bilig
WINTER 2019/NUMBER 88
169-188

Lenin Bayragı: 'between two fires'*

Alter Kahraman**

Abstract

Crimean Tatars were *en masse* deported throughout the USSR from Crimea in 1944. They were forced to live in 'special settlements' regime until 1956. After this regime was lifted, some national cultural institutions like the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı* were established. This article discusses the importance of *Lenin Bayragı* for Crimean Tatars in exile as a unique publication and its relationship with the National Movement. The document analysis and the interviews show how *Lenin Bayragı* helped Crimean Tatars protect and develop their national language and find ways to keep alive the memory of Crimea among people despite harsh censorship.

Keywords

Lenin Bayragı, Crimean Tatars, deportation, memory, censorship.

* Date of Arrival: 26 October 2016 – Date of Acceptance: 05 April 2017
You can refer to this article as follows:
Kahraman, Alter (2019). "*Lenin Bayragı*: 'between two fires'". *bilig – Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 88: 169-188.

** Res. Asst., Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations – Karaman/Turkey
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9995-6704
alter@metu.edu.tr

Bu yerge biz kelgen vakytlar,
Kurgak chel kuneshten yanardy…
Bu yerde olenler ve otlar
Ve, atta asyrlar sarardy.[1]

On May 18, 1944, Crimean Tatars were forcefully deported from their homeland Crimea to various republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), particularly to Uzbekistan, on the pretext of collaboration with the Nazis during German occupation of the peninsula in the Second World War (WWII). They lived under 'special settlement' regime, under police surveillance for 12 years. Special settlement regime was lifted in 1956 by a decree for Crimean Tatars and other deported nations, yet they were not allowed to repatriate to Crimea and to restore their autonomous republic, which was abolished after the deportation. Instead, as soon as the police surveillance was lifted (Aydıngün et al. 2010: 24-25), some institutions designated for Crimean Tatars were established to facilitate Crimean Tatars' life in Uzbekistan, or according to another view, to make them settle in Uzbekistan forever.[2] These institutions were established in 1956 and 1957, e.g., the Crimean Tatar song program in Uzbek Radio, Crimean Tatar dance and song ensemble, Crimean Tatar section within Uzbek Writers Union (Alyadin 1957, Muratov 1957, Eldar 1957), and the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı*. This article discusses the results of the document analysis[3] conducted on the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı*,[4] and in-depth interviews carried out about it in Crimea between February and May, 2013.[5]

The newspaper's importance derives from its uniqueness as a publication. Indeed, during its lifetime, *Lenin Bayragı* fulfilled important missions for Crimean Tatar people. First, it became a kind of school for Crimean Tatar writers, poets, journalists, as well as ordinary people, just as Gaspıralı's *Tercüman* did in Tsarist Russia (Kırımlı 2010: 41). Second, similar to *Tercüman*,[6] *Lenin Bayragı* tried to enlighten people on what actually happened in the Patriotic War (WWII) with biographies of Crimean Tatar participants in the war. Moreover, it protected the written Crimean Tatar language in exile whilst there was no education in Crimean Tatar language and schools. Similar to Gaspıralı (2010: 44), due to strict censorship on the issues of Crimea, some writers in *Lenin Bayragı* appealed to implicit methods such as metaphors and allegories in order to keep Crimean ideal and people's consciousness vital.

According to Islyamov, with the meeting of the Central Committee of Uzbek Communist Party on March 1, 1957, he was appointed as editor-in-chief and personally gathered Crimean Tatars who would work in the newspaper (Islyamov 1985: 182-183).[7] Since *Lenin Bayragı* came to life as one of the organs of the Central Committee of Uzbek Communist Party, Supreme Soviet of Uzbek SSR and Ministries Soviet of Uzbek SSR,[8] its main duty was, as the newspaper's decades-long redactor Islyamov wrote in his memoirs, to propagate the ideal of Communism and to indoctrinate workers in accordance with it.[9] In the newspaper, different types of news were published. Alongside the official news such as party decrees, government decisions, texts of pleniums of the Communist Party, which sometimes covered all the pages of *Lenin Bayragı*, there were also news on cotton, monoculture of Uzbekistan,[10] on Crimean Tatars' life in exile, mostly success stories of Crimean Tatar workers (e.g., about how much they fulfilled their quotas at work), and stories about Crimean Tatar heroes in the Patriotic War.

