

Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture As a Modernization Project

Esra Aliçavuşoğlu
Université de Marmara



Synergies Turquie n° 3 - 2010 pp. 79-90

Résumé : *Le Musée de Peinture et Sculpture d'Istanbul qui est un des plus importants symboles du changement à la fois formel, contextuel et idéologique de l'histoire de muséologie turque a une place à part dans l'histoire d'art depuis sa fondation. Le Musée inauguré le 20 septembre 1937 par l'ordre d'Atatürk et installé dans l'Appartement de Prince Héritier du Palais de Dolmabahçe a été une des institutions majeures de l'idéal « d'enseigner le peuple » et de « le porter au niveau de la civilisation contemporaine » de la République. Par contre, cette institution qui était privée de tout équipement et approche de muséologie contemporaine dans son passé s'étendant sur 73 ans qui assureraient la réalisation de cette idéale, qui n'avait pas pu se renouveler et devenir indépendante a été privée également des visiteurs qui sont un must pour un musée. Dans ce texte, les dynamiques de fondation du Musée de Peinture et Sculpture étant un des acteurs majeurs de la modernisation de la Turquie républicaine et les modèles qu'il avait pris comme base seront étudiés. Egalement, la raison pour laquelle elle n'a pas pu s'institutionnaliser dans son histoire passée par des fermetures et réouvertures sera traitée.*

Mots-clés : *Musée, idéologie, modernisme, collection, œuvre, Elvah-ı Nakşiye, art turc, enseignement.*

Özet: *Türk müzecilik tarihi içinde hem biçimsel, hem içeriksel, hem de ideolojik değişimin en önemli simgelerinden biri olan İstanbul Resim Heykel Müzesi, kuruluşundan bu yana sanat tarihi açısından da özel bir yere sahiptir. 20 Eylül 1937'de Atatürk'ün emriyle açılan ve müze binası olarak Dolmabahçe Sarayı Velihaht Dairesi tahsis edilen Müze, Cumhuriyet ideolojisinin "halkı eğitmek" ve "muhasır medeniyet seviyesine" ulaştırmak ülküsünün önemli kurumlarından biri olmuştur. Ancak, 73 yıllık tarihinde bu ülkünün gerçekleşmesini sağlayacak her türlü donanımdan, çağdaş müzecilik yaklaşımlarından uzak kalan, kendini yenileyemeyen ve bağımsızlaşamayan kurum, bir müze için zorunluluk olan izleyiciden de mahrum kalmıştır. Bu metinde, Cumhuriyet Türkiye'si'nin modernleşme serüveninde payı olan önemli kurumlarından Resim Heykel Müzesi'nin kuruluş dinamikleri irdelenecek, temel aldığı modeller incelenecek ve açılıp, kapatılma ile geçen tarihinde neden bir türlü kurumsallaşamadığı irdelenecektir.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Müze, ideoloji, modernizm, koleksiyon, yapıt, Elvah-ı Nakşiye, Türk sanatı, eğitim.*

Summary: *The Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture which is one of the most important symbols of morphological, contextual and ideological change in the history of Turkish museology has retained a very special position from the viewpoint of art history ever since its first establishment. The Museum was opened to public on October 20th, 1937 as ordered by Atatürk, at the Quarters of the Crown Prince in the Dolmabahçe Palace. The Museum has been one of the most prominent institutions of the Republican Period ideology aimed at “the education of the people” and “carrying the country up to the higher levels of contemporary civilization”. The institution that has been lacking in every kind of necessary equipment, contemporary museum practices and policies and therefore being unable to renew itself or achieve independence during its history of 73 years had also lost its viewers which is a must for any museum. In this article the dynamics of the foundation of the Museum of Painting and Sculpture that has an important share in the adventure of the modernization of the Turkish Republic will be examined, the models used as basis for the foundations will be analyzed and the reasons for its failing to truly become an establishment during its history of times spent in being a museum that has been opened and closed down continually.*

Keywords: *Museum, ideology, modernizm, collection, work of art, Elvah-ı Nakşiye, Turkish art, education.*

