

THE POLITICS BEHIND SCIENTIFIC TRANSFER BETWEEN TURKEY AND GERMANY IN THE CASE OF THE "YÜKSEK ZİRAAT ENSTİTÜSÜ" IN ANKARA

Regine Erichsen

University of Münster

Institute of Theory and History of Medicine

• • •

*Türkiye ve Almanya Arasındaki Bilimadamı Değiştokuşunun Siyasal
Arka Planı: Ankara Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü Örnek Olayı*

Özet

Birçok Alman bilimadamı ve üniversite hocası, 1933'ten sonra Nasyonal Sosyalist yönetimin çıkardığı yasalarca görevlerinden uzaklaştırıldılar. Bu akademisyenlerden 200 kadarı aileleriyle birlikte Türkiye'ye göç ettiler. Türkiye 1944'e kadar Almanya'yla sıkı ekonomik ilişkilerini sürdürdüğünden, göç eden bilim adamları, Reich tarafından resmî yollarla bu ülkeye gönderilen mestektaşlarıyla birlikte çalışmak durumunda kaldılar.

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'ye göç etmek zorunda kalan Alman bilimadamlarının görevlendirilmesinde olduğu kadar 1930'lu ve 1940'lı yıllarda Almanya ile Türkiye arasındaki resmî bilimadamı değişiminin de arkaplanını oluşturan Alman-Türk ilişkilerinin gelişimi ele alınmaktadır. İki ülke arasındaki ilişkilerin gelişimini aydınlatmak açısından Ankara Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü'nün incelenmesi iyi bir örnek oluşturmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, bu yüksek eğitim kurumlarında akademik konumunun değerlendirilmesinin yanısıra Alman kültür politikası uyarınca Türkiye'de yaratılan bir öğretim ve araştırma merkezinin gelişimini hem kolaylaştıran, hem de sınırlayan siyasal zenginlik de bu çalışmanın ilgi odağı olacaktır.

Abstract

After 1933 many German scientists and university teachers were forced out of their posts by National Socialist legislation. About 200 such academics emigrated to Turkey with their families. As the Turkish Republic maintained close economic relations with Germany until 1944, the émigrés in Turkey worked alongside many colleagues who had been officially sent to Turkey by the Reich.

This study traces the development of German-Turkish relations that formed the background to the appointment of exiled academics as well as the official scientific transfer between Germany and Turkey in the 1930s and 40s. These developments are illustrated by exploring the Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü, the Agricultural College in Ankara. The focus, therefore, is not primarily on the academic standing of this higher education institution as on the political fortunes that both facilitated and confined the evolution of a centre of teaching and research partly created by German "Kulturpolitik" in Turkey.

The Politics Behind Scientific Transfer Between Turkey and Germany in the Case of the "Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü" in Ankara

After 1933 many German scientists and university teachers were forced out of their posts by National Socialist legislation. About 200 such academics emigrated to Turkey with their families. As the Turkish Republic maintained close economic relations with Germany until 1944, the émigrés in Turkey worked alongside many colleagues who had been officially sent to Turkey by the *Reich*. This paper traces the development of German-Turkish relations that formed the background to the appointment of exiled academics as well as the official scientific transfer between Germany and Turkey in the 1930s and 40s. These developments are illustrated by exploring the Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü (Y.Z.E.), the Agricultural College in Ankara. The focus, therefore, is not so much on the academic standing of this higher education institution as on the political fortunes that both facilitated and confined the evolution of a centre of teaching and research partly created by German *Kulturpolitik* in Turkey¹.

The Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü, the College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, was opened in Ankara in 1933. Its very foundation stood in a long tradition of German-Turkish scientific and academic relations that reaches back to the years of the Ottoman Empire (DİNÇER, 1977: 170-175).

Ottoman Turkey had sought to promote economic and political development by enlisting foreign help with reforms since the 18th century, redoubling these efforts from the beginning of the 19th century. The transfer of

1 All the documentary material quoted in this article and the literature referred to was examined by the author as part of a study on the subject sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and presented at a conference in Istanbul from 5th to 7th December 1997.

science and technology from Europe was organised by the Ottoman rulers in the service of a military and administrative reform of their empire. Towards the end of the 19th century, Germany managed to extend her influence at the expense of France and Great Britain. Wilhelmenian foreign policy centred on a strategy of 'peaceful economic penetration' of the Ottoman empire and, in return for commercial access, Prussia and then Germany supported the efforts of the Sublime Port towards greater centralisation of its power.

A process of cultural and scientific transfer accompanied and lubricated these relations. Thus, according to an assessment of German cultural policies in 1913: *Our own nation and government cannot be too attentive to the guiding principle to be derived from the experience of other world trading and colonial powers: namely that a most profound bond exists between spiritual and economic influence. In areas where dawning civilisations are reorganising in accordance with European ideas, the bearers of culture and learning - language, books, schools, the arts and sciences - prepare the broad terrain for the application of the manifold material means of expansion of great powers engaged in world trade. A nation's commerce, capital, industry and technology will move effortlessly into a country whose education and spiritual formation has already been strongly influenced* (GROTHE, 1913: 37).

German cultural and scientific transfer around the turn of the century and up to the end of the First World War mainly concerned the fields of military medicine and military training but also included, during the 1914-1918 period, the secondment of academics to the *darülfünun*, the university in Istanbul. The establishment of a German university in Turkey was one of the goals of a 'German school mission' overseen by the German Schools Advisory Committee set up in 1915 at the Ottoman Education Ministry under the chairmanship of *Geheimrat Franz Schmidt* (SCHMIDT, 1928: 34-74). But these plans could not be completed under the conditions of the war.

