

MEMORY, IDENTITY, HOME:
SELF-PERCEPTION OF IDENTITY
AMONG THE ARMENIAN AND JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN ANKARA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZGÜR BAL

IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

MAY 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç (METU, SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeđen (METU, SOC) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdođan (METU, ADM) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Özgür Bal

Signature:

ABSTRACT

MEMORY, IDENTITY, HOME: SELF-PERCEPTION OF IDENTITY AMONG THE ARMENIAN AND JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN ANKARA

Bal, Özgür
M.S., Department of Sociology
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç

May 2006, 381 pages

This thesis explores the identity perceptions of the Armenian and Jewish communities in the context of Ankara. Purpose of the study is to understand the ways the members of these communities experienced the social, spatial, political and cultural changes in the capital-city after the establishment of Turkish nation-state; and in what ways they draw on these experiences in terms of their identifications, self-understanding, and feelings of belonging.

For this purpose, life-story narratives of people who were born in the early Republican era and of the following generation were collected through oral history methodology. As a result of the analyses of these narratives, multiple, fluid, contextual, and contingent character of identity in terms of the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara is pointed, and it is concluded that community identity for the members of these communities was symbolically constructed.

Keywords: Identity, Ethnicity, Memory, Ankara, Armenian Community, Jewish Community

ÖZ

BELLEK, KİMLİK, VATAN: ANKARADA'KI ERMENİ VE YAHUDİ CEMAATLERİNİN KENDİ KİMLİK ALGILARI

Bal, Özgür
Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç

Mayıs 2006, 381 sayfa

Bu tez Ermeni ve Yahudi cemaatler arasındaki kimlik algısını Ankara bağlamında inceler. Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye ulus-devletinin kurulmasından sonra başkentte yaşanan sosyal, mekansal, siyasi ve kültürel değişimlerin bu cemaatlerin üyeleri tarafından nasıl deneyimlendiğini; ve bu deneyimlerin onların kimliklenme, kendini tanımlama ve aidiyet duygularını nasıl etkilediğini anlamaya çalışır.

Bu amaç doğrultusunda, sözlü tarih yöntemi kullanılarak erken Cumhuriyet döneminde doğan kişilerin ve onları takip eden kuşağın yaşam öyküsü anlatıları toplanmıştır. Bu anlatıların analizinin sonucunda, Ankara'daki Ermeni ve Yahudi cemaatlerinin çoklu, akışkan, bağlamsal, ve olumsal kimliklerine işaret edilmiş; ve bu cemaatler için topluluk kimliğinin sembolik olarak kurulduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kimlik, Etnisite, Bellek, Ankara, Ermeni Cemaati, Yahudi Cemaati

To My Family ...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç for her valuable guidance, supportive criticism, encouragement and insight throughout the research. I have benefited immensely from the great experience of working with her.

I am also greatly indebted to my examining committee members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen and Assist. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan, for their critical reading, enlightening suggestions and encouraging comments, which will, without doubt, contribute to my further academic work.

I am thankful to Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu and Dr. Mustafa Şen for their kind interest and support during the research.

I appreciate technical assistance of Şafak and emotional support of Özlem, Reyhan, Selda, Zeki and Feyaz. I am especially indebted to Zerrin Arslan for dedicating a considerable amount of time to read the thesis, critically advising on the final composition of it, and her unforgettable friendship.

I owe a special gratitude to each member of the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara who were integrated into this study. This thesis came out of a process, which was intensely full of emotional burdens. Focused themes were often quite sensitive ones both for me and for them. However, in this process I was never alone thanks to their embracing attitude and eagerness to help. The outcome, I believe, is of theirs as well as of mine. I am also greatly thankful to the dear priests of the French Catholic Church, who kindly accepted helping me know the Armenian community and arrange various contacts. I also appreciate kind interest of Beki L. Bahar who helped me arrange the preliminary contact with the Jewish community.

Any piece of academic work, I believe, is a result of a longer process than the actual research occupies. I feel indebted to my professors in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Marmara University and in the MA Program of Cultural Studies at Istanbul Bilgi University, who have greatly contributed to my intellectual development and training in this longer process. I am grateful to Ayhan Aktar, Ayhan Kaya, Büşra Ersanlı, Günay Göksu Özdoğan, Belkıs Kümbetoğlu, Aydın Uğur, Murat Belge, Ferhat Kentel and Arus Yumul.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the members of my dear family. My parents, Hüseyin Bal and Zeynep Bal, have always been a great source of support and confidence in my life, academy being not an exception to this. I am greatly thankful to my father for his helpful advices and criticisms in the process of this study, and to my mother for her belief in me and heartening motives she offered to me. Throughout the study, my dear husband, Ahmet Uzun, constantly supported me and became a source of joy and happiness for an exhausted soul. I am greatly thankful to him for his confidence in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE RESEARCH QUESTION	1
1.2 DEFINITIONS OF MINORITY, CITIZENSHIP AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN TURKEY	9
1.2.1 Definition of Minority and the Legal Status of Minorities	9
1.2.2 Citizenship and National Identity	11
1.2.2.1 Consequences of the ‘Undecidable’ Definition of Turkish Citizenship for Minorities	13
1.3 THE PLAN OF THE THESIS	17
2. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	19
2.1 IDENTITY	19
2.1.1 From Identity to Identities	21
2.1.2 Identity as an Analytical Tool and Alternative Analytical Concepts ...	33
2.1.2.1 Identification	35
2.1.2.2 Self-understanding	37
2.1.2.3 Commonality, Connectedness, Groupness	37
2.1.2.4 Belonging	41
2.2 THEORIES OF ETHNICITY	46

2.2.1 Primordialism	46
2.2.2 Circumstantialism/ Instrumentalism	47
2.2.3 The Constructionist Approach	49
2.2.3.1 Assignment and Assertion	49
2.2.3.2 Comprehensiveness of Ethnicity	50
2.2.3.3 Subjective and Objective Criteria of Ethnicity	51
2.2.3.4 The Boundaries	52
2.2.3.5 The Construction Sites	55
2.3 THEORY OF PRACTICE AND ‘HABITUS’	61
3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND THE RESEARCH PROCESS	70
3.1 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH	70
3.1.1 What is Oral History?	71
3.1.2 History of Oral History	72
3.1.3 Relation of Oral History to History, Memory, Narrative, and Identity	74
3.1.3.1 History	75
3.1.3.2 Memory	76
3.1.3.3 Narrative	77
3.1.3.3.1 Importance of the Structure of the Narrative	78
3.1.3.4 Identity	79
3.1.4 Weaknesses of Oral History and the Ways to Cope with the	
Weaknesses	83
3.1.5 Strengths of Oral History and Its Importance for the Current Study....	86
3.2 HOW THE RESEARCH IS CONDUCTED	91
3.2.1 Reaching the Interviewee	95
3.2.2 Circumstances of the Interviews	96
3.2.3 Organization of the Interviews	99
3.2.4 Interrelation between the Interviewer and the Interviewee	101
3.2.5 A reflection on the Written Form of the Narratives	106
4. AN OVERVIEW ON THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF ANKARA AND	

THE EXISTENCE OF THE NON-MUSLIM POPULATION IN THE CITY	107
4.1 ANKARA IN HISTORY	107
4.2 ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE CITY	109
4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE OF THE CITY	111
4.3.1 Armenian Community in Ankara	113
4.3.2 Greek Community in Ankara	115
4.3.3 Jewish Community in Ankara	115
4.4 SPATIAL ORGANIZATION AND THE NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE CITY	117
4.5 THE END OF THE COSMOPOLITAN STRUCTURE OF THE CITY .	118
4.5.1 1915 Deportation	119
4.5.2 1917 Fire	120
5. THE CITY: POSITIONING OF THE ARMENIAN AND JEWISH COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE CITY SPACE	122
5.1 MEMORIES OF THE OLD CITY	123
5.1.1 Loss of the old city in the fires	126
5.1.2 Separate Neighborhoods	130
5.1.2.1 Separate spaces-separate identities	131
5.1.2.2 The Mythical Neighborhood	135
5.2 SETTLEMENT IN THE NEW CITY	140
5.3 ANKARA: THE CAPITAL / ISTANBUL: THE REFERENCE	148
5.3.1 Ankara the Home	149
5.3.2 Ankara the Big City	152
5.3.3 Ankara the Capital	154
5.3.3.1 Becoming a Part of the Capital City through Recreational Spaces	160
6. THE STATE: IDENTITIES CONSTRUCTED THROUGH THE ENCOUNTERS WITH THE STATE POLICIES	172
6.1 MINORITY IDENTITY	173
6.1.1 Reflections on the Concept Minority	173

6.1.2 Experiences as a Minority	181
6.1.2.1 1915 Armenian Deportation	182
6.1.2.2 1923 Population Exchange	187
6.1.2.3 The Campaign of “Citizen, Speak Turkish!”	189
6.1.2.4 1942 Capital Levy	192
6.1.2.4.1 Capital Levy- The War Conditions- Reserved Forces	200
6.1.2.5 The September 6-7 Events of 1955	204
6.2 NATIONAL IDENTITY	208
6.2.1 The Migration Patterns of the Armenian Community and the Perception of ‘Homeland’	214
6.2.2 The Migration Patterns of the Jewish Community and the Perception of ‘Homeland’	219
6.3 CITIZENSHIP	222
6.3.1 Reflections on the Citizenship Position	222
6.3.2 Representation, Elections and Voting	226
6.3.3 Reflections on the European Union Integration Process	232
7. THE COMMUNITY: CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY IDENTITY IN EVERYDAY LIFE ON THE LINE BETWEEN SELF AND OTHER	239
7.1 OCCUPATIONAL LIFE	240
7.1.1 ‘Occupational habitus’	240
7.1.2 Identity Effects of the Occupational Concentration	249
7.1.3 Inter-Ethnic Relations in the Occupational Life	253
7.2 MARRIAGE RELATIONS	259
7.2.1 Marriage Patterns	259
7.2.2 Attitude towards Inter marriages	263
7.3 RELIGIOUS LIFE	269
7.3.1 The Jewish Community	269
7.3.2 The Armenian Community	273
7.3.2.1 The Church	273
7.3.2.2 Religious Feasts	278

7.3.2.3 Weddings and Funerals	281
7.4 DAILY EXPERIENCE	285
8. CONCLUSION	294
REFERENCES	309
APPENDICES	
A. THE GUIDELINE FOR THE INTERVIEWS	326
B. THE QUESTIONNAIRE	331
C. INTRODUCING THE NARRATORS	335
D. Table 4: Social Demographic Profile of the Armenian and Jewish Communities	339
E. Table 5: Data on the Birth Place and Birth Date of three Generation Armenian and Jewish People	340
F. THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN A.T; M.T; Ö.B. ON THE PHOTO ALBUM ...	341
G. THE WRITTEN PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH AND THE RESEARCHER	342
H. K.G.'s NARRATIVE	343
I. K.G's LETTER	344
J. TURKISH ORIGINALS OF THE QUOTATIONS	346

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 3.1: Generation dispersal according to educational level	94
Table 3.2: Generation dispersal according to community	94
Table 3.3: Gender dispersal according to community	94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE RESEARCH QUESTION

This study focuses on the social, spatial, political and cultural existence of the non-Muslim populations in Ankara with an objective of understanding the self-perception of identity among the Armenian and Jewish communities in the city. This objective was formulated with a special emphasis on ‘belonging’, which will be revealed in terms of spatial relations on the city level, relations with the operations and definitions of the state, and of communitarian relations. To meet this objective, I will be analyzing the life-story narratives recollected by the members of these communities, by referring to their identifications, self-understandings, and feelings of belongings.

The methodology utilized to collect life-stories was oral history. Finally, with sixteen narrators, who were defined in terms of ethnicity, age, living in Ankara, and the length of their dwelling in Ankara, oral history interviews were undertaken. Accordingly, the narrators were first generation -born between 1910 and 1940- and second generation -born between 1941 and 1970- Armenian and Jewish persons who have been living in Ankara at least from their early childhood onward. Additionally, a questionnaire composed of open-ended questions was applied to seven people who were defined according to the criteria mentioned above, occupation being an additional one. Accordingly, the respondents of the questionnaire were Armenian people of second generation who were all jewelers, and who have been living in Ankara since their birth.

The methodology of this study relies on the assumption that every single life-story is a powerful tool to see how people make sense of their past and how it becomes part

of the present; how individual experiences and the broader social context are connected; and how memory is used to interpret individual lives and to reveal various identifications (Bornat, 1999). Oral history as a methodology is crucial for the purposes of this study, because it provides participants with voices, each having a particular way of speaking that includes the content of what is said as well as how it is said. Particular ways of speaking, on the other hand, are assumed in this study, to be defined by “differential positionings” of the narrators from which belongings are imagined and narrated (Yuval-Davis, 2001). In this framework, affects of various positionings such as gender, class, stage in the life cycle, level of education, social network is aimed to be understood by reference to Bourdieu’s (1992) conceptualization of capitals: namely the social, cultural, economic, political and symbolic capitals.

Although main purpose of this study is not a reconstruction of history, it appeared as a side product of the process. In this case, however, history was what people who lived it made of it. One point to note here is that each narrative was greatly rich and unique in its value so much so that in order to provide for the voices of the ‘practical analysts’ (Bourdieu, 1992) and to let them speak for themselves, I quoted narratives and responses¹ as much and as detailed as possible, which inescapably brought forth the length of the thesis.

Drawing on the merits of oral history, the main theoretical intention of this study is to reveal the multiple, fluid, contextual, and contingent character of identity. What I try is to look at the local for the lived experience of the multiple identities and search for the moments where they appear through “enunciative strategies”, through “different subject-positions” and through “articulation” (Hall, 1993). Such trial is important to prevent any kind of “epistemic violence” (Spivak quoted in Hall, 1992b) in defining a population, which is already ‘hailed’ and ‘ascribed’ an identity, the minority identity, often indicating not only a legal-political status, but also a social status (Yumul, 2006: 106).

¹ Throughout the thesis, I will be using ‘narrative’ and ‘narrator’ in order to point that quotation was collected through oral history interview; and I will be using ‘response’ and ‘respondent’ in order to point that quotation was collected through the questionnaire.

The historical, social, and spatial context of this study is particularly important in terms of realizing such theoretical intention. The historical context focuses principally on the early Republican era in Turkey with its lingering affects on the present affiliations and perceptions. Moreover, within a larger context, this study will try to point to the memories transmitted from earlier generations in an attempt to have an idea on the conditions of these populations in the late Ottoman era; and to point to the very recent developments in the political scene of the country, in an attempt to comprehend present identifications and belongings. Oran (2005a) specifies two revolutionary processes in Turkey, one in the establishment of the republican nation-state in 1923, the other in the course of the European Union. Each of these socio-political processes is, obviously, at the same time a process of identification for both the majority and minority communities in Turkey. It is so, since the systems of meaning and cultural representation (Hall, 1992a), which are crucial for any process of identity construction, were affected enormously by each of these processes. This is the reason why this study is not limited to the past historical context, but also includes the present, in order to understand the current processes of identification, changes of consciousness, and changes of self-recognition for the minorities in Turkey.

The social context of this study focuses on the minorities. 'Minority', here, is understood within the legal-political framework specified in Turkey, excluding the broader sociological definitions. As we know, the three traditionally largest non-Muslim *millet*s of the Ottoman Empire, were defined to be the 'minority' groups by the newly establishing Turkish nation-state. These, namely Armenian, Jewish and Greek communities, composed also the traditional non-Muslim population living in Ankara. Therefore, this study will also be excluding the other non-Muslim groups currently living in Ankara, namely the Assyrian and Keldani groups. Still given that the Greek population is no longer a part of the city since the 1923 Exchange of Populations, the research group of the current study will actually be limited to the Armenian and the Jewish communities in Ankara.