The history of museology in Turkey has developed in parallel to the process involving the opening up of the Ottoman Empire to the West. It begins with the endeavors of Fethi Ahmet Pasha, the Minister of War and Tophane Field Marshall (1801-1857) who ordered the guns taken as war booty gathered in the Ministry since the conquest of Istanbul and all historical works of art found in various excavations to be assembled at the Hagia Eirene Church in 1846. In the year 1869 the institution was named Müze-i Hümayun (The Imperial Museum) and with the passage of time the number of art works gathered increased, especially with due to the increase in excavations. Therefore the process of carrying the museum to a new venue, the Çinili Köşk constructed during the times of Fatih, began in the year 1873 and the museum was opened to the public in 1880. It is only in 1891, however that the institution could be established in a building that was specifically built as a building for a museum and the collection was reorganized to suit the identity of the institution as a museum. The new building accomplished through the initiative of the Museum Director, Osman Hamdi and brought to reality by Alexandre Vallaury has taken its place among the “temple museum” category typology with its neo-classical style.

The history of museology and the logistics of creating collections is generally based on two major axis, namely military art and historical artworks. The introduction of a new concept of museums cannot be implemented in spite of the extensive efforts of Osman Hamdi. The opening of a museum taking as a model, the increasing number of fine arts museums that have appeared grow in number with the nationalization of privately or state owned collections since the 18th century in the West, especially in Europe could not be realized.

The fact that the Ottomans were not as willing to create a collection taking the European “art museums” as a model can be related to a number of reasons. The first reason to come to mind is the ban on depicting faces on canvas or stone. The second reason is while the Ottomans could compete successfully with the military and historical monuments in other European countries under almost equal conditions, felt they could not compete with Europe using the collections of their “contemporary” and rather new “paintings and sculptures” because due to its short history, painting and sculpture would have to remain local in concept. It may be possibly true that the Ottomans who had a tendency to play big believed that did not have enough appeal for satisfactory competition. The third reason can be connected to the “Reluctance of the Ottomans to adopt the aesthetic values of Western art”, as pointed out by Wendy Shaw in her book titled *Ottoman Museology*. Shaw while stressing the fact that the Ottomans did not have any intention towards creating a small Oriental Europe model in Istanbul, calls attention to the fact that the museums founded by the Ottomans take rivalry and not imitation as a basis. She also asserts her belief that a conscious infiltration had been applied as some institutions of the European culture was being assimilated in the country, during the Westernization process (Shaw, 2004: 315-316). As the military and historical buildings seemed to confirm a sense of having power, helping the Ottomans feel “we are still in power”, museums taking only collections of fine arts into consideration when being founded may bring pure imitation into mind. This may be put forward as a more logical reason, considering the founding logic of museums, though it may not generally be put into words. As Shaw has pointed out, the Müze-i Hümayun intention was to show the foreign visitors of the museum the unity and power of the Ottoman lands through the assimilation of the Hellenic-Byzantium legacy, praise and honoring of the military past, impressing the national and religious pride of the people and they did not bother with training or educating visitors at the museum either (Shaw, 2004: 316). The idealism of educating museum visitors, “cultivating and educating the people with culture” and thus reaching the level of contemporary civilizations was one of the major ideals of the Republican Turkey. As a matter of fact the education of citizens would constitute an important portion or dimension of the project for the creation of a new nation implemented by the founding leaders of the Republic (Üstel, 2004: 127).

The first attempt towards founding a fine arts museum was made in 1883. This suggestion was included in the 13th clause of the Statutes for Fine Arts dated September 10th, 1883. According to this clause besides the exhibitions of paintings that would be held every year at the school of Sanayi-i Nefise (Fine Arts School) and the Museum of Antiquities of that period, it was proposed that a new museum for exhibiting paintings and sculpture exclusively and another one named the Museum of National Arts should be established (Germaner, 2009: 19, Edhem, 1970: 38). In spite of these stipulations nothing was achieved.

Actually Osman Hamdi’s dream of founding an institution where copies of fine art masterpieces by prominent painters would be exhibited besides the works of national artists was very different from the Ottoman concept of a “The Imperial Museum” serving as a show case for the political power of the rulers. This enterprise was initially planned and undertaken to serve as a sort

of “laboratory” to support the educational process of the students of Sanayi-i Nefise. It was named a “museum” but it was never supported, neither by material assistance nor by provision of a locality for the project. This situation did not however present any obstacles to the creation of the Elvah-ı Nakşiye Collection which in the later years would constitute the basic groundwork for the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture.