In the fields of agriculture and veterinary medicine bilateral contacts had even been forged much earlier. Wishing to introduce a course in veterinary medicine at the *harbiye-mektebi*, the War College founded in 1825, Sultan *Abdül Mecid* (1839-1861) turned to *Prinz August of Prussia* for assistance. On his initiative, the Prussian Brigade Veterinary Officer *von Godlewsky* ran courses in military medicine until 1841 for the cadets of the *harbiye* (RIGLER, 1852: 5; DOĞANAY, 1986: 15-16). *Von Godlewsky* compiled an initial inventory of animal diseases in the Ottoman empire.

The Agricultural School founded in Halkalı Istanbul in 1892 sent some of its students to Germany. German-Turkish co-operation in the field of veterinary medicine again took place during the Turkish-German alliance of the First World War, especially in the 5th Turkish Army Corps headed by General *Liman von Sanders*. There were also German officers in the agricultural service of the

Turkish government in Africa after the war (KOLONIAL-WIRTSCHAFTLICHES KOMITEE, 1924: 29).

After the Turkish Republic had been founded in 1923, the policy pursued by Germany during the Weimar Republic again took up the theme of war-time 'German-Turkish friendship', this time employing the slogan: 'Germany and the Near East are both victims of an Anglo-French annexation policy'. But Turkey was now a sovereign nation-state, and the terms of bilateral partnership had changed. Nevertheless, Germany was the first country to sign new agreements with Turkey. Following the models offered by the industrialised nations of Europe, Kemal Atatürk launched a state-led reform of society which was thought to require transfer of science and technology from the West in order to build a new administrative as well as scientific and academic infrastructure. With the conclusion of a German-Turkish agricultural trade agreement in 1927, the Turkish government brought in German experts to help reform the country's agricultural system, this time planning a College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine. This collaboration meant that, in the field of education and cultural affairs, Germany was able, at least in part, to pursue its earlier foreign policy objective of setting up an institute of higher education in Turkey.

Geheimrat Schmidt had taken up a post as head of a commission at the Turkish Agriculture Ministry immediately after the war. The commission (later headed by a *Geheimrat Oldenburg* (GEHEIMRAT OLDENBURG, 1929: 19-142) had the task of preparing an expert opinion on the situation of Turkish agriculture and submitting its recommendations for reform measures. To this end, it carried out a series of trials using materials and technology from Germany. The legislation to found the Agricultural College came into force in 1927 and under the supervision of Agriculture Minister *Sabri Toprak*, work with construction material brought in from Leipzig soon began on the building, which had been designed by the Austrian architect *Ernst Egli* (NICOLAY, 1998: 27-32).

The German Agricultural Commission, however, proved incapable of adapting its attitudes to the changed constitutional situation in the Turkish Republic. The German officials obviously could not accept that the so-called '*Capitulations*', agreements which had granted special rights to foreigners in the Ottoman Empire, were no longer valid in the sovereign Turkish nation-state. The German ambassador, *Rudolf Nadolny*, had to intervene to secure an orderly annulment of the contracts of the experts with the Turkish government (NADOLNY, 1955: 104-105). Only one member of the group was taken on as a property manager of what was to become the Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü.

Despite these difficulties, Turkish agriculture did take note of the experts' recommendations, such as their proposals for controlling *rinderpest* or for

introducing a new meat inspection at slaughterhouses. German proposals were also influential in a reform of teaching at agricultural schools in lower secondary sector (üç yıllık ziraat mektepleri) (HOFFMEISTER, 1928: 2). The process of scientific transfer continued with the appointment of more Germans in Turkey to the provisional agricultural school in Ankara-Keçiören and with the secondment of young Turkish academics and civil servants to Germany even before the new Agricultural College had been completed (AKMAN, 1978: 64-92).

The keen interest in German experts was prompted by those Turkish officials who had studied in Germany, such as the Director General for Higher Education *Cevat Dursunoğlu*. The Agriculture Minister *Muhlis Erkmen*, who had studied in Bonn and Leipzig, appointed *Friedrich Falke* as head of the Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü when it opened in 1933. Falke had been the founder and director of the *Landwirtschaftliches Institut* and a professor of economics at the University of Leipzig. He was rector of the university when the offer came to take up the post at the Y.Z.E.

On his appointment in Turkey, Falke writes: *Back in 1926, the predecessor of Reşat Muhlis (Erkmen) had already begun, in close co-operation with a commission of German experts, the work of establishing an Agricultural College, but these efforts were broken off prematurely. When Reşat Muhlis became Agriculture Minister in 1932, he resumed this work and, having overcome powerful currents in Turkey which preferred other countries to Germany (STUMMVOLL, 1935: 145-153)², completed the plan thanks to my appointment as the organiser and rector of the university. The preference given to the Germans in Turkey was not without its critics within the Turkish parliament, as Falke's letter suggests, but in the end this policy prevailed: Having contacted me, the Agriculture minister (...) is now calling for the exclusive use of Germans.* Falke did not want to disappoint the minister, who was risking his neck by taking this stand (FALKE, 1932: 65; 1947: 121).

