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This article considers the representation of transnational political movements around 1968 in Özdamar’s autobiographical novel Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn (1998). The transnational perspective enables Özdamar to articulate cultural transfers between Turkey, West Germany, Greece, Spain and Italy in the context of Cold War political activism. The article will show how the novel reappraises the political movements of the late sixties and early seventies as transnational phenomena which in West Germany included the participation of ‘Gastarbeiter’, thus serving as a corrective to Eurocentric histories of 1968. This is followed by a consideration of the cultural practices of the political activists. The characters continually reference a canon of revolutionary authors including Brecht, Lorca, Rosa Luxemburg and Nâzım Hikmet in order to foster a sense of transnational identity. The article comments on the relevance of Hikmet’s concept of secular resurrection for Özdamar’s novel. Finally the article considers how words are depicted as physical presences and bodies are subjected to physical transformation. These techniques are central to Özdamar’s utopian presentation of transnational political activism as an erotic experience.
insbesonders die Art, auf die die Wörter als etwas Körperliches und die Körper als verwandelbar erscheinen. Diese Technik trägt wesentlich zur utopischen Darstellung des transnationalen politischen Aktivismus als Erotische Erfahrung bei.

Schau auf die Geschichte, schau genau hin.¹

**INTRODUCTION**

Recent scholarly work on German-language literature produced by writers of Turkish origin has attempted to move beyond binary oppositions between German and Turkish culture. This critical turn or ‘Turkish turn’ was developed by Leslie A. Adelson through a series of publications between 1994 and 2005.² Adelson’s work raises a provocative question: ‘Is it possible that one of the potential contributions of Turkish-German literary production to German culture is to point to what might be construed as a shared cultural history?’³ Adelson’s concept of ‘touching tales’ suggests ‘that Germans and Turks in Germany share more culture (as an ongoing imaginative project) than is often presumed when one speaks of two discrete worlds.’⁴ Yet as Jim Jordan notes, the ‘two worlds paradigm’ is still widespread,⁵ suggesting that while Adelson’s critique has found acceptance within German Studies as a discipline, it has yet to reach the mainstream. Indeed, precisely the persistence of (nationalist) binary oppositions in mainstream cultural discourse makes it more important than ever to find texts which articulate shared elements of cultural history.

This article will show that Özdamar’s autobiographical fictions have a contemporary relevance because they do precisely this: they bear witness to historical events which were shared across national boundaries. In doing so, they articulate a form of transnational
identity. Studies by Elizabeth Boa, Susanne Rimmer and B. Venkat Mani respectively have explored ‘transnational identity’, ‘transnational memories’ and ‘cosmopolitan memories’ in Özdamar’s novels. This article by contrast will consider ‘transnational history’: the focus will be on how Özdamar’s protagonists are implicated in transnational historical events. The concept of transnational history has become increasingly popular in German studies in the last decade and was debated on the H-Net German discussion network in 2006 by the historian Konrad Jarausch amongst others. The term designates approaches distinct from the more loaded ‘geopolitics’, which was tainted for decades as a result of its association with National Socialism. Scholars working on European history and on left-wing political activism deploy the paradigm of transnational history. Especially relevant to the present article are studies from a transnational perspective of the protest movements of the sixties and seventies. These are the political movements which take centre stage in Özdamar’s novel Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn (1998).

German historians have, until recently, neglected the theme of migrant political activism. For example, Wolfgang Kraushaar’s Achtundsechzig. Eine Bilanz claims that activism was limited to a West German academic elite, ‘eine kleine […] Minderheit’. In contrast, Niels Seibert has shown that ‘1968’ involved considerable participation by ‘Gastarbeiter’ and African, Latin American and Middle Eastern student organisations. Migrant workers formed a substantial section of the industrial workforce who participated in the strikes of September 1969 (140,000 strikers) and May to October 1973 (275,000 strikers). The Ford strike of August 1973 began when a number of Turkish workers were dismissed. In a speech of 1968, the student leader Rudi Dutschke called on students to cooperate and organise with foreign workers. Just as historians have turned to this theme only recently, literary scholars too have only recently begun to examine the political engagement amongst migrants. As Myriam Geiser suggests, literary critics have tended to view political
engagement and artistic autonomy as polar opposites. Only four scholars have looked at Özdamar’s representation of political activism in any detail: Mahmut Karakuş, Elizabeth Boa, Monika Shafi, who shows how Özdamar’s novel moves beyond typical representations of 1968 as a generational struggle, and Beverly M. Weber. In 2010 Weber remarked that:

Studies of Özdamar [...] pay scant attention to the fact that her main characters, mostly women, work in German factories, immigrate as guestworkers, participate in political movements, and undergo political and intellectual transformations in ways that illustrate productive crossings of cultures already intimately bound up in one another.

This article will develop the insights of these Özdamar scholars (Karakuş, Boa, Shafi and Weber), but with a different emphasis. By foregrounding Özdamar’s representation of transnational history and Cold War political activism around 1968, it will illuminate the many ways in which Turkish, German and other European cultures are ‘already intimately bound up with one another’ (Weber, p. 41).

1 – HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CONNECTIONS

For all the great differences between Germany and Turkey, the historical development of the two countries shares a variety of structural similarities and points of contact. Wilhelmine Germany and the Turkish Republic were successor states emerging from vast medieval empires. Both Prussia and the Ottoman Empire instigated sweeping educational reforms in the nineteenth century in a bid to become more internationally competitive (Wilhelm von Humboldt in Prussia; Sultan Abdulmejid’s Tanzimat system in the 1840s and 1850s). Both
lost World War One, shedding their imperial status in the process and becoming republics for the first time. Both countries have a history of genocide. In both countries, too, the military has played a leading role in domestic politics. In Germany, the political dominance of the military ended in 1945; in Turkey, the military has continued to play a leading political role until very recently.