In 1910 at the meeting of the Parliament of Representatives, it was decided that an extra yearly income of 1000 liras should be allotted to the budget of the “The Imperial Museum”, works by old masters that could be found and obtained should be bought and those that could not be afforded by the museum should be copied. The Museum administration through written connection with various museums in Paris, Berlin, Munich, Vienna and Madrid ordered many paintings; and some foreign and local artists, chosen under the surveillance of museum directors were commissioned to make copies of pictures. Besides these, paintings that had been purchased at the exhibitions in Istanbul or obtained by other means were bought and gathered at the Sanayi-i Nefise. This collection was first exhibited at the Sanayi-i Nefise in October 27th, 1915 (Germaner, 2009:19).

One of the most important problems of the collection that was growing richer slowly but firmly, even though not very systematically was its failure to have an appropriate location for the exhibitions. Halil Edhem who had become the Director of the Museum after Osman Hamdi, reports in his book titled the *Collection of Elvah-ı Nakşiye* that it was decided that the Topkapı Palace Alay Köşk would be given over to the museum directorate but unfortunately this does not eventuate (Germaner, 2009: 21). The collection was later moved to the Fındıklı Palace together with the Sanayi-i Nefise after the declaration of the Republic and it would only be opened to the public in the year 1937 when the collection, renamed as the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, was established in its new venue at the Crown Prince’s Quarters of the Dolmabahçe Palace.¹

With an official protocol signed in July 18th, 1937 the control, maintenance and legislation of the Crown Prince’s Quarters in the Dolmabahçe Palace was handed over to the Academy of Fine Arts and delivered to the Museum of Paintings and Sculpture Directorate (Mülayim, 1999: 123). Halil Dikmen who is one of the teachers of the Academy is appointed director of the Museum.² The formal opening is held in September 20th, 1937. On the entrance facing the boulevard there is an epitaph with this inscription: “The Museum of Painting and Sculpture has been established in 1937 as commanded by Atatürk” (Mülayim, 1999:123). This epitaph seems to be important from a few different angles; the first is the fact that it has made a dream that had existed in the minds of many an artist and intellectual such as Nurullah Berk for years come true; and the second is the fact that it has shown us, even though in a rather implicit way, that this dream could only become a reality with the guidance of Atatürk, who was the leading actor in the project of the foundation of the Turkish Republic and the modernization of the country.

The establishment of the museum is accomplished with amazing speed. Fast decisions were made, personnel for the museum were appointed; the teacher

of painting at the Galatasaray Lycee was made director, Ahmet Muhip Diranas, Cihat, Hamdi and later Nuri İyem and Rahmi Artemiz were appointed secretary (Berk, 1973: 52). Berk informs us that this speed was achieved because of Atatürk's command and that Atatürk had expressed his explicit wish to visit the museum before his return to Ankara.³ This also shows us the fact that the Museum has been opened too fast to allow for the necessary studies, research and work to be accomplished.⁴ This Crown Prince's Quarters/sanctuary the exterior and interiors of which are decorated and embellished with baroque, rococo and empirical styles (Katipoğlu, 1995: 316) now appears on the stage as a symbol of a new period in history beginning with the year 1937.

The Ottoman concept of museology as merely a showcase where the governmental power, strength and the dimensions of its boundaries would be amply stressed and exhibited has changed with the evolution of the Republican Turkey, moving towards a new concept of museum as a means to educate, train and prepare the Turkish people for the higher levels of modern civilization. One of the most concrete indicators of this revolutionary change is the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture. When we consider the fact that the Elvah-ı Nakşiye Collection that is the origin of the Museum's beginnings is an institution specifically aimed at developing the knowledge and experience of art students, it is not surprising to observe this mission growing to such great dimensions so as to include all the people as well as the students. In a letter written to the Prime Ministry by the Ministry of Education on July 12th, 1926, it had been stated that every civilized nation had a number of painting museums and that the presence of such museums was vitally important for the education of the people and the youth of the country had been stressed (Germaner, 2009: 22-23).

This museum will also serve this country headed towards modernization through a series of reforms that will follow each other incessantly aiming for the reconstruction of a new nation (Berkes, 2002: 521). It can be maintained that the museum, as in other establishments of the modernization movement, was installed not in response to the demands or requests of the people but with the aim of emphasizing its participation in its contributions to education, reforms and certainly to becoming a modern Republic. A concept of museum that would not be answering the needs of the masses but creating and teaching people to feel the need for the things the museum would provide. One of the reasons for the still existing problem of the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, namely the problem of having very few "viewers" may be the incomplete process of canalizing the requirements of the general public towards museums. A museum for exhibiting paintings and sculpture has been opened to service but the impetus that would make those masses visit the museum has not been created.