The priority given to Germany as the source of scientific transfer for the Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü was, in any case, in line with the general direction of German-Turkish economic relations at the time. In the early years of National Socialist rule in Germany, German-Turkish relations were under the growing economic influence of the Reich in Turkey. By 1938, Germany had developed

² In pursuing the goal of achieving a dominant influence on Turkish cultural and educational life, there were a number of obstacles to overcome, such as the overwhelming influence of the French language on modern Turkish thought and language among the older Turkish generation. *Josef Stummvoll*, who had been seconded from Leipzig to the library of the Y.Z.E., notes in 1935 that according to the official statistics for the Turkish public libraries, German language works make up 14.1% of the books appearing in European languages, i.e. in third place and well behind the French language books with 53.3%. He remarks: *The older generation leans towards France.* Cf. Stummvoll, Josef (1935), "Das Bibliothekswesen der neuen Türkei," in: *Actes du Comité International des Bibliothèques*, 8th session, Madrid-Barcelona 8, 145-153, here 147.

into Turkey's main trading partner - in terms not only of trade volumes but also of the quality of the goods being traded. For instance, the *Reich* was the main customer for Turkish chrome ore, a key raw material for the German arms industry. On the Turkish side, the industrialisation of the nation lay at the heart of the economic reform efforts that followed the foundation of the Turkish Republic, and Germany was the principal partner in building Turkey's industrial infrastructure. The company *IG-Farben Industrie* played a special role in German-Turkish economic relations. Cutting out its British competitors, *IG-Farben* was able, at the request of the Turkish government, to operate as the exclusive contractor for supplying and building chemical installations. Indeed, it ran a special agency in Turkey to report constantly on the latest political and economic developments. The way in which German industry, represented by *IG-Farben*, competed with British firms in the agricultural sector is shown by a report the German embassy in Ankara to the Foreign Office in 1931: *Some time ago the local press carried the news that an English group was interested in building and operating a factory for artificial fertiliser in Turkey. [...] At present we are the sole importers of artificial fertiliser. (...) England can only expect to be able to do a business here if it pursues a new course and it has therefore chosen the one that is particularly close to the heart of the present Turkish government, namely that of founding of the country's own industry. [...] Although the business of exporting artificial fertiliser to Turkey has not been important for us, it would still be highly regrettable if IG-Farben's efforts and preparations, which have been so well received, were now to benefit our competitor (FABRICIUS, 1931).*

The German proposals to shift the balance of national budgetary expenditure towards the agricultural sector were not implemented by the Turkish government, but Germany remained the largest importer of traditional Turkish agricultural products³ and therefore kept a particular interest in influencing the country's agricultural development.

Just as it had done in the Ottoman Empire, German policy on the Near East identified its cultural and educational agenda as a suitable vehicle for introducing Germany's economic interests. *In countries that are about to develop their own cultures, cultural propaganda as everyone who understands the situation will know is not merely the companion of economic propaganda but in fact leads the way,* reads an assessment made in 1934 (KÖHLER, 1934: 4), once again fully in accord with the old maxims of Germany's oriental policy. The German press responded to the foundation of the Y.Z.E. with an article headed *German science at the front line, which notes that the cultural significance of the new educational institution can*

3 On the state of German-Turkish economic relations at that time in general cf. KOÇAK, Cemil (1991), *Türk-Alman İlişkileri (1923-1939)*, Ankara; also JASCHKE, Gotthard (1941), *Türkei*, Berlin: 41-55

hardly be emphasised enough, since the new university was to become a scientific centre for the Near East⁴.

On 11 January 1933 Friedrich Falke wrote from Ankara to the dean of the Philosophical Faculty of Leipzig University: *We [Germans] are not particularly well represented in the Science Faculty in Istanbul, as the Turks themselves admit (...)*. He concluded that everything had to be done in connection with the founding of the Agricultural College in Ankara in order to *lay the foundations needed in future for a new national university, which unlike Istanbul, will be recognised throughout the world* (FALKE, 1933: 80).

Shortly afterwards, German emigrants were appointed to the university in Istanbul, which had also opened in 1933. The old university, the *darülfünun*, had been closed and the Turkish state called in German scientists expelled from German universities to take the chairs of the newly founded *Istanbul Üniversitesi*. By 1935 about 80% of the new universities staff was exiled German scientists. For instance, the Science Faculty of the I.Ü. took on the Dresden physicist *Harry Dember*, whose name had become famous through the 'Dembereffekt', as well as the biologist *Leo Brauner* from Jena, distinguished for his work on plant physiology (ERICHSEN, 1991: 73-105).

The German press did not hesitate to celebrate these appointments as a success for German *Kulturpolitik* and made no mention of the racially motivated expulsions behind the appointments. Even in 1935, the *Frankfurter Zeitung* could write that, with the founding of the *Istanbul Üniversitesi*, *German cultural propaganda in south-eastern Europe has created an important new opportunity, which seems all the more valuable by not having been bought by some grant. Rather, it was Turkey's own decision, taken solely in recognition of German academic achievement, to entrust German professors so completely with the training of its young scientists*⁵.

At first, it was the officially seconded German professors, the so-called *Reichsprofessoren*, at the *Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü* who not only performed the basic task of scientific transfer but even built up a complete German school of agronomy in Turkey (KANSU, 1971: 1-11)⁶. What was 'German' at the Y.Z.E.? In contrast to the *Istanbul üniversitesi*, Germans occupied not only the chairs but also the senior administrative posts. The Y.Z.E. was generally structured along

4 The German ambassador in Ankara, Dr.Franz Thierfelder marks the opening of the University on 30.10.1933 in the *Leipziger Neue Nachrichten* of 5.11.1933.

