



Review Article

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURAL HERITAGE AND TOURISM IN TURKEY:
A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE (1923-2000)****

Nazım ÇOKIŞLER^{1*} (orcid.org/ 0000-0003-3273-7472)

¹İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Guidance, Izmir, Türkiye

Abstract

This study reviews the development of the relationship between the two concepts in the past century under two titles: “The Early Republican Period” and “The Post-World War II Period”. The review is based on information accessed through literature scan. According to the results of this research, the evaluations about the growth of the cooperation between the fields of culture and tourism in the 20th century are as follows: With the founding of the Turkish Republic, importance was attached to cultural heritage in the face of foreign states' claims on Anatolian lands, and tourism was regarded as a tool for mass promulgation of cultural heritage. Forming national consciousness also constituted an important aim in this period. In the post-World War II period, attempts to utilize cultural heritage for tourism gathered speed owing to the Office of Tourism under the General Directorate of Press and Publications, and the purpose of monetizing cultural heritage came to the fore because of liberalistic policies intended to be carried out by the Democrat Party. This historical review concludingly contributes to understanding better how the issues currently discussed in Turkey in terms of the cultural heritage–tourism relationship progressed over the past century to reach their present state.

Keywords: Cultural heritage, Tourism, Culture policies, Tourism-culture relationship, 20th century.

** This article has been produced from the first chapter of writer's PhD thesis titled ‘The Use of Turkish Folklore Creation in Tourism: A Case of Black Sea Region’ prepared in 2013 at Ege University Institute of Turkish World Studies, Department of Turkish Folklore.

* Sorumlu yazar: cokisler@hotmail.com

DOI: 10.33083/joghat.2022.193

Introduction

Culture and tourism are among the most important concepts that left their marks on the 20th century, and recent developments in the 21st century have drawn the two fields closer to each other. Two concepts came into prominence in the 20th century and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, dated to 2003, has brought these concepts nearer to each other. International institutions, notably the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Tourism Organization, have been making efforts to establish closer cooperation between the two fields. Such efforts have currently produced studies of the cultural heritage–tourism relationship by different disciplines.

Today, cultural heritage studies have begun to be taught as a program at universities, been introduced as an academic department, declared its independence, so to speak, and become a distinct field of study. Considering these developments in tandem with the anticipation that tourism movements will continue to grow, it may be suggested that the concepts of culture and tourism will retain their significant roles in the 21st century. Knowledge of the past is necessary in order to build the future. With reference to this idea, the research here seeks to answer the question of “what course did the conjunction of culture and tourism policies follow over the 20th century in Turkey”, and it presents the progress of the two fields with a historical perspective based on exhaustive literature scan.

The study has two sections: “The Early Republican Period” and “The Post-World War II Period”. The cooperation efforts between culture and tourism are reviewed by means of certain activities of the Turkish Traveler Society, written works related to the subject, and various attempts of Atatürk for the early Republican period; and by means of articles published in ethnology and tourism journals as well as several assemblies and conferences organized by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism from the 1980s onward for the post-World War II period. Prominent and accessible sources are referred to in both sections; *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* (“Journal of Provinces and Municipalities”), the journal of *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları* (“Turkish Folklore Research”), and *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* (“Anatolia: Journal of Tourism Research”) have been the most used ones. To be able to place the subject into a historical perspective, background explanations are provided for events that came into prominence in the said periods. The study starts with the founding of the Turkish Republic and ends with the year 2000. Ethics committee permission is not applicable as this article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.

The Early Republican Period

Although the inclusion of tourism into the fiscal program of the State of Turkey dates to 1930 (Evcin, 2016a), the notion of protection as well as promotion of cultural heritage emerged earlier. The initial activities regarding use of cultural heritage for the field of tourism were carried out by the Turkish Traveler Society, which was established in 1923 by Reşit Saffet Atabinen at the behest of Atatürk. Subsequently renamed Touring and Automobile Association of Turkey, the society was engaged in activities such as preparing the first travel posters, training tour guides, and conducting the first tourism-related surveys, thereby trailblazing the promotion of historical and cultural heritage by means of tourism (Kozak, Kozak and Kozak, 2012: 106).

As part of the early tourism efforts, two purposes of putting historical and cultural artifacts into touristic use stood out: raising national consciousness through education and improving Turkey's image in the view of foreign states (Batr, 2018). The Touring Association's membership of various tourism-related international organizations and its participation in international meetings exemplify the efforts to employ tourism in improving Turkey's image. The most notable of these attempts is the seventh convention of the General Assembly of the International Touring Alliance, which was hosted by the Touring Club of Turkey in 1930 and was held at the Dolmabahçe Palace. The placement of emphasis on the success of the Turkish Revolution in the circular distributed to all Touring associations at the conclusion of the meeting and the designation of the Dolmabahçe Palace for the convention indicate the importance given to the Touring Association and its objectives in this period (Şahin, 2006: 153).