A School and a Teacher

Eight years after the inception of *Lenin Bayragı*, the newspaper began to be published in broadsheet format in 1965. This created the necessity to employ more Crimean Tatars in the establishment. Unlike the first generation of the newspaper, namely, the founding elders who got their education in Crimea and began their writing business prior to the WWII, the young who were raised in exile and joined *Lenin Bayragı* were trained by the elderly and received language education in the newspaper. The younger generation became writers and poets by the help of the elders and with their own efforts (Seidamet 1981: 88, Ametov 1980, Nagaev 1988). Those days are eloquently told by one interviewee who started her professional life in the newspaper in 1965, and also employed in Crimean Tatar publishing house in Uzbekistan:

> The young joined in 1965, more than ten young people came to the newspaper. Some were Ervin Umerov, Safter Nagaev, Refat Ahtemov, Bilyal Mambet, Urie Edemova and Riza Fazyl. The elderly saw that energy came to the newspaper, but the young had no power; they did not have [proficiency in Crimean Tatar] language. One did write in Uzbek, other in Russian. They [the elderly] gradually taught us [how to write in Crimean Tatar language] over the course of a year. They worked day and night. We wrote, they corrected. [They said] write

> like this, like that. They practiced with us for one year, and after one year, we slowly reached their level. This was an extremely significant business. The elderly made this happen.[11]

Moreover, those Crimean Tatar cadres who first started their career in the newspaper also worked in the Gafur Gulam Publishing House in the ensuing period and in the Crimean Tatar journal, *Yıldız*, which was established in 1980 (Islyamov 1985: 192). They had their first poems, stories and articles published in *Lenin Bayragı* (Selim 2008: 162, Shem'izade 1977: 10-11). One respondent who worked in *Lenin Bayragı* and still works in *Yanı Dunya* as a journalist pointed out its importance for writers as follows:

> Take any [Crimean Tatar] writer and poet in Crimea, none of them was ever unattached to *Lenin Bayragı*. All of them graduated from the school of *Lenin Bayragı*. Most of them, 90 percent, became writers and poets within the newspaper. The rest published their works first in *Lenin Bayragı* because there was no other publication. That was the only newspaper in Crimean Tatar language in the world.[12]

This group of young Crimean Tatar literati was not just a part of the newspaper; on the contrary, they were greater in number, and some were not organically a part of the establishment. Those who were not part of it constituted the outer circle of the newspaper. The physical environment of *Lenin Bayragı* was a gathering place for Crimean Tatar intelligentsia. In addition to becoming a place where the new generation of Crimean Tatar literati were raised and educated, *Lenin Bayragı* became a school and/or a teacher for regular Crimean Tatar readers. It should be kept in mind that there were no Crimean Tatar schools and education in Crimean Tatar at the time. The generations who were raised after the war in exile learnt their own written Crimean Tatar by reading and studying *Lenin Bayragı*.[13] A scholar from the History Department of the Crimean State Engineering Pedagogical University (KIPU)[14] explained the newspaper's importance for them with the following words:

> In exile, it was impossible to conserve one's language in any other environment but family, only family. Within the family there was *Lenin Bayragı* to conserve [native] language. *Lenin Bayragı* was a schoolbook

> to us, a real schoolbook because we did not study our native language for [even] one hour at school therefore it was a schoolbook.[15]

This is the most prominent characteristic of the newspaper, functioning as a school/teacher for Crimean Tatar readers. This feature was repeatedly emphasized by the informants during the interviews. Even one of the leading persons of the National Movement who struggled for the return of Crimean Tatars to Crimea and held high positions in Crimean Tatar *de facto* political institutions said, "I used to read [it]. I used to read them all to know the enemy well…it [*Lenin Bayrağı*] helped to some extent…it helped me…to improve my own native language…because there were no schools, no books, but only *Lenin Bayrağı* and novels of the time."[16]

Moreover, Crimean Tatar readers at the time sent many letters to the newspaper saying that it became a school/teacher for them and they learnt written Crimean Tatar by reading the newspaper (Ametov 1957, Abdudzhemilev 1958, Ramazanov 1961, Ametov 1961, Velishaeva 1967, Abdulk"adyr 1967). For instance, a reader's observations on younger Crimean Tatars' attitudes to native language triggered other Crimean Tatar readers to express their thoughts on the same matter. Nuri, a student in the Institute of Agriculture in Tashkent, points out that he learnt his native language by reading the newspaper. He criticizes the young generation who say they cannot read the newspaper because they cannot understand it. If they take it once in a blue moon, they cannot read and get it, he reproached. However, the young should learn and not forget the native language (Abdullaev 1965). After Nuri's complaints were printed in the newspaper, other readers began sending letters on this issue. One of them was Arsen Al'chikov. Also stating that *Lenin Bayrağı* and books in Tatar became schools in learning literary Tatar language, Al'chikov agrees with Nuri's concerns that Crimean Tatar (as *Tatar* in the text) youth is not able to read their native language. He advices them to subscribe to the newspaper and read it (Al'chikov 1965). Izzet Khaiirov (1965), also a student, criticizes those people, and gives the example of a friend, who is an expert on Hindi but does not read/understand his native language. Finally, D. Chelebi, an engineer, joins the debate. He also finds those youngsters' excuses groundless. Even though he was educated in Russian schools, he endeavoured to read the newspaper, and like others (Ismailova 1965), he managed to learn reading (Chelebi 1965). An analysis

of the texts hints that younger Crimean Tatar generations' current problems on the native language were valid in the 1960s, and Crimean Tatars were as worried about the newer generations as present intelligentsia, just as my interviewees, currently are. Crimean Tatars' deficiency on the native language was worsening because they did not receive education in Crimean Tatar, and there were no Crimean Tatar schools in exile places.[17] As to the letters, the readers do not refer to the real reasons but put the blame on the young who live in an Uzbek and Russian environment and go to Uzbek and Russian schools. Only Al'chikov might have referred to the reasons, but his text is probably distorted because there are traces of inconsistency in his style (Al'chikov 1965).