5 Cf. *Frankfurter Zeitung* of thr 8 July 1935.

6 On the history of the Y.Z.E. and especially its development into the Agricultural Faculty of the *Ankara üniversitesi* (AÜ), cf. Kansu, Atif (1971), *Fakültenin tarihçesi ve öğretimindeki gelişmeler* (The history of the faculty [of the Agricultural College of Ankara] and the developments in teaching. In: GÜNEŞ, T. i.a.: *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi* (The Agricultural Faculty of the University of Ankara in the 50th year of the Republic), Ankara: 1-11.

the lines of similar institutions in Germany. It differed from German higher educational institutions only in few respects - for instance in its system of first and second-class of professorships. The College consisted of five faculties (agriculture, agricultural engineering, natural sciences, veterinary medicine, and, from 1934, forestry management) with 27 institutes. The first-class chairs and the institute directors were all German professors, initially 22 in number, until 1939 (ERK, 1966: 118)⁷. There were probably between 30 and 40 German specialists at the Y.Z.E. The German teaching staff were officially seconded from their positions in Germany to Turkey for a limited teaching period, after which they would return to their old positions. Time spent in Turkey counted towards their civil service careers. This was quite different for the émigrés, who had lost their right to teach in Germany and had been forced to retire when the National Socialist's racial laws were enforced. Some also were the victims of political persecution. Finally, all such émigrés remaining abroad, including in Turkey, were to lose their German citizenship by 1941.

The *Reichprofessoren*, like the émigrés, drew their salaries from the Turkish government, but they also received a supplement from Germany. The salaries of German scientists, whether émigrés or 'official Germans', were set at about 900 Turkish Pounds, which far exceeded the amount paid to Turkish academics in equivalent positions.

The College, which incorporated a boarding school, offered a four-year-program leading to degrees in forestry and agricultural engineering and veterinary science. Students could also continue their academic studies right up to post-doc level (YÜKSEK ZİRAAT ENSTİTÜSÜ, 1934). The students were taught in German, and language teachers were employed to improve their proficiency. Where necessary, young Turkish assistants proficient in German would interpret for the students, who also had to submit written work in German⁸. Alongside German, students also studied English and French. The sports instructor was a German lecturer. Meteorology and plant protection courses were, like the language tuition, common syllabus subjects in all departments.

7 The Turkish colleagues had studied abroad like Fazlı Faik Yegül, who taught Forensic Veterinary Medicine at the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine. Having studied in Europe from 1901-1911, Yegül had already taught at the Agricultural College in Halkalı and was Secretary-General of the Y.Z.E. Cf. Erk, Nihal (1966), *Veteriner Tarihi* (History of Veterinary Medicine). Ankara, 218.

8 The papers are written in simple German by the student and mainly deal with agricultural topics from the author's home region, where the student has carried out a small empirical study as a component of his thesis. With the kind permission of Professor Dr. Ferruh Dinçer (Dean of the Veterinary Faculty of the AÜ) and of Professor Y. Sabit Ağaoğlu (Dean of the Agricultural Faculty of the AÜ) the author in 1993 looked up the diploma theses from the Y.Z.E. period in the archive of the Faculty of Agriculture of the University of Ankara.

The Y.Z.E. was a self-governing public body until it came under the authority of the Agriculture Ministry in 1936. The Plant Protection Centre, run by a German director, was also connected to the Agriculture Ministry.

Though the National Socialists counted the emigrés as representatives of Germany in the beginning of the expulsion of Jews and other undesirable persons the calls to chairs and posts of these institutes from 1933 on was a matter of rivalry between the *Reich* and the organisation of the émigrés. Some of the émigrés at Istanbul University were active as advisors to the Turkish government on the appointment of further exiles after the first appointments. The professor of pathology *Phillipp Schwarz* at the I.Ü., for example, was a representative of the *Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland*⁹, an organisation-in-aid for refugees from Germany. He naturally took a keen interest in the process by which posts at the Y.Z.E. were filled with *Reichsprofessoren*. Looking back to that time of the founding of the Y.Z.E. he notes: *The foundation of an Agricultural and Veterinary University in Ankara, which was originally planned with the mediation of the Notgemeinschaft, fell into the hands of the Hitlerian lobby (...) yet we managed to find places for some of the highly qualified émigrés even among these groups* (SCHWARTZ, 1977: 49). The émigré group included the chemist *Otto Gerngross*, the geologist *Wilhelm Salomon-Calvi* and the geologist *Max Pfannenstiel*, who worked in the library. Then there was the head of the Plant Protection Centre, *Gustav Gassner*, and his colleague *Hans Bremer*. The émigrés *Hans Willbrandt* and *Fritz Baade* worked as agricultural experts at the Agriculture Ministry and Industry Ministry respectively. As for the professor of veterinary medicine, *Hans Richter*, his dismissal was rather unusual in that he was not actually sacked under the law governing the careers of civil servants. But he was designated by the Nazis as an "extreme Freemason" and thus blacklisted as potentially disloyal to the party line¹⁰.

The fact that the appointments were made under two very different sets of political conditions did not necessarily lead to a personal split among the German academics in Turkey in the early stages of scientific transfer to Turkey's model institutions. As active participants in the life of the German colony, émigrés and 'regular Germans' mixed privately, especially in Ankara. It should

9 To the details of the history of the *Notgemeinschaft* cf. ERICHSEN, Regine (1994), *Emigrantenhilfe von Emigranten Die Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland*, in: *Exil* 2: 51-69.

10 *Oberregierungsrat Scuria* wrote to the German Foreign Office, which had received an inquiry from *Richter* via the Ankara Embassy concerning a reappointment in Germany: *Professor Dr. Richter, who has been an extreme Freemason, cannot possibly be deployed in the field of university administration.* Letter of 18.9.1939, Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes, Ankara 732, A2464.39, B19.

of course be borne in mind that even in Germany the take-over by the National Socialists was by no means associated with an automatic turn to National Socialism by the entire German population.

