both the Balkans and the Baltics again felt the burden of a prolonged war more harshly than any other region of the world. In the case of the Baltic, as Reddeway indicated, “Upon the shores of that inland sea, six states at least based their security on the antithesis between Germany and Russia...A few weeks changed the whole scene. Poland, with her 35,000,000 people, went down before the eightfold strength of the two Great Powers”. The so-called ‘Baltic States’, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, could not refuse the demands of a Russian Empire which had thirty times their united populations.\textsuperscript{26}

Whereas Nazi forces entered Estonia in 1941 and occupied the country until 1944, the period of Soviet Russia’s rule extended from 1944 to 1991. The Soviet annexation of Estonia in 1940, the second Soviet occupation in 1944 and the subsequent loss of national independence damaged the identity and the existence of Estonia. At the same time the Stalinist regime began in 1944 to set up strict constraints for civil society and civil culture in the region.\textsuperscript{27}

The republic of Estonia, like the Republic of Turkey, had not actually participated

\textsuperscript{23} BCA 30-18-1-2/57.67.5.
\textsuperscript{24} See, BCA30-18-1-2/piece numbers: 53.22.11, 75.49.6, 74.33.2, 75.49.7, 76.57.19, 84.80.16.
\textsuperscript{25} Details in BCA 490-1-0-0/1095.2.2.
\textsuperscript{26} Details in W. F. Reddeway, Problems of the Baltic, Cambridge 1940, pp. 2-3,35.
\textsuperscript{27} For the state/national community relations of Baltic post-war history, see Rein Ruutsoo, Civil Society and Nation Building in Estonia and the Baltic States: Impact of traditions on mobilization and transition 1986-2000, Rovaniemi 2002, pp. 94-104; for Soviet annexation of Estonia (1940) and German occupation of Estonia (1941-1944), see Pascal Lorot, Baltık Ülkeleri, translated into Turkish by H. Dilli, Paris/Istanbul 1991, pp. 78-82.
in World War II and had declared neutrality; both, however, were worn down in different ways by the results of such a devastating war. Estonia lost her independence due to the rivalry of the big powers, whilst Turkey was influenced by a variety of politico-economic agenda such as fear of the Soviet threat in the early Cold War years or the 1946 devaluation of the Turkish lira, which occurred on September 7th of that year. In addition, on July 21st 1946 the general election marked the transition of the Republic of Turkey to a multi-party system. In other words, Turkey was also being tested economically prior to the 1946 election, and struggling to overcome the socio-economic difficulties of the war years, ward off the threat of Stalin’s Russia, overcome the difficulties of the “1946 devaluation” during the newly established Recep Peker Government (1946-1947) of the Republican People’s Party, and –on top of all this– complete the democratization process.28

Although the Soviet perspective during the Stalinist era (1924-1954), especially during the doctrine under Léonid Brejnev in the 1960s, argued in favour of interventionist policies, it is a fact that the Baltic countries (including Estonia) were to remain caught between Germany and Soviet Russia. Probably the most striking location for a demonstration of Stalinism was Yugoslavia, which included Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In 1941 the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was severely threatened by the Axis alliance. The course of World War II saw not only its occupation, but also the presence of the fascist-influenced Croatian Ustasa regime in the Axis-occupied Yugoslavia. In 1945, as the Germans withdrew from Yugoslavia, the Ustasa29 were defeated by

28 Although two previous attempts to implement a multi-party system in Turkey had already been made in 1924-1925 and 1930; transition came about on July 21, 1946 with the “direct universal suffrage” system. Involved in this democratic development were the “National Development Party (MKP)” founded by Nuri Demirdağ in 1945, the “Democratic Party (DP)” established in January 1946 by the signatories of “Dörtlü Takrir (Proposal of the Four, June 1945)”—by Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Fuat Köprülü and Refik Koraltan; and the “Republican People’s Party (CHP),” the oldest political party of the Turkish Republic to remain in the political arena from the year it was established in 1923 (with the exception of a short break in 1924 and 1925) until 1950. This era is known as the “Single Party period (1923-1950)”; in 1938, upon President Atatürk’s death, İsmet İnönü became the second President of Turkish Republic until 1950. When Celal Bayar was President between 1950 and 1960, Adnan Menderes’ Democratic Party (DP) came into office following the election of May 14, 1950, after having initially lost on July 21, 1946 in the year of its foundation. About “Direct Suffrage Election” see Prof. Nihat Erim’s articles in the newspaper “Ulus” dated 12 May and 2 June 1946. Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 150 (Ankara, May 1946), pp. 58-60; and No. 151 (Ankara, June 1946), pp. 23-24. For the Turkish Constitution and the Electoral Code, see Tarhan Erdem, Anayasalar ve Seçim Kanunları 1876-1982, İstanbul 1982, pp. 1-437.