Another effort worthy of mention is *Karadeniz Vapuru* (“Black Sea Ferry”), which, in 1926, toured a total of 12 countries and 16 cities in Europe and the Baltics over 86 days with the purpose of introducing Turkish culture. Products deemed useful in promoting the Republic of Turkey, such as ceramic tiles, carpets, Turkish delight, glassware, Sümerbank fabrics, brogans, and paintings by students of the Imperial School of Fine Arts, were exhibited on the ship. Also, the passengers included 85 people who were able to speak non-Turkish languages and were with various occupations such as architects, painters, artists, members of parliament, writers, composers, and interpreters (Özçelik and Güneş, 2017). An article about the journey, published in the

Official Gazette on June 12, 1926, tells how Europe regarded Turkey at the time of post-Turkish War of Independence as follows: “Until recently, Turks sent only armies to Europe. Turks, who reached Spain and the Algerian coasts by sea, and the forts of Vienna by land, had swords in their hands. It is for this reason that the present civilized world still knows us for our combat art—exclusively as warriors” (Resimli Gazete [The Illustrated Paper], from Bozkurt, 2019: 1122). As is apparent, the main objective of Karadeniz Vapuru was to relieve Turkey of its “warrior” image, and thereby to ensure direct communication between arts and culture experts and the target audience. Other examples of image improvement attempts in the Atatürk era include the signing of the Treaty of Security and Amity with Iran in 1926, followed by the first military air travel as a way of paying a “contentment and courtesy visit” to Tehran on May 3–27, 1926, and the participation of the Turkish air force aerobatic squadron in the Labor Day celebrations on May 1, 1934 in Moscow. As with Karadeniz Vapuru, these efforts also involved publicity on a face-to-face and personal level.

As an outcome of the image improvement attempts, the political climate after the Turkish War of Independence was influential in placing importance on the fields of culture and tourism in the early years of the Republic. In order to fend off European states' claims on Anatolian lands, emphasis was laid on studies contributing to the Turkish History Thesis, which posits that Turks are not a people who invaded Anatolia and that, on the contrary, they represent a great ancient civilization who contributed to the rise of civilizations such as Sumer and the Hittites (Güler-Bıyıklı and Aslan, 2013). To this end, attention was directed particularly toward Turkish history and folk culture, the *Association for the Study of Turkish History* was founded in 1931, and *Halkevleri* (“Community Centers”), “a state-backed semi-official organization”, were opened beginning in 1932 (Gürçayır, 2005: 48). The scope of Halkevleri included “history and museum branches” with the intention of collecting, studying, and publishing ethnographic artifacts; furthermore, opening exhibitions and establishing museums were encouraged for publicizing such artifacts (Evcin, 2014: 64).

Besides the purposes of supporting the Turkish History Thesis and promoting Turkey internationally, nation-building as well as raising national consciousness constituted a significant aim in making use of cultural artifacts within the context of the tourism and culture policies of the early Republican years. This perception can be traced through the activities of historian, writer and diplomat Reşit Saffet Atabinen. Also the founder of the Touring Association, Atabinen penned numerous works in Turkish and French, one of which—notable in terms of its relevance to this research—is titled “Cultural, Political, and Economic Benefits of Tourism”. Written in 1933, Atabinen’s comments on tourism in the essay provide an idea of the cooperation between tourism and culture at the time and of the purpose thereof. He refers to the opportunities presented by the historical heritage and natural beauties the country possesses by asserting that “at the least, we are obliged to prove our national ability through utilizing this heritage” (Evcin, 2016b: 12). Atabinen also pointed out that tourism should be a practice engaged in not to make profits, but to gain the ability to comprehend, appreciate, and compare diverse cultures; he distinguished obligatory travel from tourism by the latter’s requirement of a certain intellectual training adequate to enjoy sightseeing. According to him, “trying to compare beauties, strengths, emotions, ideas that are all different from one another is one of the greatest factors of civilization... The easiest and most effective means of ensuring that our citizens appreciate their homeland is to familiarize them with the natural beauties of their homeland” (Özdemir, 2012: 255). Atabinen, then, stresses tourism’s educational and psychological benefits as well as its importance in terms of intellectual training, while putting the pursuit of achieving economic gain on the back burner.