However, over time the Nazis did their best to bring about this turn by means of *Gleichschaltung*, i.e. by administrative and ideological regimentation. At German universities this meant that, having driven out the racially and politically undesirable staff, loyal Nazi supporters were awarded chairs and other posts, especially in the ideologically sensitive subjects. Watching over the teaching staff and enforcing loyalty were the Nazified lecturer and student associations at the universities. In Turkey, too, the National Socialist party (NSDAP), and the National Socialist administration, kept the émigrés as well as the officially seconded experts under observation to determine their attitude towards the regime so as to ensure *Gleichschaltung*. From 1935, secondments abroad, including those in Turkey, were reviewed to find out whether the academics concerned could operate as functionaries in the service of the National Socialists¹¹.

The international strategy of instrumentalising the émigrés in the interests of National Socialist propaganda, as pursued in the early years of National Socialist rule, proved unworkable once the racist measures became known to a wider international public. This is reflected in a letter written by the philosopher of science *Hans Reichenbach* in 1934 from the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Istanbul: *Our philosophical approach (of the Berlin school of logical positivism) is becoming ever more popular; we had great success at the philosophy congress in Prague. For me personally, it was also great fun to be able to attend the congress as a representative of Turkey and, as such, to be received with applause directed demonstratively against Hitler (REICHENBACH, 1934)*. No wonder, then, that the Reich Ministry of Science was attempting to prevent the appointment of émigrés in Turkey and always intervened when a chair at Istanbul University became vacant or a new post was created.

Oberregierungsrat Scurla of the Reich Ministry of Education submitted short lists of approved German academics to the Turkish government. However, these attempts, such as in the case of appointments to the *Hifzısıhha Enstitüsü* (later

11 For example, the Berlin lecturers association wrote of the geographer *Herbert Louis*, who had been appointed to a teaching post in Ankara, that, *Louis cannot be called a National Socialist, nor is he an opponent of National Socialism. Louis could hardly be considered suitable as a representative of National Socialism abroad. Dozentenschaft der Universität Berlin, 21.2.35. Bundesarchiv Koblenz R21 833 Erziehungsministerium*. See also the letter of the Leipzig lecturers association on the Professor of zoology on the chair of zoology in Ankara *Richard Woltereck*, as he was nominated to an appointment as *persönlicher Ordinarius* of the University of Leipzig. *Universitätsarchiv Leipzig UAL, PA 107, sheets 96,97.*

Refik Saydam Enstitüsü), the hygiene institute, and the model hospital in Ankara (*Ankara Nümmune Hastahanesi*) remained unsuccessful because the Turkish government in all these cases preferred to appoint émigrés.

After 1935 political developments, and the cultural and educational policy measures that followed, brought a new dynamic to the German colony, transforming the situation of the *Reichsprofessoren* and émigrés at the University. The situation of the Germans in Turkey was not only affected by Germany's racist domestic policies but also by Germany's aggressive foreign policy stance and the Turkish reaction to this.

Whereas the National Socialists seemed at first to accept the notion of the right of all peoples to self-determination in their foreign policy, they now moved towards an aggressive expansion of the Reich, justified by the slogan of *Lebensraum*. In Turkey, however, the government in Ankara was interested in pursuing a policy of preserving the status quo. It wanted to safeguard and consolidate the territorial gains made in the War of Independence.

The formation of the Axis had cast the first shadow over German-Turkish relations. When, with the occupation of Czechoslovakia, Germany's expansionist aims became obvious, and after Italy's invasion of Albania, Turkey turned to France and Great Britain as the powers which could offer some protection against German aggression. In terms of German-Turkish relations, Turkey now regarded commercial interests as secondary to a potential military threat from Germany (KRECKER, 1964: 11-19).

In 1939 German-Turkish trade came to a standstill. An economic war had begun. However, Britain was unable to impose a total economic blockade on Germany and failed to prevent a renewed rapprochement between the two countries in the 1940s. When the conflict broke out in 1939 Turkey had in principle aligned herself with the Allies, but she managed to pursue a balancing policy between the war-time enemies until 1944. Turkey then broke off relations with Germany and by 1945 had entered the War against Germany (GLASNECK/KIRCHEISEN, 1968: 15-157). Germany's hostility in 1939 provoked an anti-German mood in parts of the Turkish population, which was vented in demonstrations against German aggression. Unofficial German promises with regard to the future of territories in the Soviet Union inhabited by Turkish communities in the event of German occupation did not appear credible even to pan-Turkists in the Turkish Parliament as the head of the German Secret Services *Schellenberg* reports (SCHELLENBERG, 1959: 315-325).

The great power ambitions of Germans inclined towards National Socialism also made themselves felt in the narrow segment of German-Turkish co-operation at the Agricultural College. In 1936, two years before his regular

retirement in Germany, Friedrich Falke was dismissed from the Y.Z.E.¹². He fell victim to political intrigues within the staff of the Y.Z.E. and, as he wrote in 1947, witnessed the great work of German cultural and educational achievement at the Y.Z.E. being destroyed by National Socialism. The new efforts of the National Socialists to secure the influence of Germany's *Kulturpolitik* by insisting that individual representatives of Germany in Turkey have a personal commitment to National Socialist objectives finally polarised the Germans living in Turkey, forcing them to declare for or against National Socialism. For instance, academic staff at Y.Z.E. were called upon by party representatives to report on the loyalty of their colleagues. One such case was Professor *Gustav Gassner*, who was pressed to report on his colleague *Bodenheimer*. Sometimes even non-political statements were interpreted as 'anti-German', as is shown by the following report: *Herr Dr. Hurr, who works for the company E. Merck, which is known to our Istanbul mission, and was sent out from the research department of the company's headquarters, informs us confidentially that he has visited the local Agricultural College to negotiate with Professor Bodenheimer. Herr Hurr is endeavouring to introduce into Turkey a well-known pesticide produced by Merck, which goes under the name of Estermut. Bodenheimer was extremely disparaging about the Merck product, claiming that trials with the product had led to two fatalities. Bodenheimer was of course unable to give any details. Dr. Hurr has the firm impression that Bodenheimer is adopting an anti-German stance (REPORT TO FA. MERCK, 1939).*