29 Even though the Germans had surrendered, Pavelić’s Ustasa intended to continue to fight against Tito’s forces. Acting on news from Belgrade dated May 9 1945, Pavelić’s “puppet government” declared a general mobilization. Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 138, Ankara, May 1945, p. 915. On the other hand, according to Yugoslav radio, Marshal Tito, speaking in Zagreb, had proclaimed that the “New Yugoslavia” had not been established as a result of round-table talks, adding that new Yugoslavia was founded on four years of hardship and torture endured by
the socialist Yugoslav partisans under the control of Marshal J. Broz Tito.\textsuperscript{30} Thus, the beginning of the Cold War era in 1945 witnessed the transformation of pre-war royalist Yugoslavia (1929-1941) to socialist Yugoslavia; Tito’s administration held power for years by succeeding in controlling ethnic and political chaos within the country. Following Tito (PM 1945-1953, President 1953-1980), the disintegration of Yugoslavia seemed unavoidable and occurred gradually up to 1991.

Events by 1945 were probably indicators of different issues; whereas King Peter of Yugoslavia declared that he had not accepted the Marshal Tito administration and that Tito was not authorized to act on his behalf, reports from Belgrade quoted Marshal Tito as having indicated that the time had come to discuss the matter of the Kingdom’s future since the King’s name was being mentioned in conjunction with those of Chetnik General Draža Mihailović\textsuperscript{31} and General Milan Nedić, who both had collaborated with the Germans, during his speech at the Congress of the United People’s Front.\textsuperscript{32}

It is possible to find plenty of information regarding the difficult conditions in Yugoslavia during and after World War II in “\textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)},” published by the Turkish Prime Ministry General Directorate of Press and Publications.\textsuperscript{33} For example, several issues of this monthly periodical contained news reports from New York and Belgrade concerning the trial of Mihailović, who was accused by the Yugoslavian administration of collaborating with the Germans.\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{her people. In this new Yugoslavia, every nation that constituted Yugoslavia would possess the rights they had earned. Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month),} No. 138, Ankara, May 1945, p. 919. Additionally, from a London-based source (June 4, 1945) it was reported that - with nationalism in mind – Marshal Tito had re-confirmed Yugoslavia’s demands on Carinthia during a speech he had delivered, stating that “We have liberated Carinthia, but international conditions were such that we had to leave it temporarily Carinthia is ours and we shall fight for it”. \textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month),} No. 139, Ankara, June 1945, p. 565.

\textsuperscript{30} For the foundations of Tito’s national policy, his federalism and Yugoslavianism, and a short comparison of Tito, Lenin and Stalin, Esad Zgodic, \textit{Titova Nacionalna Politika}, Sarajevo 2000, pp. 161-248,328-374.

\textsuperscript{31} According to Hüseyin Cahit Yağcı one could see General Mihailović as a national hero when observed from a certain distance, but such a subjective opinion could not ‘definitely and objectively’ certify that General Mihailović did not commit or was incapable of committing any crime. For H. C. Yağcı’s article “The Belgrade Trial” printed in the \textit{“Tanın”} gazette on August 2, 1945, \textit{see Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)}, No. 141, Ankara, August 1945, p. 237.

\textsuperscript{32} For news based on Belgrade source \textit{see: Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month),} No. 141, Ankara, August 1945, p. 234.

\textsuperscript{33} Meanwhile, according to reports from Belgrade in September 6\textsuperscript{th} 1945, the Yugoslav Board of Regents had appointed M. Božin Simić to the Yugoslav Embassy in Turkey, \textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)}, No. 142, Ankara, September 1945, p. 289.

