

towards a complex reading of this highly diverse society. In the light of these publications, many of Zandi-Sayek's theses do not sound as unique. Her statement in chapter 1 that identities were created through a process of negotiation comes close to Marie-Carmen Smyrnelis's well-known "*jeux d'identités*", where Smyrnelis illustrated how the Smyrniots skilfully manoeuvred between different nationalities and allegiances (*Une société hors de soi: identités et relations sociales à Smyrne aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles*. Paris, 2005). The ability and limits of citizens claiming to strive for the public good within and without formalized institutions has been a constant theme in numerous articles by Vangelis Kechriotis (e.g. "Protecting the city's interest: the Greek Orthodox and the conflict between municipal and *Vilayet* authorities in İzmir (Smyrna) in the second constitutional period", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 24/2, 2009, 207–21). Likewise, Oliver Schmitt has described the 1842 Corpus Christi celebration (*Levantiner – Lebenswelten und Identitäten einer ethnokonfessionellen Gruppe im osmanischen Reich im "langen 19. Jahrhundert"*, Munich, 2005, 328–37) and Hervé Georgelin has commented on groups carrying their identity into the public space (*La fin de Smyrne. Du cosmopolitisme aux nationalismes*, Paris, 2005, 101–48). It is hard to understand why these authors are not mentioned in the main body of the book. It is possible to conclude that Sandi-Zayek intends to dominate the field of modern Smyrnology, assuming that English-language readers will not know the ample historiography on the subject as it is mostly in French. But let me hope that such a harsh view of the book is unfounded. Smyrnelis is after all mentioned in the acknowledgements and some other authors in the bibliography.

Moreover, that is not to say that this book has nothing new to offer. It follows already published arguments to a point, but either develops them in new directions or charts them on little-known terrain. It focuses on the *Tanzimat*, while most studies have concentrated on earlier or later periods. It takes urban space and the visual dimension seriously, not only in its analysis but also in its evidence, including, in the 200 pages of the main body, 61 photographs and drawings that are not merely illustrations, but tightly intertwined with the text, and 24 maps processed for the purpose of the book. Most importantly, Sandi-Zayek is besides Kechriotis the only researcher who takes the Ottoman state as a major actor in urban politics. Many others tend to see İzmir as a strictly self-made society, whereas she stresses the dialogical nature of identity creation, influenced by local society and the state. It is unfortunate that the book does not bring across the dialogical nature of research into late Ottoman Smyrniot society as well.

**Malte Fuhrmann**  
Orient-Institut Istanbul

M. ŞÜKRÜ HANIOĞLU:

*Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography.*

xvi, 273 pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011. £19.95. ISBN 978 0 691 15109 0.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000742

Teachers of Turkish history in particular will be very grateful for this concise and accessible study of one of the most enduring national leaders of the twentieth century. As the title suggests, the emphasis is upon the intellectual milieu within which Atatürk emerged and governed, and less on the actual events associated with his life.

It is a book that complements very well the much longer and denser biography of Atatürk written by Andrew Mango.

There are few if any other scholars who could have undertaken such a comprehensive intellectual biography of Atatürk. Drawing as he does on his former encyclopaedic works on late Ottoman intellectual trends (*The Young Turks in Opposition* and *Preparation for a Revolution*) Hanioglu surprises in his ability to make this complex history intelligible through the lens of one great leader. Reflecting his intimate familiarity with the many forces that contributed to the shaping of Atatürk's intellect, Hanioglu is able to qualify the intense admiration that Turks have for Atatürk by demonstrating that in fact he was not an original thinker, nor did he bring about a rupture with the past. Rather he was very much a product of his time, remarkably skilled at seizing on the opportunities that came his way and able to manipulate circumstances such that he succeeded at utilizing his Utopian view of the past to shape a vision for the future.

Hanioglu's approach to Atatürk is helpful and refreshing. On the one hand, he continues the tradition of relying heavily on Atatürk's speeches to interpret his understanding of the world and his intentions as leader of an emerging nation-state. On the other, Hanioglu dissects and analyses these with a thoroughness and critical acumen that allow us to understand just how Atatürk managed to emerge as the dominant figure in the new Turkey. Although Hanioglu does not hesitate to praise Atatürk's accomplishments, this contextualization of the implementation of his ideas manages to move the narrative beyond the hagiographic and unproductive images of Atatürk as the sole "great man" that have been so dominant.