According to Berk, Atatürk wanted to have this museum founded in order to save the mature and sensitive products of art that had been accumulating in the country since the mid-19th century from disarray, to introduce these products of art to the public, to implement the sense of design and color into the roots of the people and deliver the fatal stroke onto the religious ban on sculpture (Berk, 1974: 25). Plastic arts that had not been a part of public life up to that date have thus received a sanctuary where art works could be kept

together under a roof with this museum. It can be alleged that the reason for its being unable infiltrate the general public is the fact that it has been closed shortly after its opening with the advent of the World War II. In 1939, being closed till 1951 and then closed again later and being still closed even at present for restoration purposes. Both these interruptions of long durations and the absence of programs that could help draw the viewers into the museum do intervene in the process of people becoming accustomed to it. The museum has a dearth of visitors in comparison to its equals in the world. While in the year 1937 when it had been first established, the number of visitors per day was about 300-400 people (Köksal, being printed, Archives of the Istanbul Museum of Paintings and Sculpture 1937/no: 21) this number is limited to about 70 per day in 2006 (Köksal, being printed, Aygündüz, 2006:10-11). As these numbers indicate also, the number of visitors that should have increased in the passing years has suffered a very important decrease.

As many other establishments the Museum is a foundation of the Republic and it can accomplish its function in its capacity to inform and “educate the people” in direct relation with how much it is visited and viewed. Actually, in its present state that has remained unchanged or revised in any way since it was first founded, with artworks lined up simply side by side in chronological order, just gathered under the same roof that “seems” to be a museum. Therefore it can be described as one of the most unlucky foundations in the history of the Republican Turkey. It cannot be said that it has been able to achieve the great jump that would help the realization of the ideological strategies for the education of the people by dragging those masses along. It has not been able to educate and train its visitors, help to turn them into citizens and be an establishment that could attract crowds to itself unlike the museums of the West (Artun, 2002).

It has offered its service to a small minority of people who can appreciate paintings and sculpture, even more so to the Academy. While on one hand the museum had started on this voyage with the aim of “educating people”, on the other hand no additional activity or educational project beyond exhibiting the existing collection is organized in order to attract the people to the museum. In this context the museum remains to be “seemingly” a museum. The fact that any attempts geared at interesting the viewers to its own area of attraction have not been realized up to now, besides the other technical and contextual issues resulting in failure this can be regarded as one of the greatest defeat stories of the Republican ideology. In truth, this situation may mean the Republican ideology, even more than the people themselves, did not really accept or take a serious interest in the museum.

The museum seems to be unsuccessful mainly because of the lack of viewers it needs the most and because of its failure to maintain continuity and achieve independence. And yet, though it may seem to be in conflict with each other, when the theory that museums materialize ideologies is brought to mind, the Museum, in this context does re-create itself as one of the important institutions that have materialized the revolutions of the Republic. In reality this situation brings to mind the idea that Museum has been minimized into the role of a decoration supporting the background scenery during the grand project of

creating modern Turkey. It is more “setting” containing real artworks, than a “real” museum; it cannot be made to work or entered. This situation where the Museum is simply a part of the scenery does seem to run parallel to the Ottoman concept of museums where the museum was regarded as a showcase. In both situations, the visitors, the “must have” of operating a museum is of secondary importance or is even being completely ignored. Let us remember these words by Adorno: “Museums demand insistently, what all artworks demand in fact: Some audiences to watch them, one way or another,” (Adorno, 2006: 201), then we will see that in both periods, in those experiences with museums the viewers were left out or in other words no activities that would attract the viewers were held.⁵ Therefore the education prescribed for “achieving contemporary civilization” cannot be done in a museum where there were no visitors. If we recognize the fact that a museum considered to be both the shrine of an elitist religion and a democratic tool for educational purposes, can only be ailed with schizophrenia from the very beginning (Nochlin, 2006:12) we can easily follow the traces of this schizophrenic state of matters as embodied in the Museum. A very distinguished elite temple has been erected and furnished with examples of Turkish art. But just like the Antique Greek temples this building is also a place that cannot or is not entered. The building of the museum besides its technical handicaps, has the additional disadvantage of having the image of a storehouse where art works are simply brought together haphazardly, a sort of “temple” and this image has survived up to the present in spite of the insistent objections of almost all past museum managers.

