Dear Mrs. Moral,  

Thank you very much for your letter, and for the appreciation you so kindly express about my book. May I please refer to the points you mention:

1. On the appearance of the Turks of Turkey and of Central Asia, I am not quite clear what point you are making here. I am of course well aware that there are Turks in Turkey with the more Asiatic physical features you refer to, such as the persons you mention. The point I made in my book was of course a generalisation, i.e. that the majority of Turks in Turkey look much more "European" (or less "Asiatic") than the Turkish peoples of Central Asia. Is that not true? In spite of the immigration from the Soviet Union and China, surely the number of Turks with "Asiatic" features is still a small minority?

2. I take your point on the orthodox Muslim attitude to representational art, and maybe I expressed myself too crudely on this. The point I wanted to make clear was that (apart from statues of Ataturk) there are still extremely few statues in Turkey today, as compared to western countries, and I cannot help feeling that this must have something to do with the traditional Muslim attitude to the question.

3. "O" and "He" Unfortunately I have no Turkish newspapers or other texts here, but, with the greatest respect, I cannot help feeling that you are wrong on this.
The only thing I have here in Turkish is a novel by Yaşar Kemal, in which the pronoun "o", meaning "he", when it comes anywhere except at the beginning of a sentence, is always a small "o". It is also always small in the cases, such as "onun" or "ona" etc. On the other hand I have always read, in most Turkish newspapers, books, etc, about Atatürk, the capital "O", and also "O'num", "O'na". Of course at the beginning of a sentence it has to be a capital, but, unlike the English "I", it is usually the small "o" in the middle of sentences, unless referring to God or Atatürk (or others to whom reverence is due).

4. you are quite right in your interesting reference to what Byron wrote in his notes to Childe Harold, but I was not referring to Byron's views of the Turks, but the Turks' view of Byron. Over the years, especially when the Cyprus trouble flares up, or at other moments of anti-Greek feeling in Turkey, I have so often seen disparaging references to Byron's friendship for the Greeks, as symbolising the unfair favouritism of western Europe for the Greeks as against the Turks. I was not suggesting that Byron was in fact an "anti-Turkish villain", only that he tends to be accepted as such in Turkey.

5. I admit I had not realised the origin of the line about "Türküm ve düşmanım...", and thank you for letting me know this.

6. Life of the people. I quite agree about this. In many ways I too felt most at home among the peasants, who always seemed to me to be genuine and outspoken, and to have a real culture of their own.

7. Armenian question. I read a lot of things when I was writing the book, and in particular on the Armenian
question. To be frank, I cannot be quite sure whether I read the work you mention or not, as I have rather lost track of some of the books I read, which were borrowed either from libraries or from other people. I should say it is more than likely that I did, because on the Armenian question, where I had to be very careful what I wrote, and to at least try to be as objective as possible, I did read everything I could lay my hands on.

I notice that the observations of the Russian consul-general in Van and Erzerum concerned the 1893-7 events, not the 1915 events, with which I in my book was principally concerned.

**Female corpulence** Am I right in thinking that, though the tall slim type was the ideal in poetry and painting, female corpulence was often preferred by the less poetic members of the male sex in practice?

I am afraid these answers are rather inadequate, but I very much hope to have the opportunity of meeting you when my wife and I come to Istanbul at the end of this month for the opening of the Bosphorus bridge and the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Turkish Republic. If you permit it, I shall get in touch with you, and perhaps we could discuss some of the points further.
Thank you once again for your interesting letter, and for having taken the trouble to write.

Yours sincerely,

David Hotham.

P.S. On the Armenian question, you may have noticed that in the Turkish edition of my book this chapter has been very much altered from the original English.