The personal motive behind the study was twofold. One stemmed from an outsider's, the now-cliché, perception of Ankara as a joyless, routine, 'grey city',² an exception to which was, for me then, provided by the social and spatial image of the Ulus district with its relative mess, narrow roads and historical buildings. Ulus was likely to appear as a sign of another history in this city and that history was a matter of curiosity for me. The second curiosity, making up the personal motive behind this study, which was about a probable non-Muslim population in the city, was led by a visit to Kocatepe Mosque that, with its entire splendor, stood at the center of the city as if it was claiming exclusionary hegemony over it. Was it really so? Were there no worship places of other religions? I was looking for the non-Muslim 'citizens' of the city. These two dimensions of the personal motive came up to be related strongly in that Ulus, as the main settlement place of the city until the republican period, was where the non-Muslim population of the city, which amounted to one third of the total population in the 19th century, lived.

There are various important studies on Ankara focusing on both the pre-Republican and the Republican periods, which elaborate on the historical, social, cultural and economic characteristics as well as on the demographic and spatial organization of the city. However, there is no study focusing specifically on the non-Muslim population of the city, although it is crucial not only for understanding the sociological structure of this population but also for understanding Ankara's social structure more comprehensively. Şenol-Cantek, for example, in her study on Ankara, which focused on the process of its becoming the capital city, stated that interviewing the members of the non-Muslim population of Ankara was not possible

² As I have continued with the study, I learnt interestingly that such perception or the need to negate such perception was the cause of other studies on Ankara, too. Etöz, for example, states in the preface of her valuable Ph.D. dissertation that studying the history of a city where she came with the feeling that it was "a huge public office and its streets were the corridors of this office" might follow from a trial to love something that is not being loved (1998: ii). Aydın, Emiroğlu, Türkoğlu and Özsoy, moreover, state the main reason for their greatly detailed and crucial study on Ankara, to be the unjust, reductionist and de-historicizing representations of it either as "a city created from absence by the Republican regime" or a "grey city which stands for the state and formality" (2005: 15). Similarly, Şenol-Cantek states the main reason for her important study, which focuses on Ankara in the process of becoming the capital city for the newly established nation-state, as to create an alternative to the official historiography on Ankara, in addition to her personal indebtedness to the city where she grew up (2003: 9).

and thus there was not the ground for cross-checking the findings that the narratives of the Muslim interviewees had revealed (2003: 311). The need for compensating such lack provided the academic motive behind the current study -even if it can only be a partial compensation.

However, it was a recurrent implication throughout the research process that Ankara was not much the ‘convenient’ place for studying ‘minority’ groups, since their population was actually very small.³ Being aware of the difficulties caused by the small number of population -it led some shortcomings especially in case of the Jewish community- I still propose that studying ‘minorities’ in the spatial-historical context of Ankara is an important attempt, especially within the framework of its capital city status. In relation to this status, it is often asserted that Ankara was projected to be both a symbol and a model for the Turkish Republican nation-state (Tekeli, 1994; Tankut, 1988; Şenol-Cantek, 2003). Tankut, accordingly, states that Ankara was the model platform created for the realization of the principles of Kemalism, emphasizing the special focus given to Nationalism (1988: 94). It is also apparent that Ankara was part of a new ‘identity construction’ in the republican construction era, in which together with the new state and the new capital city, the ‘invention’ of a new citizen had been projected by the state elites, and the ‘laboratory’ for this invention was planned to be the capital city (Tankut, 1988: 93). It was so much that the “first Turk” and the “first Ankaralı”⁴ was projected to be the one and same people by the new regime. A good example of this projection is provided in the quotation below:

³ Although it was not possible to reach an exact number indicating the amount of Armenian population in Ankara, from various comments the narrators made, and from the data provided by the priests of the French Catholic Church, I estimate the number, including both Catholic and Gregorian Armenians, to be around four hundred to five hundred. This estimation seems to be in line with Kevork Hanci’s (1995) point that in 1995 the amount of Catholic Armenians was three hundred. The Jewish group, on the other hand, was stated to be composed of ten to fifteen families, total number of which not exceeding forty or forty-five people.

⁴ To point people who were born in Ankara, I will be using the Turkish word “Ankaralı” during the study, rather than translating it as ‘people from Ankara’.

Ankara that is being constructed step by step will produce its people one day. ... First Turk that Turkey will bring up and first Ankaralı that Ankara will bring up, would emerge on the same day perhaps. ... This individual who lives in a civilized city of a civilized nation that is a member of the civilized community ... will be called Ankaralı (Burhan Asaf, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 1929 quoted in Aydın et. al., 2005: 407)⁵.

Accordingly, Ankara was burdened by the missions of achieving a daily life, whereby modernization and westernization aims of the Republic were actualized in practice; and it was projected to be the source of the homogeneous population that would help to construct the nation as an ‘imagined community’ (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 42). In this framework, it becomes important to understand how the minorities, who were defined at the margin, if not outside, of the newly ‘imagined nation’, have experienced this tripartite construction of the state, city-space, and citizen respectively. In relation to the spatial context, thus, this study asks, basically, the following questions: How the members of the Armenian and Jewish communities were positioned -socially, economically, and spatially- in relation to the ‘opportunities’ that the ‘new city’ had provided? What was the role of the ‘old city’/Ulus in terms of their identifications and feelings of belongings? How did they perceive and practice life in the capital city? These questions serve for one of the main theoretical assumptions of this study that is to understand the specificities of living in the capital city in terms of its conditioning the ‘minority identity’.

Turning back to the theoretical intention of the study as formulated above, it should be clear that ‘identity’ whose character is aimed at being revealed as multiple, fluid, contextual, and contingent is, in this context, the ‘minority identity’. Minority, in Turkey, refers to a legally defined category, thus, to an ascribed identity. Just as we know that all “categorization is intimately bound up with power relations” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 181), we know that majority versus minority definitions are also inescapably determined by power relations. Cornell and Hartmann argue that:

Some groups have the power to draw the boundary lines where they wish, and thus to successfully classify both themselves and others within the dominant system. Others lack that power and find themselves either struggling against dominant classifications or adjusting to them. Either way, the classificatory system and the identities it proposes become part of the world with which they have to deal, and at times part of their own conceptual schemes (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 182).

⁵ Translation from Turkish sources is mine throughout the thesis, unless stated otherwise.

This quotation provides for one of the targets this study aims at reaching. The fact that a boundary was drawn between ‘minority’ and ‘majority’ in legal-official terms, through delimitation of each group respectively, provides for a classificatory system; and I will be looking at if, to what extent and in what ways the members of the Armenian and Jewish communities, which are proposed ‘minority’ identity by this system, made it a part of their own conceptual schemes. Moreover, I will be looking at the ways this ascription conditioned their experiences in the encounters with the state; their relation with Turkish national identity and citizenship status; and their projections in reference to the European Union integration process, especially when its influence on the re-definition of identities is thought in relation to Oran’s (2005a) argument referred above.

This purpose of understanding how the ascribed identities are embodied, transformed and asserted by their addressees, draws on the theoretical assumption that in construction of identities, different actors, factors and socio-historical processes have roles; and, equally, on the challenge of another theoretical assumption that poses for the uniqueness, homogeneity and fixity of ‘communities’. Re-presentation of minority groups in Turkey, in the dominant media and in the official discourse, is usually in line with this latter assumption of uniqueness, homogeneity and fixity. It is especially important to note that such assumption has its role whether minority communities are represented as ‘threatening others’ for the larger society or as ‘enriching mosaics’ for the culture of the larger society. Yumul (2006), for example, points that in the process of re-discovery of non-Muslims in Turkey, which had coincided with the process of transformation of the city culture of Istanbul as a result of rural-urban migration, non-Muslims were represented as urban, civilized, westernized and cosmopolitan ‘subjects’ of the city. In this process, “non-Muslims were constructed as valuable and esoteric objects that should be protected and secluded” (Yumul, 2006: 116). Yumul explains this process with reference to the concepts ‘patina’, ‘boutique multiculturalism’, and ‘promotion of communities’,⁶ the main point of which could be understood in reference to the fixing, essentializing and commodifying view of ‘ethnic cultures’. This view follows the ‘cosmetic’ and

⁶ For a detailed analysis of these concepts, which are borrowed from Mc Cracken (1998), Fish (1997), Pierrot respectively see Yumul (2006).

‘superficial’ relation established with the ‘other’, which denies the possibility of accepting the ‘other’ as a part of the larger society, and which denies the divergent experiences of the various groups and individuals included.

This study draws on the idea that ethnicity is an ‘embodied knowledge’ (Bottomley, 1995), rather than seeing ‘ethnic identities’ as unique outcomes of ‘cultural difference’. Accordingly, ‘community’ is not approached as a ‘morphology’ (Cohen, 2000), but is understood in terms of the meanings attributed to it by its ‘members’, and their experiences of it. In this line, the primary focus of this study is not to specify the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara in some ‘communitarian identities’ and ‘cultural aspects’; but to see in what objective conditions the perceptions and experiences of the members of these communities are shaped; and how these objective conditions, in turn, were shaped by their very practices. In order to grasp this dialectical process, I will be utilizing the concept ‘habitus’, which is defined “as a matrix of the agents’ perceptions, appreciations and actions when confronting a conjuncture or an event produced by history which it has helped to produce” (Liénard and Servais, 2000: 88). Habitus, in this study, is taken as more an analytical tool, rather than an end-point to be revealed. In accord with the understanding of ethnicity as an embodiment of knowledge, a reflection of ‘practical sense’, the assumption in this study follows the argument that “it is the commonality of experience and of the preconscious habitus it generates that gives members of an ethnic cohort their sense of being both familiar and familial to each other” (Bentley, 1987: 32). Drawing upon this argument, therefore, I will be laying the factors, which led to the ‘commonality of experience’ for the researched group in three broad categories: having lived in Ankara the capital-city; being defined externally as minority; and being defined, both externally and internally, as the Armenian and Jewish ethnic communities.

I have already specified the questions I will be asking in relation to the former two categories. In relation to the third category, moreover, I will be asking about the meaning of community identity for the members of the two respective communities and to what extent their practices have been defined by this identity; about the ways

in-group and out-group relations have been established and the meaning attributed to these relations.

The questions formulated in this study aim at reaching conclusions, which will reveal the contingency, contextuality and internal heterogeneity of community identities. Understanding minority experience and perception in such context, I believe, also provides a valuable ground contributing to the reconstruction, transformation and redefinition of official definitions. At this point, therefore, there emerges a need to reflect, briefly, on the definitions of ‘minority identity’, ‘national identity’ and ‘citizenship’ in the context of Turkey.

1.2. DEFINITIONS OF MINORITY, CITIZENSHIP AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN TURKEY

1.2.1. Definition of Minority and the Legal Status of Minorities

The concept minority, both in its definition and the framework of rights it points to, is a highly broad and debatable issue, and an elaboration of the vast literature on it extends far beyond the current study. However, there is, still, a need for a brief discussion, in order to clarify what is understood by ‘minority’ in this study and within which framework it will be referred to. Although regulations about protection of minorities is an older one, which, starting from the post-Westphalia period, proceeded in great terms till the WWI (Okutan, 2004: 67), the main developments in terms of universal human rights were introduced in post WWII period (Çavuşoğlu, 1998: 13-14). The historical process of debates on the issue points two conceptualizations of minorities. One defines minorities in a narrower framework which is conceptualized mostly in legal terms (Oran, 2005a). Although various criteria might be enumerated to define minorities legally, the basic framework of the widely referred usage is claimed to be delimited by the UN reporter Capoport’s definition in 1978 (Çavuşoğlu, 1998; Okutan, 2004; Oran, 2005a). According to this definition ‘minority’ refers to a group which has relatively a small population compared to the total population in the country; which is not dominant; which is the

citizen of that country; whose members have different ethnic, religious, linguistic⁷ differences than the rest of the population and show a feeling of solidarity/intent - even if an implicit one- to keep their culture, tradition, religion or language (Çavuşoğlu, 1998: 26; Okutan, 2004: 62; Oran, 2005a: 26). In this definition, while the former four characteristics are stated to be the ‘objective conditions’ of minority identity, the last one is understood to be the ‘subjective condition’ (Oran, 2005a). Secondly, the concept has recently been understood not only in reference to the ethnic, religious, cultural communities, but also in a broader framework which refers to the disabled, the women, the homosexuals, the guest workers, the addicted, the homeless etc. (Üstel, 1999: 37). According to this sociological definition, if someone perceives herself to be disadvantaged in the face of the majority in terms of political, social, civic, cultural, economic rights, and thus feels herself belong to a group for this reason, that group could be counted as ‘minority’ sociologically (Kaya and Tahranlı, 2006: 11-12)

In Turkey, the only groups that have legally acquired the status of minority are the largest non-Muslim groups of the Ottoman *millet* system, namely the Armenians, the Greeks and the Jews. These three groups were defined to be “religious minorities” in the 1923 Lausanne Treaty and were, accordingly, granted rights under the protection of international law (Toktaş, 2005; Oran, 2005a). These rights were specified in the Articles 37-45 of the Treaty (Kurban, 2004: 40; Toktaş, 2005a: 398)⁸.

It is obvious that the legal regimes regulating the minority rights have greatly extended and deepened due to innumerable conventions, protocols and decisions including the Conventions of ECSC and EOCS, to various UN Conventions, and to

⁷ It has been argued that besides ethnic, religious, linguistic definitions of minority groups, there is also a concept of ‘national minority’ which was mostly introduced in the post-WWII era, but whose definition is an uncertain one (Okutan, 2004; Oran, 2005a). Without going into details of this uncertainty, I will state that Turkey uses this term in reference to “the groups whose status are defined in the international documents” pointing to the Treaty of Lausanne (Oran, 2005a: 40).

⁸ Kurban (2005) and Oran (2005a) points clearly that these three groups were not the only groups who were given rights in the Lausanne Treaty. The treaty names, on the contrary, four groups who were endowed with differing degrees of rights: Non-Muslim citizens of Turkish Republic; citizens of Turkish Republic speaking a language other than Turkish; all citizens of Turkish Republic; and everyone who inhabits in Turkey (Oran, 2005a: 69).

the recently Copenhagen Criteria (Kurban, 2005; Oran, 2005a; Çavuşoğlu, 1998). It is also apparent, however, that the current regulations in Turkey are mostly limited with the Lausanne Treaty; and, more, these are even not applied fully (Oran, 2005a: 63-71). Still, additionally, there are some recent changes in the legislation which are undertaken as a part of the EU integration process.

In terms of the current study, however, more important than the legal developments and the legal definition of minority status, is the meaning attributed to the way it is defined. This attribution, seemingly, is a bilateral one, at least in terms of its direct participants, on the one side there is the state, and, on the other, the minorities themselves. Since I will be dealing with the latter in the sixth chapter in detail, here I will try to refer to the former. It should be apparent that what I mean by the meaning attributed to the definition of minority [by the state] is its relation to the broader definitions of ‘citizenship’ and ‘national identity’.

1.2.2. Citizenship and National Identity

The conceptual relation between definition of minority, citizenship and state, is an apparent one. Indeed, the concept ‘minority’ has been differentiated in direct relation to the meaning attributed to citizenship (Üstel, 1999) and ‘citizenship’ connoted membership to a state.⁹ This was especially so in the context of the nation-state “as an ideal typical model of membership” (Brubaker, 1990: 380). In this ‘ideal typical model’, Brubaker argues, membership of the nation-state takes six forms, which are namely egalitarian, sacred, national, democratic, unique and socially consequential (1990). However, it is also pointed by Brubaker himself that “diverging definitions of the citizenry embody and express distinctive understandings of nationhood”

⁹ We are long familiar with the debates on the erosion of the national borders and the shrinking importance of the nation states as the ultimate ground of political communities. This has undoubtedly vital consequences on the scope and content of citizenship. Debates on new modalities of citizenship have recently boosted. In Turkey, also, there are important elaborations on the issue and the current understanding of Turkish citizenship is argued to be challenged in the “denational order of things” due factors including “the ethno-political resistance of Kurds, and Turkey’s declared aim to be a member of the European Union” (Yeğen, 2004: 53); “increasing international migration since 1960, and the new increasing vocal and powerful religious, ethnic and sectarian movements especially since 1980s, namely the Kurdish, Islamic and Alevi movements” (İçduygu et.al., 1999: 197).