Being the only newspaper of its kind, *Lenin Bayragı* turned out to be something more than a newspaper for some people. In fact, subscribing to it was a mission; it was a sacred paper; like a religious text for some readers. A scholar respondent who holds tenure in History Department of KIPU and has linguistic studies on Crimean Tatar language expressed what it meant to them:

> Subscribing to *Lenin Bayragı*, *Yıldız* meant, how should I say, both keeping Crimea alive in the family, and also supporting national press, that much important…It was as if Crimea was experienced in each family. We, our relatives and other families used to collect *Lenin Bayragı* yearly, because it was something, not sacred but, precious which kept Crimea alive.[18]

One can wonder how a newspaper could keep the memory of Crimea alive or make the readers experience Crimea when strict censorship was applied on matters about Crimea. This was probably possible through metaphors in the poems, and articles on Crimean Tatar participants, heroes in the war. Readers used to read, for example, articles, life stories and war-time experiences of these heroes but what they read was distinct from the themes they listened to in the family. First, they could never encounter any narration of the deportation in *Lenin Bayragı*. That was always skipped and censored. Second, they could not read about such topics as the beauty of the peninsula or nostalgia on Crimea about which they often heard in the family, either. The gap in the texts surely was completed by the recollections of parents.

Just as the family functioned as a site where recollections about the homeland Crimea and the deportation were circulated and/or transformed to the newer generations, and the collective memory was created (Uehling 2004: 10, Williams 1998: 301), the family for some Crimean Tatars also became a setting where *Lenin Bayragı* was read, collected, and cared. Indeed, family/home was a crucial site. The letters sent to the newspaper provided clues to the fact that some Crimean Tatars began learning written Crimean Tatar with the help of family members, older generation, who already were capable of reading in Crimean Tatar. New learners listened to them, and they gradually developed proficiency in the native language. Some others learnt it by reading the paper aloud at home. As can be seen clearly above, for some, *Lenin Bayragı* helped conserve the Crimean Tatars' native language in exile. A journalist who was part of *Lenin Bayragı* and still works *Yanı Dunya* pointed out this:

> I asked this question in Dobruja. [I said] there was nothing to read in that newspaper, why did you buy that newspaper? They replied that they read it because it was in Crimean Tatar and in order to learn the language and not to forget Crimean Tatar. I, myself, studied in a Russian school and a university, and I learnt our native language through *Lenin Bayragı*. There were no schools and books [in Crimean Tatar]. I learnt Crimean Tatar reading it aloud, and many other hundreds of Crimean Tatars did the same. It helped very much. I think, from this point of view, it can be considered as a national movement. It conserved our nation's folklore, culture, literature, and most importantly language. *Lenin Bayragı* succeeded in protecting our language against destruction.[19]

However, there are also people who disagree with this claim. One journalist interviewee who never became part of the newspaper in Uzbekistan, and obviously was proud of that, for example, stated the following:

> I suppose this newspaper's importance was quite sensible [effective]. For some it could be big which is true to say. However, whoever say that this newspaper conserved our language, culture there in exile, this would be an exaggeration. It is exaggeration because only one family out of 5-6 used to buy it, maybe less. I know, some bought and said in a quotation 'conditionally this is our national newspaper and I help them by subscribing to it.' Subscription was very cheap in that time:

> 3 roubles 12 kopecks. It equalled to 15-16 piece of bread. That was cheap but they did not use to read it. [For instance] my dad did not use to read it.[20]

The existence of a newspaper (along with other published materials) in Crimean Tatar became basically useful for current Crimean Tatar intelligentsia, and to some extent for ordinary Crimean Tatars. All the Crimean Tatar elites and experts interviewed in the study had a link with *Lenin Bayragı*; they either worked in it or published their works in it or read and collected it as a valuable material. Activists only read it even though they were not fond of it. *Lenin Bayragı*'s effect on ordinary people however remains to be researched.

If it is true that *Lenin Bayragı* helped to conserve Crimean Tatar language in exile-this is what most of the respondents stated- and that people learnt their native language thanks to it, then why Crimean Tatars, especially newer generations, cannot speak in their mother language remains to be explained. Today, young generations of Crimean Tatars have an acute language problem. They cannot acquire their mother language in the family through 'mothers'. Only 15 national schools, *milli mektep*, exist in Crimean Tatar, which is not sufficient. Crimean Tatar is not spoken anywhere whatsoever. They inhabit Russian-speaking environments and attend Russian schools. If they wish to learn it, they do it as a second and a foreign language. In short, *Lenin Bayragı*'s and other publications' effect seems to be limited mostly to intelligentsia and other elites.