In the period after 1945, the Federal Republic of Germany presents some remarkable structural similarities with Turkey. Both countries were seen by the USA as bulwarks against communism. They soon became key members of NATO and ‘front-line participant[s]’ in the Cold War. In March 1945 the Soviet foreign minister Molotov demanded control of the strategically vital Black Sea Straits (i.e. the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). The effect was to drive Turkey, which had been neutral during World War Two, into the arms of the West. By the summer of 1946, American policymakers had decided that ‘the independence of Turkey was vital to the security of the United States’. On 12 March 1947 President Truman announced the ‘Truman Doctrine’, asking Congress for $400 million in military and economic assistance for Greece and Turkey. Three months later on 5 June 1947 the US Secretary of State George Marshall announced the Marshall Plan to support the economic recovery of Western Europe, notably the British and American zones of Western Germany, which by this time already had a centralised administration. In consequence of their strategic importance, Turkey and West Germany were brought swiftly into the sphere of Western influence: in September 1949 Adenauer was elected chancellor of the FRG; in May 1950 Adnan Menderes, the new Turkish prime minister, announced that he was going to turn Turkey into a ‘little America’; in October 1950, Turkey dispatched army units to fight in the Korean War. In Özdamar’s novel, the father is a building contractor who profited from the Turkish construction boom of the 1950s, fuelled in part by American money. This invites comparison between the Turkish and West German students of the sixties, both of whom
questioned their parents’ adherence to American values. In 1950s Turkey the Turkish Communist Party was banned; in West Germany, the Communist Party was forbidden by the Constitutional Court in 1956. Turkey joined NATO in 1952, West Germany in 1955. A secret condition of NATO membership was the establishment of clandestine resistance groups in order to resist the spread of communism. Belgium, France, Holland, Greece, Italy and West Germany have all acknowledged that they participated in this covert network.

The title of the special NATO organisation in Turkey was Özel Harp Dairesi (Special Warfare Department); it was later used against Turkish communists in the seventies. The Menderes government was deposed in 1960 but close cooperation with NATO has continued ever since.

During the Cold War, Turkey and the two German states were potential flashpoints in a global conflict between East and West. Turkey played a key role in the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962: indeed according to William Hale, it might be ‘more appropriate’ to speak of ‘the Cuban-Turkish missile crisis’, because one of the triggers for the crisis was the installation of fifteen Jupiter missiles armed with nuclear warheads near İzmir in Turkey, in late 1961. The missiles became operational in the spring of 1962 – only a few months before the Cuban crisis in October of that year. And the Cuban crisis was only defused by a secret quid pro quo: Khrushchev withdrew the Cuban missiles in return for Robert Kennedy’s promise to remove the US missiles from Turkey in return.

This sketch of historical parallels between Turkey and the Federal Republic of Germany in the fifties and sixties, deriving from their common status as front-line participants in the Cold War, offers a basis for analysis of the specific events during the years 1966 to 1975 which are covered in Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn.
Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn tells the story of an unnamed female protagonist and her gradual politicisation against the background of 1968. Together with its bold narrative experimentation (more on this in section 5 below), the novel offers a uniquely transnational perspective on the events of 1968. The two-part structure – Part One mainly in West Berlin, Part Two mainly in Istanbul – might suggest a binary vision of ‘two worlds’. On closer reading, however, the many parallels between the various locations do not support such an interpretation. Even the title of the novel refers to the Galata bridge between two European districts of Istanbul. Running from North to South, rather than an East-West opposition, it implies a sense of crossings within Europe.

The novel centres on transnational political movements motivated by three factors: anti-imperialism – against French imperialism in Algeria and US imperialism in Indochina – anti-fascism, and anti-capitalism. It is no coincidence that the first major demonstrations in West Berlin concerned Algeria. The activists at the time perceived this to be a global struggle. As Eric Hobsbawm puts it:

The student revolt of the late 1960s was [...] global, not only because the ideology of the revolutionary tradition [...] was universalist and internationalist [...] but because, for the first time, the world, or at least the world in which the student ideologists lived, was genuinely global. The same books appeared, almost simultaneously, in the student bookshops in Buenos Aires, Rome and Hamburg [...] The same tourists of revolution crossed oceans and continents from Paris to Havana to São Paulo to Bolivia.
But Hobsbawm immediately qualifies this analysis by stressing the national and regional character of most political conflicts around this time and also notes the disintegration of the Moscow-centred internationalist communist movement precisely in 1968, in the wake of the Soviet suppression of the Prague Spring.\textsuperscript{35} Within the global framework of the Cold War there were huge political and cultural differences between the various countries involved. The highly differentiated analysis of the kind Hobsbawm offers is beyond the scope of this article. The point here is that Özdamar’s novel invites the reader to adopt a transnational perspective. By foregrounding the international political movements of 1968 the novel implies the existence of a common cause which united student activists in Turkey, West Germany, France, Spain and Greece. This was the common cause against global imperialism which helped to foster a sense of shared identity.

Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn shows how cultural transfers contribute to the transnational spread of political activism. Turkish migrants in West Berlin (Ataman and the hostel warden) discuss Brecht (pp. 70-72), go to bars in East Berlin and mingle with young East Germans (pp. 72-9), and are wounded in demonstrations against the Vietnam War, shouting ‘Amis raus aus Vietnam’ together with West German students (p. 81); Turkish students hold political meetings in Berlin (pp. 82-3); Kuhle Wampe, a film co-directed by Brecht and Slatan Dudow, is shown in Istanbul (p. 212). The narrator makes friends with Bodo and Heidi, two members of the SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund), both of whom later attend a left-wing student festival at Istanbul Technical University (p. 247). The dramatist Heinar Kipphardt gives a talk at the Goethe Institute in Istanbul, which the drama students there discuss for many days afterwards (p. 249). The narrator even jokes about the high prestige enjoyed by Turkish students who have been to Europe (p. 250). Ironically though, the only time that the narrator gets physically close to a German male is on a crowded
Paris metro. As she discovers, this German in Paris feels stigmatised by his national identity, much as she herself felt previously as a Turkish woman in Berlin (p. 125).