\textsuperscript{34} In one such article –Belgrade, June 10\textsuperscript{th} 1946– one allegation against Mihailović determined that a detailed account should be made concerning the matter of Mihailović’s high treason between 1941 and 1945. Moreover, an article published in Belgrade on June 11, 1946 states that one of the prosecution, a Colonel, had accused Mihailović of pillaging villages and killing people. \textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month),} No. 151, Ankara, June 1946, pp. 243-244.
Setting aside the accusations made during the trial, as well as the counter-charges,\textsuperscript{35} it is necessary to examine the tough political dilemma Yugoslavia was facing during that period. In this regard it would not be wrong to state that Yugoslavia was under German threat, being trapped either between the communists and the Allies or alternatively at the centre of shifting external policies whilst defending its homeland and waging war against its enemy, Germany. The future of Yugoslavia, including the much-desired Balkan lands, was right at the centre of the rivalries which had settled like a black cloud around the great powers during and after the war.

Tito’s socialist Yugoslavia gathered the Bosnians, Croats, Serbs, Slovenians, Montenegrins and Macedonians into a federation. Tito also, in a sense, defeated his adversary Mihailović. Furthermore, he secured his own post with the 1945 elections\textsuperscript{36}, which were won by his Narodni Front (national front). Bosnia-Herzegovina, on the other hand –as revealed in the guidebook “Informative Prirucnik o Bosni i Hercegovini”– based its existence on Yugoslavia’s principle of federalism with the November 29, 1943 manifesto of AVNOJ (the “Anti-Fascist Council” of Yugoslavia’s liberation movement) during the Second World War. With regard to Bosnia-Herzegovina’s future, the legal and political composition of the newly established “ZAVNOBIH” –the National Anti-Fascist Governing Council (including Muslim participants)– was still experiencing difficulties in 1943-1945.\textsuperscript{37} Between 1945 and 1953, however, the People’s Assembly of Bosnia and Herzegovina undertook this pivotal task. In other words, events occurring during the first five to six years following World War II were quite important in shaping the Federation and Yugoslav socialism.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{35} An article by A. Şükrü Esmer in the “Ulus” newspaper, dated June 18\textsuperscript{th} 1946, deals with the Mihailović story. Addressing the question “why is Mihailović now being tried as a ‘traitor’ in Belgrade”, Esmer stated: “The sad part of this matter is the fact that the developments in Yugoslavia’s internal policy are the result of the treaties made between the great powers and not the result of events which transpired within the country concerned”. Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 151, Ankara, June 1946, p. 247. As stated in reports from London on July 17\textsuperscript{th} 1946: “According to an announcement on New York radio, the Minister of Defence of the former Yugoslavia, 55-year-old General Mihailović, has been executed by firing squad.” Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 152, Ankara, July 1946, p. 218; for earlier info (No. 138, Ankara, May 1945, p. 915).

\textsuperscript{36} For the list of candidates from the Narodnog fronta/Narodni Front for the city of Sarajevo, see Zbirka Varia: Period Socijalisticke Jugoslavije (1945-1963. godina), ZV-231, Sarajevo 1945.

\textsuperscript{37} For the role of ZAVNOBIH and AVNOJ in strengthening Bosnian statehood and nationality and also the dualism of the government between 1941-1945, see Omer Ibrahimagic, Bosanska Drzavnost i Nacionalnost, Sarajevo 2003, pp. 269-334.

According to a report dated January 1946 from Reuter’s (London) correspondent in Belgrade, the new constitution of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia (FPRY/FNRJ) had been drawn up according to “unique and revolutionary” points. One of the most important aspects of the 1946 Constitution was the fact that before being approved by Parliament it was presented to the people for consideration and review.\(^39\)

The new Yugoslav Constitution came into effect on January 31\(^{st}\) 1946, and the Tito administration accordingly resigned.\(^40\) The National Assembly charged Marshal Tito with establishing a new government. With the new Constitution coming into effect, the constituent assembly of Yugoslavia was to be known as “Federativna Narodna Republika Jugoslavija (FNRJ)”. Although Tito became president in 1953, he established Yugoslavia as a socialist federation incorporating his own interpretation of socialism. The non-alignment movement and Tito’s rapprochement with neighbouring countries were among his remarkable activities.