(1990: 379). Therefore, it is important to understand how citizenship in Turkey was conceptualized and what meanings it connoted in terms of nationhood.

İçduygu, Çolak and Soyarik have argued that citizenship in Turkey “was officially taken to be one of the key elements of successful nation-building” and the state had been the main determinant and actor in the development of citizenship (1999: 187). Turkish state in this role has been characterized to be highly central and unitary with a deep Republican tradition (Toktaş, 2005a); and ‘monist’ in terms of its definition of nation (Oran, 2005a). Not independent from such an organization of the state, Turkish citizenship is usually understood to be pointing to a passive subject position, a republican/communitarian political spirit, and one that is definitive not only in the public sphere but also in the private sphere. Yeğen argues that there is a consensus on these aspects of Turkish citizenship in the recent studies on it (2004: 53-54). There is, however, one other dimension of citizenship -which is crucial to understand the constitution of national identity- on which such consensus could not be safely pointed: the ethnic content of Turkish citizenship. This last dimension of citizenship refers to a differentiation made between two historical models of citizenship as they were clarified by Brubaker (1990), the French and the German models. Within this framework the point is whether ‘Turkishness designed by Turkish citizenship’ is defined in territorial-political terms, as in the former model, or in ethnic terms, as in the latter one. As Yeğen points one position in the existing literature on the issue, suggests “that Turkish citizenship, especially at the time of its original constitution, signifies a political–territorial definition of Turkishness instead of an ethnic one”, pointing to an expansionist and inclusive Turkish citizenship; while other position “have acknowledged the traces of both a political and an ethnicist logic in the very definition of Turkishness”, pointing to the exclusivist and differentialist aspects of Turkish citizenship (2004: 54-55, 64). Still, however, the belief that the ethnicist content of Turkish citizenship -even when it is recognized- is an “accidental” situation, following from “a deviation from the theory” is a pervading one in the current literature (Yeğen, 2004). Here, the argument usually follows that “against such a formal definition of citizenship and national identity that emphasizes territoriality rather than ethnicity, actual state practice has been very different”

(Kirişçi, 2000: 1). Thus, ‘ethnic’ character of Turkish citizenship becomes a matter of ‘practice’. However, Yeğen strongly argues, through a ‘close reading of the constitutional texts’-especially of the 1924 Constitution- that the “oscillation of Turkish citizenship between a political and ethnic idea of citizenship”, marking an “undecidability”, is not only a matter of practice but also, and, indeed, “primarily a matter of the very texts constituting Turkish citizenship” (2004: 55). He points the “different degrees of Turkishness” apparent in the “inconsistent terminology” used in these texts, namely ‘being a subject of the Turkish Republic/being a Turkish citizen’, ‘being a Turkish subject’, ‘being Turkish/being of Turkish race’ (2004: 56). What is crucial, further, is Yeğen’s claim that “the undecidability in the definition of Turkishness has become a textual spirit in all Turkish Constitutions and that the Constitutions of 1961 and 1982 are ostensibly haunted by the same” which is evident in their selective usage of the terms ‘everyone’, ‘every Turk’, ‘citizens’, ‘subjects of the Turkish State’, ‘Turkish citizens’ (2004: 62).

Turning to our starting point, we can argue that, what all these discussions indicated in terms of the relation between ‘citizenship’ and ‘national identity’ is that Turkish “citizenship [was] not the unique qualifier for Turkishness” (Yeğen, 2004: 56) and this had important consequences in terms of minorities.

1.2.2.1. Consequences of the ‘Undecidable’ Definition of Turkish Citizenship for Minorities

The above argument refers that there are certainly other qualifiers of Turkishness which is apparently something more than the citizenship has implied. In the current literature on the issue an important other qualifier is pointed to be the factor of ‘religious affiliation’. It is usually pointed, thus, that Muslimhood plays an important role in the definition of Turkishness. It is even so much so that the “differences of religion were used to promote nationalistic goals’ (Karpat, 1959) and ‘the older idea that Muslim equals Turk and non-Muslim equals non-Turk persisted’ (Lewis, 1968)” (Karpat and Lewis quoted in Yumul, 1992: 70). Such persistence is viewed usually as a consequence of the heritage of Ottoman *millet* system (Yumul, 1992) in that

“non-Muslim groups [we]re regarded as Turkish citizens as a continuation of their community status in the Ottoman Empire” (İçduygu et.al., 1999: 195). It is, further, argued that “not ethnicity but the legacy of the millet system and ethno-religious identities shaped Turkey’s citizenship policies in the interwar period” (Çağatay, 2003: 601); and “*millet* system has still (implied) affects in the current understanding of Turkish citizenship” (İçduygu et.al, 1999: 196).

Thus, Muslimhood appears to be one qualifier of Turkishness. This is clearly expressed in the words of Lewis indicating that “in the Republic of Turkey a non-Muslim ‘may be called a Turkish citizen, but never A Turk’ (quoted in Yumul, 1992: 74-75); and in the words of Yeğen indicating that “Muslimhood was considered by the Turkish authorities to be the key to achieving Turkishness; [while] non-Muslimhood was seen as ‘the natural’ obstacle to achieving Turkishness” (2004: 58). Consequence of such overlap between Muslimhood and Turkishness was clearly pointed by Aktar in his argument that:

In the early republican years, the Turkification policies¹⁰ carried out by the one-party government, could be ‘inclusive’ for the non-Turk but Muslim groups living in the country; while appeared to have ‘discriminative/ contra-minority’¹¹ characteristics in terms of the non-Muslim minorities (2004: 102).

However, there is still one point to be made on the role of ‘Muslimhood as a qualifier of Turkishness other than citizenship’. This is the argument that such role does not indicate a ‘categorical closure’ (Yeğen, 2004a). It is to state that “Turkishness is neither categorically open to the Muslims, nor categorically closed to the non-

¹⁰ The now widely used term “Turkification policies” was first used by Deringil in a newspaper article in 1996 (Bali, 1999: 26) and was clarified by Aktar to indicate the purpose of “Turkish ethnic identity” to achieve “uncompromising predominance and hegemony at all levels and in all dimensions of social life from the language spoken at the street to the history would be thought at the school; from trade to state personnel regime; from private law to the settlement of the citizens into specific regions” (2004: 101).

¹¹ Aktar argues, however, that counter-minority policies cannot be defined as being against an ethnic or a religious group; he states, on the contrary, that we observe discriminative treatments of exceptionally every social group which cannot be Turkified because of structural reasons (Aktar, 2004: 102). For a detailed argument of why the early republican policies could not be viewed as racist policies see Aktar (2004).

Muslims”; and that “the supra-principle deciding the inclusion to Turkishness is the loyalty to the state” (Yeğen, 2004: 174-175).¹²

It is now time to discuss what consequences such conceptualization of Turkishness and Turkish citizenship brought forth in terms of minorities. It is, however, not possible here to give any kind of a detailed chronology or elaboration of policies and their results. I will refer only to some in order to supply a general perspective.

İçduygu and Kaygusuz argue that there were two important consequences of early ‘national enclosure’ of Turkish citizenship:

First, the former Ottoman citizens of non-Muslim origin, namely the Greeks, Armenians and Jews were definitely excluded from the future ‘community inside’. Secondly, the Ottoman-Muslim majority, which was composed of various ethnic and religious communities – Turks, Kurds, Circassians, Lazes, Arabs and some other smaller sects, were portrayed as a single organic cultural unit, which would be the principal social basis of the new political organization (2004: 36).

The above quotation provides us with a framework to point the traces of the citizenship practices in the early republican Turkey. First, non-Muslim groups were seen as outsiders (İçduygu et.al., 1999); second, this exclusion of non-Muslims from the future political community and from proper membership rested on an emerging concept of ‘national security’ which is still a part of the present day ‘politics of citizenship’ in Turkey (İçduygu and Kaygusuz, 2004); third, since the dominant ideology of the time was national interest supplemented by unity and collective purpose, the special rights granted in the Treaty of Lausanne gave rise to enmity against minorities in the eyes of the public,¹³ and non-Muslims were expected to willingly opt out of the articles on minorities in Lausanne (Toktaş, 2005a);¹⁴ and the

¹² Yeğen’s argument follows from an analysis of the ‘uneasy’ relation to the state of the Kurds as a Muslim society, on the one hand, and the Jews as a non-Muslim group, on the other. For the details of the argument see Yeğen (2004a).

¹³ For instance, between 1923 and 1927, non-Muslims were discharged from their positions in state offices and state owned companies (Levi, 1998: 37).

¹⁴ In 1925, all the three minorities opted out in the Art.42 of the Treaty which granted them the “privilege of maintaining their own law on family and inheritance matters” (Yumul, 1992: 70). Karpas states that this renouncement of privilege was in view of the forthcoming introduction of the Civil Code (quoted in Yumul, 1992); and Aktar points that this act of ‘opting out’ was not that a ‘willingly’

Law enacted in 1926 specified Turkishness, instead of Turkish citizenship, as a requirement for becoming a state employee (Yeğen, 2004: 56).¹⁵ These policies and conceptions were named to be “differentialist practices of citizenship” (Yeğen, 2004) or, as it appeared above, “Turkification policies” (Aktar, 2004) and the 1923 population exchange, 1942 Capital Levy,¹⁶ were also, undoubtedly, included in these.

The above quotation, moreover, lays also another set of traces, which we can follow, in the second consequence. According to this citizenship norms safeguard republican principles that prioritize social cohesion over individualistic aspirations and universal rights over group rights and, thus, a conception of uniform society despite religious, ethnic and cultural diversities and differences in the society emerges (Toktaş, 2005a); within this framework, citizenship refers more to equal rights and responsibilities like paying taxes, performing military service and voting, entitled as positive freedoms in republicanism (Toktaş, 2005a); and it points as a result to a duty-based–passive identity (İçduygu and Kaygusuz, 2004).

We can conclude, in this regard, that since citizenship in Turkey has been in the early years of the newly establishing state, a “universal citizenship that appeals to equality with universal rights and responsibilities” rather than a “differentiated citizenship that appeals to difference in the context of distinctive identities and needs of ethno-cultural minorities in multi-ethnic societies” (Kymlicka and Norman, 2000 quoted in Toktaş, 2005a: 394-395) we can expect a tension in the perception and practice of Turkish citizenship by the minorities. One of the purposes of this study will be tracing such tension in the narratives of minorities themselves.

act (Aktar, 1996b: 328-329). Aktar also argues that due to ‘opting out’ “the last remnants of Ottomans have disappeared; non-Muslim citizens were Turkified ‘legally’ being stripped off all the privileges of being a member of a religious and ethnic community which were defined under protection of international laws” (Aktar, 1996b: 329).

¹⁵ Yeğen, referring Aktar (1996b), states that this law, specifying the ethnic Turkishness as a precondition for becoming a state employee, was in use until 1965; while Article 657, which is currently in use, specifies Turkish citizenship instead of Turkishness as a precondition for becoming a state employee (2004: 56).

¹⁶ I will be referring to these enactments and also to others including ‘Citizen, speak Turkish!’ campaign and the September 6-7 Events of 1955 in the sixth chapter.

1.3. THE PLAN OF THE THESIS

This study is designed as eight chapters. In the second chapter, the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study will be elaborated. In this respect, firstly, main approaches to identity will be outlined. Then, drawbacks of applying identity as an analytical tool in social sciences will be discussed; and other concepts, namely ‘identification’, ‘self-understanding’, ‘commonality, connectedness, groupness’ and ‘belonging’ will be posed as alternative analytical tools to think through in relation to the identity matters. Secondly, main approaches to ethnicity will be summarized with a specific focus on the premises of a constructionist approach on which the current study draws its theoretical basis. Thirdly, Bourdieu’s “Theory of Practice” and the concept of “habitus” will be explored with a purpose of providing a ground for a practice theory of ethnicity.

In the third chapter, the methodological approach, methods applied and the research process of the study will be detailed. In this vein, first, oral history will be defined with a specific focus on its importance for the current study. Here, the basic concepts of the study, namely history, memory, narrative, and identity, will be positioned in relation to the oral historical approach and fruitful ground that the methodology provides for the purposes of the study will be stressed. Secondly, the way the research was actually conducted will be outlined. Here, many details about the interviewees and the interview process will be supplied.

In the fourth chapter, the social history of Ankara with a special focus on the historical existence of the non-Muslim population within the city will be explored. Here, the economic, demographic and spatial structure of the city, especially in the late Ottoman period, will be described with a purpose of understanding the positions of the research groups in this period. Another point, will be on the disappearance of the formerly cosmopolitan city structure which preceded the Republican period.

In the fifth chapter, narratives recollected in relation to the life in Ankara will be analyzed. Here, a specific focus will be directed to the memories on the ‘old city’, to

the relative positioning of the Armenian and Jewish communities in the resettlement era within the city-space, and to the narrators' perception of Ankara as the capital city. This will provide us with several forms of belonging, various levels of identifications, and with the diversity of ways through which the members of these communities have become a part of the city.

In the sixth chapter, 'encounters' with the state as the construction site of identities are centered on, with a specific aim of understanding the positions of the Armenian and Jewish population of Ankara towards being a 'minority', being a 'national member' and being a 'citizen'. Here, not only perceptions, but also experiences and practices of the research group are aimed at being revealed. In this vein, this chapter will be exploring the era of 'Turkification policies' and cases of 'differential citizenship practices'; the symbolic ways of participation in the idea of 'Turkish nation'; citizenship practices such as voting, and the projections of the research group on Turkey's European Union integration process.

In the seventh chapter, inner community life and inter-community relations will be emphasized. The special focus will be on the construction of community identity in the everyday life relations and practices of the two communities respectively and on the meaning of this identity for the members. Occupational life, marriage relations, religious life, and everyday interactions with the 'other' are taken in this chapter as the construction sites of various identifications.

The last chapter, consequently, aims at giving a conclusion of the thesis whereby the research question is re-discussed in the light of the research findings.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

“Each agent, wittingly or unwittingly,
willy nilly, is a producer and reproducer
of objective meaning”

Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 1977

2.1. IDENTITY

Identity has been a much debated and an overburdened concept in various branches of the social sciences. It is because the conceptualization of identity is indeed very much related to the conceptualization of the social and the political, in more precise words, of the subject, of the action, of the society itself in its very historicity. ‘Identity’ has long established connections to such other concepts as ‘belonging’, ‘home’, ‘community’. Once it is pronounced, it might have connotations on some ethnic, religious affiliations or ‘racial’ labels, on national identity, and on citizenship. These connotations are in no sense only at conceptual levels. ‘Identity’ has reflections on bloody wars, ethnic conflicts, religious hostilities; it has a word on borders, boundaries; it has a word on the world politics itself.

As Hall argues “the logic of the language of identity is extremely important to our own self-conceptions” (1993: 42). Thus, basic questions about identity called for an examination of “the relation between personal experience and public meanings; subjective choices and evaluations, on the one hand, and objective social location, on the other” (Mohanty, 2003: 392).

Moreover, as Bradley states identity is about ‘belonging’, “about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others. At the most basic level it gives you a sense of personal location, the stable core to your

individuality. But it is also about your social relationships, your complex involvement with others” (1996: 24). As we see, identity is always an issue of ‘others’ as well as ‘ourselves’.