If we were to return to the years when the museum was being installed perhaps the first question that would come to mind should be the reason why the Crown Prince’s Quarters at Dolmabahçe Palace had been chosen as its venue. The building as a prospective venue for a museum is probably one of the last buildings that should be considered for this position because it is made of wood, its situation is close to the sea, it has an eclectic style that would have an adverse effect on the artworks exhibited, contradicting their characteristics of their style. It is obvious that the most important factor in the selection of this building for the museum is its being very close to the State Academy of Fine Arts. Yet if we were to view this choice from another angle, it can be argued that choosing to convert a building belonging to the Ottoman period into a museum instead of constructing a new building reflects the subconscious tendencies of the Republican ideology. The message given through this choice of building is explicit: it is important that a civilian building that is related to the Ottoman period and the reign of royalty is thus converted into an institute that belongs to the public and therefore becomes a symbol of the Republic ideology. In this context this conversion carries parallel features with the conversion of Louvre Palace into a museum that belonged to the people after the French Revolution. Actually while the Museum is being founded, the MOMA (New York Museum of Modern Arts) created by Alfred Barr was being talked about all over the world with the revolutionary museum practices it had introduced. When Barr was appointed as director of MOMA in 1929 he made his most influential emphasis on the viewers; in fact, this really coincided with the educational mission of the foundations installed by the Republic. The staff of the Turkish Republic preferred the model of Louvre, the symbol of revolution and by

that time had become a prototype of museology that was rather outdated in comparison to Barr's MOMA, that perceived the museum as a laboratory where the people could actively participate in. The Louvre model however appears only during the conversion processes. The Louvre galleries that have centered their attention on the exhibition of the history of art history, showing well-known masterpieces, emphasizing the myth of famous artists seriously differs from the "contemporary" galleries of the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture. In a sense the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, with its exhibitions that show the "Turkish paintings of the last half century" alongside contemporary artworks included in the collection is a museum/gallery which is diverges completely from the concept of Louvre. Consequently the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture does not create a revolution in the field of museology but it does serve the revolutionary Republic of Turkey.⁶

Berk in his article published in the *Ar Magazine* in 1938 does not mention the inconveniences of the building, voicing his pleasure and happiness concerning the establishment of the museum with great enthusiasm. In the article he wrote in 1961 for the *Varlık* however, he mentions the inadequacy of the palace as a site for a museum and expresses his wish for the paintings and sculptures to be removed from the desolate hovel the old palace had become and re-located at a decent museum building (Berk, 1961: 5). In another article he wrote for the same magazine in 1971, he reflects upon his experiences as manager of the museum. Here he points out the fact that the building is unsuitable for use as a museum, drawing attention to the problems such as danger of fire and rainwater, saying that he had warned the authorities concerned many times to no avail. He mentions rats that were as big as cats, how they were worried that foreign guests would come and visit the museum.⁷ Berk also gives voice to the fact that the dilemma of the museum has two dimensions, technical as well as cultural. The characteristic quality of the collection, its remaining localized and its being so far from the contemporary concept of museology are all included in a multi-dimensional criticism of the institution. Another interesting fact appears in the presentational article Berk has written for the museum catalogue in 1972; here he points out the insufficiency of the building at every opportunity and says that they would still be at this building when this catalogue is printed and delivered and predicts that they would stay here for many more years to come. Yet he is still hopeful for the future. Therefore he handles the catalogue of the museum as a mini summary of contemporary history of Turkish art and not as a guidebook for the present building (Berk, 1972: i-ii).

In direct opposition to Linda Nochlin who describes the myth of the history of art and the museum that is the temple of that myth (Nochlin, 2006: 11) there is no art history myth in the foundation of the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture and neither does the museum become the temple of that myth. In the years following its foundation, probably due to its being closed for long periods it could not produce myths like other museums in the international arena of art. It rather resembles a gallery where the recent past and the contemporary is being exhibited together, chronologically listed. During the first years of the establishment the collection was organized this way at the museum:

1. Primitives - our first painters in the period covering the beginnings of the XIX. Century up to the middle and later years.
2. Middle Period - those artists that were born and worked during the period beginning with 1870, continuing till the end of the XIX. Century.
3. Modern Period - the artists the eldest of which were born in the year 1900 and therefore were only 40 years of age at the time, the young artists of the new generation. (Berk, 1938: 10)