In addition to such Turkish-German contacts, the novel shows cultural links being forged between Greeks, Turks and Spaniards; alongside Turkey, Greece, Spain, Italy and Portugal were the countries which provided ‘Gastarbeiter’ to fuel the West Germany economy in the fifties and sixties. On her first venture beyond her own ethnic group, Özdamar’s protagonist meets fellow guest workers from Greece: she becomes friends with Madame Gutsio and Yorgi, Greek political exiles (pp. 110, 119-22). From them she learns of political similarities between Greece and her own country. Greece was ruled by a military junta between 1967 and 1974, and Turkey was subject to a series of military coups in May 1960, March 1971 and, beyond the time-scale of the novel, in September 1980. (Such military abuses were, of course, largely ignored by the Western allies for strategic reasons.) Özdamar’s novel also alludes to fascist Spain and Portugal, so touching on political problems shared across southern European states. These southern European connections are reinforced when the protagonist goes to Paris to stay with Yorgi’s Greek friend, only to find he has gone to an anti-junta conference in Marseilles (p. 125). Instead she falls into the hands of Turkish student spies who ask her to name the Turkish communists she knows in Berlin (pp. 127-9). She escapes them, and falls in love with a Catalan socialist called Jordi.

The novel’s depiction of the close friendships between Greek and Turkish students living in West Berlin in 1967 is poignant in the light of the so-called ‘bloody Christmas’ of 1963, when Greek Cypriots had killed scores of Turkish Cypriots, and the later Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. The tone of the passage is comical, as the students are referred to satirically as chickens (‘Hühner’), but our knowledge of subsequent history lends pathos to this representation of solidarity:
The presence of West German students highlights further the sense of international solidarity. Özdamar’s metaphorical description of students as ‘chickens’ also anticipates, however, the civil bloodshed which would afflict Turkey in the 1970s: this was a time when militant groups ‘killed innocent people like chickens and turned the country into a lake of blood.’

In this way, **Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn** treads a fine line between humorous celebration of 1968 and mourning for the victims of the ensuing political violence. At the centre of the novel, the protagonist falls in love with Jordi in Paris and has an out-of-body experience. This moment is not only a sexual awakening. The transgression of corporeal boundaries is also a transgression of national boundaries and a metaphor for the dawning of a new transnational consciousness. But Özdamar is well aware that in many of these countries, the events of 1968 proved to be a false dawn. By juxtaposing descriptions of extreme physical states such as lovemaking with torture and assassinations, her novel evokes both the utopian internationalism of 1968 and the dystopian repressions which followed in the seventies.

Of course, the political repressions which followed 1968 were also an international phenomenon. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia is well known, but one should also recall that De Gaulle only faced down the Paris protests by ensuring the support of General
Jacques Massu and threatening to send in the army. Özdamar’s novel reminds us that, in the wake of May 1968, 22 people were killed and 477 injured in Paris and Lyon, and in Asturias in Spain striking miners were shot by Franco’s Guardia Civil (p. 257). West Germany saw the murder of Benno Ohnesorg by a policeman on 2 June 1967 and the shooting of Rudi Dutschke on 11 April 1968, which led to the radicalisation of left-wing groups. But events in Western Europe were surpassed by the violence in the Balkans. In Greece, the Athens Polytechnic uprising was brutally suppressed on 17 November 1973, when a tank was sent into the Polytechnic, 83 people were killed and over a thousand wounded, and martial law was imposed. The memorialisation of this event helped legitimate the democratisation process (Metapolitefsi) in Greece: that the first post-junta elections were held on 17 November 1974 transformed the date into a national symbol. But while Greece made the transition to democracy in 1974, Turkey seemed to be moving in the other direction. Throughout the seventies, Turkish civilians suffered brutal violence from fascist groups (the Grey Wolves) and organised police torture. While Western Europe experienced fairly limited bloodshed in the aftermath of 1968, in Greece and Turkey the death toll was much higher.