The allocation, in 1933, of 50,000 TL to the Directorate of Antiquities and Museums within the Ministry of Education for “collaboration with tourism organizations”, which was intended to draw tourists to protected areas and museums, constitutes one of the earliest examples of the notion of using the tourism industry for the protection of cultural property (Arık, 1953: 35, from Evcin, 2014: 65). A 1934 article titled “History – Archaeology – Museums – Tourism” by Remzi Oğuz Arık, the Director of Antiquities and Museums at the time, is a key source in which the purposes and aims of the culture policies of the period can be traced. The article explains the purpose of archaeological and ethnographical museums as “reminding, preparing, and presenting folkloric materials, works of art, and archaeological artifacts in a way to teach masses about them within their respective historical frameworks, while ensuring that masses enjoy learning this way” (Arık, 1934: 33). The piece also points to travel as the main factor that lends tourism its current importance, emphasizing that traveling enriches the entertainment, manners, and thoughts of “blind masses” and that it is able to achieve what books cannot do. According to Arık, tourism primarily serves to make use of and manage artifacts preserved by archaeology and fine arts, which is why “Turkey is ... the single country that needs to be visited and known by—ahead of and more than foreigners—her own children” (Arık, 1934: 36). As is understood, the culture and tourism policies of this period regarded tourism and cultural heritage as a couple of

prerequisites for being civilized, and brought to the fore its educational significance for instilling national consciousness, while holding the economic aspect of tourism on the back burner.

The Post-World War II Period

The post-World War II period, when tourism movements accelerated worldwide, saw Turkey advance to a multi-party system, and the Truman doctrine along with the Marshall plan started to also influence Turkey's culture policies (Aslan, 2017).

İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi (“Journal of Provinces and Municipalities”), launched in 1945, is a notable source in which the culture and tourism policies of the period can be traced. The objective of the journal, whose first issue was published in July 1945, was stated in article two of its trilingual (Turkish, English, French) statutes as “conducting scientific studies to help local governments develop”, and municipalities were requested to submit monthly information about various topics, including ones related to tourism. Listed under the title “Information Regarding the Travel (Tourism) Status of the Town” were the following questions: (a) *Name the antiquities in the town, and provide photos;* (b) *Are there any promenades or hot springs? Provide photos and info;* (c) *Provide information about hotels (with photos) and room rates, restaurants and their prices;* (d) *Provide information about roads in and out of the town, and state whether they are fit for automobile rides;* (e) *Are there any travel agencies? If so, name them* (İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi, 1945: 3).

The first two tourism-related articles published in the journal were authored by Süreyya Ergün, the Head of Tourism Department at the then General Directorate of Press and Publications, in the 12th and 14th issues, dated to September and November 1946, respectively. The one titled “What Turkey Expects from Domestic and Foreign Tourism” seeks to answer the questions of what status, in terms of tourism circumstances, Turkey is in and what its initial aims should be, and includes the following comments: Foreign countries generate large amounts of income through tourism; Turkey has not been able to fulfill its potential so far; a change in mentality is needed to activate that potential—because we have come to be commercially corrupt—and in order for these to be accomplished, subsidy is required (Ergün, 1946a). Titled “New Sources of Income for Municipalism in Regard to Tourism”, the other article highlights the role of tourism in generating new sources for municipalities (Ergün, 1946b). A third article in the 51st issue mentions the economic aspect of tourism once again by noting that “The tourism industry constitutes one of the most substantial sources of income for the international economy of modern societies”, suggests that “tourism activities are, above all, a subject matter that requires social training and knowledge”, and states that educating the public falls also on municipalities (Alaçam, 1949: 3).

Turkey considered tourism a crucial tool with which to attune itself to the international system at the post-war period, when American hotel chains emerged and began spreading all around the world (Çetin, Ultav and Uz, 2019); the first hotel chain Hilton was opened in the same period. Despite being an American hotel, it featured cultural elements in its architecture and decoration to be able to meet tourists' oriental expectations. To this end, the lounge in front of the reception desk was decorated with cupolas; the shopping area was designed like a bazaar; the walls of the lobby were covered with custom-manufactured tiles, and the floors, with carpets; a section of the lobby called *Lalezar* (“Tulip Garden”) was conceived as a *Şark Köşesi* (“Oriental Corner”) by being furnished with divans and adorned with draperies that resembled a harem; and the harem ambiance was bolstered up with waitresses dressed in traditional attire (Tozoğlu, 2007: 41–44). Moreover, the ornate pergola in the garden was named *Muhabbet Köşesi* (“Chat Corner”); the lobby bar, *Karagöz*¹; and the restaurant on the garden floor, *Şadırvan*²; thereby combining reality and expectation to present tourists elements that matched the image of the Orient on their minds (Tozoğlu, 2007: 47). Thus began the pattern of including oriental elements into hotel decorations (Çetin et al., 2019) and of designating a section of the lobby as *Şark Köşesi*, which was perpetuated in hotels built after the Hilton (Gönlügür, 2014).

Several periodicals launched in Turkey expedited the process of change in cultural habits; consequently, products of American culture speedily made their way into the daily life, and the consumerist ideology was internalized, which paved the way for changes in the identity of Turkish society (Erdem 2009). *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* was one of the magazines that often ran American-style house advertisements in this era. According to Akçan (2001: 40), advertisements in the 1930s, the time of the Kemalist regime, showed the Turkish woman in front of public buildings so as to emphasize that she, too, can have a career; whereas housing advertisements of the 1950s started to depict Turkish women inside houses, together with their spouses, children, and dogs, in a way that highlights their identity as homemakers. According to Erdem (2009: 61), over this period, the American lifestyle was portrayed as a dream, especially for city dwellers and those who belong to the high-income group, and the message that products of popular culture need to be consumed as the way

to realize this dream was given through Hollywood films, radio broadcasts, periodicals, and associations, which turned out to be successful.