Particularly valuable in this regard is Hanioglu's treatment of how Turkism and scientism contributed to Atatürk's vision for a "secular" nation-state. Hanioglu, of course, is more interested in the ideas behind Atatürk's reforms than in their implementation, but here we note evidence of hubris in how he approaches the topic. While he concentrates on a careful analysis of primary sources relating to Atatürk's ideas, he scarcely acknowledges the increasingly rich scholarship that has recently begun to explore the impact of these ideas on Turkish society. Rarely does he reference this, even in his notes; and yet it constitutes an important part of the story, and by choosing to ignore the work of other scholars Hanioglu contributes to the aura of infallibility surrounding Atatürk that he is implicitly challenging.

This neglect of the broader field is particularly notable in the fact that even as Hanioglu expertly dissects Atatürk's bold Turkish nationalism, there is silence with regard to its impact before and after the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Today, a wide range of scholars are exploring the complex and contested history of minorities that inevitably relates to Turkish nationalism. However, Hanioglu completely ignores the matter.

Two examples illustrate this well. In his treatment of the First World War, Hanioglu naturally concentrates on the Gallipoli campaign in 1915 before touching briefly on Atatürk's subsequent role in eastern Anatolia. However, the historiography of this period and the debate about whether or not the term "genocide" is appropriately applied to the devastation of Anatolia's Christian minorities are matters that biographers of Atatürk cannot ignore. So far Atatürk has remained largely absent from the debate, if only because he was not directly involved in the events of 1915. Nevertheless, he was a product of the same nationalism that led to the tragedy. Moreover, he himself was dispatched to south-eastern Anatolia in the early spring of 1916, where he cannot but have witnessed the outcome of what had taken place. Surely in the midst of his voluminous correspondence and writings there must be evidence of his reactions to and thoughts about the impact of this Turkish nationalism on the Christian population?

Similarly, there is the question of Atatürk's attitudes towards the Kurdish population of Anatolia. Hanioglu does a fine job exploring the many facets of Turkish nationalism, yet only occasionally do Kurds enter the narrative. Yet recent scholarship has left no doubt that the nationalism that came to be articulated during Atatürk's presidency had a tremendous impact on the lives of Kurds throughout Anatolia. It is an impact that is still in evidence today, even as Turkish nationalism takes on new dimensions in the changing context of new eras.

The point is that by not engaging the broader scholarship that today addresses the larger debates that define the field of modern Middle Eastern history, Hanioglu is avoiding issues that were ultimately critical to the emergence of the Turkish nation-state. Atatürk was an important figure not only in the shaping of the new state, but also in articulating and implementing Turkish nationalism. These are some of the most difficult issues in our field today, and we need scholars of Hanioglu's calibre to contribute to our understanding of how they came about. Unless studies of Atatürk – including intellectual biographies – help us to understand his own engagement with these critical trends and events, then scholars run the risk of reinforcing the sanitized version of the history of the emerging Turkish nation-state that has now lost legitimacy.

**Gavin D. Brockett**  
Wilfrid Laurier University

DIETRICH JUNG:

*Orientalists, Islamists and the Global Public Sphere: A Genealogy of the Modern Essentialist Image of Islam.*

(Comparative Islamic Series.) 323 pp. Sheffield and Oakville, CT:

Equinox, 2011. £19.99. ISBN 978 1 84553 900 9.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000766

Jung's book advances a sophisticated thesis to explain the genealogy of the essentialist image of Islam – a modern social imagination about Islam and Muslims. It observes similarities in the image of Islam found in the writings of Islamists and some Western scholars and asks, "Why do orientalist and Islamists similarly define Islam as an all-encompassing religious, political and social system?" (p. 7).

Underlying this image of Islam are certain assumptions: that Islam is a total way of life whose bedrock is a legalistic outlook; that it has a pure essence against which the observed forms can be checked for "aberrations"; and that this essence lies in Islam's origin. In the writings of the orientalists this Islam and the cultures shaped by it are sharply distinguished from the image of European cultures as dynamic, democratic and pluralistic, with religion being just one element of life. Though the essentialist image of Islam competes with what is called the constructivist image of Islam, social and political developments over several decades, the author tells us, have helped sustain its preponderance. Jung's aim is to challenge the predominance of the essentialist image by taking away its greatest appeal – its naturalness – by showing its contingency. Methodologically this is done by the genealogical analyses and application of the concept of "global public sphere" as an analytical device to understand the stage of the world society in which multiple modernities play out.

Jung situates the emergence of the modern essentialist image of Islam in the broader context of modernity. More specifically, he shows four overlapping and