How we understand these events depends on the historical and national frameworks we bring to bear. All too often, studies of 1968 which assert a global frame of reference focus mainly on the USA, the USSR and Europe, with little reference to the Middle East or Africa. In Özdamar’s novel, the continuous newspaper headlines are crucial in establishing a sense of a global narrative. The narrator’s newspaper of choice is the left-wing Cumhuriyet. In late 1967, Cumhuriyet juxtaposes reports on the Vietnam War with a report about Turkish police shooting striking miners (p. 184). Soon afterwards the death of Che Guevara is reported (p. 199). In the autumn of 1968, the narrator reads that 27 students have been massacred by police in Mexico and Peru (this may be reference to the massacre in Tlatelolco, Mexico, on 2 October 1968), and she sees photos of Soviet tanks in Czechoslovakia (p. 282).
A little later, the newspaper describes American atrocities in Vietnam and Soviet atrocities in Prague (p. 294). The narrator also describes several newspaper photos, indeed one of her exercises in drama school is to perform an improvisation based on a photograph of a murdered concentration camp victim (p. 206). This is followed by an entire sequence of photos depicting a slum-dweller in Istanbul, an American soldier ‘ganz allein’ in Vietnam, funeral processions of Turkish miners killed in mining accidents, Israelis and Palestinians (pp. 206-07). These suffering figures are covered in sweat: the sweat-drenched shirts of the U.S. soldier in Vietnam and the Istanbul slum dweller imply that they have a shared status as victims. In contrast, there is a photo of Süleyman Demirel, the Turkish prime minister standing next to the U.S. President Lyndon Johnson. The narrator explicitly comments that these two heads of state did not sweat (‘sie schwitzten nicht’, p. 207). That Demirel and Johnson do not sweat suggests their shared status as capitalists who make other people sweat on their behalf. The political significance of sweat is underlined at the end of the sequence by a newspaper headline: ‘Der Arbeitgeber will den Schweiß der Arbeiter zu billigen Preisen kaufen’ (p. 208). At the same time, the photo of the two leaders emphasises Demirel’s support of the Vietnam War and his close collaboration with President Johnson, whom many student protestors at the time viewed as a war criminal.39 This sequence of photos allows the narrator to imply Turkey’s strategic importance within the context of the Cold War, and at the same time to draw parallels between injustices at home and abroad. In this way, Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn works through a number of parallels between Turkey and other countries. These parallels centre on the political activism of the period and the subsequent political violence of the seventies.
Recently, Sofia Serenelli-Messenger has argued that there are many 1968s, because the movements of this period were ‘deeply influenced by contextual aspects [...] which imply a multiple definition of the movement’. Her argument calls for a plurality of local perspectives in order to give an accurate sense of the different movements of 1968. Situated in the student milieus of West Berlin and Istanbul, Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn conveys this plurality and the protagonist is well placed to compare the student movements in the two cities on the basis of empirical experience. As Monika Shafi points out, the protagonist’s travels allow her ‘to gain a far more complex and cosmopolitan perspective on the events than the German students, whose avowed affinity to Vietnam’s or China’s population is primarily based on ideological grounds’. Because she is a woman, Özdamar’s protagonist is also in a position to observe the sexism within these groups. Beverly Weber states that the male characters’ tendency to sexualise women’s bodies reveals affinities between the left in both Germanies and in Turkey. In contrast, Mahmut Karakuş argues that students’ attitudes to gender relations were very different in West Germany and Turkey. He points out that West German students at least tried to address the problem of inequality between the sexes, whereas amongst Turkish students the problem of sexual relations between men and women remained completely taboo. The progressive emancipation of the female narrator reflects the gender battles which were taking place not in Turkey, but within the West German student movement, for example in the SDS, when the ‘Aktionsrat zur Befreiung der Frauen’ led by Helke Sander campaigned under the slogan ‘Befreit die sozialistischen Eminenzen von ihren bürgerlichen Schwänzen!’.

The novel therefore identifies a number of affinities between left-wing activists in West Berlin and Istanbul: comparable sexist attitudes and male-dominated social
organisation. More positively there is a shared passion for left-wing cinema (at one point Bodo tells the narrator: ‘Filme sind die einzige gemeinsame Sprache dieser Welt’, p. 153) and for smoking cigarettes: Bodo stubs his cigarettes out in his coffee cups and so the narrator associates this smell with German politics (p. 155). Then, when she gets to Istanbul, she decides that ‘Die Zigarette ist das wichtigste Requisit eines Sozialisten’ (p. 241), although Dutschke is the exception who proves this rule (p. 154). In this way, the narrator shows her awareness of how socialists in both cities perform their subcultural identity. The narrator also foregrounds the playful nature of the groups. The descriptions of student activists as ‘chickens’ (p. 159) and as street children pulling a cat’s tail (a cat designated by the narrator as ‘American imperialism’, p. 238) emphasise the essentially playful, non-violent character of the student movement of the sixties, before it became radicalised by police violence. Around this time, Dieter Kunzelmann and Fritz Teufel, both members of Kommune I, developed humorous urban guerilla tactics and media provocations designed to raise public awareness (the German term for such tactics is ‘Spaßguerilla’). The narrator draws explicit parallels between German and Turkish activists: ‘Die deutschen Studenten hatten Dutschke als Studentenführer, bald bekamen auch die türkischen Studenten in Berlin ihren Chef’ (p. 160). And she also asserts the equivalence of Bild and Hürriyet, the leading populist newspapers in West Germany and Turkey, both of which took a strong line against students. The Hürriyet is described as the ‘die türkische Bild-Zeitung’ (p. 180), and the narrator does not trust anyone who reads it (she prefers to read Cumhuriyet, p. 184). Generally, though, the narrative perspective on the student activism maintains a critical distance. The narrator’s enthusiasm for political activism is counterpointed by her political naivety. Her attempts to talk to workers in Istanbul to raise their political consciousness meet with little success. In this way, the novel suggests the socio-economic gulf between the idealistic student activists and the workers whom they wish to represent.
Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn invites the reader to compare and contrast the ‘1968’ movements in West Germany and Turkey. Near the end of Part One, the narrator works as a chambermaid in ‘Hotel Berlin’ and becomes friends with Bodo, a member of the SDS. Bodo takes her to Café Steinplatz, the ‘heart of the student movement’, and there he tells her all about the SDS and Kommune I (pp. 152-5). Bodo also explains how the students have been slandered by their opponents: Hans-Joachim Lieber, the rector of the Freie Universität, claiming that student ‘sit-ins’ have ‘faschistische Züge’ (p. 153), and the Axel Springer newspapers linking the students with Walter Ulbricht and the SED (p. 155). Soon afterwards, the narrator becomes a founding member of a Turkish student socialist association in Berlin (p. 161). Then, in Part Two, the narrator joins the Turkish Workers’ Party (Türkiye 0çï Partisi, or T0P) (p. 237). Along the way, important differences emerge between the student movements in the two countries. Their attitude towards the military and the judiciary differed. West German students were strongly anti-authoritarian and anti-militaristic. They accused the previous generation of not having confronted National Socialism adequately, and, as early as 1959, the SDS compiled lists of Nazis still active in the judiciary. Dutschke’s critique of ‘fascism inside the structure’ of West German society and Ulrike Meinhof’s idea of ‘Hitler Within You’ are echoed in the novel when Ataman announces that Hitler’s facial mask is so easy to imitate that everybody has to stay alert, so as not to become like Hitler (p. 74). In Turkey, by contrast, socialists were much more favourably disposed towards the military, because of their respect for Kemal Atatürk, and because the 1960 military coup had given rise to the most democratic and liberal constitution in Turkish history. Thanks to this constitution, the Turkish Workers’ Party (T0P), which Özdamar’s protagonist joins (p. 237), was founded in February 1961. It was the only legal socialist party in Turkey until it was banned after the coup of 1971. One irony of Turkish politics in this period is that all the main political parties adopted a Kemalist stance of continuity. In the novel all parties lay wreaths
by the Atatürk statue in central Istanbul (p. 258) and the communist hostel warden refers to the Turkish war of independence (1919-1923) when the Turkish nationalists called themselves ‘Bolsheviks’ (p. 83), since the Soviet Union provided ammunition and financial support to Atatürk at this time. But while the military coup of 1960 favoured the Turkish left, the coup of 12 March 1971 did not. As the narrator comments, initial optimism soon changed to disillusionment: ‘Die Putschisten entfernten [...] über Nacht alle hohen Offiziere, die sie verdächtigten, auf der linken Seite zu stehen’ (p. 309). The new military regime imposed martial law and imprisoned thousands of left-wing students and workers, many of whom were tortured. The later coup of 12 December 1980 led by General Kenan Evren crushed the left-wing challenge even more ruthlessly. The 1980 coup also made significant concessions to the Islamists, clearing the way for the rise of moderate Islam as a political force which would culminate in electoral victory for Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, AKP) in 2002. In West Germany, then, ‘1968’ meant anti-militarism, whilst in Turkey in 1968, left-wingers briefly entertained mistaken hopes in top-down military intervention before the crackdown of 1971.