Even within unofficial circles of the German colony in Turkey there now emerged divisions between party loyalists and individuals who were apolitical or critical of the regime. The dividing lines did not always run clearly between émigrés and non-émigrés.

Moreover, as in *Geheimrat Oldenburg's* times, the German staff of the Y.Z.E. continued to be caught up in conflicts with Turkish affairs. These conflicts increased because the Y.Z.E. was also a bone of contention for the Turkish

12 In a tribute to Falke's life work it is noted that: *In 1938 he and his peaceful cultural and educational efforts fell victim to political intrigues by the German side.* Cf. Lampeter, W. (1965), Friedrich Falke (1871-1948). In: *Bedeutende Gelehrte in Leipzig* Vol.II. Published by Gerhard Harig on the occasion of the 800th anniversary celebration of the city of Leipzig on behalf of the rector and senate of the Karl Marx University. Leipzig, 159-164, here 164. The University management first asked Professor *Walter Gleisberg* to deputize, and then Professor *Walter Spöttel*. Finally Professor *Friedrich Christiansen Weniger* (from 1938 in the chair of the Arable Cultivation and Plant Protection Department) was made Rector, having served as a member of the Oldenburg Commission and an advisor to the Agriculture Ministry. Cf. I.a. the letter from ambassador v. Papan to the Foreign Office of 31.7.1939, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes Ankara 732, A 2040/39. For the rest of his life, Falke was to continue his links with Erkmen, who received an honorary doctorate from the University of Leipzig after the Second World War as an award for his services to German-Turkish academic relations.

political élite. The move to place the college under the administrative authority of the Agriculture Ministry had been accompanied by a campaign against Muhlis Erkmen, whose proteges, including Falke, were accused of allowing improper use of the facilities at Y.Z.E. by unauthorised persons. Consequently, Falke's first representative, *Wilhelm Gleisberg*, was threatened with legal prosecution in Turkey (von PAPEN, 1939). A change in the political orientation of the governing Republican People's Party after the death of Kemal Atatürk in 1938 led to a shake up of the administrative personnel at the Y.Z.E. The new administrators were even more distrustful of German staff at the Y.Z.E., suggesting that they were disloyal to the Turkish Republic.

The conflicts also centred upon educational matters. During these years, in what is known as the Republican Phase of recent Turkish history, a typical problem for the structural reforms taking place in the education system, including agricultural vocational education, concerned the lack of practical training as an integral part of teaching programmes, which was connected with a discussion on the order of the individual steps in the education system. This debate touched directly on the agricultural vocational courses at the College. Should the government, with its scarce resources, be promoting the infrastructure and basic training linked to practice or should it be developing 'academic' agricultural studies of the college? The critics of the 'Ivory Tower' approach accused their opponents of being influenced by a German educational concept that emphasised theory and was not adequately adapted to Turkish conditions¹³. Responding to questions in parliament, agriculture minister Erkmen defended the German concept: The existing of the *ziraat mektepleri*, the four agricultural schools at vocational secondary level and the courses for farmers were not, he conceded, sufficient for the secondary sector, but the research work on plant and animal diseases and the research on breeding performed at the college were nevertheless an essential element in any reform of practical farming and therefore just as important as lower secondary education (T.B.M.M. *Zabıt Ceridesi*, 1939: 365).

Those responsible at the German embassy watched the situation unfold with great concern. Senior embassy official *Klaiber* assumed at first that the situation at the Y.Z.E. would settle down again once the general political crisis in German-Turkish affairs was resolved: *When the political situation permits, the Turks will soon understand that, for certain fields, they are dependent on German experts*, he wrote, adding that the practical achievements of the University

13 This discussion resembled very much the discussion on what was called the *Tuba ağacı nazariyesi* (the theory of the *Tuba* tree, a heavenly tree which roots in the sky, the top reaching down to earth) among the reformers of the Ottoman Empire like *Emrullah Efendi* and *Satı Bey*: Should an educational reform start from 'above' with the education of teachers and the higher education or from 'below' with the reform primary schools?

would decline under Turkish leadership (KLAIBER, 1939). The situation finally came to a head when, in 1939, the aforementioned *Oberregierungsrat Scurla* from the Reich Education Ministry came to Turkey to inspect the conditions of Germans at Turkish university services. In the meetings he had with Turkish government officials, he threatened to expatriate the German émigrés employed in Turkey if the Turkish government should continue to appoint them. He proposed to his ministry in Germany that it should build up the Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü as a counterweight to the 'jewified' University of Istanbul (GROTHUSEN, 1986: 112).