There are definitions of identity, making distinctions between “the processes situated in the individual” and “processes grounded within the social in which individuals and groups are engaged” (De Fina, 2003: 15). Distinctions are made, for example, between ‘personal identity’, which is claimed to refer to the construction of the self, that is our sense of ourselves as unique individuals and how we perceive ourselves and how we think others see us, on the one hand; and ‘social identity’, on the other, which is argued to refer to the way we, as individuals, locate ourselves within the society in which we live and the way in which we perceive others as locating us (Bradley, 1996). Personal identity is claimed, in this understanding, to evolve from the whole package of experiences that each individual has gone through, and to be highly complex and individualized; while social identities derive from the various sets of lived relationships in which individuals are engaged. As a ‘logical’ consequence of such distinction, ‘personal identity’ is seen as an area studied by psychologists; whereas ‘social identity’ concerns sociologists.

However, at the current stage social theory has arrived, it is not so easy, anymore, to draw such clear cut divisions between what is ‘personal’ and what is ‘social’ or even between ‘disciplines’ of social theory. It is not so easy, especially after the theories of ‘subjection’ and ‘subjectivities’ have taught us this much. Therefore, positioning myself closer to the strong assertion of feminist theory, “the personal is political”, I see ‘identity’ as a ‘construction’ through an endless ‘process’ whereby a complexity of forces take place. An elaborate understanding of this position, however, could be achieved only after a brief overview of different approaches to the concept identity. Therefore, I will try, in this chapter, to provide a framework on the debates around identity and to clarify the concepts I will be using during the analyses in the following chapters.

2.1.1. From Identity to Identities

In order to trace the historical changes and conceptual shifts in the approaches to the concept 'identity', I think it would be helpful to utilize Stuart Hall's tripartite classification between the 'Enlightenment subject', 'sociological subject' and 'post-modern subject' (1992a).

The Enlightenment subject, which reflected "a very individualist conception of the subject and 'his' identity", as Hall states, "was based on a conception of the human person as a fully centered, unified individual, endowed with the capacities of the reason, consciousness and action"; and the 'inner core' which composed its 'centre' "first emerged when the subject was born, and unfolded with it, while remaining essentially the same – continuous or 'identical' with itself – throughout the individual's existence" (Hall, 1992a: 275). The essential centre of the self was, thus, a person's identity. Such a conception of individual subject, as Hall quoted Raymond Williams, brought together two distinct meanings in that the subject was, on the one hand, 'indivisible', an entity which was unified within itself and could not be further divided; and it was, on the other, an entity which was 'singular, distinctive, unique' (Hall, 1992a: 282). This notion of subject which can best be understood in the famous motto of Descartes, "Cogito ergo sum" or "I think therefore I am", was named to be the well known 'Cartesian subject' (Hall, 1992a). Hall argues that "to imagine the great processes of modern life as centered upon" this 'sovereign individual', who was born between the Renaissance humanism of the sixteenth century and the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, was then possible; however, "as modern societies grew more complex, they acquired a more collective and social form" and as "the classic laws of political economy, property, contract and exchange had to operate, after industrialization, amidst the great class formations of modern capitalism", a more social conception of subject emerged, which was "seen as more located and 'placed' within these great supporting structures and formations of modern society" (Hall, 1992a: 281-284).

The second notion of the subject and of identity in Hall's categorization is, thus, the sociological subject, which bears an objection towards the 'inner core' of the Cartesian subject that is understood to be autonomous and self-sufficient; and poses, instead that this 'inner core' is "formed in relation to 'significant others', who mediated to the subject the values, meanings and symbols – the culture- of the worlds he/she inhabited" (Hall, 1992a: 275). Sociology, therefore, "developed an alternative account of how individuals are formed subjectively through their membership of, and participation in wider social relationships; and conversely, how processes and structures are sustained by the roles which individuals play in them" (Hall, 1992a: 284). Such an interactive conception of identity and the self, bridged the gap between the 'inside' and the 'outside', between the personal and the public worlds - though remaining a notion of an inner core or essence that is the 'real me'.

Thus, introduced by the works of Cooley and Mead, study of identity formed a critical cornerstone within modern sociological thought (Cerulo, 1997) and in the classical sociological conception of the issue identity is understood to be formed in the 'interaction' between self and society (Hall, 1992a). In other words, in sociological conceptualization, "identity stitches ('sutures') the subject into the structure. It stabilizes both subjects and the cultural worlds they inhabit, making both reciprocally more unified and predictable" (Hall, 1992a: 276). Nevertheless, as Hall points, mainstream sociology has retained something of Descartes' dualism, 'the individual and the society', as two connected but separate entities (1992a: 284).

Till this point, following Hall's terminology, there is something guaranteed about the 'logic' or discourse of identity:

It gives us a sense of depth, out there, and in here. It is spatially organized. Much of our discourse of the inside and the outside, of the self and the other, of the individual and society, of the subject and the object, are grounded in that particular logic of identity. And it helps us, I would say, to sleep well at night (Hall, 1993: 43).

However, as we are long familiar, "sleeping well at night" is not so easy anymore with the declaration of the end of the 'old logic of identity' and with the so-called 'crisis of identity'. The question of 'identity' has been vigorously debated in social

theory and a more disturbed and disturbing picture of the subject and identity has been pointed in 'late-modern' times (Hall, 1992a; Hall, 1993). What has led to the 'crisis of identity' and to the debates in social theory, nevertheless, remains intact; and since it is an important question for a sociological study, at this point I will turn, briefly, to the advances in social theory and human sciences which have occurred in, or had their major impact upon, thought in the period of late-modernity -the second half of the 20th century.

Recovering and re-reading of traditions of Marxist thinking in 1960s and Freud's 'discovery' of the unconscious (Hall, 1992a); post-structuralist and social constructivist positions developed in 1960s and 1970s (De Fina, 2003; Hall, 1992a); impact of feminism both as a theoretical critique and as a social movement and the emergence of 'identity-politics' due to 'new social movements' (Somers, 1994; Cerulo, 1997; Hall, 1992a); and the development of new communication technologies (Cerulo, 1997) are stated to be some of the reasons for the change in the conceptualization of 'identity'.

Hall argues that re-reading Marx in the light of his argument that "men make history, but only on the basis of conditions which are not of their own making" led to a claim for the displacement of any notion of individual agency. In this line, he points to the Althusserian argument that "Marx displaced two key propositions of modern philosophy: that there is a universal essence of man; [and] that this essence is the attribute of "each single individual" who is its real subject" (Hall, 1992a: 285-286).

The second advance is the destabilization of the knowing and rational subject with a fixed and unified identity by a 'theory of unconscious', which, in the articulations of Freud and Lacan, pointed more to the incomplete, always 'in process', always 'being formed' character of identity (Hall, 1992a). Such 'discovery', as Hall asserts, prevents us from conceptualizing "identity as a finished thing", which is "already inside us as individuals"; and permits, rather, to speak of identity only as an on-going process of identification, which stems "from a lack of wholeness which is 'filled'

from outside us, by the ways we imagine ourselves to be seen by others” (1992a: 287).

Thirdly, it is the post-structuralist thought, which has contributed to the destabilization of ‘identity’, through its reflections on ‘the subject’ in language and its point on the irreducible link between the constitution of subjectivity itself and language (De Fina, 2003). Saussure’s argument that “we are not in any absolute sense the ‘authors’ of the statements we make or of the meanings we express in language”; but “we can only use language to produce meanings by positioning ourselves within the rules of language and the systems of meaning of our culture” (Hall, 1992a: 288); Benveniste’s equation between the subject and the subject of speech (De Fina, 2003: 15); Derrida’s assertion that “individual speaker can never finally fix meaning, including the meaning of his or her identity [and] meaning is inherently unstable, it aims for closure (identity), but is constantly disrupted” (Hall, 1992a: 288) and that “the subject is ‘inscribed in language, is a function of language’” (De Fina, 2003: 15) are given as examples of a new concept of subject which is de-centered and de-stabilized. Moreover, another tenet of post-structuralist thinking is stated to be “the idea that subjectivity only exists as an effect of social practices and cultural templates” which is apparent in Althusserian and Foucauldian understandings (De Fina, 2003: 16). Foucault has produced a sort of ‘genealogy of modern subject’ and isolated a new type of power, the ‘disciplinary power’, whose basic object is to produce a human being who can be treated as a ‘docile body’. Hall argues that the paradox Foucault makes clear is that “the more collective and organized is the nature of the institutions of late-modernity, the greater the isolation, surveillance and individuation of the individual subject” (1992a: 289-290).

De Fina, also, refers to the social constructionist theorists in the social sciences as having contributed to a notion of identity based on the premise that social realities are constructed and not given and therefore need to be regarded as accomplishments to which human beings arrive through social work (2003: 16). The social constructionist approach to identity, thus, rejects any category that sets forward essential or core features as the unique property of a collective’s members (Cerulo,

1997: 390). Benedict Anderson's (1991) famous work on nations, which argues a nation to be an "imagined community", thus a socio-cognitive construct, for example, is accepted to be one important work reflecting social constructivist approach.

The fourth advance is understood to be feminist theory and feminism as a social movement, which is a part of broader 'new social movements' and which calls for a parallel elaboration on the so-called 'identity politics'. Feminist theory is understood to have had a direct relation to the conceptual decentring of the Cartesian and sociological subject by questioning the classical distinction between 'inside' versus 'outside' and 'private' versus 'public'. Its slogan being 'the personal is political', it opened whole new arenas of social life to political contestation and politicized subjectivity, identity and the process of identification, by challenging the social position of women and expanding to include the formation of sexual and gendered identities (Hall, 1992a). Feminism as a part of 'new social movements', on the other hand, together with nationalist movements of 'post-colonial' era, necessitated new theories of action and agency and shifted scholarly attention to issues of group agency and political action (Cerulo, 1997; Somers, 1994). "As a result", Cerulo argues, "identity studies have been relocated to the site of the collective, gender/sexuality, race/ethnicity, and class forming the 'holy trinity' of the discursive field" (1997: 385).

Theories of 'identity politics', which Hall refers as "one identity per movement" (1992a: 290), are stated to "have shifted explanations for action from 'interests' and 'norms' to *identities and solidarities*, from the notion of the universal social agent to particularistic categories of concrete persons" (Somers, 1994: 608). Somers argues, moreover, that "based on the assumption that persons in similar social categories and similar life-experiences (based on gender, color, generation, sexual orientation, and so on) will act on the ground of common attributes, theories of identity-politics posit that 'I act because of who I am', not because of a rational interest or set of learned values" (1994: 608). Thus, it is a shared argument that "identity-based movements act rather than react; they fight to expand freedom, not to achieve it; they mobilize

for choice rather than emancipation” (Cerulo, 1997: 393). Cerulo argues, therefore, that the special form of agency that identity politics and new social movements suggest is a self-conscious “collective agency”, which means that “identities emerge and movements ensue because collectivities consciously coordinate action [that is] group members consciously develop offenses and defenses, consciously insulate, differentiate, and mark, cooperate and compete, persuade and coerce” (1997: 393).

As I have noted earlier, ‘identity politics’ and ‘new social movements’ are accepted to have brought “pathbreaking theoretical challenges” in that they revealed, on the one hand, “the gendered or racially-or class- specific character of the ‘general’ modern social actor”; while, on the other, had proposed and envisioned “a theoretical alternative that transforms those very devalued traits of (female or racial) *otherness* into a newly esteemed ideal of selfhood and normatized social action” (Somers, 1994: 610). Still, however, the effect of identity politics in conceptualization of ‘identity’ should be evaluated more cautiously bearing in mind that outcries of ‘essentialism’ are simultaneously directed towards these new identity-politics. Somers suggests us ask, among many others, if “the new theories of identity-politics are not creating their own new ‘totalizing fictions’ in which a single category of experience, say gender, will over-determine any number of cross-cutting simultaneous differences such as race and class” and; “how is it possible to claim these approaches as truly arguing for a *social* construction of agency, given that they theorize identity from essential (that is pre-political) or fixed categories constructed from given attributes” (1994: 610-611). Somers count categories of ‘woman’ or ‘African-American’ among these attributes. One important political implication of these questions are apparent again in Somers’ assertion that “if identities are fixed there can be no room to accommodate changing power relations –or history itself – as they are constituted and reconstituted over time” (1994: 611). Stuart Hall, accordingly, in his work on ‘black identity’, shows that “there is no a Black collective identity replacing the other identities, [since] there are people of color, or ‘black’ people who do not identify with that collective identity” and asserts strongly that “Blackness ... is always complexly composed, always historically constructed; it is never in the same place but always positional” (1993: 56-57).

The fifth advance still in need of being named is the new communication technologies which, having “freed interaction from the requirements of physical copresence” and thus having “expanded the array of generalized others contributing to the construction of the self”, made possible “the establishment of ‘communities of the mind’ and the negotiation of copresent and cyberspace identities” (Cerulo, 1997: 385-386).

The “post-modern subject”, which appears as a result of all these theoretical, social and political developments, “become[s] fragmented [and] composed, not of a single, but of several, sometimes contradictory or unresolved, identities” which are not unified around a coherent ‘self’ (Hall, 1992a: 276). Correspondingly, Hall argues:

[t]he identities which composed the social landscapes ‘out there’, and which ensured our subjective conformity with the objective ‘needs’ of the culture, are breaking up as a result of structural and institutional change; [and moreover] the very process of identification, through which we project ourselves into our cultural identities, has become more open-ended, variable and problematic (1992a: 277).

Reflecting upon this ‘new subject’, whose “identifications are continuously being shifted about”, Hall argues that identities are “formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us” (1992a: 277). This argument is important for the purposes of the current study in that it suggests “if we fell we have a unified identity from birth to death, it is only because we construct a comforting story or ‘narrative of the self’¹⁷ about

¹⁷ The relation between ‘narrative’ and ‘identity’ is indeed a much debated one. One important theorist who tries to conceptualize a notion of identity through narrativity in order to challenge categorical rigidities and essentialist formulations of identity is Margaret Somers. Arguing for a notion of narrativity as not limited to a representational form, but as a concept of social ontology, which means that “it is through narrativity that we come to know, understand, and make sense of the social world, and it is through narratives and narrativity that we constitute our social identities” (1994: 606), Somers claim that through a notion of “narrative identity” we have “the opportunity to engage with historically and empirically based research into social action and social agency that is once temporal, relational and cultural, as well as institutional, material and macro-structural” (1994: 607). Her claim follows from the argument that thinking through narrativity is to incorporate into the core conception of identity the categorically destabilizing dimensions of time, space, and relationality. This argument, moreover, “builds from the premise that narrativity and relationality are conditions of social being, social consciousness, social action, institutions, structures, even society itself; the self and the purposes of self are constructed and reconstructed in the context of internal and external relations of time and place and power that are constantly in flux” (Somers, 1994: 621). Drawing a connection to Bourdieu’s conception of ‘habitus’, Somers argue that to reconceptualize agency and action sociological studies should look at actors’ places in their relational settings. In this sense, narrative identity approach “assumes people to act in particular ways because *not* to do so would fundamentally

ourselves” (Hall, 1992a: 277), repercussions of which I will be turning during the discussions on narrative in the third chapter.

Such conceptualization of identity, however, should not be thought as being independent of historicity and sociality. Hall’s understanding of the subject which is “confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities any one of which [s/he] could identify with, at least temporarily, as the systems of meaning and cultural representation multiply” (1992a: 277) seems, on the contrary, to offer an integration of historicity and sociality into the scene. It is because change or multiplication of the “systems of meaning and cultural representation” points indeed a change in the ‘social’, the societal organization at micro or macro levels, which should be thought as being interwoven into power relations and historical forces. Thus, identifying one of the “possible identities” could be thought as accepting the company of history, going a step further, which means indeed of politics. This idea is indeed affirmed by Hall himself and by Bhabha (1994) among many others who have argued that the ‘unities’ which identities proclaim are, in fact, constructed within the play of power and exclusion, and are the result, not of a natural and inevitable or primordial totality but of the naturalized, overdetermined process of ‘closure’ (Hall, 1997).