According to the Turkish historian Çağlar Keyder, the Turkish left at this time, inspired mainly by Latin American groups, was ‘more anti-imperialist than socialist’. In Özdamar’s novel, the Turkish student leader Deniz Gezmiş denounces American imperialism (p. 248) and later begins an armed struggle in imitation of Che Guevara. The Turkish left, Keyder observes, thought that Turkey was dominated by an oligarchy, an alliance of ‘compradors’, i.e. Turkish traders in alliance with Western imperialist powers. They therefore believed that if these imperialist ties were severed, then internal domination would collapse. Keyder argues that this diagnosis was drastically mistaken, because the Turkish bourgeoisie was not ‘comprador’, but was oriented towards an internal market; consequently, the political strategy of the left was also misdirected. Moreover, the Turkish Workers’ Party (TİP)
failed to connect with the largely conservative rural population, and only enjoyed limited electoral success. In 1965 the TÖP won 270,000 votes – 3% of the total, and gained fifteen seats in parliament, as Özdamar’s narrator points out (p. 231).

Amongst student activists in Turkey, then, the watchword was anti-imperialism. This was in line with students in Greece, Spain and West Germany who were influenced by neo-colonial theory which identified the United States as a sponsor of fascism in Spain and the Greek junta. The presence of U.S. military bases in Greece, Spain and Turkey was perceived as a form of neo-colonialism; Greek leftists believed that the Colonels’ coup of 1967 had been engineered by the U.S.; and Greek and Turkish students were angered by the presence of the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Arab-Israeli wars of 1967 and 1973. Özdamar describes how, when the Sixth Fleet arrived in Istanbul in the summer of 1968, Turkish students lowered the Turkish flag to signal that Turkey was not a free country and beat up American sailors, throwing them into the Sea of Marmara (p. 260). The backlash comes very quickly when the law student Vedat Demircioğlu is pushed out of a window during a police raid on 17 July 1968. He dies shortly afterwards. The students hold a demonstration, launching a coffin into the Sea of Marmara: ‘dann ließen sie den symbolischen Sarg des ersten toten Studenten ins Marmara-Meer, in dem er tagelang schwamm’ (p. 261). Ominously, this is the coffin of the first dead student – the first of many. This ‘first’ death in Istanbul acts as a parallel to the death of Benno Ohnesorg on 2 June 1967 in West Berlin (p. 170).

As a verdict on 1968 in Turkey, Çağlar Keyder highlights the disjunction between the Turkish left and the majority of the Turkish people, a gap which Özdamar’s protagonist tries hard to overcome. In Istanbul, she tries to persuade shopkeepers and cobbler to vote for the TÖP (p. 243). Later, when she and her friend Haydar travel to Hakkâri province in south-east Turkey where the majority of the population are Kurdish, the protagonist is determined to
use the language of class struggle, rather than ethnicity. She denounces America to the peasants she meets there (p. 267). She tells peasant women that they have a ‘right to orgasm’ (p. 270), and describes the efforts of a female doctor to explain the contraceptive coil to the women (p. 271). Her attempt to raise consciousness by throwing newspapers out of a bus for peasants to read threatens to be especially disastrous: village children have been hit by cars whilst gathering newspapers from the street, as the bus driver tells her (p. 272). The protagonist’s idealism is also mocked when she advises some builders to march to Ankara to demand their rights. The builders laugh and respond that they do not own enough pairs of shoes to get them to Ankara (p. 285). All this shows the inadequacy of the students’ political theories when faced with the realities of life in the provinces.