The influence of such changes in the cultural life on culture and tourism policies can be traced over the courses of establishment as well as the activities of the then-emerging “tourism and promotion” associations. *Halkevleri* (“Community Centers”), which comprised 477 branches and 4332 *Halk Odası* (“Community Chamber”) by 1950, were shut down pursuant to Law No. 5380, enacted on August 8, 1951, by the Democrat Party (DP), who saw them as an offshoot of the Republican People's Party (CHP); subsequently, they were replaced by new associations with names such as “tourism” and “promotion” (Gürçayır, 2005: 48). Tourism and Folklore Association of Van (1952), Tourism and Promotion Association of Kars (1954), Association for the Promotion of the Culture and Tourism of Konya (1959) were the first to be established (Öztürkmen, 1998: 44, from Gürçayır, 2005: 66). The bylaws of the 1959 Association for the Promotion of the Culture and Tourism of Konya have valuable hints about how the importance, in relation to tourism, of cultural heritage was regarded. The objective for founding the association was expressed in the bylaws as follows: “to bring to light, preserve, and evaluate all tourism assets of our Konya, including those that concern nature, history, archaeology, culture, art, and folklore, and to turn the countrywide tourism industry into Konya's most important economic and social topic” (The Bylaws of the Culture and Tourism Association of Konya, 1965: 3 from Gürçayır, 2005: 66).

Another important episode with reference to culture and tourism policies in this period comprised undertakings by several associations and institutions about promoting handicrafts. The Tourism Institution of Turkey, founded in 1949 by Nejat Eczacıbaşı, and the Association for the Promotion of Turkish Handicrafts, founded in 1953 by volunteer housewives, were the first to be engaged in publicizing handicrafts (Çetinkaya, 2020: 104). The latter, one of the nearly-five thousand associations active in the 1950s, collaborated with the Turkish-American Association to help handicrafts acquire currency by holding numerous exhibitions that displayed works from various places in Anatolia (Çetinkaya, 2020: 104). These attempts later on developed into further institutional efforts, and handicrafts became the first cultural element endeavored to be turned into a touristic product.

The two decades between 1960 and 1980 were a troubled period for Turkey, when economic and political instabilities of the interior as well as the Cyprus and opium poppy crises in foreign affairs occurred. Referred to also as the “Inter-Coup”, this episode included the adoption of the 1961 Constitution, one of the incidents that determined the culture and tourism policies. Upon the enactment of the constitution, which stated that cultural development, in addition to economic and social development, was a duty of the State (Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, 1961: Art. 41), ways to use cultural elements as tools for development were sought, and to that end, handicrafts were selected the first. A circular from the Prime Ministry to the Ministry of Commerce in 1961 asked for “the attainment of manufacture and sales opportunities of small articles of handcraft and touristic souvenirs”, following which, an ad hoc inter-ministerial commission prepared a report titled “The Topic of Turkish Handicrafts and Souvenirs for Tourism, and Development Opportunities for These Affairs” (TTOSOTBB, 1962). The report, which deemed necessary an organization that would coordinate individual efforts and would be active countrywide, listed the benefits that would be brought about by manufacture of handicrafts and souvenirs under seven titles: a) provision of income for individuals and of foreign currency for the country, b) evaluation of raw materials, c) evaluation of employment potential, d) ease of transportation, e) partial defrayal of consumption, f) growth of national income, and g) savings (TTOSOTBB, 1962). It is seen that the benefits pertain primarily to gaining profit, which explains why handicrafts were chosen. Handicrafts were regarded as the cultural heritage element with potential to generate the most extensive and common income, and, for this reason, were the first such element considered to be utilized for tourism.

The outlines of the 1960–1980 culture and tourism policies can also be traced through the organizing of tourism at ministerial level. The name of the Ministry of Press and Tourism, established in 1957, was changed to “Ministry of Tourism and Promotion” in 1963, and to “Ministry of Culture” in 1971. The ministry was downgraded to an undersecretariat in 1972; in 1974, the “Ministry of Culture” was re-established, which, in 1977, was replaced with the “Ministry of National Education and Culture”; the cabinet-level body was ultimately re-organized in 1982 as the “Ministry of Culture and Tourism” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2022). Considering these developments, it seems like tourism and culture policies continued to be shaped by political decisions.

İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi was, in this period also, the medium that ran tourism-related articles most frequently; an example is “National Dances and Tourism”, published in 1954, by Selahattin Çoruh, who worked at the General Directorate of Press and Tourism. Similar articles, which discuss the cultural heritage and tourism cooperation, are seen in *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları* (“Journal of Turkish Folklore Research”) beginning in 1964, soon after the inauguration of the Ministry of Tourism and Promotion. These articles broadly stress the importance of folklore in terms of tourism (Hınçer 1964, Hınçer 1967, Sezgin 1968); review certain specific subjects, such as folk dances (Hünerman, 1968) or Turkish cuisine (Çoruh, 1979), with regard to tourism; deem Turkish folklore “the biggest asset of our cause for tourism” (Hınçer, 1964:1); and consider folkloric wealth the aspect of destinations that tourists from developed countries “are interested in the most” (Sezgin, 1968: 553).

The most substantial project with regard to making use of cultural heritage for tourism in this period was the idea of exhibiting folkloric products within open-air museums. Gaining currency for the first time in 1958 through an article by Hamit Zübeyir Koşay (1958), the director of the Ethnography Museum of Ankara, which introduced open-air museum models from around the world, this topic had a wide coverage in the scholarly literature in 1974–1976 and 1983–1985; it also yielded “Opportunities for Establishing Folkloric Open-Air Museums in Turkey”, a symposium organized by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 1985. The museum project, however, failed to be implemented (Tan, 2003).

In parallel with these developments, changes were seen in the way the subject of tourism was covered in textbooks from around the 1970s. Besides the notion that protecting Anatolia's historic monuments is a civic responsibility because of such monuments' involvement with Turkish culture and civilization, historical artifacts and monuments started to be taught as a valuable source for tourism in textbooks (Güler-Bıyıklı and Aslan, 2013). For instance, the fourth-grade social studies textbook written in 1974 covers the subject of tourism in a separate section, which underlines the importance of foreign currency in relation to the national economy, points to tourists as the most effective way of bringing foreign currency into the country, and states that tourists, then, need to be hosted in the best manner (Güler-Bıyıklı and Aslan, 2013: 264–265).

Following the Encouragement of Tourism Law No. 2634, enacted in 1982, the interval of 1983–1990 came to be the period when the tourism sector was prioritized at the state level the most, and tourism in Turkey developed the most rapidly as a result of the enterprises of the Tourism Bank (Özdemir and Kozak, 2000). While the top priority of the ministers of culture and tourism in 1983–1987 was to increase the country's tourist accommodation capacity, the notion of using cultural heritage for tourism was uttered by a minister, Mesut Yılmaz, for the first time in 1987 (Özdemir and Kozak, 2000: 136). Additionally, in this period, scholarly discussions of tourism as well as setting the subject as agenda were aimed at via various conferences and symposia organized by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. A browse through the topics of these meetings reveals that the most discussed elements were handcrafts, culinary culture, and folk dances (Table. 1), thereby providing an idea of which elements of cultural heritage were sought to be highlighted.

Tablo 1. The 1980–2000 Symposia And Congresses With Topics Regarding Cultural Heritage

Year	Title, Date, Place
1981	Symposium on Turkish Cuisine (October 31–November 1, 1981; Ankara)
1981	1 st International Handcrafts Symposium (November 18–21, 1981; İzmir)
1982	2 nd International Handcrafts Symposium (November 18–20, 1982; İzmir)
1983	3 rd International Handcrafts Symposium (November 23–25, 1983; İzmir)
1983	Symposium on Traditional Turkish Desserts (December 17–18, 1983; İstanbul)
1984	4 th International Handcrafts Symposium (November 21–24, 1984; İzmir)
1986	1 st International Congress on Turkish Tiles and Ceramics (1986; Kütahya)
1987	Symposium on the Problems Encountered in Staging Turkish Folk Dances (October 26–28, 1987; Ankara)
1988	Symposium on Turkish Folk Medicine (November 23–25, 1988; Ankara)
1988	Symposium on Yunus Emre (May 2–5, 1988; Ankara)
1988	2 nd International Gastronomy Congress (September 3–10, 1988; Konya)
1988	International Symposium on the Architect Sinan (October 24–27, 1988; Ankara)
1989	International Symposium on Khoja Nasreddin (May 15–17, 1989; Ankara)
1990	Symposium on Turkish Folk Architecture (March 5–7, 1990; Konya)
1990	Symposium on the Problems Encountered in Teaching Turkish Folk Dances (March 6–8, 1990; Ankara)
1990	3 rd International Gastronomy Congress (September 7–12, 1990; Konya)
1991	International Symposium on Yunus Emre (October 7–10, 1991; Ankara)
1991	International Symposium on Ahmad Yasawi (September 26–27, 1991; Ankara)