Before going into detail of the issue of ‘politics’ which the new conceptualization of ‘identity’ could be argued to be implying, I shall first turn to an overview of the “late-modern” or “post-modern” society, since, I believe, conceptualization of identity cannot be thought in isolation from any conceptualization of society. However, an elaborate discussion of “postmodernity” is beyond the question and the limits of the current study; thus, I will suffice with referring to some basic concepts, which are understood to define what is called the “postmodern condition”, and this will be again mostly to broaden our grasp of the question of identity.

violate their sense of being at that particular time and place”, which is to argue, indeed, that “in another time or place, or in the context of a different set of prevailing narrative, that sense of being could be entirely different because narrative identities are constituted and reconstituted *in time and over time*” (Somers, 1994: 624).

Indeed, to have a perspective on what is called postmodern in order to deal with the issue of identity, might be more critical than it seems, when we take into consideration the argument Dunn poses in that “the concept of the postmodern itself was an attempt to articulate a growing sense of problematization of identity as a generalized condition of life in postwar Western society” (1998: 2). This ‘generalized condition of life’ might be understood as the objective socio-historical condition rooted in “changes in the nature and patterns of production and consumption; the reconstitution of society and culture around the mass media; a restructuring of capital and culture through a new wave of globalization; and the rise of identity-based social movements” (Dunn, 1998: 109).

What is more important for the purposes of this study is the reflection of this socio-historical condition on the conceptualization of the society and identity. Such reflection could be summarized, albeit very roughly, in that a distinctive type of structural change is transforming modern societies, fragmenting the cultural landscapes of class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race and nationality which gave as firm locations as social individuals (Hall, 1992a); transforming time and space (Giddens, 1991); entailing a rootless break with any or all preceding conditions which is characterized by a never-ending process of internal ruptures and fragmentations within itself (Harvey, 1989); creating a dislocated structure whose center is displaced and replaced by another, but by ‘a plurality of power centers’ (Laclau, 1990); leading to a double displacement by de-centering individuals both from their place in the social and the cultural world, and from themselves (Hall, 1992a); and lastly destabilizing identity (Dunn, 1998).

If so, what is the use of talking about identity? What is it still? Hall answers the question on his behalf stating that he returned to the question of identity because the question of identity has returned to us; it has returned to the politics (1993: 42) since there has been a veritable discursive explosion around the concept of ‘identity’ at the same moment as it has been subjected to a searching critique (Hall, 1997: 1). So the question becomes, what kind of a return has identity experience and what is the use of talking about it? It has not returned the same old place that is the old identity

politics of the 1960s social movements, for sure. Therefore, it is the time to introduce the last concept above: “difference”.

Laclau, as Hall refers, argues that late-modern societies are characterized by ‘difference’, that is they are cut through by different social divisions and social antagonisms which produce a variety of different ‘subject positions’ – i.e. identities-for individuals. In this argument if such societies hold together at all, it is not because they are unified, but because their different elements and identities can, under certain circumstances, be articulated together. And this concept of “articulation” is important since it refers to a partiality, that is the structure of identity remains open, without which as Laclau argued, there would be no history (Hall, 1992a: 279). And I would argue, for the purposes of the current study, that this notion of “articulation” is important since it points to politics that is the question of how differences would be articulated.

What points to the possibility of politics is Laclau’s pointing to the positive features of dislocation. According to this argument, dislocation “unhinges the stable identities of the past, but it also opens up the possibility of new articulations – the forging of new identities, the production of new subjects, and what he calls the ‘recomposition of the structure around particular nodal points of articulation’” (Laclau, 1990 quoted in Hall, 1992a: 279).

Difference in this conceptualization, however, should not be understood as it appears in ‘multiculturalist’ arguments.¹⁸ Hall’s reference to Derrida’s concept of “différance” as an important way to understand “difference” is significant at this

¹⁸ ‘Multiculturalism’ or ‘multi-ethnicity’ are concepts in terms of which the politics of antiracism has often constructed itself (Hall, 1992b), with connotations of integration. One criticism directed towards the idealization and mystification of the concepts of multiculturalism and integration, however, is that they reflect “under-theorized, elite re-production of a long-lost idea of national political community; papering over inequality, conflict and power relations with a therapeutical, top-down discourse of multi-cultural unity” (Favell, 1999: 214). Favell argues that “the happy, idealized language of integration” falsely projects a normative ideal as the teleological motor of present social dynamics. The other criticism is that in most discussions of multiculturalism and cultural diversity, culture exists as a separate and integral entity which is inextricably identified with ethnicity (Bottomley, 1991) and such identification bears the long-lasting connotations of one culture one nation prevalent in nationalist discourses.

stage (Hall, 1993). Hall argues that “‘différance’ sets the word in motion to new meanings, yet without obscuring the trace of its other meanings in its past”; and, connoting both “to differ” and “to defer”, points to “an infinite postponement of meaning, [...] which still retains its roots in one meaning while it is, as it were, moving to another, encapsulating another, with endless shiftings, slidings” (Hall, 1993: 49-50). Therefore, it is not a “‘difference’ which makes a radical and unbridgeable separation”, but a “‘difference’ which is positional, conditional, and conjectural” (Hall, 1992b: 6). Though stating that Derrida does not say much about a relation between difference and identity, Hall’s point that in the new notion of identity which has to be conceptualized we should take into consideration that “there is always something left over, always something which goes on escaping the precision” (1993: 51) might be useful to establish such relation.

Referring to ‘deconstructive’ approach’s attempt not “to supplant inadequate concepts with ‘truer’ ones”, but to put them “under erasure” (Hall, 1993: 51); Hall describes identity in its new understanding “as a concept – operating ‘under erasure’ in the interval between reversal and emergence; an idea which cannot be thought in the old way, but without which certain key questions cannot be thought at all” (1997: 2). Thus, he argues though its return had not been to its old place, the irreducibility of the concept ‘identity’ is still there. Such irreducibility stems from its centrality to the question of agency and politics, Hall argues. Both of these concepts have critical importance for the current study.

By referring to ‘agency’, Hall echoes Foucault’s (1970) argument that we need “not a theory of the knowing subject, but rather a theory of discursive practice” (Hall, 1997: 2). He claims that “precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies” (Hall, 1997: 4). What is critical in this conceptualization of identity is that Hall refers both to the structure and to the agency, in that identity refers to the meeting point, the point of suture, which is “interpellated” or “hailed” on the one hand, and “spoken” on the other (1997: 5). Identity is spoken because

“the subject invests in the position”, and for this reason “suturing of a subject to a subject-position” though “hailing” on the one hand, has to be thought of as an *articulation*, rather than a one-sided process” on the other (Hall, 1997: 6). Hall argues, moreover, that identities:

[e]merge within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally-constituted unity – an ‘identity’ in its traditional meaning (Hall, 1997: 4).

Noting that such an understanding of identity permits us to count the weight of historicity on the identification process, I return to the second critical point, that of politics, in Hall’s conceptualization of identity. By politics Hall refers to “a politics of location” or “a politics of the local”. Arguing that he uses the ‘local’ in the sense that positions, positionings, localizations, Hall searches for the answers to the question if there is “a general politics of the local to bring to bear against the general, over-riding, powerful, technologically-based, massively-invested unrolling of global processes ...which tend to mop up all differences, and occlude those differences” (1993: 51-52). In contrast to the process of globalization, which leads difference to lose meaning since “it doesn’t make any difference that they are different, they are just different” (Hall, 1993: 52), the politics of the local could be understood “the politics of living identity through difference” (Hall, 1993: 57). He suggests that it is the politics that all of us are composed of multiple social identities, not of one. Referring to the Gramscian notion of “the war of position”, Hall argues that “it is also to recognize that any counter-politics of the local which attempts to organize people through diversity of identifications has to be a struggle which is conducted positionally” and asserts further that “it is the beginning of anti-racism, anti-sexism, and anti-classicism” (1993: 57).

I understand Hall’s call for a politics of the local as a theoretical support to the methodology of the current study. Because against the claims of an all-encompassing, in itself, “politically guaranteed”, predesigned process, he calls for a politics of the positioned, of the conditional, of the local, that is of the lived experience in all its multiplicity and ambivalence. What I try, to engage in this call, is to look at the local for the lived experience of this multiple identities and search

for the moments where politics is crafted through “enunciative strategies”, through “different” “subject-positions” and through “articulation”. I understand Hall’s argument as a call being empowered by his very assertion that “when you try to find whether they are able to resist, to mobilize, to say something different to globalism at a more local level, they seem to have more purchase on the historical present” (1993: 62). Such a trial is meaningful, when we remember the connotations of “interpellation” and “hailing” as “epistemic violence” (Gayatri Spivak quoted in Hall, 1992b: 4); and also when we understand “multiple identities” as Hutchinson and Smith does, that is it “include[s] not only the many different affiliations of individuals with other kinds of grouping such as gender, region, class, religion and the like, but also the many shifting identifications between different ethnies or ethnic categories” (1996: 7). What should be kept in mind in all this process, to repeat, is the role of historicity, since speaking about positions does not mean to deny but to re-position it within the discourse on identity, in that each positionality is embedded in history and re-embeds it through its “investments”. Such an understanding of identity and the social is more apparent, I would argue, in Pierre Bourdieu’s well-known concept of ‘habitus’ to which I will be turning in the following pages. For the moment, however, I shall focus on the concept identity in its helps and drawbacks as an analytical tool.

2.1.2. Identity as an Analytical Tool and Alternative Analytical Concepts

I have previously referred to the ‘irreducibility’ of thinking through ‘identity’ pointing to Hall’s rationalizing; and to the new framework in which the concept was understood. However, for many theorists, arguing for the social constructedness of ‘identity’ does not suffice; and what is at stake, for them, is the critique of the term itself as an analytical concept.

One argument relates the usage of the terms to describe the political competitions and conflicts by the media. Used as a tool for describing political clashes it is argued, identity connotes homogeneity and permanence and implies uniqueness (Martin, 1995). Such a flattened common use of identity in political descriptions, Martin

points, tends to make it meaningless and leads the concept lose its explanatory and analytical power whatever descriptive value it might have (1995: 5-6).

Another argument, regarding the use of the term by “the social sciences and humanities”, goes that “‘identity’... tends to mean too much (when understood in a strong sense), too little (when understood in a weak sense), or nothing at all (because of its sheer ambiguity)” (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000). Brubaker and Cooper warn us about the intellectual and political costs of using such an “ambiguous” and “ambitious” term for social analysis, which requires relatively unambiguous analytical categories. There are two directions of criticism in their argument.

One, which is parallel to Martin’s criticism, concerns the references to ‘collectivities’ and points to the danger of ‘reification’, which Brubaker and Cooper (2000) call a social process, not only an intellectual practice. The problem, as they argue, is that:

‘Nation’, ‘race’, and ‘identity’ are used analytically a good deal of the time more or less as they are used in practice, in an implicitly or explicitly reifying manner, in a manner that implies or asserts that ‘nations’, ‘races’, and ‘identities’ ‘exist’ and that people ‘have’ a ‘nationality’, a ‘race’, an ‘identity’ (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 6).

Trying to make a distinction between “categories of analysis” and “categories of practice”, they argue that “we should avoid unintentionally reproducing and reinforcing such reification by uncritically adopting” the latter as the former. By categories of practice, moreover, they mean following Bourdieu, “categories of everyday social experience, developed and deployed by ordinary actors, as distinguished from the experience-distant categories used by social analysts” (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 4). Identity, therefore, like many other key terms in social sciences such as ‘race’, ‘nation’, ‘ethnicity’, ‘citizenship’, ‘democracy’, ‘class’, ‘community’, and ‘tradition’, as named by Brubaker and Cooper, is at once a category of social and political *practice* and social and political *analysis* (2000).

Second direction of their criticism is towards the language of anti-essentialist and constructivist stance which theorizes identity as “multiple, fragmented, and fluid”. Brubaker and Cooper argue first of all that even such theorizing does not suffice to

eliminate the reification that ‘identity’ connotes since “it leaves us without a rationale for talking about ‘identities’ at all and ill-equipped to examine the ‘hard’ dynamics and essentialist claims of contemporary identity politics” (2000: 1). They ask, in this line, the crucial questions that:

If it is fluid, how can we understand the ways in which self –understandings may harden, congeal, and crystallize? If it is constructed, how can we understand the sometimes coercive force of external identifications? If it is multiple, how do we understand the terrible singularity that is often striven for? How can we understand the power and pathos of identity politics? (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 1).

What do they try to ask seems to be one about what to do with the effects of ‘reel politics’ with this “blunt, flat, undifferentiated vocabulary” which tries to “conceptualiz[e] all affinities and affiliations, all forms of belonging, all experiences of commonality, connectedness, and cohesion, all self-understandings and self-identifications in the idiom of ‘identity’” (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 2). Their answer is, indeed, hidden in their question that the alternative terms which will do the theoretical work ‘identity’ is supposed to do are, in their proposal, “identification and categorization”, “self-understanding and social location”, and “commonality, connectedness, groupness”. I will refer to these alternative analytical concepts within a wider framework appealing some other proposals, too.

2.1.2.1. Identification

Before pointing to the ‘alternative’ status of the concept ‘identification’ we should point to another difference made between two understandings of ‘identification’. “In the common sense language”, Hall argues, “identification is constructed on the back of recognition of some common origin or shared characteristics with another person or group, or with an ideal, and the natural closure of solidarity and allegiance established on this foundation” (1997: 2). In this language identity, itself, “means, or connotes, the process of identification, of saying that this here is the same as that, or we are the same together” (Hall, 1993: 47). ‘Identification’ defined in this “naturalism”, however, is not the one, which could have an alternative status to ‘identity’ as an analytical concept. Alternativeness of the term, on the other hand, appears in, what Hall calls, “the discursive approach” which “sees identification as a

construction, a process never completed – always ‘in process’” (1997: 2-3). And this is what Laclau, Brubaker and Cooper understand by the term.

Laclau (1994), in his *The Making of Political Identities*, points to such a distinction between identity and identification, “whereas the former [...] designates an object of discovery or recognition, implying an originary essence defining the person, the latter [...] refers to a process of identity construction based on Freudian-derived notion of ‘radical lack’” (quoted in Dunn, 1998: 3). The concept of identification is argued, moreover, to “show how identity is constituted in and through yet problematized by difference” (Dunn, 1998: 4); or else to be constructed through ambivalence and through splitting (Hall, 1993).

Processual and active character of the concept is appreciated by Brubaker and Cooper, too. They argue that it lacks the reifying connotations of ‘identity’, in that, identification, as an analytical concept, does not presuppose that such a process “(even by powerful agents, such as the state) will necessarily result in the internal sameness, the distinctiveness, the bounded groupness that political entrepreneurs may seek to achieve” (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 14). Identification, in this sense, is intrinsic to social life and always situational and contextual. What it is most critical in this argument, for the purposes of this study, is that ‘identification’ by its connotations invites us to specify the agents that do the identifying. One may identify others or oneself –still in a dialectical relationship to others-; might also be identified by others, one form of which is identification by powerful, authoritative institutions, as modern-state, which are the formalized, codified, objectified systems of categorizations (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000). One might identify oneself relationally and categorically, the former pointing to “a position in a relational web (a web of kinship, for example, or of friendship, patron-client ties, or teacher-student relations)” and the latter to a membership in “a class of persons sharing some categorical attribute (such as race, ethnicity, language, nationality, citizenship, gender, sexual orientation)” (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 15). And identification has a “psychodynamic meaning” which refers identifying oneself emotionally with another person, category or collectivity, largely independent of the cognitive,

characterizing, classificatory meanings that is fitting a certain description or belonging to a certain category (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000). The ‘process’, I think, could best be summarized in Hall’s words:

It is not determined in the sense that it can always be ‘won’ or ‘lost’, sustained or abandoned. Though not without its determinate conditions of existence, including the material and symbolic resources required to sustain it, identification is in the end conditional, lodged in contingency....Identification is then a process of articulation, a suturing, an over-determination, not a sub-sumption. There is always “too much” or “too little” - an over-determination or a lack, but never a proper fit, a totality. Like all signifying practices, it is subject to the ‘play’, of *différance*. It obeys the logic of more-than-one. And since as a process it operates across difference, it entails discursive work, the binding and marking of symbolic boundaries, the production of ‘frontier-effects’. It requires what is left outside, its constitutive outside, to consolidate the process (Hall, 1997: 2-3).