This classification by Berk also shows that a “historical” collection which could truly serve the creation of a myth related to the artist or work of art in the museum is still out of the question at this point in time. Berk follows an interesting method in this same article; as he talks about the artists and artworks in the museum he couples some of the artists with the masters of Western art such as Courbet, Decamps, Gerome, Corot, Signac, Picasso, Matisse, Dufy, Gauguin. For example as he talks about Ali Rıza Bey he says that he is a sort of Corot; while speaking of Şeker Ahmet Paşa he says that the artist displays the maturity of Courbet; he mentions that Malik Aksel reminds one of Gauguin. In reality he is trying to create a myth that is parallel to Western art, dreaming up an imaginary collection that seems to move in the same axis as collections in the Western museums.

A chronological system is adopted, therefore instead of the Western Museums where the individual genius is exalted and revered, a preference for the innovational and progressive concept of the Republican establishment becomes predominant. Rather than creating a myth of the national artist, the vision of an “establishment” that is the symbol of revolution is preferred. The museum described as a myth of art history and the temple of that myth by Linda Nochlin recreates itself at the Museum as the “temple” of a revolution, an ideology and the Republic of Turkey.

The administration of the Museum, the “temple” of the Republican modernism has continued to be handled by appointment of directors who have no experience regarding museum management but are teachers at the Istanbul State Fine Arts Academy (Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts). It should not be overlooked that every director who worked at the museum has shown great effort for improving the institution, though the ownership of the museum belongs to the National Palaces Foundation and its management is controlled by the Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts.

The Museum that has been continually opened and closed ever since the day it was founded and is lacking in specialists that could adopt and put into practice new revolutionary methods of museum management seems to have been overshadowed by the rise of more prominent private museums beginning with the years after the 2000's, their number increasing rapidly and becoming more popular and visible by making productive use of PR activities. In contrast to the ability of private museums to recreate themselves out of nothing by making ample use of billboards and posters all over the city, informing people of new exhibitions, the Museum⁸ with its door that is almost invisible, watches the “game of museology” from the outside. The museum, for which a ball of string could not be bought

without the permission of the Director of the Academy (Berk, 1971: 10), the managerial regulations of which could be issued at the year 2003, the restoration of which had only started in the year 2007 with the contribution of the National Palaces Directorate under Turkish National Assembly and has been continuing ever since, that museum which had been minimized into a simple symbol by the revolutionary Republic is still struggling through the negative aspects of being installed but not kept alive and going onwards.

It can be claimed that these negative impressions and influences are in direct proportion to the basic cultural policies implemented by the Republic. Especially the period beginning with the year 1980 the rapid privatization of all matters pertaining to culture by powerful corporations due to the neo-liberalization movement and the encouragement given to privately owned museums the existence of the Museum had been almost completely forgotten. Atatürk in a speech he delivered about 4 years before he gave the command for the establishment of a museum, had informed the people thus: "...it is our national ideal to develop and improve our love of fine arts and our sense of national unity continually by giving them the necessary feedback by every kind of research." (Akay,1981: 257). Whether we look at it from the viewpoint of historical procedures or the level we have reached so far, it is plain to see that the Museum has not been able to achieve this ideal. The Museum is just a part of the cultural policy that keeps the greatest cultural center of Turkey, the Atatürk Cultural Center in Istanbul closed, a country where the ministries of Culture and Tourism are controlled jointly by the same Ministry, when the construction of dams on archeological sites such as Hasankeyf and Allianoi is supported by the State. In this context, it would be more logical to accept the fact that the Museum can be saved not by the still continuing restoration of the building but by a new project for the restoration of the cultural policy of the state.

Bibliography

- Adorno, T.W. 2006. "Valery, Proust ve Müze". *Tarih Sahneleri, Sanat Müzeleri 2 Müze ve Eleştirel Düşünce*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Akay, İ. 1981. *Atatürkçülüğün İlkeleri*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Altar, C.M. 1987. "1937'den 1987'ye Anılar". *Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi Resim ve Heykel Müzesi*. 50. Yıl: İstanbul, No.3, pp.5-6.
- Artun, A. 2002. "The Museum That Cannot Be", presented in *Exposer L'art Contemporain du Monde Arabe de Turquie*, IISSM-Ecole Des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.
- Aygündüz, F. 2006. "11 bin esere 70 ziyaretçi". *Milliyet Pazar*, May 25th pp.10-11.
- Berk, N. 1938. "Resim ve Heykel Müzesi". *Ar Dergisi*, n° 4, p.10.
- Berk, N. 1961. "Resim ve Heykel Müzesini Gezerken". *Varlık*, n° 551, p. 5.
- Berk, N. 1966. "Resim ve Heykel Müzesi". *Türk Yurdu*. vol 5, n° (327), p.10.
- Berk, N. 1971. "Resim ve Heykel Müzesi". *Varlık*, n° 760, p.10.