1992	4 th International Gastronomy Congress (September 3–6, 1992)
1993	International Symposium on Khoja Ahmad Yasawi (May 26–29, 1993; Kayseri)
1993	1 st International Symposium on the Ahi Culture (October 13–15, 1993; Ankara)
1994	5 th International Gastronomy Congress (September 1–3, 1994)
1996	International Scholarly Feast on the Art of Carpet-, Kilim-, and Cicim-Weaving of Peoples of Turkic Descent (May 27–31, 1996; Kayseri)
1996	1 st Symposium on the Sociocultural Texture of the Turkish Ethnicities of the Mediterranean Region (Yörüks) (April 25–26, 1994; Antalya)
1996	International Scholarly Feast on Khoja Nasreddin (December 24–26, 1996; İzmir)
1997	Symposium on Khoja Nasreddin (January 6–7, 1997; Ankara)
1997	Symposium on the Tradition of Handcrafts in Turkey, and Its Role in Contemporary Arts (1997; Ankara)
1997	International Symposium on Folklore and Köroğlu in Bolu (1997; Bolu)
1998	2 nd International Symposium on Ceramics of Kütahya (October 14–16, 1998; Kütahya)
1998	1 st International Congress on the Saints of the Turkish World (August 13–16, 1998; Ankara)
1999	2 nd International Symposium on the Ahi Culture (October 13–15, 1999; Kırşehir)
1999	Symposium on Anatolian Music and Instruments across History (November 12–13, 1999; Ankara)
2000	1 st International Symposium on Haji Bektash Veli (April 27–29, 2000; Hacıbektaş)
2000	Symposium for Evaluating Turkish Folklore in Terms of Tourism (October 19–21, 2000; İstanbul)

Source: Çokişler, 2013: 55–56.

The cultural heritage–tourism relationship started to be treated in more academic publications from the 1990s onward, which apparently was effected also by the launch, in 1990, of *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* (“Anatolia: Journal of Tourism Research”), the first tourism journal of Turkey. Thereby, ethnologists, who had long been engaged in the matter, were joined by tourism researchers beginning in the 1990s. Both groups of scholars expressed similar views revolving around the argument that the key elements Turkey should present for tourism were cultural values, but that culture did not receive the attention it deserved because of the priority given to coastal and marine tourism. Folk dances, folk music, handcrafts, and Turkish cuisine were cited as the neglected features of the available wealth of culture (Eroğlu, 1991; Hastürk, 1990; Kartari, 1991). Noteworthy is the similarity between the mentioned elements and the topics of the symposia organized by the Ministry.

The first and only scientific meeting exclusively on the use of cultural heritage for tourism, titled “Symposium for Evaluating Turkish Folklore in Terms of Tourism”, was organized by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 2000. It encompassed nine presentations about the use, for tourism, of folk dances; four presentations about that of entertainment shows; three, of handcrafts; and one, of culinary culture. The papers were authored to iterate that the use of cultural elements for tourism was far from the desired level, and to point to missteps as well as to offer solutions. A few examples here should help to better understand what the criticized elements were.

Turkish Night programs:

“... these shows have been yielding profit for individuals and groups, while they have been damaging the way our country is promoted. The so-called Turkish night shows, which we all often get to see, have been humiliating our ladies by portraying them as bondwomen. Belly dancers who sinuate around a sultan, the sultan being presented with ladies wrapped in carpets, and other such spectacles cheapen and debase human values... (Cavaz, 2001: 38–39). “Sometimes they go so far as to have those who are picked to play the bride and groom drink rakı by the jug” (Artun, 2001: 17).

Folk dances:

“Because of commercial concerns, musicians who charge the least get hired; consequently, moves and tunes tend to be out of sync... At certain tourist facilities, we may even see the cook, waitstaff, or parking lot attendant perform as members of the so-called folk dance group later in the night” (Artun, 2001: 17–18). “The dances are performed wrong, and they lack enthusiasm and aesthetics; redundant yells are let out; the clothing is totally wrong; musicians play poorly; dances of different regions get jumbled up” (Ay, 2001: 21). “The tourism industry favors cheap, low-level, tawdry, likeable groups, who go with the asked numbers and lengths of time, and who perform dances of only certain regions. The theme, contents, and authenticity of the dances are generally of little

importance for them. Encouraging tourists to participate in the dances and facilitating, if possible, to increase tourist spendings are the main intentions” (Aydın, 2001: 23).

Inferred from the quotations above is a sense of displeasure about the use of cultural elements for tourism, conveyed by authors who criticize aspects of the entertainment events they disapprove of. Solutions proposed for the issue at hand included putting an end to such touristy shows; inspection of cultural entertainment shows and employment of trained cultural entertainers at tourism destinations, to be carried out by the Ministry (Cavaz, 2001: 37); and asking guidance from relevant experts (Artun, 2001).

Conclusion

This study has reviewed the relationship between the fields of culture and tourism, which will seemingly maintain their significance in the 21st century, with a historical perspective. To conclude, the notion of using cultural heritage for the tourism industry started with the founding of the Turkish Republic and retained, albeit by slow steps, its dynamism through the past century. In the early years of the Republic, importance was attached to cultural heritage to respond to foreign states' claims on Anatolian lands. In this period, efforts by *Karadeniz Vapuru* and by the Turkish Traveler Society under the leadership of Reşit Saffet Atabinen stood out; as part of these efforts, cultural heritage was given priority with the aim of improving Turkey's international image and of raising national consciousness, and tourism was seen as a tool that allowed mass promulgation of cultural heritage.