2.1.2.2. Self-understanding

The importance of ‘self-understanding’, which Brubaker and Cooper suggest as an alternative analytical concept, should be viewed in its providing space for weighting the role of agency and subjectivity. As they argue, it refers to “one’s sense of who one is, of one’s social location, and of (given the first two) one is prepared to act”; and thus it is a “dispositional term” that designates a “situated subjectivity” (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 18). Self-understanding is argued, moreover, to belong to the realm of ‘sens pratique’, the ‘practical sense’, as Bourdieu calls it.¹⁹ So, it does not “imply a distinctively modern or Western understanding of the “self” as a homogeneous, bounded, unitary entity”, but being at once cognitive and emotional, points to what persons have of themselves and their social world. Self-understanding, in this sense, lacks the reifying connotations of ‘identity’ and suggests some degree of articulation (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 18-19).

2.1.2.3. Commonality, Connectedness, Groupness

A further set of alternative concepts Brubaker and Cooper pose should be evaluated in relation to another much debated and significant concept in sociology, “collective identity”. Therefore, before looking at the alternative we should look first, briefly, at

¹⁹ I will elaborate on the concept ‘practical sense’ during the discussion on the concept ‘habitus’ in the following pages.

the 'master concept'. Collective identity appears to be a concept grounded in classical sociological constructs as we see in Durkheim's "collective conscience", Marx's "class consciousness", Weber's "verstehen", and Tonnies' "gemeinschaft". Cerulo argued that "so rooted, the notion addresses the "we-ness" of a group, stressing the similarities or shared attributes" –which are taken by earlier literature as 'natural' or 'essential'- "around which group members coalesce" (1997: 386). A collective's members, by this literature, were believed to internalize these qualities, suggesting a unified, singular social experience, a single canvas against which social actors constructed a sense of self. In other words 'collective identity' was seen to be "the emotionally laden sense of belonging to a distinctive, bounded group, involving both a felt solidarity or oneness with fellow group members and a felt difference from or even antipathy to specified outsiders" (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000: 19). Thus, as some social psychologists argue, there is a depersonalization, as a process enabling collective identities which "permits social stereotyping, group cohesiveness, ethnocentrism, cooperation and altruism, emotional contagion and empathy, collective action, and other processes" (Turner quoted in Cerulo, 1997: 396).

One other concept, crucial to understand for the purposes of the current study, is 'cultural identity', since it is seen as being of particular relevance to ethnic minorities (Bradley, 1996), and since cultural identities could be defined as "those aspects of our identities, which arise from our 'belonging' to distinctive ethnic, racial, linguistic and above all, national cultures" (Hall, 1992a: 274). Such 'belongingness', however, points to an 'identity' which is defined "in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective 'one true self', hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves', which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common" (Hall, 1990: 223). These common historical experiences and shared cultural codes provide, moreover, 'one people' with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history (Hall, 1990). It was understood, mostly, to be this 'identity' which should be discovered, excavated, brought to light and expressed by, for example, the people of 'Diaspora' or of 'post-colonial struggles' (Bradley, 1996; Hall, 1990).

However, when the above review reflecting on the changing paradigms of conceptualizing identity is remembered, it is not a long step to claim that there is a fragmentation and erosion of collective social identity. This is, however, not to claim that collective social identities, which are understood to be class, race, ethnicity, nation, gender, or the West, have disappeared. It is to argue that “none of them is, any longer, in either the social, historical or epistemological place where they were in our conceptualizations of the world in the recent past” (Hall, 1993: 45). And this is the reason that they cannot any longer be thought in the same homogeneous form, without paying attention to their inner contradictions, their segmentations and their fragmentations. This means, in other words, that these collective social identities which were formed in, and stabilized by the huge, long-range historical processes which have produced the modern world, are being transformed in parallel to the enormous historical transformations of modernity and thus should be conceptualized differently to compensate for their weakening explanatory reach.

In this rethinking, the concept ‘cultural identity’ seems, mostly, to be preferred instead of ‘collective identity’, no doubt though, through a questioning of its ‘essentialist’ connotations. In this reconceptualization it is asserted that “as well as the many points of similarity, there are also critical points of deep and significant *difference* which constitute ‘what we really are’; or rather – since history has intervened – ‘what we have become’” (Hall, 1990: 225). Cultural identity in this sense appears to be a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’, in that it belongs to the future as much as to the past. The crucial argument is that “far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power”; and, in this way, identities are not recoveries of the past, but “the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Hall, 1990: 225).

To reintroduce some earlier concepts, we may argue that, cultural identities in this understanding become the points of identification, the unstable points of identification or suture, which are made, within the discourses of history and culture. Thus, as Hall argues, referring to the act of ‘positioning’, cultural identity

implies that “it is always related to a politics of identity, a politics of position; and is always constructed through memory, fantasy, narrative and myth” (1990: 226). Still, however, in order to understand the formation of such an ‘identity’, we should always bear in mind two axes or vectors, that of ‘similarity and continuity’; and of ‘difference and rupture’ (Hall, 1990).

Theoretical paradigm of conceptualizing ‘collective’ or ‘cultural’ identity changed in this way, however, brought the problem of analytical tools to utilize for this conceptualization. Now it is time to introduce the third alternative set of concepts that Brubaker and Cooper have suggested with the purpose of achieving a more differentiated analytical language instead of “stirring all self-understandings based on race, religion, ethnicity, and so on into the great conceptual melting-pot of ‘identity’” (2000: 20). They argue that their point is to distinguish instances of strongly binding, vehemently felt groupness from more loosely structured, weakly constraining forms of affinity and affiliation. To achieve this differentiated language, they pose “commonality” denoting the sharing of some common attribute; “connectedness”, the relational ties that link people; and “groupness”, the sense of belonging to a distinctive, bounded, solitary group, which could be engendered by neither of the former two alone.

I have stated the purpose of the study at hand to understand multiple identifications, perceived commonalities and ‘differences’, articulations and positionings of people who are ‘ascribed’ or ‘asserted’ to be members of some ‘ethnic’ groups, namely the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara. Stating the purpose in this way makes it apparent that there remains the need for a closer look at the concept ‘ethnicity’. However, since “we often use terms like ‘ethnicity’ [...] to label people’s belonging to a state, territory, nation or community, frequently in a process of categorization” (Christiansen and Hedetoft, 2004: 1) we should first of all have a look at on the concept of ‘belonging’.

2.1.2.4. Belonging

Literature on the concept focuses on a term: ‘politics of belonging’ (Christiansen and Hedetoft, 2004; Geddes and Favell, 1999; Yuval-Davis, 2001). Politics of belonging, it is argued, used to be coterminous with the politics of nation-building, cultural homogenization, minority assimilation and national defense. In other words it was coterminous with the “Gellnerian assumptions about congruity between individual, nation and state” (Christiansen and Hedetoft, 2004). This meant that “‘belonging’ was first politicized in and by the nation-state context in a process of different interacting ‘modernities’, then essentialized (ahistorized) as ‘natural identity’ in a process of ascriptive discourse (Christiansen and Hedetoft, 2004: 1). This might be thought to be the reason why the exclusive discourse of belonging has, in most countries, set the tone of political debate; and why there has been academically a context in which to speak in terms of ‘belonging’ is often regarded as articulating a form of xenophobic or racist exclusion (Crowley,1999).

This mode of thought and analysis -according to which legitimate states originate in nations which are rooted in ethnicities and which presupposes that because of the convergences between states, nations and territories people’s primary ‘belonging’ resides in their ‘national identity’ (Christiansen and Hedetoft, 2004)- however, had to be reformulated in the attempt to cope with the consequences of immigration in the global-context (Crowley,1999); and to understand the emergence of diasporic communities which are often engaged in narratives of belonging or of yearning to belong, not only in relation to the country/society where they live, or even ‘cosmopolitan’ boundary-less humanity, but also in relation to their country, nation and/or state of origin (Yuval-Davis, 2001). Therefore, with individuals appropriating and engaging in multiple belongings and political identities that transcend and, to a degree, challenge the labels of ‘nationality’ and ‘ethnicity’, there emerged the need to pay attention to these different forms and processes of belonging, to how feelings of belonging are constructed and ‘negotiated’ in different political settings, to individual, local and regional variations in belonging, and to the interplay between

highly different politics and strategies of belonging - from 'below' as well as from 'above' (Christiansen and Hedetoft, 2004).

Such a reshaping of the world context and of the experiences had, no doubt, significant implications on the conceptualizations of these experiences. That is particularly of 'membership', 'national identity', 'citizenship', 'ethnicity', 'space' and indeed 'nation-state' itself. It is not here possible for me, however, to elaborate on all these re-conceptualizations, which are great literatures in themselves. Therefore, I will be content with referring to the changes in the conceptualization of 'belonging' as an analytical tool, with its connotations on the above broadly debated notions.

Belonging is understood to be a concept, which is "analytically and normatively crucial to thinking about the problems of political order in a democratic society, regardless of one's judgment on the value and viability of the nation-state" (Crowley, 1999: 20). That is why a redefinition of it is important, as Crowley argues, because belonging is conceptually not just accidentally exclusive with its implications in 'national' or 'ethnic' discourse. To overcome this conceptual impediment Yuval-Davis argues that there is a need to deconstruct notions of belonging as they relate to ethnic and national processes and suggests a model which encompasses both 'elements of identification'/identity and 'elements of citizenship', a differentiation that identity politics has tended to ignore (2001). Such differentiation is necessary, as Yuval-Davis argues, because citizenship signifies the participatory dimension of belonging, whereas identification relates to the more emotive dimension of association. This means that feeling to be a part of a collectivity, a community, a social category, or a yearning to be so, might not denote actually taking part in a political community with all the rights and responsibilities involved (Yuval-Davis, 2001). Such differentiation brings Yuval-Davis, on the one hand, to propose for an exploration on the ways common histories, experiences and places are created, imagined and sustained, which was called by Vicky Bell as 'the performativity of belonging'; and to examine the hierarchy and dynamics of power that are exercised

in between different collectivities people feel attachment to, namely local, ethnic, national, inter/supra-national, and their cooperation and conflict, on the other (2001).

What is more in such redefinition of the notion of 'belonging' there is also a reconceptualization of space. Yuval-Davis's suggestion introduces a critical point to the 'spatial dimension' of belonging in that it takes space not as areas with boundaries around but as articulated movements in networks of social relations and understanding (2001). Thus imagining places in general and homelands in particular are grasped, crucially, as embedded in social relations and history around which narratives of belonging are woven (Yuval-Davis, 2001).

This new model of belonging understood within its references to 'social relations', 'narrative', 'performativity' and 'multi-layered'ness, thus, calls for the informal emotive dimensions of belonging rather than just the formal ones of citizenship rights (Yuval-Davis, 2001). Taking the informal emotive dimensions of belonging into consideration means taking into consideration "the differential positionings" from which belongings are imagined and narrated. In this way, differential positionings, in terms of gender, class, stage in the life cycle for instance, become important in the notion of belonging even in the same community and in relation to the same boundaries and borders (Yuval-Davis, 2001). If these differential positionings are not considered as reflecting informal emotive dimensions of belonging, then there is only a talk about 'otherness' on the one hand and 'crossing the borders' on the other, which leads as Yuval-Davis claims, to the ignorance of the ways these borders and boundaries are actually imagined by people (2001).

Considering 'the differential positionings', however, does not mean to neglect the 'power dimension' which is often disguised equally, both by arguing for the ever changing, fluctuating and contested nature of identities and by the claims of fixity and essentialism of the identity. To prevent such disguise, Yuval-Davis suggests for the examination of belonging not as an abstract notion but as being embedded in specific discourses of power, in which gender, class, sexual and racialized social divisions are enmeshed; and calls for a political form of participation in which

differential belongings as well as positionings are acknowledged in a non-exclusionary way (2001).

What I get from this suggestion of a redefinition of 'belonging' is the necessity to pay attention to different contexts that belonging is constructed. Hedetoft puts forward four key parameters in relation to which the concept of belonging must be situated analytically, which are claimed to be responsible, in varying configurations, for the concept's relations to and importance for the identity politics of different groups: sources of belonging; feelings of belonging; ascriptions and constructions of belonging; and fluidities of belonging (2004: 24). According to this scheme, *sources of belonging* refer to the locality and the familiar, which are understood to be the place rather than the abstract 'space', sensual experience, human interaction and local knowledge. These are the necessary conditions, but not the sufficient reasons for feeling of belonging, homeness and identity-producing processes (Hedetoft, 2004: 24-25). *Feelings of belonging* refer to identification and memory; in that feeling as belonging is rooted in a positive identification with all or some of the above conditioning elements and the interiorization of them as determinants of homeness, self-identity and socio-psychological security. This identification is not necessarily a conscious process, rather plays itself out in terms of the satisfaction of needs, recognition by a specific community, participation in its cultural and social activities, and a shared horizon of ideas, knowledge, networks and topography. Hedetoft argues that it is, "in this sense and at this point, a category of practice rather than theory – it is unreflexive, embedded" (2004: 25). The third parameter is named as *ascriptions or constructions of belonging*, which refer to nationalism and racism. At this stage belonging is collectively transformed into the modern, nation state dependent form of identity and is institutionalized in the form of passport, citizenship, socializing agencies creating official, ethno-national versions of historical memory; drawing boundaries of sovereignty between 'us' and 'them'; transforming concrete 'place' into abstract (imagined) 'territoriality'; and reinterpreting 'familiarity' as 'nationality' and 'strangers' as 'aliens'. Belonging, in short, is an ascription imposing homogeneity and excluding who do not 'authentically belong' (Hedetoft 2004: 25-26). In the fourth parameter *fluidities of*

belonging: globalism and cosmopolitanism Hedetoft points to the global, migratory, multiple processes that we have above discussed, as having undermined the nation-state ideal of belonging. What he points is “a new ideal of homogeneity”, namely, belonging to the globe rather than the nation, which he names the “contemporary cosmopolitan dream” (2004: 26).

As a logical extension of this categorization Hedetoft indicates, moreover, to the distinction between ‘house’/ ‘locality’, on the one hand, which refers to the immediate life-world of individuals and ‘home’, on the other, which refers to the images of homeness and belonging which are culturally and politically constructed (2004). As we see in the third parameter above, there is a construction of nation-as-home and this home is always abstract in Benedict Anderson’s sense of imagined communities implying that “collective national memory” is established through politically, culturally and historically orchestrated spaces, landscapes and locales (Hedetoft, 2004). Thus, ‘national identity’ becomes a ‘representation’ and nations, more than a political entity, appear to be something, which produces meanings, a system of cultural representation (Hall, 1992a). In this argument, “people are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the *idea* of the nation as represented in its national culture. A nation is a symbolic community and it is this which accounts for its power to generate a sense of identity and allegiance” (Hall, 1992a: 292).

Rethought within the framework established to this point, it appears that I will be looking at the components of belonging felt, asserted, experienced, embedded and embodied by a population which is defined, that is ‘represented’ at the margin -by means of minority status- of the ‘national identity’ constructed by the Turkish Republican nation-state. However, there is still the need for a discussion of how ‘ethnicity’ is conceptualized in the literature, since ‘ascription’ of the population by the ‘minority identity’ follows from the ‘ethnic identity’. In the light of above discussions, I understand ethnic identity as a constructed identity, but to see how it is constructed necessitates a broader look at the theories of ethnicity.