In the end, however, almost all *Reichsprofessors* had to leave Turkey because their appointments with the Turkish state were not prolonged. This marked a victory for those forces in the Turkish parliament who had always wanted to end as quickly as possible a scientific transfer policy involving the appointment of foreigners to Turkish institutions (*T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, 1939: 366; *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, 1933: 134)¹⁴. This group had also been arguing against the continued employment of emigrants. However, unlike the experts seconded by the Reich, the émigrés, having been expelled from Germany, were not considered by the Turkish government in general to be representatives of National Socialist policy and could therefore retain their positions in Turkish institutions when German-Turkish relations deteriorated. Only émigrés who worked as advisors at the Turkish ministries were dismissed in 1939 because their close insight into Turkish political and economic affairs in times of political conflicts with Germany was no longer desirable¹⁵.

In view of the escalation of racism in Germany and in the countries occupied by the German army, with anti-Semitism on the rise in Turkey itself (although restricted to small political circles) Prime Minister *Refik Saydam* made a statement in 1939 to the press, saying: *All Turkish citizens are entitled to protection under the Republican Laws of Turkey. Although the government will not permit Jewish immigration from abroad, it does not tolerate any pressure on Turkish*

14 Already in 1933 Muhlis Erkmen had had to face the question of a time limit on the contracts of foreign staff during the debate on the foundation law for the Y.Z.E. and had stated a period of four to five years. 1939 Erkmen, replying to a question as to whether Turkish professors of agriculture were now at last being trained and take over the chairs at the Y.Z.E. from the Germans, gave an account of the staffing structure of Y.Z.E. and the increased number of Turkish lecturers compared to 1933. On this, cf. the discussion during the budget debate 1939 and the debate on the law governing the Y.Z.E. of 10.6.1933 on Article 8 'The academic teaching body', in: *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre 4, İltima 68, Cilt 16, 1933: 134.

15 *Max von Porten*, for instance, an émigré and economic advisor to the Turkish government gave information to the IG-Farben company. Cf. the letter from Max Unz (IG-Farben representative in Istanbul) to the company's office in Berlin of 12.12.1936 concerning the Turkish plant projects. Leuna-Werke, Company Archive.

citizens. We only allow immigration in the case of specialists, along with their next of kin, working for the government [...]'¹⁶. The Turkish government did allow the relatives of émigrés who had initially stayed in Germany to join the breadwinner in Turkey if their lives were threatened. The émigrés were also permitted to transfer money to relatives in Germany. If the émigrés in their countries of refuge had been deprived of their German citizenship under National Socialist laws, the term 'haymatloz' (stateless) was entered in their Turkish work permits, and these permits were renewed each time their employment contract with the Turkish state was extended¹⁷.

The immigration regulations in Turkey remained strict during the war. However, with the escape routes for those fleeing persecution by the Nazi regime being successively cut off in an expanding Reich, the international aid organisations helping refugees, such as the *Joint Distribution Committee*, the *War Refugee Board* and even *Mossad* and the *Jewish Agency* were able to operate from Turkey. Changing the rules to take account of the desperate plight of refugees, the Turkish government permitted the passage of thousands of refugees to Palestine, despite pressures from England to stop this practice. Finally, through the mediation of the Jewish Agency an intervention by Foreign Minister *Menemencioğlu* saved the lives of almost 3,000 Turkish Jews in France (SHAW, 1993: 99).

When German-Turkish relations finally broke off in 1944, Germans in Turkey were either expelled or interned. Yet most of the émigrés were able to remain in their place of work, i.e. in Ankara and Istanbul. It was, then, the exile status of these academics that enabled German-Turkish scientific relations to maintain a continuity through and beyond the period of the Nazi regime from 1933-1945. This should never be forgotten when we review the merits of these relations from today's perspective.

References

- AKMAN, Arif (1978), *Türkiye'de Ziraat Yüksek Öğretim Reformunun Anatomisi* (Ankara).
- DİNÇER, Ferruh (1976), "A Brief History of The Scientific Relations between Turkey and European Countries in the Veterinary Field," *Fırat Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi*, III (1977): 2-3.
- DOĞANAY, Sabriye (1986), *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der deutsch-türkischen tierärztlichen Beziehungen*, Dissertationsschrift an der Tierärztlichen Hochschule Hannover.

16 Cf. the Turkish daily *Ulus* of 27 January 1939.

17 As seen in the identity papers of the émigrés, the *Devlet veya Belediyeler hizmetlerindeki mütechassislara mahsus beyannameler*, in the personal files of Istanbul Üniversitesi, which the author examined with the kind permission of the Administration Board of the I.Ü.: Istanbul Üniversitesi Yönetim Kurulu Kararı 8; Toplantı tarihi 6.6.1991; Toplantı sayısı 86.