- Berk, N. 1972. *İstanbul Resim ve Heykel Müzesi*. İstanbul: Akbank Yayınları Sanat Kitapları Serisi 1.
- Berk, N. 1973. "Resim ve Heykel Müzesi". *Türkiyemiz* 50.yıl Special issue, pp. 53-54.
- Berk, N. 1974. "Sanatçı Sorunları". *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*, n° 99, p. 25.
- Berk, N. "Müzenin Yeniden Dirilişi ve Birkaç Öneri". *Sanat Çevresi*, n° 12, p.10.
- Berkes, N. 2002. *Türkiyede Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Edhem, H. 1970. *Elvah-ı Nakşiye Koleksiyonu*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları.
- Germaner, S. 2009. "Elvah-ı Nakşiye Koleksiyonu'ndan Resim Heykel Müzesine". *Serginin Sergisi*. İstanbul: Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Yayınları. n° 714, p.19.
- İstanbul Resim Heykel Müzesi Arşivi 1937/ no. 21.
- Katipoğlu, H. 1995. "Resim ve Heykel Müzesi". *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı ve TarihVakfı Ortak Yayını, Vol. 6, p. 316.
- Köksal, A.H. being printed. "National Art Museums and the 'Modernization' of Turkey". *The Nation Exhibited*, eds. S.J:Knell, P.Aronsson et all, Routledge.
- Mülayim, S. 1999. *Cumhuriyetin Kültür ve Sanat Kronolojisi*. İstanbul: 118-T Lions, Yönetim Çevresi Yayını.
- Noclin, L. 2006. "Müzler ve Radikaller: Bir Olağanüstü Durumlar Tarihi". *Tarih Sahneleri, Sanat Müzeleri 2 Müze ve Eleştirel Düşünce*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Özşen, F. 2009. "Sunuş" *Serginin Sergisi*, İstanbul: Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Yayınları, n° 714, p.9.
- Shaw, W.M.K 2004. *Osmanlı Müzeciliği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Üstel, F. 2004. *Makbul Vatandaşın Peşinde II. Meşrutiyet'ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Notes

- ¹ The first museum named the Hitite Museum is installed in Ankara after the declaration of the Republic (Artun, 2002).
- ² Halil Dikmen continues to hold this post till 1962, after him Nurullah Berk is appointed to the post. Berk remained at this post till 1969.
- ³ The activity Berk mentions as being before he returned to Ankara is the Second Turkish History Congress. The meetings that continued till the 25th of September have been held at the Dolmabahçe Palace (Mülayim, 1999:123).
- ⁴ Almost 70 years after the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, the second most important establishment in the area of fine arts, Istanbul Modern was also opened with great speed as ordered by the Prime Minister of that period. The ordering of both of these two institutions is significant in showing the way politics view contemporary art as a tool to be used.
- ⁵ "Because the art of drawing and painting pictures has not become an integral part of our cultural structure, those who have visited the one and only Museum of Paintings and Sculpture are rather few in number and those interested in these arts are almost non-existent." (Berk,1966: 10).

⁶ The construction of a new museum building that can assist the ideology of the Republic with its architectural concept and style is doubtlessly an effort that will require a lot of time and money. Therefore it should not escape our notice that this factor must have played an important role in the choice made in favor of the Crown Prince's Quarters as the venue.

⁷ Berk gives up on the project of changing the venue of the Museum after the year 1974 and suggests the organization of the area of its present site as a special place for art and artists after the necessary renovations (Berk, 1979:10).

⁸ The director of the museum, Ferit Özşen has informed us that the museum which was connected to the Directory of National Palaces and was not awarded with the budget needed for its restoration, could begin its restoration only after the opening of privately owned museums and the comparisons between the quality and quantity of collections thereby exhibited were made (Özşen, 2009:9).