World War II can be marked as a turning point in the historical progress of the cultural heritage–tourism relationship. Tourism was regarded as an income- and employment-generating industry in the post-World War II era, and target-driven tourism policies were made accordingly. The tourism-related articles written after 1945 may arguably be considered the intellectual milestone for the replacement of the goal of the use of tourism in forming national consciousness with the prioritization of tourism's economic benefits. From then on, tourism started, most inevitably, to be seen as a source of income due to the imperativeness of being intended to be developed by an institution, which brought to the fore the idea of utilizing cultural heritage for the tourism sector to generate financial income. The CHP government approached cultural heritage with the purpose of helping to form national consciousness, whereas the DP government, in a way that paved the way for the liberalistic policies it would carry out, attempted to focus on utilizing cultural heritage for the tourism industry. Pursuant to these developments, the aim of raising national consciousness gave way to the goal of laying the groundwork for liberalistic policies.

Following World War II, activities of newly-established tourism and promotion associations were effective in advancing the idea of utilizing cultural heritage for the tourism industry. Differences in the political views of the two parties led to the emergence of the tourism and promotion associations, which were instituted as a reaction to Halkevleri. The associations contributed to the progress of the promotion of cultural heritage, notably of handcrafts, by means of tourism.

Another important source in which the development of the subject can be traced has been a selection of ethnology and tourism journals. The number of articles published in such journals showed an increase from the 1970s onward, when the tourism sector started to grow, and they expressed as a common opinion the necessity of further utilization of cultural heritage for tourism. Pursuant to the adoption of the Encouragement of Tourism Law, increasing the tourist accommodation capacity was determined to be the primary goal. Owing to "Turkish Nights", touristy shows organized at accommodation facilities, the use of cultural heritage for tourism increased over this course of time. The introduction of cultural heritage to tourists in these programs, which became almost ubiquitous across hotels, was found to be a failure and came under criticism, with the presentation of culinary culture and folk dances being criticized the most. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism supported the scholarly treatment of the subject by organizing various academic meetings; the first subject-specific conference was held in 2000. Beginning in the 1980s, handcrafts, culinary culture, and folk dances have stood out as the cultural heritage elements whose use for tourism has been discussed the most frequently and criticized the most.

Overall, it may be suggested that a significant change in perception occurred after World War II; that the foundations of the cultural heritage–tourism relationship as well as of the above-mentioned topics, which continue to be discussed today, were laid within the past century; that this subject was treated largely by researchers with backgrounds in tourism and folklore/ethnology; and that critical issues and subject of criticism have changed little over the decades.