- ERICHSEN, Regine (1991), *Die Emigration deutschsprachiger Naturwissenschaftler und Mediziner von 1933-1945 in ihrem sozial- und wissenschaftshistorischen Wirkungszusammenhang*, STRAUSS, Herbert A. et al., Die Emigration der Wissenschaften nach 1933 (München).
- ERK, Nihal (1966), *Veteriner Tarihi* (Ankara).
- GLASNECK, Johannes/KIRCHEISEN, Inge (1968), *Türkei und Afghanistan Brennpunkte der Orientpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Berlin).
- GROTHER, Hugo (1913), *Die asiatische Türkei und die deutschen Interessen* (Halle).
- GROTHUSEN, Klaus-Detlev (ed.) (1986), *Der Scurla-Bericht. Bericht des Oberregierungsrates Dr. rer.pol. Herbert Scurla von der Auslandsabteilung des Reichserziehungsministeriums in Berlin über seine Dienstreise nach Ankara und Istanbul vom 11.-25. Mai 1939* (Frankfurt).
- KANSU, Atif (1971), *Fakültenin Tarihi ve Öğretimindeki Gelişmeler, (The history of the faculty [of the Agricultural College of Ankara] and the developments in teaching. in: GÜNEŞ, T. i.a., Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi (The Agricultural Faculty of the University Ankara in the 50th year of the Republic), Ankara.*
- KÖHLER, Kurt (1934), *Raumpolitik Kulturpolitik* (Leipzig).
- KRECKER, Lothar (1964), *Deutschland und die Türkei im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Frankfurt am Main).
- NADOLNY, Rudolf (1955), *Mein Beitrag* (Wiesbaden).
- NICOLAI, Bernd (1998), *Moderne und Exil. Deutschsprachige Architekten in der Türkei 1925-1955* (Berlin).
- RIGLER, Lorenz (1852), *Die Türkei und deren Bewohner in ihren naturhistorischen, physiologischen und pathologischen Verhältnissen vom Standpunkte Constantinopel's* (Wien, Zweiter Band).
- SHELLENBERG, Walter (1959), *Memoiren* (Köln).
- SCHMIDT, Franz (1928), *Vier Jahre als türkischer Schulreformer*, in: SCHMIDT, Franz/BOELITZ, Otto (eds.), *Aus deutscher Bildungsarbeit im Auslande* (Langensalza).
- SCHWARTZ, Phillipp (1972), *Ein Bericht an die Teilnehmer des zweiten Internationalen Symposiums zur Erforschung des deutschsprachigen Exils nach 1933, Teil I, Kopenhagen, August 16.-18.*
- SHAW, Stanford J. (1993), *Turkey and the Holocaust. Turkey's Role in Rescuing Turkish and European Jewery from Nazi Persecution 1933-1945* (New York).
- STÜMMVOLL, Josef (1935), *Das Bibliothekswesen der neuen Türkei*, in: Actes du Comité International des Bibliothèques, 8th session, Madrid-Barcelona 8.
- T.B.M.M. *Zabit Ceridesi* (1933), Devre 4, İçtimai 2, Cilt 16.
- T.B.M.M. *Zabit Ceridesi* (1939), Devre 6, İçtimai F, Cilt 1-2.
- T.C. YÜKSEK ZİRAAT ENSTİTÜSÜ (ed.) (1934), *T.C. Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü Ankara, Müessesenin Kuruluş Tarihi 1933* [T.C. Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü, Ankara. ([T]o its foundation 1933), Ankara.

Unpublished Sources*

- FABRICIUS (1931), embassy official, from Ankara to Auswärtiges Amt in Berlin, Ankara 25.2. Zentrales Staatsarchiv Merseburg, 09.01. Auswärtiges Amt, Signatur 45740.
- FALKE, Friedrich (1932), to Wölker, Ministerium für Volksbildung in Dresden. Archiv der Universität Leipzig (UAL), Personalakte Falke, PA 449.
- FALKE, Friedrich (1933) to the dean of the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Leipzig, 11.1. Universitätsarchiv Leipzig (UAL), Personalakte Friedrich Falke, PA 449.

- FALKE, Friedrich (1947) to the dean of the Philosophical Faculty of Leipzig University, 2.6., Universitätsarchiv Leipzig (UAL), Personalakte Falke, PA 449.
- GEHEIMRAT OLDENBURG (1929), II. report of the German delegation of agricultural experts submitted by Geheimrat Oldenburg concerning their activity in the period from 1 October 1928 to 30. September, Einzelberichte der Institutsdirektoren und Abteilungsleiter, Zentrales Staatsarchiv Merseburg, 09.01 Auswärtiges Amt, Signatur 45981.
- HOFFMEISTER, Veterinary Officer to Ambassador Nadolny, Ankara 24.2.1928, Zentrales Staatsarchiv Merseburg, 09.01. Auswärtiges Amt, Signatur 45980.
- KLAIBER (1939), embassy official, to Scurla, Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Volksbildung Berlin 11.10, Akten des Politischen Archivs des Auswärtigen Amtes Ankara 732, B19, Kult U 5222.
- KOLONIAL-WIRTSCHAFTLICHES KOMITEE (1924) to Foreign Office, Berlin 6.9., Deutsches Zentralarchiv Potsdam, 0901 Auswärtiges Amt, Signatur 45980.
- REICHENBACH, Hans (1934) to Landé, 27.12. from Istanbul. Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Nachlass Landé, Nr. 64.
- REPORT TO FA. MERCK (1939) 27.5. from the files of the Auswärtiges Amt, received from the manager of the company's office in Istanbul, Akten des Politischen Archivs des Auswärtigen Amtes Inland II 1,3, Vol.83-76, 31/5.
- SCURLA (1939) to Auswärtiges Amt Berlin 18.9, Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes, Ankara 732, A2464.39, B19.
- von PAPAN (1939), Ambassador in Ankara to Auswärtiges Berlin, 31.7., Akten des Politischen Archivs des Auswärtigen Amtes Ankara 732, A2040/39.

*The research on the documents in East Germany like in the Leuna-Werke Company Archive or the Staatsarchiv Merseburg was carried out before the structural change in the German archive system after 1990.

Fast of Equity Mutual Fund Performance in Turkey Using a New Economic Measure: Gini Coefficient

Abstract

Abstract: This paper examines the performance of equity mutual funds in Turkey using a new economic measure, the Gini coefficient. The study is based on data from the period 2000-2010. The results show that the Gini coefficient is a useful measure of income inequality and can be used to evaluate the performance of equity mutual funds. The study also shows that the Gini coefficient is a useful measure of income inequality and can be used to evaluate the performance of equity mutual funds. The study also shows that the Gini coefficient is a useful measure of income inequality and can be used to evaluate the performance of equity mutual funds.