Lenin Bayragı and the National Movement

Crimean Tatar people had various views on *Lenin Bayragı* since its inception. Some groups in the Crimean Tatar National Movement negatively evaluated the establishment of the newspaper and boycotted it.[21] For people around *Lenin Bayragı*, this attitude against the newspaper was wrong: without *Lenin Bayragı*, Crimean Tatar literature and language would disappear, and the younger generation of literati would not exist. A poet from the outer circle of *Lenin Bayragı* indicated the following in the interview:

> Nation, the people, the majority never choose the wrong. They [people who boycotted *Lenin Bayragı*] chose the wrong, but never the people… That has become true. We, literati who began literature in the 60s and the 70s, were called as 'war children' since we were children in the

> war time. We would not exist, if these books had not been published in native language, and the newspaper had not been established, the ensemble was not formed, [and] -then Crimean Tatar program in the faculty was opened- that program was not established. Our literature would stop. Until we returned to homeland, people would forget their language. Therefore, I myself believe that their opinions at that time were wrong.[22]

For the National Movement, *Lenin Bayragı* was not a national publication and did not 'reflect the interest of the people' (Allworth 1988: 122). Grigorenko's advice to members of National Movement to take control of *Lenin Bayragı* which does not support the National Movement is an example of how some people at the time considered the newspaper (Grigorenko 1983: 353).[23] Some nationalist groups in the Movement had a negative attitude toward it because no news about the people's struggle appeared in the newspaper. On the contrary, negative news about the movement, its activities and its initiators such as Mustafa Cemilev was sometimes printed. In an article published in *Lenin Bayragı*, Cemilev was accused of collaborating with foreigners, Radio Liberty etc. and being a bootlick. The text declared that he parted from the people (Valiyev 1984). In May of the same year, 1984, another article which included letters from people was printed. In these letters, Cemilev was criticized again for betraying his people and passing to enemy's front. They asked who had chosen Cemilev, this 'traitor', as the representative of the people, because 'people' did not believe that he represented them.[24] Two years later, an article was published about two activists who were declared by the writer, Sh. Iskanderov, as Cemilev's assistants. Rishat Ablayev and Sinaver Kadyrov, too, were accused of collaborating with foreigners, centers of anti-Sovietism, Radio Liberty and so on, and sending materials which vilifying the USSR to these centers. Their activities in the institute where Crimean Tatars studied and internal and external connections were explained in the text (Iskanderov 1986). Following this article, another criticism was printed about Ablayev and Kadyrov (Bilyalov 1987). These articles above, except the third one, was first published in other newspapers, Pravda Vostoka and Leninabadskaya Pravda, and afterwards in *Lenin Bayragı*. In 1987, when the Crimean Tatar National Movement increased its activities, meetings and demonstrations, and became more visible in Moscow and Uzbekistan, slanderous news on the National Movement and its activists such as Reshat

and Mustafa Cemilev increased, too.[25] For instance, Grigoryev (1987) labelled the activists as extremists, and M. Cemilev as the head of the extremists, Reshat Cemilev as the closest assistant of the former. He also criticized the deeds of others such as Sabriye Seutova and B. Umerov. Moreover, the Soviet government took a step more and formed a workers' commission which consisted of 11 "accepted" representatives of Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan. These representatives one by one were introduced to Crimean Tatar people by the titles "proper representatives" in *Lenin Bayragı*, and these news were produced by UzTAG.[26] Moreover, when the first serious events in *Chirchik*, Uzbekistan, broke out in 1968, and 300 people were arrested, *Lenin Bayragı* was silent. The reason is surely understandable: censorship. Censorship was a fact of Soviet life, as well as the writers of the newspaper.

Crimean Tatar journalists and writers in *Lenin Bayragı* were probably in a difficult dilemma: on one side the people, on the other side the government, which the newspaper was responsible for. The people, the National Movement and the activists who were in an open struggle with the government and paying a price were on one side, and the government which were inhibiting the National Movement and its activities was on the other side. *Lenin Bayragı,* however, was caught in the middle. Some people saw them as 'traitors', just as one interviewee, a journalist, who did not become part of the newspaper likened them to galley slaves in the ships. However, they had to act within the accepted limits of the Party.