The divide between left-wing intellectuals and the people is also shown in topographical terms. In Istanbul, Kerim rents a flat with six friends, all of whom want to make revolutionary films. On the floor below, Istanbul Greeks are hard at work making clothes on their sewing machines; on the floor above there is a brothel (p. 304). Kerim and his friends, while they claim to represent the workers, have no interest in their proletarian neighbours. The topography of the ‘Wohngemeinschaft’ in West Berlin in Seltsame Sterne starren zur Erde is remarkably similar: on the floor below there are seamstresses, and on the ground floor there is a brothel. In both cases, the students are so concerned with communist ideology that they lack a connection with the workers. Another example of the social gulf between intellectuals and workers occurs when the narrator befriends some prostitutes, who accompany her back to her flat during a power cut. The narrator shares this flat with two blind students who, when the prostitutes enter, are discussing Marx and Engels in the dark. The prostitutes ask the narrator if the students’ discourse is a ‘language for the blind’ (p. 300). The joke cuts both ways: it signals the sex workers’ lack of political understanding, but also the blindness of the students’ left-wing discourse. At one point the protagonist’s friend
Haydar even accuses her of only playing at socialism: ‘Die bourgeoisen Kinder spielen nur Sozialismus’ (p. 286). But if this is a game, it is a game with deadly consequences: many of the left-wing students were arrested and tortured after the military coup of March 1971, and many more were assassinated by the Grey Wolves, the fascist militia organised by Alparslan Türkeş, who, later on in the seventies, was rewarded by a ministerial post in Demirel’s government. This enabled the Grey Wolves to continue their unofficial war against Turkish socialists throughout the seventies, until the military clampdown of 1980.

Towards the end of Die Brücke von Goldenen Horn, the narrator hears of the death of the student leader Deniz Gezmiş. Like Andreas Baader in West Germany, Gezmiş had founded an armed terrorist group, People’s Liberation Army of Turkey (THKO). He was inspired by the tactics of the Vietcong and by Che Guevara who called for ‘two, three, many Vietnams’ at the 1967 Tri-Continental Conference in Havana. In the novel, this call is echoed by Turkish students: ‘Wir schaffen viele Vietnams’ (p. 239). In 1970, Deniz Gezmiş and the THKO planned to go into the mountains and start a guerrilla war, hoping that leftist officers in the Turkish military would support their struggle: ‘Wir wollen in die Berge gehen und mit dem Guerillakampf beginnen’ (p. 303). But a veteran of the Spanish Civil War delivers a stark prognosis to Deniz: ‘Steig auf den Berg. Sie werden dich mit dem Berg zusammen vernichten’ (p. 303). Guerilla tactics which worked in Vietnam fail miserably in Turkey. In Vietnam, the communists had much more widespread support because of the anti-colonial struggle against the French. They successfully used the rhetoric of ‘kinship’, ‘blood’ and ‘family’, rather than of ‘class’ to harness grass-roots support. In contrast, Turkish left groups were confined mainly to urban centres. Their attempts to politicise the rural population were largely unsuccessful, as the journey to Hakkâri in Özdamar’s novel shows. Deniz Gezmiş and two of his comrades were executed on 6 May 1972 (p. 324). But this was only the beginning of the brutal civil violence which was to afflict Turkey in the seventies.
The violence peaked in December 1978 with the civilian massacre in the town of Kahramanmaraş, where over 107 people were killed over two days. But Özdamar’s protagonist, having experienced police arrest herself, finally decides to leave Istanbul on 21 November 1975, the day after the death of General Franco.

4 - A TRANSNATIONAL CANON

The transnational political movement of 1968 constructed its own historical canon as a means of articulating a collective identity. Revolutionary heroes, poets and intellectuals are the canonical figures who serve as common currency between different national and ethnic groups. Writing on 1968, Eric Hobsbawm has commented: ‘probably no other revolutionary movement contained a higher percentage of people reading and writing books’. The protagonist of Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn finds herself constantly following in the footsteps of radical poets and writers. These works accompany her everywhere she goes and take on a physical presence. In the hostel, Rezzan reads The Picture of Dorian Gray by Oscar Wilde: ‘Sie las soviel in diesem Buch, daß sie zu diesem Buch wurde’ (p. 34). The presence of this book helps the protagonist to overcome her and Rezzan to overcome the fear of their brothers and fathers. She attends a performance of Brecht’s Arturo Ui at the Berliner Ensemble and comments: ‘Ich verstand kein Wort und liebte es’ (35). She, Ataman and the communist hostel warden are united by their love of Brecht (p. 71). Later, when the protagonist reads Maxim Gorky’s novel The Mother it impels her to write a letter to her own mother (p. 96). Soon afterwards, her Greek communist friend Madame Gutsio introduces her to the works of Kafka and Camus (p. 110). When the protagonist meets Jordi, he plays her a recording of a poem by the Turkish socialist poet Nâzım Hikmet (p. 131), and recites a gypsy
ballad by Lorca to her (p. 134). The narrator’s love for Jordi is mediated by their shared love of Lorca (pp. 224-8). In this way, the novel shows that these canonical authors have an essential mediating function within this cosmopolitan movement. The revolutionary figures and radical authors serve as badges of transcultural belonging, as identificatory figures and as repositories of shared cultural values. Their very names invoke virtues such as civil disobedience and political, moral and sexual revolt.

The protagonist selects three female role models whom she aspires to imitate: Anna Magnani, Leila Khaled and Rosa Luxemburg. Her boyfriend (and later husband) Kerim has studied film in Italy and is a follower of Pasolini (p. 251). She decides to dress like Anna Magnani in order to impress him (pp. 252-3). She also wears a ring with a bullet soldered onto it, in honour of Leila Khaled, the Palestinian guerilla fighter, who wears a similar ring (p. 311). Her identification with Rosa Luxemburg, however, is much deeper. Aged only nineteen, the protagonist decides that she will become like Rosa Luxemburg: ‘Rosa Luxemburg hatte so viel gelesen und geschrieben. Aber ich hatte noch Zeit, so wie sie zu werden. Ich war erst neunzehn Jahre alt.’ (p. 241) On the train to Hakkâri province, she identifies herself once again with Rosa Luxemburg: ‘Auch Rosa Luxemburg hatte sicher im Zug zwischen Berlin und Warschau Bücher gelesen und ab und zu mal in den Regen, der gegen das Zugfenster schlug, geschaut’ (p. 264). On her dangerous mission to Hakkâri, she risks her own life in conscious imitation of Rosa Luxemburg.