2.2. THEORIES OF ETHNICITY

The most classical classification of ‘ethnicity’ theories is made between the ‘primordialist’ and ‘circumstantialist or instrumentalist’ approaches; and I will not break the rule here. Both primordialist and circumstantialist approaches to ethnicity were theorized to overcome the insufficiencies and misinterpretations by a preceding one, the ‘assimilationist view’. Assimilationist model of ethnicity, which was posed by Boas to oppose the Darwinists assumptions of “natural and biological ethnicity of groups”, and which was heavily influenced by the works of Robert Park and the Chicago School of sociology, was briefly based on the assumption that the “assimilated person can participate, without encountering prejudice, in the common life, economic and political” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 42-43). In this model, ‘assimilation’ implied that modernity would bring an end to ethnicity. Though the model introduced an understanding of ethnicity as a cultural phenomenon, rooted in the social and the cultural, according to which ‘ethnicity’ was variable and contingent and it could change, it was a universalistic model in the end. It projected a general process in which minority identities eventually would disappear. The predictions did not come true, however, and the unexpected persistence of ethnicity, together with the diversity of forms ethnicity had taken led to different theorizations dealing with the issue of ethnicity. These two alternatives, primordialism and circumstantialism – the fixed and the fluid – were in fact poles around which much of the sociological debate about ethnicity and race has evolved (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998).

2.2.1. Primordialism

Primordialist approach to ethnicity argued that ethnic identity was a “basic group identity” (Isaacs, 1975), which “consist(ed) of the ready-made set of endowments and identifications”, that is the “primordial attachments” and the assumed ‘givens’ of social existence (Geertz, 1963; Shils, 1957) that “every individual shares with others from the moment of birth by the chance of the family into which he is born at that given time in that given place” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 48). According to

primordialism, thus, ethnicity is fixed, fundamental, and rooted in the unchangeable circumstances of birth and happens to us before we have the opportunity or capacity to make meaningful choices. This is the incomparably resilient and enduring element in it and this is the reason why assimilation came to grief.

However, the basic assumptions of fixity make the approach problematic in the face of various cases in the world which points to the variability of the primacy of ethnicity for many people and groups; to the shifts of identity over the course of life; and to the possible unrootedness of the 'elemental givens of social life'. Still, on the other hand, as Cornell and Hartmann clearly argue, what Geertz and Shils put forward was indeed the rootedness and fundamentality of 'significance attributed to the ethnic identity' offering the key to the puzzle of ethnic power and this, moreover, pointed to the power of primordialist approach (1998: 56).

2.2.2. Circumstantialism/ Instrumentalism

The other response to the assimilationist model was that it was the practical uses of ethnic identities which accounted for their persistence and these uses were in turn of the circumstances and contexts in which ethnic groups found themselves. This response, which was called as 'circumstantialism' or 'instrumentalism', posed that ethnicity was "the medium through which various groups organized to pursue their collective interests in competition with one another"; or "a result of intensive struggle between groups over new strategic positions of power" (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 56-57). The utilitarian logic apparent in the circumstantialist approach led, on the one hand, to the argument that the basis of collective political mobilization or of claims to certain resources; and on the other, to the assertion that individuals and groups emphasize their own ethnic or racial identities when such identities are in some way advantageous to them. Nevertheless, these do not point, as Cornell and Hartmann stress, that ethnic and racial attachments are necessarily superficial, or are necessarily easy to mobilize (1998). This utilitarian logic, moreover, is a circumstantially driven one, which leads to the argument that both identity and action are mediated, if not determined, by the circumstances and

contexts, that is concrete social and historical situations. This is, moreover, the point suggesting “that ethnic and racial identities are not fixed and unchanging, but are instead fluid and contingent, responding to the needs of the situation or the moment” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 59).

The point that ethnicity is a dependent variable, that is it is less creator of circumstances or situations than product of them (Nagata, 1981 quoted in Cornell and Hartmann, 1998), leads us to ask the question of what are these circumstances. Cornell and Hartmann pose the important one to be ‘competition and conflict’ arguing that “ethnic and racial identities become bases of collective conception and action when distinct populations are thrown into competition with another for relatively scarce resources, such as jobs, housing, political power, or social status” (1998: 61). The focus on competition and conflict in that they may reinforce preexisting ethnic or racial boundaries or even, in some cases, generate anew, is taken to be an indicator of a concern on ‘power’ and an introduction of ‘class dimension’.

However, the main point of criticism directed towards the circumstantialist approach is that it has a difficulty dealing with ethnicity in and of itself, attributing the resilience of ethnicity to something outside the realm of the ethnic such as economic or political interests. Such assumption, it is argued, raises two problems. One, relates the issue of ‘agency’, that is the role of the sentiments and experiences of many ethnic groups themselves; the other, relates the issue of priority of ‘ethnicity’ over other “potential bases for collective identity, such as class, occupation, sex, region, or religion”, in that it does not account for the strength of ‘ethnic identity’ (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 65-66).

Instead of choosing between two approaches, which would be an inadequate attempt for a comprehensive understanding of ‘ethnic phenomena’, Cornell and Hartmann argue that we “need to recognize that ethnicity is both contingent on circumstance and therefore fluid”; and, however, “is often experienced as primordial and therefore as fixed” (1998: 71). To achieve this they pose an alternative model of ethnicity.

2.2.3. The Constructionist Approach

Retaining the basic assumptions of circumstantialism in terms of the determining effect of the context, and bearing in mind the key insights of primordialism in terms of the strongly felt power of ethnicity, the constructionist approach introduces the ‘actor’ into the scene. It argues that there is an interactive relation of ‘ascription’ by the circumstances and ‘assignment’ of the ‘other’, on the one hand, and the ‘assertion’ of the group or the individual, on the other (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). In this vein, identity, as a “reciprocal fluxion”, points to a continuous change, which occurs at the intersection of the claims one makes about her/himself and the claims others make about her/him. Sociology’s basic norm states that:

We need to understand both how people interpret and negotiate their lives in ethnic or racial ways, and how larger historical and social forces organize the arenas and terms in which those people act, encouraging or discouraging the interpretations they make, facilitating some forms of organization and action and hindering others (Cornell and Hartman, 1998: 12-13)

Drawing on this basic norm and presuming, moreover, that “ethnic identities are changeable, contingent and diverse”, Cornell and Hartmann call for a “close attention to how their forms and functions vary and how they change over time” (1998: 73). To achieve this they follow some paths regarding the ‘assertion and assignment’; ‘comprehensiveness’; ‘subjectivity and objectivity’; ‘the boundaries’; and ‘construction sites’ of ethnicity. I will follow a similar path in the following overview, though trying to integrate a larger amount of discussion on ethnicity.

2.2.3.1. Assignment and Assertion

I referred above to a twofold understanding of ethnic groups. First, they are seen to be ‘assigned/ ascribed’, that’s passively ‘made’, ‘labeled’ by external forces, which includes not only material circumstances but also the claims that other persons or groups make about the group in question. Second, they are viewed to be ‘asserted’, that’s actively engage in the process and ‘make’ themselves, through using the raw materials of history, cultural practice, and preexisting identities to fashion their own distinctive notions of who they are by accepting, resisting, choosing, specifying,

inventing, redefining, rejecting or actively defending those claims (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 77-80).

Significance of the twofold process is also shared by other theorists such as anthropologist Fredrik Barth (1969) who claimed that both self-ascription and ascription by others are critical factors in the making of ethnic groups and identities. Barth, moreover, differentiates the process of ethnic identity formation by referring to the forms of ascription. In this, a categorical ascription is an ethnic ascription when it classifies a person in terms of his basic, most general identity, presumptively determined by his origin and background. As a consequence of his definition of ethnic groups as forms of social organization, Barth argues that to the extent that actors use ethnic identities to categorize themselves and others for the purposes of interaction, they form ethnic groups in this organizational sense (Barth, 1969). I will return to this understanding of ethnic group as an organizational type under the subtitle of ‘the boundaries’.

2.2.3.2. Comprehensiveness of Ethnicity

By comprehensiveness, Cornell and Hartmann refer to the degree that ethnic identity organizes social life. According to this criterion, “a comprehensive or ‘thick’ ethnic tie is one that organizes a great deal of social life and both individual and collective action”, determining “whom you would marry, where you lived, how you were treated by the police, what your employment opportunities were, how much political power you had”; while “a less comprehensive or ‘thin’ ethnic tie is one that organizes relatively little of social life and action” (1998: 73-74). Such a categorical differentiation between thin and thick ethnic identities, though being mostly an analytical one, is indeed important to understand the variety that ethnicity is experienced by different groups. It is because, while “for some groups ethnic or racial background reliably predicts life chances, organizes social relations and daily experience, and plays a prominent role in individual self-concepts; for others, it may do only one or two of these or none”; and while “some people are reminded of their ethnic or racial identity- proudly, angrily, sadly, or indifferently- every day; others

for the most part ignore [it]" (1998: 11). It is also important to point to the heterogeneity of the experiences within the group itself that different members could experience this 'comprehensivity' at different degrees.

2.2.3.3. Subjective and Objective Criteria of Ethnicity

One of the earliest examples of the significance attributed to the 'subjective' element in defining ethnicity, is in Weber's approach as it appears in *Economy and Society* that "we shall call 'ethnic groups' those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration" (quoted in Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 16). For Weber, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists. Cornell and Hartmann argue that they retain the basic assumption of Weberian approach in 'the subjective belief in common descent', in their adoption of Schermerhorn's (1978) definition of an ethnic group as "a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood" (1998: 19). That 'symbolic elements' in this definition, might be, as they argue, kinship patterns, geographical concentration, religious affiliation, language and physical differences as well as common history or descent from a common homeland (1998).

The symbolic elements being understood as connoting some 'objective traits' or 'objective differences' of culture, however, is related to a view of culture as an enduring, traditional, structural and coherent body that lives and dies, rather than a contingent, syncretic and historical view of it (Bottomley, 1991). Such a conflation of culture with ethnicity, moreover, gives rise to unitary categories, despite obvious complexities of regional, class, gender, historical, and social differences within such categories. Bottomley claims that both political economists who see culture as epiphenomenal and ideological; and those asserting the primordality of ethnic consciousness and the primacy of ethnic identification over class affiliation, though having theoretically and politically opposed positions, ironically "have a point of

convergence in regarding culture/ethnicity as unproblematic because already constituted” (1991: 3). This view of ‘unproblematic constitution’, nevertheless, might lead ‘ethnicity’ to be seen as a ‘*stigmatized identity*’ (Cashmore and Troyna, 1983 quoted in Bradley, 1996), which, in turn, bears important connotations on the way identities are articulated, positioned and displayed.

‘Objective traits’, in this account, might be taken not to be the sum of ‘objective’ differences, but those which the actors themselves regard as significant and this brings us to Anthony Cohen’s argument that:

[T]he ethnic group is an aggregate of selves each of whom produces ethnicity for itself. What these various productions have in common may well be more a matter of formal appearance than of meaningful reality. It is the self’s consciousness which has primacy in the creation of ethnicity, in rendering boundaries meaningful, in the interpretation of ethnic identity. The self consciousness is the obvious point at which to begin. (1994: 76).

In this argument, “ethnicity has a definite appearance, but rather indefinite substance”, though still it is not an “insubstantial” one (Cohen, 1994: 62). To reflect more on the notion of ‘self-conscious’, however, it should be pointed that “although an ethnic is self-consciously ethnic, its self-consciousness often has its source in outsiders” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 20) and this is the point which draws upon the famous dichotomy of ‘us’ and ‘them’.

2.2.3.4. The Boundaries

Cohen asserts that “by definition, the boundary marks the beginning and the end of a community”; however, the crucial question, for him, is why such marking is necessary, and the answer lies in “the exigencies of social interaction” (2000: 12). Barth, moreover, points to these exigencies in that “ethnic identities function as categorization of inclusion/exclusion and of interaction, about which both ego and alter must agree if their behavior is to be meaningful” (1969: 132). Thus, the distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ is to be seen as a condition of meaning. Such idea finds one of its strongest echoes in Bauman’s works. He argues that clarity of social world and its order is achieved only by drawing boundaries, making classifications and categorizing social phenomena in dichotomies (Bauman, 2003).

The most important of those dichotomies, Bauman argues, is the one between ‘us’ and ‘them’ which represents not only two separate group of people but the distinction between two completely different attitudes, that of emotional attachment and antipathy, of trust and fear, of solidarity and competition (2003: 51). Bauman asserts, moreover, that this distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ is given in sociology as the distinction between ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’. And these opposing poles cannot be separated from each other, since they make sense only together, in their opposition to each other. They gain all their meanings from their opposition (Bauman, 2003). This ‘constitutive other’ which becomes the “foe” in Bauman’s words is usually understood in a ‘stereotypical scheme’. I will return to the issue of ‘stereotypes’ during the analyses.

A focus on the ‘boundaries’ could also be understood as a broader issue of ‘culture’ and the ‘objective traits’ argument, referred above. According to this focus there is a problem in delimiting ethnic groups as contrasting cultural units (Eidheim, 1969), in that it produces a picture in which there is “a world of separate peoples, each with their culture and each organized in a society which can legitimately be isolated for description as an island to itself” (Barth, 1969: 11). Besides leading to a view of a homogeneous, coherent, given ‘culture’, such a view also allows us to assume that the boundary maintenance is unproblematical. Following from the mismatch between the ‘culture’ and the ‘ethnic group’, what Barth (1969) call for is a focus of investigation on the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses. Barth claims it to be true “that ethnic groups are distinguished by a number of cultural traits which serve as diacritica, as overt signals of identity which persons will refer to as criteria of classification, [including those] items of custom, from style of dress to rules of inheritance” (1969: 132). He equally stresses, however, ethnic dichotomies do not depend on these. His focus on the boundaries, leads him to claim that an ethnic group is, indeed an organizational type since social life is canalized by the ethnic boundary entailing a frequently quite complex organization of behavior, social relations and criteria of membership (1969: 15-16). This means that stable, persisting, and often vitally important social relations are maintained across such boundaries, and frequently based precisely on the

dichotomized ethnic statuses; rather than ethnic distinctions depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance (1969: 9-10).

Cornell and Hartmann (1998) add to this discussion by stressing the importance of the 'meaning' attributed to the line between us and them which could be associated, for example, with 'superiority', 'good' and 'trust' on the one hand, and 'inferiority', 'evil' and 'distrust', on the other. Such meaning attribution is seen also related to the 'perceived position' of the ethnic group in the larger society, which could be associated with an assumed 'difference', as well as with a position in a stratification system related to distribution of power, ascription of status, or allocation of resources. They argue that "change in any of these variously maintains, alters, reinforces, undermines, or otherwise affects the identity of the group. In short, it reconstructs that identity" (1998: 81-82).

The focus on the constructedness of ethnic groups, however, does not deny the role of "primordial attachments" altogether, as the argument follows that each ethnic group, whether thin or thick in the organization of social life, "typically retain some of the significance commonly attached to blood ties", "as touching something deeper and more profound than labels or interests or contingency" (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 89). Cornell and Hartmann name this as "constructed primordiality". This constructed primordiality could be understood within a wider framework that takes 'ethnicity' as a 'symbolic entity'. In this understanding ethnicity as a symbolic entity is "concerned with the symbols of ethnic cultures rather than with the cultures themselves" (Alba quoted in Cerulo, 1997: 389). This approach keeping with constructionist premises, states that symbolic ethnicities are easily reshaped in response to varying situational contexts and growing social needs and this brings us to the issue of 'context'. Here, operates another construction, "the reconstruction of circumstances", which retains that identity has its own impacts in that "once established an ethnic identity becomes a lens through which people interpret and make sense of the world around them, [in other words], it becomes a starting point for interpretation and ultimately action" (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 94). Ethnic identity, thus, might be seen both as a "product of personal choice, a social category

individuals actively decide to adopt or stress” as Waters (1990) states, and as a “sociopolitical phenomenon” as Nagel (1995) states (Waters and Nagel quoted in Cerulo, 1997: 389).