Hence, as the end of the Second World War approached, one could see that important issues were yet to be resolved, issues that involved questions as to the fate of the Yugoslav king and as to whether Yugoslavia’s right over the countries which had come under Italy’s control at the end of World War I (such as Trieste, Istria, Rijeka, Zadar, Lastovo and Palagia\(^41\)) would be recognised. Yugoslavia was still in the process of reformation and of determining her stance on matters varying from war to politics. Based on reports from Paris (also mentioned in the Ayın Tarihi) dated September 1, 1945, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party Vladko Maček contended that the existing political regime in Yugoslavia had not provided any democratic guarantees and that unless the existing regime changed there would be no chance for free and fair elections in Yugoslavia. Articles published in Belgrade on September 4\(^{th}\) show that the four Yugoslav political parties had decided to issue separate electoral lists of rival candidacy in the general elections. On the other hand, the People’s Front (encompassing many parties supporting Tito) decided to enter the election with just one list. The four opposing parties consisted of: the ‘Democratic Party’ under the leadership of Dr. Milan, who had resigned from Marshal Tito’s cabinet a month before, the “Radical Party,” the “Socialist Party” and the “Agrarian Party” under the leadership of Milan Gavrilovitch.\(^42\)

---

\(^{39}\) Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 146, Ankara, January 1946, p. 197.

\(^{40}\) Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 146, Ankara, January 1946, p. 199.

\(^{41}\) Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 141, Ankara, August 1945, pp. 235-236.

\(^{42}\) Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 142, Ankara, September 1945, p. 289.
The Council of Foreign Ministers from the five great powers met in London in the second week of September 1945 for peace talks. This development was closely followed in the Turkish press, and the monthly periodical “Ayn Tarihi” gave wide coverage to articles such as: “Observations on the Council of Five” (Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, October 1st 1945, “Tanin” gazette), “Council of Five” (Tevfik Rüştü Aras, October 4th 1945, “Tan” gazette), “The Tragic and Unfortunate Death of Two Peace Conferences” (Necmeddin Sadak, October 4th 1945, “Aksam” gazette), “A Grave and Difficult Situation” (Falih Rifki Atay, October 4th 1945, “Ulus” gazette), “The Bankruptcy of the London Conference” (M. Zekeriya Sertel, October 5th 1945, “Tan” gazette), “Let’s See What Events Will Bring?” (Cavit Oral, October 6th 1945, “Bugün” gazette), “A Clear Definition of Bankruptcy” (Şevket Bilgin, October 6th 1945, “Yeni Asır” gazette) and “The Policy Adopted in the Balkans Were Wrong from the Very Beginning” (Necmeddin Sadak, October 18th 1945, “Aksam” gazette). All of these articles, along with many others, were written in the hope of reducing Soviet Russia’s ambition for victory, and in the hope of a new era entailing new negotiations. Necmeddin Sadak stated that “As well as urging for free elections in the Balkans, the first condition for establishing democratic governments is that the Russian invasion come to an end,” adding: “Since there is no peace yet, the Allies cannot ask Soviet Russia to withdraw from the Balkans and even if they did, Russia would decline to do so. Such being the case, the peace process needs to be hastened and the invasion has to come to an end to in order that the Balkan nations gain freedom and independence”.44

Whereas some intellectuals in the Turkish Press found the removal of Moscow politics from the Balkans absolutely necessary for permanent peace in the region, some considered this future peace as part of a bigger picture since external policy games on the world stage actually affected domestic politics in the Balkans, and vice versa.

In his article entitled “Internal Policy Games in Foreign Politics” printed in the newspaper ‘Haber’ (Istanbul) on July 9th 1945, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın made the criticism that Tito was intending to make use of internal disputes and turmoil in order to maintain himself, as well as the Moscow regime (behind which he was hiding), in a position of power.45 In short, one needs to thoroughly comprehend and analyse the fact that most of the criticism which seemed to be directed towards Tito in the Turkish Press did not really target Tito personally but was actually meant for Stalin’s Russia; Turkey and those with Turkish interests at heart had been quite worried from 1945 onwards as to Stalin Russia’s intentions involving “the Turkish Straits and the Turkish lands in Eastern Anatolia as well as to the threat of a further expansion of communist activities”.46