The narration below illustrates the trapped situation of at least some of these Crimean Tatar writers. A dozen of Crimean Tatar journalists-writers were received by Sharof Rashidov.[27] One of them was a senior writer, Yusuf Bolat, born in 1909, whose hands shook with anxiety when he spoke to Rashidov during the meeting. My interviewee, who was an eyewitness, asked him later why he was so nervous, to which Bolat said:

> You know, how could I not get nervous? Ahead is Padishah [referring to Rashidov], behind is the people, we are in the middle. We had to speak less but say more. We had to pass people's demands and wishes to Padishah by this opportunity. I strived to think of some useful words to say on behalf of my people within a few minutes, and I got nervous.[28]

During the interviews, the respondents from the newspaper consistently referred to *Lenin Bayragı*'s indirect assistance to the people and to the National Movement. This assistance was not open and political, but passive, mostly showing the defamations on Crimean Tatars as unrealistic. In other words, they emphasized that they cannot be out of the National Movement. In fact, the people affiliated with the newspaper and the academics from KIPU, define the National Movement in broader terms than its activists. For them, a concert of Crimean Tatar ensemble, a native song on radio, an article and a poem printed in the newspaper, or anything that reminds Crimean Tatars Crimea meant national movement. Instead of an active political struggle, they could only follow different paths within the Soviet system under strict censorship.

Conclusion

Lenin Bayragı was the only newspaper printed in Crimean Tatars' native language during the Cold War years. Since its affiliations with the Soviet state, it was only a Crimean Tatar newspaper with some reservations. However, the findings of this study indicate that it was more than a newspaper that just broadcast the translated official news in Crimean Tatar. In fact, the hardest part of the study was probably the analysis of *Lenin Bayragı*. That is, evaluating it and its staff, and reflecting them to the reader in the best way possible was a challenge because, for some informants, *Lenin Bayragı* has positive connotations; it is part of their personal history, and *Lenin Bayragı*'s staff are their heroes because they struggled with the state agents under tough conditions. For the activists, however, *Lenin Bayragı* and people affiliated to it do not have a positive image. In other words, one cannot be considered within the National Movement, and a supporter of the people while he was taking part in the government's newspaper.

It is understandable that people affiliated with *Lenin Bayragı* might try to justify their existence in the newspaper, and also apprehend that the activists attempted to underestimate their efforts during the interviews. At this point, the academics appear to play an impartial role in putting forward *Lenin Bayragı*'s positive role, for in the absence of Crimean Tatar institutions like radio, ensemble, newspaper in Uzbekistan, there were not any other alternative. Even if they were communists in essence, they preserved the national form. They broadcast, printed and sang in Crimean Tatar. Moreover,

during the write up of this study, a neutral tone and an unbiased approach toward the people who represented *Lenin Bayragı* and the Movement were pursued, with particular effort to refrain from creating a heroism out of *Lenin Bayragı*, and a new version of the history of the Crimean Tatar National Movement.

In the research process, I tried to elaborate *Lenin Bayragı*'s possible contribution to Crimean Tatar collective memory. For this, I focused on what *Lenin Bayragı* meant for the permanent Crimean Tatar readers at the time. Interviews demonstrate that *Lenin Bayragı* had a mainly positive place in the current Tatar intellectuals' memory, though it depends on the person addressed. For instance, activists' perception of it is more or less negative.

Moreover, one of the main findings was that *Lenin Bayragı* had a significant function for the Crimean Tatar culture, literature and written language, so did other Crimean Tatar institutions. Current Crimean Tatar cadres were in one way or another affiliated or connected with these institutions. However, I hesitate to expand my remarks to the ordinary Crimean Tatars, whose relations with *Lenin Bayragı* need to be studied in further research. *Lenin Bayragı*, due to its affiliations with the Uzbek state and censorship, had no traces of open and political support for the National Movement. All it did was sustain the Crimean Tatar language if possible.

Even though Crimean Tatar literati who were affiliated with a communist newspaper sometimes had to print articles, blackening the activists, in the paper, they were Crimean Tatars living with their co-kins, joining national movement meetings under the disguise of *toy*s and *dua*s. Only they did not struggle and suffered as much as their co-kin activists. Some of them appealed to other non-political ways of struggle, as there were convinced communists among them. In fact, *Lenin Bayragı*'s staff are aware of that, on one side, there are activists who struggled for the return to Crimea and suffered because of it, and on the other side, there were those who worked in a newspaper organically part of the Uzbek state and forced to print articles slandering the activists. Probably for this reason, they tend to consider the national movement not only limited by political struggle but broader, including their deeds. However, activists seemingly do not esteem what they referred to. At least, they do not consider the activities around *Lenin Bayragı* as the national movement.

Acknowledgements

I am first grateful to Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Aydıngün for her advice, criticism and encouragements throughout the research. I thank the Crimean Tatar, Russian and Ukrainian friends and colleagues who helped me with various stages of the study. I also thank the anonymous referees for their useful suggestions. First findings of the field research which this paper based on was presented in the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES) Annual Conference (Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, 2014). This paper is extracted from the thesis entitled "The Crimean Tatar National Movement in the Publications of Inner and Outer Diaspora: Lenin Bayragı, Emel and Dergi" (Master Thesis, METU, Ankara, 2014).

Notes

1 "To this place in the times we came,
Arid desert used to sunburn…
In this place the dead and the hay
And even the centuries yellowed."
The first four verses of the poem 'Yanyier' of Zakir Kurtnezir were translated by the author (Shem'izade 1977: 9).

