

THOUGHTS CONCERNING THE "ATLAS OF TURKEY"

W. Hüttheroth, GÖTTINGEN

It is owing to the Geographical Institute of the University of Istanbul to have edited the first Turkish Atlas which-although with restrictions by the editors themselves-can be called a "National Atlas" in the usual sense:

TÜRKİYE ATLASI Atlas of Turkey, prepared by Ali Tanoğlu, Sırrı Erinç, Erol Tümertekin; Istanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi 1961. (Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları No. 903) 125.-Ltg.

An undertaking of this kind was urgently necessary, because the only available atlas up to now, the "Büyük Atlas" for high schools, does no longer comply with the requirements and the position of research. On 87 maps, all coloured, of the scale of 1: 6 000 000 up to 1: 800 000 there is composed a considerable part of the dispersed material of the regional geography of Turkey which otherwise is hardly available especial in foreign countries. The Tradition of the İstanbul Geographical Institute to publish Turkish works in different languages is continued in a pleasant way with this atlas (legend in Turkish and English).

In contrast to many other national atlas this one shows predominantl maps having been published before as skeches at different places, originating in most cases from the editors themselves. A certain irregularity in composition and order of Material could therefore not be avoided, on the other hand it is possible to find in the special works (often published in the "Review of the Geogr. Inst. İstanbul") more detailed explanation than the sometimes too short legends may give.

At the begining there are the eight sheets of the well known Turkish map 1: 8000 000, gaining clarity by coloured hypsometric tints with a distance of 500 m. Nevertheless, the disadvantage of a small-scale hypsometric tints map is evident here: The run of the 1000 m contour line right th-

rough the ova of Konya demonstrates most clearly the necessity of a complementary morphological map!

The geological map 1: 800 000 edited about 20 years ago by the Mineral Research and Exploration Institute (MTA) is reduced in scale to 1: 2,5 Mill. and simplified by leaving out the petrographic distinctions, map inset explaining the structure.

By far the largest part of the maps (43 of 87!) is dedicated to the demonstration of climatic conditions. Here it is necessary to realise in comparison with other national atlases that the basis for all maps are the only 30 years old series of about 140 meteorological stations, among which there are very few mountain stations. This loose net of stations may explain the occasional small differences with the maps of the Meteorological Institute, as all values for mountain areas must be interpolated. The characteristic periodical and local rates of the temperature and precipitation is shown on maps for every other month (true and reduced monthly average, average of monthly precipitation) or every third month (prevailing wind direction and force). The attempts of de Martonne and Thornthwaite to find a method of demonstrating aridity are applied on Turkey, (map 33, 34) which gives an interesting possibility for comparing studies about this subject.

In comparison with the climate the vegetation is treated too shortly. The vegetation map no. 51 by Louis (the natural and not the actual vegetation is referred to) could be completed according to the position of research by the maps showing the types of forests and the kinds of trees, which have been published by the state forest administration (Orman Umum Müd.) and which are still parts of the "World Forest Atlas". The second map, no. 52, gives too little information, as nearly all provinces include largely differing natural landscapes. Here, as well as with the following maps of human geography, the usage of provinces (vilâyet) as an area of reference is too large. An arrangement according to districts (kaza) would be by far more instructive and would also be possible with regard to the source material.

Among the maps of human geography the map designed by A. Tanoğlu showing the distribution of population 1: 2,5 Mill. must be specially noted. This map, developed according to the point- and ball-method, means a considerable improvement compared with the sketches up to now. It is a pity that the design is old and is based on the census of population in 1935; namely in Central Anatolia there are important shiftings in distribution of population. This does not lessen the principal value of this map, which can be fully appreciated only in connection with the text belonging to it (Rev. Geogr. Inst. Istanbul 1959)

The interesting map 68 (Land Use Map of Turkey) may be welcomed as first attempt to put down the real range and distribution of cropland in its actual position and extent (within the limit of the scale 1: 2,5 Mill). In Central Anatolia, however, it shows even too small an extent of cropland: too old statistics (statement of the year is missing) or the fact, that the fallow (nadas), which amounts to 40 - 50 % in this region, has not been taken notice of, may be the reason. Nevertheless this very necessary map will correct many-even modern- european atlases, which show Central Anatolia as an area of uncultivated steppe with nomadic herding. Just one question concerning this map: Are there really as many vineyards in the district of Karaman as in both the Vilayets of Izmir and Manisa?

Concerning map no. 63-65: In addition to the presentation of "Rural Population per square km" and "Inhabitants per square km of agricultural land" a presentation of "rural population per square km of agricultural land" would have been instructive. Or should this be the meaning of map no. 64? The english legend is not quite clear here. A considerable number of diagrams and profiles has been added, e.g. the hypsographic curve, even separate for each sheet of the map 1:800 000, longitudinal sections of the most important rivers, **vegetation sections after Louis**, diagrams of temperature, precipitation and evapotranspiration, as well as diagrams concerning the development of **population, production and trade.**

The edition of this atlas had been planned for the year 1954 and has been delayed because of reasons concerning printing all of the statistical data therefore only cover the time till 1952 or 1953, which is a pity considering the violently advanced development of the country since then as well as the new scientific results. The symbols of the sizes of towns, too, are hence antiquated. These things will be surely corrected in the next edition, which is mentioned by the editors in the preface. It will probably be possible, too, to make use of the maps that have been worked out in the meantime, such as for example the tectonic map by I. Ketin, the map of climadiagrams by J. Walther, the soil map by Arikök and Oakes. Beside the map showing the capacity of railway transport one wants to see the map showing the density of highway traffic by the Highway Engineering Office (Karayolları Umum Müd.), and the works of the National Office for Hydraulic Works (Devlet Su İşleri) will possibly in short time allow to construct a map of irrigated areas which would be very instructive beside the land use maps.

By taking up 6 maps about the conditions of salt, temperature and currents in the Black Sea, the Marmara Sea and the Straits the editors introduced quite a new idea: the presentation of single regions of special

interest by extra maps. By this one wishes to see this principle carried on in the next edition, e.g. by adding some example maps of characteristic regions in larger scales, perhaps 1: 200 000 or the fine new map 1: 25000. Instead of this one could perhaps do without some of the diagrams about the conditions of trade, production and population, which can only show the conditions of the whole country, not the regional differentiation, which is of geographical interest.

Most of these remarks come up practically to the desire for completion, and these thoughts will have occurred to the editors of course during the last years before the atlas was published. The reviewer realizes the great difficulties especially by connection with the editors themselves— that prevent the realization of such wishes, and one may hope that there will be means to form this great and representative undertaking further. It has grown to a habit to look at a national atlas as visiting-card of a nation; in this case this “habit” may be followed only to a limited degree, for a comparison with other great “National Atlas” is for some reasons still out of place. For a country where there have been statistical inquiries practicable for regional geography since a few decades only, and where the scientific evaluation of data is still in full progress this “Atlas of Turkey” is a considerable piece of work, and everybody who is working in regional problems of Turkey in any discipline will have a remarkable help from it.