43 Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 143, Ankara, October 1945, pp. 185-213.
44 Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 143, Ankara, October 1945, p. 212.
45 Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 140, Ankara, July 1945, p. 343.
46 See the Turkish newspaper articles written by Necmeddin Sadak (7th October 1945 and 12th October
After having been careful to maintain her neutral stance during World War II, Turkey was forced to enter the war in its final year (1945). On behalf of the Allies, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met with the Turkish President İsmet İnönü at the Adana Conference in January 1943. Turkey – and conditions in the Balkans – needed to change, and this need could easily be inferred from the overtures of the Allies. Aside from various efforts to end the war, the main agenda of the new world leaders of the era – the Big Three (Churchill-Roosevelt-Stalin) – at the Yalta Conference in February 1945 concerned the preliminary requirements for being accepted to the United Nations. Therefore, even before the San Francisco Conference (which was to take place in April 1945 and which laid the foundation for the United Nations), Turkey declared war against the Axis powers on February 23rd, thus entering a war in order to be accepted into the UN.

5. Relatively Small States Have to Rely on Themselves Before Anything and Anyone in Order to Ensure Their Own Safety

Significant developments were observed regarding the Turkish relationship with Yugoslavia between 1950 and 1954; this period can perhaps be described as the golden years of President Celal Bayar and the Menderes cabinet, which had come into office following the election of May 14th 1950 (after having initially lost on July 21st 1946). Probably the most important indicator of this was a ‘visit’ and a declaration of appreciation in the Turkish Press.

Turkish and Yugoslav newspapers of August 1st 1954 reported the good news that following an invitation from the President of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, Turkish President Celal Bayar was to start his visit at the port of Rijeka on the Dalmatian Coast at 17.30 pm on September 1st. Before leaving for Yugoslavia, Celal Bayar gave a statement to the Anatolian Agency (Anadolu Ajansı) which indicated that from 1954 onwards Turkey had recognised Yugoslavia as a “de facto ally”, even before the triple alliance which was signed on August 9th 1954 at the Villa Bled palace between Turkey, Yugoslavia and Greece, a contractual agreement of mutual aid. Bayar also reminded of the good memories of Tito’s visit to Turkey in April 1953.

President Bayar was due to arrive in Bosnia-Herzegovina on the morning of Monday, September 6th. He would tour the city, visiting the National Museum,

1945, Akşam), Hüseyin Cahit Yağcı (12th October, 13th October, 16th October and 27th October 1945, Tanin; 16th October 1945, Vakıt), Asım Us (13th October, 16th October and 19th October 1945, Vakıt), Necmeddin Sadak (15th October 1945, Akşam), Şevket Bilgin (16th October 1945, Yeni Asır), Haydar Rüşdü Öktem (20th October 1945, Anadolu) in the section of “Repercussions” in Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 143, Ankara, October 1945, pp. 74-100. See also Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 144, Ankara, November 1945, pp. 70-89.


Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 249, Ankara, August 1954, p. 62. Even Tito had given a statement referring to the friendly and allied Turkish President Bayar. Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 249, Ankara, August 1954, p. 65.
the Latin Bridge (Princip), the Gazi Husrev-beg Mosque and Bascarsija, and then attend a ceremony during which he would be presented with an honorary degree by the University of Sarajevo. Many Yugoslav newspapers, such as Belgrade’s two biggest newspapers “Borba and Politika”, Mevnik, Nedeljine Informatirne Novine, as well as the Oslobodjenje gazette printed in Sarajevo and Rijeka’s Novili gazette made positive comments regarding Celal Bayar’s friendly visit to Yugoslavia.\(^49\) Emeç states that the “New Balkan League” which was instigated at Bled was not a bloc of aggression, but only an alliance of the Turkish Republic, Yugoslavia and Greece based on justifiable concerns regarding possible attacks; efforts were underway to strengthen a military alliance the like of which had rarely been seen in history. The author draws attention to the international political setting in which states were trapped between the disagreements of great powers. He writes “History continuously repeats the reality that relatively small states have to rely on themselves before anything or anyone in order to ensure their own safety… Recently Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia have also been victims of such designs,” and commends Turkey for supporting her neighbours.\(^50\)