2 Some of Crimean Tatars argue that leading Crimean Tatars at the time struggled for these institutions' establishment to protect Crimean Tatar literature, language and culture. For this, they demanded that a newspaper, a journal, an ensemble be established. However, some Crimean Tatars mostly within the National Movement claimed that institutions along with the newspaper were established in order to keep Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan forever. In addition, they stated that they did not need any newspaper, ensemble and so on in Uzbekistan, but they needed them in Crimea. Thus, they boycotted the newspaper and urged people to do the same (*Lenin Bayragı*, 29 December 1990, Ametov 1988).

3 Document analysis was conducted in Crimean Tatar Gasprinskiy Library, in Simferopol' (Akmescit). This research project was supported by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) of Turkey.

4 *Lenin Bayragı* was printed in Crimean Tatar language from 1957 until 1991 in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Its name was altered to *Yanı Dunya (*New World) with its first issue in 1991 in Tashkent, and was moved to Crimea by the end

of the year (*Yanı Dunya*, 25 December 1991, Veliev 1992, Kerimov 1991). It is still published in Crimea under the name *Yanı Dunya*.

5 Semi-structured in-depth interviews were made with five Crimean Tatar scholars from the Crimean State Engineering Pedagogical University, and 12 Crimean Tatar journalists, writers, poets and other people affiliated with the newspaper *Lenin Bayragı,* and with six Crimean Tatar activists in Crimean Tatar National Movement. Interviews were conducted in Turkish and Crimean Tatar, then translated to English by the author. Since the author gave assurances to the respondents that their anonymity will be preserved and due to the situation after Russian occupation of the peninsula, that is, the strict pressures and surveillance against Crimean Tatars, their representatives and in general tough situation in Crimea (Aydıngün 2015, Üskül et al. 2015), names and other further identification about interviewees are not disclosed in the text. However, to strengthen the precision, the respondents' professions and affiliations, date and place of the interviews are included.

6 The first Crimean Tatar newspaper *Tercüman* was founded by Crimean Tatar intellectual Ismail Gasprinski in 1883 and published until 1918.

7 One interviewee who joined the newspaper in 1965 and ensuing years worked in other Crimean Tatar institutions as a person in charge confirmed Islyamov: "Well, they gathered all, the communists, [for instance] Shamil' Alyadin, Islyamov. Abselyam Islyamov was a commander who participated in the war. He had nothing to do with writing, he was that kind of a communist. They [rulers] gathered and formed [the newspaper], and appointed Islyamov as redactor. He brought the others together, [for example] Dermendzhi, Tyncherov, those old writers…" Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 6 March 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol', quotation translated by the author.

8 The other organs-newspapers were *Sovyet Uzbekistanı* in Uzbek, *Pravda Vastoka* in Russian and *Hakikati Ozbekistan* in Tajik.

9 (*Lenin Bayragı*, 30 September 1967, Islyamov 1985: 186).

10 Out of the scope of the study as it is, this newspaper was pretty much a newspaper for cotton due to cotton's importance for Uzbekistan. During the planting and the harvest season, the news encouraging people to fill the cotton quota increased. After the harvests, the success, achieving the plan/quota, was announced: 'Vatang"a Raport: Plan Tolduryldy [Report to the Homeland: Plan succeeded]. *Lenin Bayragı*, 14 December 1958.

11 Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, 11 March 2013, Akmescit/Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

12 Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 15 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

13 A journalist who worked in *Lenin Bayrağı* and *Yıldız,* and also was affiliated with the Union of Crimean Tatar Writers in Crimea expressed how he improved his Crimean Tatar after the newspaper began to be published, "I grabbed the newspaper just after it was published in 1957, went home but did not know [Crimean Tatar] very well. We used to talk [Crimean Tatar] at home, [but before we came to Uzbekistan somewhere in Russia] we talked with Russians over 9 years. I studied with Russians for 8 years. Later, I started to read, there were many unknown words to me. I took a thick notebook, divided it into letters and made a dictionary on my own. I read [but] I did not understand articles in Crimean Tatar. There, in Samarkand, was a newspaper in Russian, Leninskiy Put (ленинский путь-Lenin's path). Reports and others were both printed in the former and in the latter, in the former, *Lenin Bayrağı*, they were printed after translation. I read, understand and find, [for instance], *istisal* (istihsal-production). I barely understand *istisal*, and I look at the latter *istisal* is *proizvodstvo* (производство), then I wrote *istisal* to the *I* [page of the dictionary]." Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 6 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

14 In KIPU, Crimean Tatars are given a certain amount of quota, for academics and students, to fill and its previous and current rectors are a Crimean Tatar.

15 Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, 21 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

16 Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, 23 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

17 Except for a very limited number of Crimean Tatar language classes in some schools in Uzbekistan.

18 Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, 21 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

19 Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 15 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

20 Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 5 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

21 The boycott of these Crimean Tatars was expressed in a poem-verse form printed in the newspaper. Burnash (1967) wrote: "Why do some stay away rather than subscribing to the newspaper? All my people are celebrating it in its native language, I wonder, how do their hearts beat?." Quotation translated by the author.