Perhaps the key poet who presides over Özdamar’s novel is Nâzım Hikmet (1902-1963). Hikmet was a political prisoner in Turkey for more than fourteen years. He spent the decade 1940-50 in prison in the city of Bursa. Finally released in July 1950 after a prolonged hunger strike, he spent the last years of his life as a political exile in the Soviet Union. His works were banned in Turkey until 1965. Nâzım Hikmet’s politically engaged poetry has deeply influenced twentieth-century poetry in Turkey and elsewhere. His work has influenced
German-Turkish artists and writers such as Berkan Karpat and Zafer âenocak. According to Karin E. Ye_ilada, ‘Nâzım Hikmet’s grandchildren write, and they are writing in German.’ The influence of Hikmet on Özdamar has yet to be studied in detail, but it seems likely that the oral quality of her work, the rootedness in an oral tradition, owes much to Hikmet, who once wrote: ‘Citizen, write as you speak.’ And Hikmet’s final work, Life’s Good, Brother (1962) was a fictionalised autobiography.

Hikmet’s work is quoted in Özdamar’s first novel, Das Leben ist eine Karawanserai (1992), which is partly set in Bursa where Hikmet was once imprisoned. Hikmet is a significant presence in Die Brücke von Goldenen Horn, too. He is discussed in the Turkish Workers’ Club in Berlin: ‘der Arbeiter hat keine Heimat. Wo die Arbeit ist, da ist die Heimat, das hat der große türkischer Dichter Nâzım Hikmet gesagt’ (p. 46); and at the protagonist’s first meeting with Jordi (p. 131). One of Hikmet’s poems is chanted at a student demonstration in July 1968 after the death of the student Vedat Demircioğlu (p. 261). It is hardly surprising to find his works being recited at a demonstration as Hikmet himself had protested against the Americanisation of Turkey as early as 1951 in the poem ‘Sad Freedom’, which contains the lines:

You love your country as your dearest love,
but one day, for instance, you could sign it over to America
together with your great freedom.
You are free in your freedom to become its airbase.

In Turkey at this time, the mere mention of Nâzım Hikmet’s name was a political provocation. On 20 February 1968, Cetin Altan, an elected deputy of the TÖP, was beaten up in Parliament by more than one hundred members of Demirel’s Justice Party for describing
Nâzım Hikmet as a ‘great poet’. Özdamar alludes to such an incident when she writes: ‘Die 15 Abgeordneten der Partei trugen oft Bandagen [...] weil die rechten Abgeordneten sie im Parlament verprügelten’ (p. 237).

Nâzım Hikmet was an atheist, but in his poetry he develops the idea of a secular form of resurrection. In the poem ‘Five Days into the Hunger Strike’ (1950), he asserts that his ideas will live on after his death. He tells his friends that ‘I’ll continue to live still in your minds’. In Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn Özdamar adopts this idea of secular resurrection, taking her cue from Hikmet. One of the key passages in the novel describes the books sold on the streets of Istanbul, which seem to come alive with the revolutionary figures of the past. This long passage is worth quoting in full because it shows how Özdamar’s protagonist identifies herself with a revolutionary tradition kept alive by the written word:

Auf den steilen Straßen standen viele Bücherverkäufer. Sie legten ihre Bücher auf die Erde, und der Wind blätterte in ihnen, Bücher von der Russischen und Französischen Revolution oder über Widerständler, die vor fünfhundert Jahren von den Ottomanen geköpft worden waren, Bücher von Nâzım Hikmet, Bücher über den spanischen Bürgerkrieg. Alle getöteten, erwürgten, geköpften Menschen, die nicht in ihren Betten gestorben waren, standen in diesen Jahren auf. Die Armut lief auf der Straße, und die Menschen, die in ihrem Leben dagegen etwas hatten tun wollen und deswegen getötet worden waren, lagen jetzt als Bücher auf den Straßen. Man mußte sich nur zu ihnen bücken, sie kaufen, und so kamen viele Getötete in die Wohnungen, sammelten sich in den Regalen, neben den Kopfkissen und wohnten in den Häusern. Die Menschen, die mit diesen Büchern die Augen zu- und aufmachten, gingen am Morgen als Lorca, Sacco und Vanzetti, Robespierre, Danton, Nâzım Hikmet, Pir Sultan Abdal, Rosa Luxemburg wieder auf die Straßen. (pp. 229-30)
‘Resistance fighters decapitated by the Ottomans five hundred years ago’ is almost certainly a reference to Hikmet’s own masterpiece, The Epic of Sheikh Bedreddin (1936) about a medieval rebel against the Ottomans. Bedreddin is captured and the Sultan orders his execution, but the poem ends with the promise of resurrection through words and ideas. Bedreddin will survive because future generations will continue his fight against injustice:

They say the body of the prophet Jesus will be resurrected with his flesh and bones and beard. This is a lie. Bedreddin’s body will come to life again without bones or beard or moustache but as eyes that see, a tongue that speaks, and breath in his bosom. [...] When we say that Bedreddin will come again we are saying that his words, his eyes, his breath, will come back again through our midst.⁷⁰

Özdamar’s narrative takes up this same idea, but with a humorous twist. The protagonist collects books about revolutionaries and poets in order to make them come alive again. Sometimes she buys the books on the street, at other times she steals them from expensive bookstores. In this way she acquires five copies of the same Nâzım Hikmet book (p. 230). At the intellectuals’ café in Istanbul she sometimes feels as if she is surrounded by living books: ‘es kam mir vor, als ob ich mit lebendigen Büchern am Tisch sitzen würde’ (p. 231). The transnational communities depicted in Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn attain a sense of cohesion through reference to a canon of revolutionary figures. That Özdamar’s narrator so loves the work of Nâzım Hikmet, a materialist poet who regarded words as the common property of everyone,⁷¹ is a sign of her solidarity.
The narrative focus on the physical embodiment of words in Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn is central to its political theme. In this novel, words seem to have real physical presence: language is part of the material fabric of the world, or, to put it another way, lived reality contains a linguistic dimension. In the hostel in Kreuzberg, the women talk so much about their fathers and brothers that the sentences seem to weave a spider’s web which covers the room and the women’s bodies (p. 33). Later on, when Turkish migrants go down the street in mid-winter, their words go before them like animals, keeping them warm. This description of words as living animals occurs twice, firstly with the Turkish workers (pp. 45-6) and again with the Communist hostel warden and Ataman (p. 71). The words in a letter that the narrator writes to her mother can wander around like little animals (p. 57). In this narrative, words, like bodies, can acquire material presence and travel independently through space.