Whilst on the one hand Tito’s visit had created a positive impression, his criticism of the 1955 Balkan Pact caused disturbance. At the beginning of 1956, Yugoslav President Tito consistently criticised the Baghdad Pact (signed in 1955 between Turkey, Iraq, Britain, Pakistan and Iran) at a meeting organized to mark his return from a very satisfactory visit of “friendship and understanding” to Egypt and Ethiopia. Marshal Tito, who on many occasions declared his opposition to pacts and to the armaments race, believed the Baghdad Pact “in actual fact, to be the “third centre of the war”, in addition to the two which already exist in the Far East and Europe, i. e. NATO and the Southeast Asian pact.” Meanwhile, according to a report based on sources in Tokyo, which was also reported in “Ayn Tarihi” in January 1956, a newspaper which supported Communist China had recounted “the belief that the friendship and collaboration which would develop between Yugoslavia and Egypt would help to reduce international tension”. Thus, in the general political situation of 1956 we see that whilst on the one hand the “Baghdad Pact” had been signed, on the other there was an air of amity between Yugoslavia and the Egypt of Prime Minister Cemal Abdünnasır (who had been in opposition to Israel), Ethiopia, Soviet Russia and communist China. Meanwhile, the “Washington Post” reacted against Marshal Tito, who since his visit to Cairo had supported Egypt’s course

\(^49\) See Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 249, Ankara, August 1954, pp. 59-64.

\(^50\) Furthermore, Faruk Demirtaş’s article “a New Alliance, a New Horizon” printed in “Bayram” gazette on August 10th 1954 and R. S. Burçak’s article issued on August 15th 1954 in the ‘Zafer’ gazette expressed opinions in favour of the Balkan League which had started with Ankara, Belgrade and Athens. For 8/8/1954 dated S. R. Emeç’s article in ‘Son Posta’ see, Ayn Tarihi (History of the Month), No. 249, Ankara, August 1954, p. 89.
of action; Egypt was a country which had positioned itself against Israel, and the Washington Post therefore criticised Tito’s Yugoslavia.\footnote{For the report based on the “Belgrade, Tokyo, Washington” source as noted in this paragraph see: \textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)}, No. 266, Ankara, January 1956, pp. 228-230.}

Moreover, the article by Ö. S. Coşar on Tito’s foreign policy, printed in \textit{‘Cumhuriyet’} and entitled “What is the Marshal saying?”, criticised Yugoslav President Marshal Tito’s allusion to the Baghdad Pact of 1955 as being, like the Atlantic Pact of 1949, “an invitation to war”; he openly warned Tito of the political games of the great powers. Coşar continued: \textit{“It is quite significant that the Yugoslav Marshal, who intimately knows the tactics of the Soviet Union and who has made a lot of comments on them, is poised today to continue undoing the common measures of self-protection of the free nations as well as to persist in talking and spreading propaganda in the same manner.”} Another of his articles, dated January 24th 1956, reports on the historical process of the Balkan Pact conference, the Balkan Pact of 1934 and the importance of the Balkan alliance of 1954. An article by A. Ş. Esmer entitled “Tito’s New Role” printed in the newspaper \textit{‘Ulus’} on January 28th 1956, expresses the opinion that an article printed in the Journal of Foreign Policy and taken up by the Yugoslav Union of Journalists – the voice of the government on matters of foreign policy – had shed some light on the most recent “arcane” policy of Marshal Tito. According to this journal, Marshal Tito was striving to open a new era in the relationship between Europe, Asia and Africa. According to Tito, Yugoslavia – a European as well as a socialist state - was an appropriate choice for this role. Esmer did not approve of the dilemma Tito created with his remarks, which were crafted to please both the West and the East; for instance, before 1948 Tito was pursuing a pro-Soviet policy, and after 1948 he turned his face to the West.\footnote{For the paragraph, see \textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)}, No. 266, Ankara, January 1956, pp. 231-234.}

Towards the end of 1955, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister Koca Popović announced in Parliament that Yugoslavia’s relationship with Russia and other Eastern countries was returning to ‘normal’. However, it would not be incorrect to say that although circumstances were somewhat relieved of political tension, the situation was different as regards the economy. In fact, Marshal Tito referred to Yugoslavia’s economic condition in a speech he made in Belgrade at the end of November 1955, declaring that many factors which had nothing to do with socialism had infiltrated the economic structure of the country due to insufficiencies in auditing and negligence during general controls, and that the proletariat was suffering the most.\footnote{\textit{Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)}, No. 264, Ankara, November 1955, pp. 236-237.}