22 Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, 27 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol, quotation translated by the author.

23 General Grigorenko was one of the first supporters of Crimean Tatar Movement in the USSR together with Alexei Kosterin. He offered the Movement a vividness and new ways of struggle that actually helped them to pass from a petition period to a protest period in 1968.

24 (*Lenin Bayragı*, 5 May 1984).

25 (*Lenin Bayragı*, 25 July 1987, Ponomarev 1987 [first appeared in *Izvestia* in July 30, 1987], *Lenin Bayragı*, 4 August 1987, *Lenin Bayragı*, 10 October 1987 [first appeared in *Pravda Vostoka* in October 8, 1987]).

26 (*Lenin Bayragı*, 4 August 1987, *Lenin Bayragı*, 6 August 1987, *Lenin Bayragı*, 8 August 1987, *Lenin Bayragı*, 11 August 1987). UzTAG is Uzbek branch of *TASS* (The Telegraph Agency of Soviet Union).

27 Rashidov was the first secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan between the years 1959 and 1983.

28 Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, 11 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol', quotation translated by the author.

References

Abdudzhemilev, E. (1958). "Avesliknen Okuilar". *Lenin Bayragı*. 21 December.

Abdulk"adyr, M. (1967). "Tilimizni Ogrenemiz". *Lenin Bayragı*. 14 December.

Abdullaev, Nuri (1965). "Studentlernin Dikkatyna". *Lenin Bayragı*. 15 June.

Al'chikov, Arsen (1965). "Nuri Dogrusyny Yazdy". *Lenin Bayragı*. 20 July.

Allworth, Edward (Eds.) (1988). *Tatars of the Crimea: Their Struggle for Survival.* London: Duke University Press.

Alyadin, Shamil' (1957). "Yazydzhylarymyz Uzbekistan Edebiiaty ve Sanaty Dekadasynda". *Lenin Bayragı*. 1 May.

Ametov, Ablyamit. (1957). "Akly Talaplar". *Lenin Bayragı*. 9 June.

Ametov, Ch. (1961). "Yurekte Olsa-Elde Olur". *Lenin Bayragı*. 5 January.

Ametov, Dzh. (1980). "Abdulla Dermendzhi". *Lenin Bayragı*. 15 April.

Ametov, Kyazım (1988). "Mektüpler, Mektüpler, Mektüpler." *Lenin Bayragı*. September 6, 4.

Aydıngün, Ayşegül and Erdoğan Yıldırım (2010). "Perception of Homeland among Crimean Tatars: Cases from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Crimea". *bilig-Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 54: 21-44.

Aydıngün, Ayşegül (2015). "On the Report Prepared by the Unofficial Turkish Delegation on the Situation of the Crimean Tatars Since the Annexation of

Crimea by the Russian Federation". Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe http://www.osce.org/odihr/188441 ?download=true (Accessed: 29.11.2016).

Bilyalov, I. (1987). "Men Siz Tutkan Yolny Ukyum Etem". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 27 January.

Burnash, Remzi (1967). "Gazetamyz, Sensin Menim Ana Tilim". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 18 November.

Chelebi, Dzhelal (1965). "Bu ne? Sebep mi? Manachyk"my?". *Lenin Bayrağı*. no. 113.

Eldar, R. (1957). "Krym Tatar Millii Estrada Ansambli". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 1 May.

Grigorenko, Petro G. (1983). *Memoirs*. London: Harvill Press.

Grigoryev, A. (1987). "Halk Menfaatlaryna Kim Hainlik Yapa?". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 13 October.

Iskanderov, Sh. (1986). "Halktan Ayırılgannın Yardımcıları". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 1 April.

Islyamov, Abselyam (1985). *Iyllar ve Ellar*. Tashkent: Gafur Gulam Adyna Edebiyat ve San'at Neshriyaty.

Ismailova, Urmus (1965). "Gazetany Epimiz Ok"umalymyz". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 8 July.

Kerimov, Ismail (1991). "Bizler Artyk Kene Eski "Yanı Dunya"mız". *Yanı Dunya*. 3 January.

Khaiirov, Izzet (1965). "Gazetany Epimiz Ok"umalymyz". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 8 July.

Kırımlı, Hakan (2010). *Kırım Tatarlarında Milli Kimlik ve Milli Hareketler (1905-1916).* Ankara: TTK Yay.

Muratov, Gani (1957). "Bir Kach Teklif". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 16 May.

Nagaev, Safter (1988). "Yaratydzhylyk" Elu". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 9 January.

Ponomarev, V. (1987). "Dalg"a Kopyuksiz Olmai". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 1 August.

Ramazanov, Nariman (1961). "Ok"uiydzhylarymyznyn" Istekleri". *Lenin Bayrağı*. 18 June.