Words, like bodies, can also be wounded. In her Kleist Prize speech of 2004, Özdamar refers to the Turkish military coup of 1971 and states that words - as well as human beings - were the victims of police brutality:

1971 putschten die Militärs in der Türkei. Gendarmen und Polizisten kamen in die Häuser und verhafteten nicht nur die Menschen, sondern auch die Wörter. Alle Bücher wurden vorsichtshalber zu den Polizeirevieren gebracht. Damals bedeutete in der Türkei Wort gleich Mord. 72

According to Özdamar here, words can be arrested by the police. Like living beings, they can be subjected to juridical violence. In an analysis of ‘Mutterzunge’, Yasemin Yıldız has shown
that Özdamar’s translation of Turkish idioms into German attests to a traumatic structure.73 The narrator of ‘Mutterzunge’ has not lost her mother tongue because of migration; instead, her ability to use Turkish has been damaged by the traumatic violence she has witnessed. In this way, Özdamar draws a connection between violence and the use of language, which reflects debates about the German language after the Holocaust.74

In Özdamar’s works, human beings are associated with the words they speak. In moments of crisis, human bodies and words suffer violence. In her analysis of Das Leben ist eine Karawanserai, Stephanie Bird points out that the narrator’s ‘remoteness is [...] most marked at moments of extreme emotional upheaval’.75 In that novel, the narrator has an out of body experience when she takes an overdose.76 In Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn, the protagonist’s body divides in two at a number of key points in the narrative. When she works in the radio factory, she suffers a dystopian sense of alienation from her own body: ‘man trennte sich aus den Stimmen der Welt und von seinem eigenen Körper’ (p. 17). At night, too, in the workers’ hostel, her head seems to be in two different places at the same time: ‘Unten dachte ich mit halbem Kopf an meine Mutter, und mit der anderen Hälfte fing ich an, auch an Rezzans Mutter zu denken’ (p. 22). Here, the sense of bodily division seems to be caused by her repetitive labour and homesickness. Later on, the division occurs as a result of her dual role as an actor and as an activist. Her own tongue becomes divided in two: ‘meine Zunge teilte sich. Mit der einen Hälfte sagte ich: “Solidarität mit den unterdrückten Völkern”, mit der anderen Hälfte meiner Zunge sprach ich Texte von Shakespeare’ (p. 293).

However, bodily separation also occurs during moments of ecstatic emotional upheaval, when the narrator falls in love. The most sustained out-of-body sequence occurs in Paris when the narrator observes herself falling in love with Jordi: ‘Es war, als ob ich als ein zweites Ich neben mir lief’ (p. 130). She sees herself walking next to the boy in the rain, she stands at the bottom of the stepladder and watches herself while she climbs up into Jordi’s
platform bed and undresses (p. 132). When they make love it is as if their bodies are flying in the air (p. 136). She feels as if Jordi’s beard is growing into her face, so that their faces are stuck together (p. 137). Later, when they visit the hall of mirrors in Versailles, there are four of them: now Jordi too has acquired a double self (p. 140). The four of them drive back to Jordi’s room and say goodbye to each other, for Jordi is a married man. The narrator has a similar experience after making love with Kerim in Istanbul: ‘Wenn wir aufstanden und herausgingen, hatte ich das Gefühl, unser Fleisch wäre ineinander gewebt gewesen und würde jetzt mit einem großen Messer vom Fuß bis Kopf getrennt’ (p. 252). Margaret Littler has suggested that the overriding of physical boundaries in this text (and in ‘Großvater Zunge’) points beyond subjective experience.77 If so, then these out-of-body sexual experiences have a political dimension because they imply an intersubjective model of the self. As Kerim tells the narrator: ‘Guter Sex hängt von revolutionärem Bewußtsein ab’ (p. 252). At the Turkish Workers’ Party (TOP) conference, the narrator feels the party members as forming one enormous body. When she goes to the toilet, she suddenly feels terribly alone and runs back to the conference hall in order to merge once again with this greater corporeal entity: ‘lief ich dann sehr schnell zurück, als müßte ich schnell meinen Körper wiederfinden’ (p. 238). The narrator’s participation in a political collective expands her bodily sense of self.

Such mingling of different languages and different bodies evokes a new form of interpersonal consciousness. Elizabeth Boa argues that the linguistic mingling in Özdamar’s work ‘takes on utopian meaning, signifying a trans-national condition’ that is ‘mutually transformative, imaginative interchange symbolised through erotic meeting’.78 I agree with Boa’s analysis but would stress especially the political dimension of the bodily and linguistic interchanges which run through Özdamar’s novel. It is not only a matter of meeting people from other countries and falling in love. Özdamar’s protagonist undergoes a series of physical and linguistic transformations which redefine her as a subject, transformations caused not
only by falling in love, but also by her participation in the political movements of her time, movements which were perceived by the participants as transnational in character. The protagonist’s travels and exchanges broaden her political horizons, transforming her both physically and intellectually. Through transcultural exchanges, she develops transnational perspectives on the political problems of her time: on the gaps between theory and practice, between workers and intellectuals, and between women and men.79
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