Throughout 1957, Tito continued to emphasise Yugoslavia’s dedication to the non-alignment policy of active co-existence and the decision not to belong to any
faction in the Cold War era. As also mentioned by Edvard Kardelj—a close friend of Tito’s—a step had been taken towards accepting individual property ownership in villages, and peasants were now wanting to leave the ‘Russian-style collective farms (kolkhoz)’ where they had been held by force for some time in Yugoslavia. According to the journalist Ahmet Halil of “Yeni İstanbul”, whilst it was natural that the peasants of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina were to regain their freedom, Yugoslav economists observed how communism in agriculture could result in bankruptcy. \(^{54}\)

Marshal Tito, in spite of his pronouncements on non-alignment, was still at the middle-right of politics. Despite the visit to Belgrade of the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Nikita Khrushchev (1954-1964) and the Minister of Defense Marshal Bulganin, the relationship between Yugoslavia and Russia after Stalin’s (1924-1953) death was inclined to revert to its previous tense state. \(^{55}\) An agreement between Marshal Tito and Soviet leaders visiting Belgrade meant deviation from the dogma “there is only one way to Socialism” and acceptance of the hypothesis “every state follows their own way to Socialism”; in other words, approval of ‘Titoism’. This development would have encouraged anti-Stalin politicians in the Soviet satellite states. With Moscow’s approval or indulgence, they had already started to disregard ‘Stalinist’ politics; thus, ‘Titoism’ started to predominate. Tito insisted on establishing relationships between governments and not between parties, obliging Khrushchev and Bulganin to agree. However, the rebellions in Poland—and particularly in Hungary—greatly alarmed Moscow and Khrushchev, and Molotov felt the need to take a step back. This being the case, it was natural that strain would be put on the relationship between the Soviets and Yugoslavia. Even though Marshal Tito approved of the movement in Poland, he objected to the one in Hungary. Nevertheless, encouraged by Moscow’s reaction, Stalinist Communist politicians in Romania and Albania as well as Albania’s Enver Hoxha (First Secretary of the Albanian Labour Party) started to attack Tito. Despite the reaction to “Titoism” in Russia and other areas under Russian influence, it did

---

\(^{54}\) See Ahmet Halil’s article titled “Movements Towards Divergence From Communism in Yugoslavia” printed in ‘Yeni İstanbul’ gazette on May 18th 1957. *Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)*, No. 282, Ankara, May 1957, p. 385.

\(^{55}\) See A. Ş. Esmer’s article “Yugoslavia and the Soviets” printed in the ‘Ulus’ gazette on March 9th 1957 in *Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)*, No. 280, Ankara 1957, p. 320. First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Nikita Khrushchev’s commendation of Yugoslavia during his speech in Prague in July 1957 had caused astonishment in Yugoslav political circles. *Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)*, No. 284, Ankara, July 1957, p. 292. Meanwhile, Yugoslav President Tito had continued to deliver speeches stating that “he would practice Socialism his own way”. Relations that had been strained due to the Hungarian Revolution had at some point improved; Khrushchev’s Russia could not however let matters rest. Moscow was worried about a possible ‘liberal movement’ in the satellite states. It seemed that the struggle between Tito, Tito’s supporters and Moscow would continue. See Mücahit Topalak’s article “Moscow-Belgrade” printed in the ‘Zafer’ gazette on July 1st 1957. *Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)*, No. 284, Ankara, July 1957, pp. 294-295.
not seem likely that Moscow would revert back to the ways of the “old Stalinism”.\(^5^6\)

As an item of additional information, the 6\(^{th}\) Congress of the Communist union opened in Belgrade in mid-March 1956 with a short speech by Marshal Tito. According to another report, Poland was the first of all the nations in the Soviet block to which the Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party decided to send an official representative. This was due to the fact that following 1948, when Yugoslavia broke all ties with the Cominform, the country had no representative in the nations behind the ‘iron curtain’. Nevertheless, whereas the diplomatic and cultural relationship between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia persisted, the Yugoslav Minister of Defence, General Ivan Gosnjak, stated in his speech to Parliament concerning the defence budget that “Yugoslavian forces are not and never will be bound to any existing faction”, adding that “we do expect the Americans to provide military aid to Yugoslavia this year as well”.\(^5^7\) In other words, the difficult position of Yugoslavia’s foreign policy dilemma was not going to be alleviated by the great powers.