References

- Akçan, E. (2001). Americanization and anxiety: Istanbul Hilton Hotel by SOM and Eldem. *Oriental Occidental: Geography, Identity, Space ACSA International Conference*, 38-44.
- Alaçam, S. (1949). Turizm faaliyetleri ve belediyelerimiz. *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 51(5), 3-6.
- Arık, R. O. (1934). Tarih-arkeoloji-müzeler-turizm. *Ülkü Halkevleri Mecmuası*, 19, 29-36.
- Artun, E. (2000). Türk folklorunun turizm açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Folklorunun Turizm Açısından Değerlendirilmesi Sempozyumu*, 19-21 Ekim 2000, 15-19.
- Aslan, A. (2017). *Demokrat Parti döneminin muhafazakâr kültür politikaları*. Master thesis. Maltepe University, İstanbul.
- Ay, G. (2000). Turistik tesislerde animasyon anlayışı. *Türk Folklorunun Turizm Açısından Değerlendirilmesi Sempozyumu*, 19-21 Ekim 20-22.
- Aydın, C. (2000). Türk folklorunun (halk oyunları) turizm sektöründeki, yeri, önemi ve yapılan çalışmaların değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Folklorunun Turizm Açısından Değerlendirilmesi Sempozyumu*, 19-21 Ekim 2000, 23-27.
- Batır, B. (2018). Türkiye’de Mektep Müzesi’nin açılışı ve sergilenen eşyaların listesi. *Erdem*, 75, 5-34.
- Bozkurt, C. (2019) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin bir propaganda ve tanıtım hamlesi: 1926 Seyyar Sergi ve Avrupa seyahati. *Belleten*, 83(298), 1097-1130.
- Cavaz, A. (2000). Turizm ve kılıç-kalkan. *Türk Folklorunun Turizm Açısından Değerlendirilmesi Sempozyumu*, 19-21 Ekim 2000, 38-40.
- Çetin, H. A., Ultav, Z. T. And Uz. F. (2019). Reflections of the İstanbul Hilton Hotel on mid-century hotel buildings in Turkey. *Art-Sanat Dergisi*, 12, 57-88.
- Çetinkaya, S. G. (2020). Türk el sanatları tanıtma derneği ve faaliyetleri (1953-1960). *Milli Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(1), 101-113.
- Çokışler, N. (2013). *Türk halk kültürü ürünlerinin turizmde kullanımı: Doğu Karadeniz örneği*. Ph.D. thesis. Ege University, İzmir.
- Çoruh, S. (1979). Turizm ve Türk mutfağı. *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*, 30(18), 8649-8650.
- Erdem, M. (2009). 'Little America' in 1950s Turkey and its reflections in cartoons. *Interactions*, 18(1), 57-72.
- Ergün, S. (1946a). Türkiye’nin iç ve dış turizmden bekledikleri. *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 14, 458-463.
- Ergün, S. (1946b). Turizm bakımından belediyeçilik yeni gelir kaynakları. *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 14, 558-560.
- Eroğlu, T. (1991). Folklor ve turizm. *Milli Folklor*, 9, 36-38.
- Evcin, E. (2016a). Basın-yayın ve turizm genel müdürlüğü döneminde turistik tanıtım ve propaganda faaliyetleri. *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 32(94), 95-160.
- Evcin, E. (2016b). Türkiye turizm tarihinde öncü bir eser: Turizm kılavuzu 1934-1935. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 27(1), 7-24.
- Evcin, E. (2014). Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin ilk yıllarında turizm ve tanıtım faaliyetleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, 55, 23-82.
- Gönlügür, E. (2014). *American architecture and the promise of modernization in postwar Turkey*. Ph.D. thesis. University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Güler-Bıyıklı, S. and Aslan. C. C. (2013). A review of cultural heritage education in Turkish schools (1962–2011). *Public Archaeology*, 12(4), 255-270.
- Gürçayır, S. (2005). 'Yeter Söz Milletindir!' neslinin halkbilimine bakışından bir kesit: Konya kültür ve turizm derneği. *Milli Folklor*, 17(66), 48-55.
- Hastürk, A. (1990). Turizm pazarlamasında halkbilimin yeri ve önemi. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 11-13.

- Hınçer, İ. (1964). Folklorun sanat ve turizme etkisi. *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*, 9(182), 3305.
- Hınçer, İ. (1967). Turizm yılı ve folklor. *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*, 10(215), 4129.
- Hünerman, Z. (1968). Halk oyunları okulu, turizm ve folklor. *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*, 11(232), 5107-5108.
- Kartari, A. (1991). Türk folklorunun turizme entegrasyonu ve halkbilim eğitimi. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2(1), 10-15.
- Koşay, H. Z. (1958). *Açık hava müzeleri ve Türkiye’de açık hava müzesi kurma imkânları*. Ankara: MEB Yayınları.
- Kozak, N., Kozak, M. A. and Kozak, M. (2012). *Genel turizm: İlkeler kavramlar (12th Edition)*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. (2022). *Genel müdürlüğün kuruluş ve tarihçesi*. Retrieved from 22 January 2022, <https://kvmgm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-43034/tarihce.html>.
- Özçelik, M. H. and Güneş, M. (2017). *Türklerin atasından fazlası: Mustafa’dan Atatürk’e*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Özdemir, M. and Kozak, N. (2000). Türkiye turizm yayıncılığı tarihinden bir süreli yayın: TC Turizm Bankası A. Ş. bülteni (1983-1988). *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 11(2), 129-141.
- Özdemir, M. (2012). Turizm tarihimizle ilgili iki çok önemli eser. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 23(2), 253-262.
- Sezgin, Ö. (1968). Folklorik ve kültürel zenginliklerin turizm yönünden değerlendirilmesi. *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 25(277), 533-556.
- Şahin, G. (2006). Atatürk döneminde Batı’daki olumsuz Türk ve Türkiye imajını düzeltme çabaları ve Türk Seyyahin Cemiyeti’nin bu konudaki çalışmaları. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(3), 137-159.
- T.C. Anayasası. (1961). Kanununun Resmi Gazete ile ilanı: 20/7/1961.
- Tan, N. (2003). Kültür Bakanlığının folklor açık hava müzesi kurma teşebbüsü ve hazin sonu. *Türkiye’de Halkbilimi Müzeciliği Ve Sorunları Sempozyumu*, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi THBMER Yayınları, 22-26.
- Tozoğlu, A. E. (2007). *Grand hotels in major cities of Turkey, 1950-1980: An evaluation of modern architecture and tourism*. Master thesis. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- TTOSOTBB. (1962). *Türk El sanatları ile hediyelik-turistik eşya mevzuu ve bu konularda gelişme imkanları*. Ankara: Türkiye Ticaret Odaları, Sanayi Odaları ve Ticaret Borsaları Birliği.