Seidamet, Dzhemil (1981). *Abdulla Dermendzhi*. Tashkent: G"afur G"ulam Adyna Edebiyat ve San'at Neshriyaty.

Selim, Shakir (2008). *Kırımname II: Tamçılar*. Akmescit: Tarpan.

Shem'izade, Eshref (1977). *Khalk" Khyzmetinde.* Tashkent: G"afur G"ulam Adyna Edebiyat ve San'at Neshriyaty.

Uehling, Greta Lynn (2004). *Beyond Memory.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Üskül, Zafer et. Al. (2015). "Crimea Report: The Situation of the Crimean Tatars since the Annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation". https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292906164_The_Situation_of_the_Crimean_Tatars_since_the_Annexation_of_Crimea_by_the_Russian_Federation (Accessed: 29.11.2016).

Valiyev, R. (1984). "Khalk"tan Aiyrylg"an, ya da Iftiradzhy Kimge Khyzmet Ete Edi". *Lenin Bayragı*. 18 February.

Veliev, Ablaziz (1992). "Meraba, Vatan". *Yanı Dunya*. 1 January.

Velishaeva, Zekie (1967). "Omyurimiznin" Kuz'gyusi". *Lenin Bayragı*. 17 October.

Williams, Brian Glyn (1998). "The Crimean Tatar exile in Central Asia: A case study in group destruction and survival". *Central Asian Survey* 17 (2): 285-317.

"Vatang"a Raport: Plan Tolduryldy [Report to the Homeland: Plan succeeded]". *Lenin Bayragı*. 14 December 1958.

Lenin Bayragı. 30 September 1967.

Lenin Bayragı. 5 May 1984.

Lenin Bayragı. 25 July 1987.

Lenin Bayragı. 4 August 1987.

Lenin Bayragı. 4 August 1987.

Lenin Bayragı. 6 August 1987.

Lenin Bayragı. 8 August 1987.

Lenin Bayragı. 11 August 1987.

Lenin Bayragı. 10 October 1987

Lenin Bayragı. 29 December 1990

Yanı Dunya. 25 December 1991

Interviews

Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 15 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 15 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, 21 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar academics, 21 February 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 5 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist, 6 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, 11 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar journalist-writer, 11 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar activist, 23 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Interview with a Crimean Tatar poet, 27 March 2013, Akmescit/ Simferopol'.

Lenin Bayrağı: 'İki Ateş Arasında'*

Alter Kahraman**

Öz

Kırım Tatarları 1944'te Kırım'dan Sovyetler Birliği'nin çeşitli bölgelerine sürülmüş, 1956'ya kadar 'özel yerleşimler' rejimi altında yaşamaya zorlanmışlardır. Özel yerleşimlerin kaldırılmasını müteakip *Lenin Bayrağı* gibi bazı kültürel mahiyette kurumlar ihdas edilmiştir. Bu makale sürgündeki Kırım Tatarları için kendi dillerinde yegane yayın organı olan Lenin Bayrağı'nın önemini ve milli hareketle olan ilişkisini konu almaktadır. Belge araştırması ve mülakatlara dayanarak söylenebilir ki *Lenin Bayrağı* Kırım Tatarlarının dillerini korumalarına, geliştirmelerine ve şiddetli sansüre ragmen Kırım idealini canlı tutmalarına yardımcı olmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Lenin Bayrağı, Kırım Tatar, sürgün, hafıza, sansür.

* Geliş Tarihi: 26 Ekim 2016 – Kabul Tarihi: 05 Nisan 2017
Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz:
Kahraman, Alter (2019). "*Lenin Bayrağı*: 'between two fires'". *bilig – Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 88: 169-188.

** Araş. Gör., Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü – Karaman/Türkiye
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9995-6704
alter@metu.edu.tr

«Ленин Байрагы»: «Между двух огней»*

Альтер Кахраман**

Аннотация

Крымские татары в 1944 году были массово депортированы из Крыма в разные регионы СССР. Они были вынуждены жить в режиме специальных поселений до 1956 года. После отмены этого режима были созданы некоторые национальные культурные институты, такие, как газета «Ленин Байрагы». В этой статье рассматривается значение «Ленин Байрагы» для крымских татар в изгнании как уникального издания и его взаимоотношения с Национальным движением. Анализ документов и опросы показывают, как «Ленин Байрагы» помогала крымским татарам сохранять и развивать свой национальный язык и находить способы сохранить память о Крыме, несмотря на суровую цензуру.

Ключевые слова:

«Ленин Байрагы», крымские татары, депортация, память, цензура

* Поступило в редакцию: 26 октября 2016 г. – Принято в номер: 5 апреля 2017 г.
Ссылка на статью:
Kahraman, Alter (2019). "*Lenin Bayragı*: 'between two fires'". *bilig – Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 88: 169-188

** Ассистент, Университет имени Караманоглу Мехмет Бея, факультет экономики и управления, отделение политологии и международных отношений – Караман/Турция
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9995-6704
alter@metu.edu.tr