**CONCLUSION**

Although its territorial grounds are not as large as those of the Bosnian province during the Ottoman era, today’s BiH has succeeded in its determination to exist once more under the name “Bosnia-Herzegovina” in the international world arena. Between 1992 and 1995, Bosnia and Herzegovina came up with a unified compromise despite major political differences.

On the one hand, the Bosnian War took place with all its suffering – alongside hopes for the future – between 1992 and 1995. From the very beginning the development of events was both positive and negative. On May 22\(^{nd}\), Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina were admitted to the UN. Bosnia-Herzegovina had also been accepted to the OSCE on April 30\(^{th}\) 1992. However, aside from such positive and important developments, Bosnia was still to face many difficulties. In fact, the Bosnian-Muslim leader Alija Izetbegović had to leave a meeting in Lisbon as Serbian attacks increased in Bosnia-Herzegovina; thus, the Bosnia-Herzegovina Conference came to an end. It was right at this moment that Turkey declared that the historical setting and cultural inheritance in Sarajevo was being destroyed, and submitted an application to UNESCO for an official to be sent to the city. Turkey made its stance clear, recalling its Ambassador from Belgrade on May 26\(^{th}\) 1992.\(^5^8\)

On the other hand, the Estonian War of Independence occurred in 1918-1920 and resulted in success for Estonia. World War I and the ensuing collapse of the Tsarist regime in Russia influenced the history of Estonia and the creation of five states on


\(^{5^7}\) *Ayın Tarihi (History of the Month)*, No. 268, Ankara, March 1956, pp. 258-259.

Russia’s west –Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland. By March 3rd 1918 German forces had taken all of Estonia’s territory; later, the Russian Bolsheviks invaded the Baltic, beginning the Estonian War of Independence on November 28th 1918. Estonia actually gained independence in 1920. During the German campaign to take Estonia, the Salvation Committee (Paastekomitee), controlled by Estonia’s first National Chamber (Maapaev), officially proclaimed Estonia’s independence on February 24th 1918, and this act became the basis of the Estonian state. The first Provisional Government of Estonia was formed in 1918, headed by Konstantin Paets. The opening session of the first Estonian Assembly was held on April 23rd 1919; the GNA of Turkey–the unicameral parliament of the Turkish Nationalists–opened on the same day one year later, in the midst of the Turkish National Struggle (1919-1922).

With the signing of the the Tartu Peace Treaty between Estonia and Soviet Russia on February 2nd 1920, the Estonian state came into being. Estonian parliamentary elections to form the Riigikogu parliament were held in 1920. The Riigikogu was divided into two chambers in 1938-1940 and was then replaced by the Estonian Soviet socialist republican regime. During World War II, Estonia was once again positioned between the regional centres of power: Germany and Russia. Subsequently, the Soviet occupation took place from 1944 to 1985, before the restoration of Estonia’s independence following the disintegration of the USSR in 1991. Today, whereas Estonia has been a member country of the EU and NATO since 2004, Bosnia and Herzegovina is still trying to fulfill the conditions for eligibility for EU membership.

59 K. Paets (1874-1956) served as Riigivanem (State “Elder”, or de facto head of government) several times between 1918 and 1934. In March 1934 Paets, as acting President, declared martial law. Early the next year he supported a government-approved single party. In January 1936 a plan for a bicameral Parliament was approved by referendum. In 1937 the Assembly, in which the opposition element was small, established a constitution. In April 1938, Paets became the first President of Estonia. With the Soviet occupation of Estonia in June 1940, although technically still president, Paets was arrested by the Soviets and deported in July to Ufa in the Urals. Mel Huang, “Estonia”, in Eastern Europe, Vol 1: An Introduction to the People, Lands, and Culture, (ed. by R. Frucht), California 2005, pp. 74-75; W. F. Reddeway, Problems of the Baltic, Cambridge 1940, pp. 32-33.

60 Between 1923 and 1960, Turkish parliamentarianism was unicameral. With the 1961 Constitution, the majority electoral system gave way to proportional representation. Following the 1961 Constitution (the third Turkish constitution out of a total of four: 1921, 1924, 1961 and 1982) the Turkish Parliament became bi-cameral until 1980.