The discussion on ‘ethnicity as a symbolic entity’ provides a ground for further discussion on community as a ‘symbolic construction’, which points to the conceptualization of *community* in this study. The symbolic construction theory, which is posed by Cohen, does not approach community “as a morphology [that is] as a structure of institutions capable of objective definition and description”; rather, it tries to “understand ‘community’ by seeking to capture members’ experiences of it” (2000: 19-20). Being different from the long recognized suggestion that “communities are important repositories of symbols”, Cohen’s argument poses that “the community itself and everything within it, conceptual as well as material, has a symbolic dimension, and, further, that this dimension does not exist as some kind of consensus of sentiment: it exist as something for people ‘to think with’” (2000: 19). Thus, ‘symbols’, in this argument, do more than merely stand for or represent something else; they give us the capacity to make meaning (Cohen, 2000: 15). Such idea of symbolic construction, however, does not mean that community is a mere “oratorical abstraction”; on the contrary, “it hinges crucially on consciousness” and there is “the reality of community in people’s experience” (Cohen, 2000: 13, 16). In Cohen’s theory, ‘symbolic construction’ connotes that this reality inheres in people’s attachment or commitment to a common body of symbols, which is realized through “boundaries which are themselves largely constituted by people in interaction” (2000: 13, 16). It is now crucial to turn to the ‘construction sites’ whereby these boundaries and the symbolic meanings attributed to them come to fore.

2.2.3.5. The Construction Sites

Identity construction may occur in any ground of society and as an aspect of virtually any set of social relations. However, overviewing the six construction sites that Cornell and Hartmann put forward might be useful in observing the construction of boundaries in terms of ethnic identities. These are namely politics,

labor markets, residential space, social institutions, culture, and daily experience, which are difficult to separate, but taken separately for analytical reasons and which are described in terms of opportunities and constraints that groups encounter there (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). I will point each of them briefly since they relate the study at hand.

Though all intergroup relations can be described in terms of *power*, that is the differential ability of human groups influence the decisions and relationships that have consequences for their lives, when the focus is on majority and minority relations in a state it becomes obviously important. Citizenship, the franchise, entitlements of various kinds, patronage relations, policy provisions, the social, political, economic rights groups or individuals have and the vulnerabilities they face are among the political circumstances groups face. Cornell and Hartmann argue that while “large power differentials between ethnic or racial groups sharpen and reinforce ethnic and racial boundaries, giving increased significance to the identities they define, small differentials, other things equal, blur those boundaries, decreasing that significance” (1998: 155).

Second site is the *labor market* and it is important for our purposes in terms of occupational concentration along ethnic lines in that certain occupations, industries, or kinds of work might become in the province of a particular group. Such phenomena is evaluated usually regarding the effects of migration, however, in other situations, too, there may well be discrimination in employment or in access to economic resources shaping ethnic or racial occupational concentrations. Such a concentration, moreover, may well follow from “the characteristics of ethnic or racial groups themselves, including the skills and experience they have and the internal connections among the group members, through which job information often moves” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 164). Whatever the reason, such concentrations increase the probability of interactions with other group members and add a spatial dimension to the ethnic or racial boundary, on the one hand, and select a boundary and gives that boundary certain real-life consequences, on the other (1998: 166).

Residential opportunity is taken along similar lines with occupational opportunity in terms of its effects on identity construction having implications on its thickness and salience. Cornell and Hartmann indicate that just as they cannot always choose where they work, people are not always free to choose where they live, pointing to the cases where discriminatory actions of others may limit residential freedom of choice (1998: 165). However what is significant for our purposes is the fact that, even where there is a substantially open housing market, residential concentrations may occur simply as a result of the choices people make, for example, choosing to live near friends, relatives, or others who are familiar or of similar background. This choice may follow a necessity for people depending on those ‘familiar’ they already know for information on housing opportunities, which might mostly be thought in cases of migration or simply movements within the city. Whatever the reason, the results of such concentration are similar to the ones in occupational concentration. And restricting certain persons- however defined- to particular positions in the labor or housing markets applies to be a boundary mechanism. Not only concentration, but also “the extent to which the positions in the labor or residential markets are available to group members are available only to them and to the nonmembers”; “the extent to which a particular position is the only opportunity available to group members”; and “the extent to which a given occupational or residential opportunity facilitates interpersonal interactions among group members” are important factors defining the ways how ethnic identity is constructed (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 167-168).

The *social institutions* are stated to include schools, churches, social service organizations, sources of financial credit, retail services, and all of the other formally organized mechanisms by which the members of a society solve the various problems of daily living. These are pointed by Cornell and Hartmann (1998) to be institutions availability and accessibility to which by all populations within a society is related to the power relations and thus to the definition of ethnic identities; accordingly, if these institutions are available and accessible the salience of ethnic boundaries is reduced. If otherwise, discrimination in this case, the denial of institutional access on the basis of ethnic identity, is a powerful boundary

mechanism, whether that access has to do with jobs, housing, political participation, schools or some other institution (1998: 169). Being denied access to dominant institutions has effect on identity in that populations have to find alternative solutions to life problems repercussion of which will vary according to the ‘variety of capitals’ the population has. Cornell and Hartmann count ‘intermarriage’ also among these social institutions, the effects of which I will be turning during the analyses.

Culture being the fifth site of identity construction refers, here, to the culture of the society at large, of the society of which a given ethnic group forms a part. It refers to those ideas and understandings that appear to be dominant and privileged in a society and assumptions about relevant differences among different groups. Cornell and Hartmann name these as being the “categories of ascription that dominate the conceptual organization of group life”; “the group classifications made by dominant populations”, which might be called classification schemes; and the status attributions the dominant culture makes regarding the various groups in society (1998: 173-174). To point ‘culture’ as a more multidimensional phenomena, however, we might understand it as a “constitutive social process that includes *both* the meanings and values”, through which people “handle and respond to the conditions of existence, *and* the lived traditions and practices through which those understandings are expressed and in which they are embodied” (Hall 1982 quoted in Bottomley, 1991: 2-3).

Daily experience being the last construction site for identities that Cornell and Hartmann (1998) point is understood to be a critical site where the boundaries between groups are often most clearly drawn or most subtly reinforced. In day-to-day interactions, it is argued people enact their assumptions, conveying messages about which identities are important to them and what those identities mean. Thus, “the encounters of day-to-day life send out messages telling people who and what they are and who and what they are not” both through “subtle, perhaps unconscious, and supposedly innocent phenomena” and through “more confrontational and extreme experiences” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 189). This site of ‘daily experience’ will be one of the most critical ones in understanding the narratives arrived in the current study.

These paths give important clues to follow the traces of ethnic identity construction at various occasions. However, limiting ourselves only with these paths may lead us to think mostly in relation to the ‘external definitions’ and ignore the real complexity of the ‘internal definitions’ to a degree, since especially the constructions sites, as they are outlined above, give prominence mostly to the operations of the ‘dominant groups’ in these processes. Cornell and Hartmann, themselves aware of this problem, argue that “identities are constructed as human populations, carrying their own characteristics, ideas, and agendas, engage the ideas, opportunities, and actors involved in these various sites” (1998: 194). It is, thus, important to understand how a group of people are ascribed and externally defined and to observe construction sites to see the operations going on there; but it is equally important to see how do people assert their multiple, shifting, multilayered identifications, their belongingness, their self-understandings and what are their relationship to those external ascriptions. It is, moreover, important to see how the boundaries are constructed and reconstructed, how they function and when they get blurred in the experiences and imagination of people.

I have outlined the above framework to supply and clarify the concepts and the necessary reference points when talking about ethnicity. To repeat, I will not be trying to point ‘what kind’ of ethnic groups are the Armenians and the Jews living in Ankara, in terms of their ‘cultural differences’. Rather, trying to go beyond the “thick list” assessments of ethnicity, I attempt to “explore what being a member of a particular ethnic group means”, that is “the influence of ethnicity as a form of identity” (Nazroo and Karlsen, 2003: 903). Nazroo and Karlsen, viewing ethnicity as a form of identity, argue that “ethnicity is just one part of who we are and should not be viewed as operating independently of other elements” (2003: 928). This argument highlights the interrelated nature of each different aspect of identity and how an experience of ethnicity is influenced by other aspects of our social identities. Thus, ethnicity as identity is an important, but variable and context dependent aspect of people’s lives, and more sensitive measures of ethnicity should be developed that can take account of this (Nazroo and Karlsen, 2003). Nazroo and Karlsen, as we see, position ethnic identity within a wider framework. This is indeed what I will try to

achieve and for this reason I try to analyze the findings of the research in terms of ‘spatial’, ‘political’ and ‘communitarian’ identifications of individuals. This is also the reason why I focus on everyday life and try to grasp the multiplicity of self-understandings and of belongingness. In short, ‘ethnic identity’, is taken in this study both as implying a series of constraints on the kinds of roles an individual is allowed to play (Barth, 1969), and as a ‘mode of being’ implying agency of the individual and the group (Nazroo and Karlsen, 2003).

Such a position regarding ethnicity -taking both the ‘social constraints’ and the role of agency into consideration, though not much in an interactive manner but in a manner being embedded in history in their mutual construction and re-construction of each other and history moreover- can be thought in line with the claim of ‘new sociology of ethnicities’. The claim of ‘newness’ is not that sincere within the limits of this chapter, since I have referred the understanding of this ‘new sociology of ethnicities’ both during the discussion on identity and on ethnicity in its basic assumptions without naming it so however. To repeat, the emphasis within the new sociology of ethnicities is on the complex and fluid nature of ethnic identity, claiming ethnicity not to be constant through an individual’s life but to be emerging only in specific contexts in which it assumes significance as an aspect of individual experience (Bradley, 1996); taking culture as referring less to a unified identity than to the mundane practices of everyday life focusing on the border zones within and between putatively homogeneous communities, thus putting into question the radical separation between us and them (Alonso, 1994: 400); not turning away from the study of material disadvantage and power disparities and not celebrating diversity at the expense of ignoring inequality, but still taking class as important element of the social processes which create ‘new ethnicities’ (Bradley, 1996: 132); viewing ‘new ethnicities’ as being historically, culturally and politically constructed as a kind of counter to the old discourses of nationalism or national identity (Hall, 1992b) with a claim in capability of ‘ethnicity’ to focus attention on specificities, on the fact that personal identity is formed at the unstable point “where the unspeakable stories of subjectivities meet the narratives of history, of a culture” (Hall 1987 quoted in Bottomley, 1991: 8). These arguments together point to a claim, moreover, that

ethnicity is not doomed to survive only by marginalizing, dispossessing, displacing and forgetting other ethnicities, because “we all speak from a particular place, out of a particular history, out of a particular experience, and a particular culture, without being contained by that position” and because “we are all in that sense, *ethnically* located and our ethnic identities are crucial to our subjective sense of who we are” (Hall, 1992b: 7).

Such an understanding of ethnicity calls also for an understanding of ‘national culture’ as “constituting a *discursive device* which represents difference as unity or identity” (Hall, 1992a: 297). National cultures, Hall argues, construct identities by producing meanings about ‘the nation’ with which we can identify and in that way influence and organize both our actions and our conception of ourselves (1992a). What representational strategies are deployed to construct our commonsense views of national belonging or identity, thus, becomes important both in terms of ‘dominant’ and in terms of ‘subordinate’ ethnic groups, or better to say of majority and minority.

To this point I have tried to make a focus both on the importance of articulations, assertions, practices, claims of the agents in construction of their and others’ identity, and also of the spatial and historical embeddedness of these constructions, social constraints, context and circumstances. I will now suggest that these are, indeed, not two distinct and separate dimensions of construction which mutually exclude each other; but they are interwoven into each other in a constitutive manner and such suggestion will introduce into the current discussion a crucial concept, ‘habitus’.

2.3. THEORY OF PRACTICE AND ‘HABITUS’

Habitus is indeed more than a ‘concept’; it implies a way of understanding the sociality, a way of theorizing the world, the practice, the history. It is, also, a way of theorizing knowledge. For the purposes of this study, to understand identity and ethnicity in such a wider perspective is important, since, as I have asserted at the very beginning of this chapter, how you understand identity is very much related to how

you understand the sociality. I suppose “theory of practice” and the concept ‘habitus’ provides us that wider perspective.

Bourdieu’s ‘theory of practice’ follows from a double refusal regarding the attempts to search and theorize about the sociality. First, there is a refusal directed towards engaging in “empiricism blind to the theoretical choices involved in all research, which relies upon precepts of a body of methodologists codifying research practices”; and second there is a refusal directed towards engaging “in theoreticism which never gets beyond first principles” (Liénard and Servais, 2000: 84).

Bourdieu criticizes existing “modes of theoretical knowledge”, which, he claims, usually imply tacit anthropological theses, and which “have only one in common, the fact that they are opposed to practical knowledge” (1992: 3). This criticism is, indeed, a broad one directed to all established projects in the field of social theories: objectivism, structuralism, positivism, formalism, nominalism, subjectivism, phenomenology, interactionism and ethnomethodology (Liénard and Servais, 2000). Bourdieu congregates the above ‘established projects’ under three ‘mode of theoretical knowledge’, phenomenology, objectivism and subjectivism, and directs his criticism towards them. According to him, phenomenological mode of knowledge in its attempt to give an account of daily life, fails to inquire into the conditions making possible the lived-in-relationships or familiarity with the world, generally (Liénard and Servais, 2000). It sets out to make explicit “the truth, the primary experience of the social world, which by definition, does not reflect on itself and excludes the question of the conditions of its own possibility” (Bourdieu, 1992: 3). As to phenomenology, Bourdieu attacks, mostly, to the stance of ethnomethodology and “exoticism inherent in the anthropologist’s relation to archaic societies” (Liénard and Servais, 2000: 83). Secondly, he criticizes the objectivist mode of knowledge. He asserts that while constructing the objective relations of practice (e.g. economic or linguistic) which structure practice and representations of practice (Bourdieu, 1992), the objectivist perspective, “neglects to explicitly pose the problem of the theoretical status granted to the operation of constructing objective regularities and practices” (Liénard and Servais, 2000: 85). Objectivism treats, moreover, symbolic

acts as acts of communication going on between impersonal and interchangeable senders and receivers; this leading to, what Bourdieu criticizes, “reduce all social relations to communicative relations and, more precisely to decoding operations” (1992: 1). Bourdieu directs his criticisms especially to structuralism and hermeneutics as objectivist approaches. He asserts strongly that:

It is necessary to abandon all theories which explicitly or implicitly treat practice as a mechanical reaction, directly determined by the antecedent conditions and entirely reducible to the mechanical functioning of pre-established assemblies, ‘models’ or ‘roles’ (Bourdieu, 1992: 73).

Liénard and Servais add to the criticism of objectivism claiming that it forgets “the principles of action do not lie in catalogues of oppositions that are treated as faits accomplis, as executed analogies; but in sociologically defined agents who appropriate them, accomplish them or carry them out in a socially structured situation through practice” (2000: 86). Accordingly, Bourdieu has criticized subjectivist mode of knowledge, such as social psychology and interactionism, in having an occasionalist illusion, which stems from the constitution of a direct relation between practices and properties inscribed in the situation and the focus on ‘interpersonal’ relations (1992: 73). He argues, moreover, that “‘interpersonal’ relations are never, except in appearance, *individual-to-individual* relationships and that the truth of the interaction is never entirely contained in the interaction” (Bourdieu, 1992: 81).

The aim of the theory of practice, on the other hand, is stated by Bourdieu to be “to make possible a science of the *dialectical* relations between the objective structures to which the objectivist mode of knowledge gives access and the structured dispositions within which those structures are actualized and which tend to reproduce them” (1992: 3). It, thus, forces attention to the social conditions in which the accomplishment of science is possible and to the principle of the production of the observed order. The theory of the mode of generation of practices, as Bourdieu names the theory of practice in order to focus its aim, “is the precondition for establishing an experimental science of the dialectic of the internalization of

externality and the externalization of internality, or, more simply, of incorporation and objectification” (1992: 72).

The relation between the ‘externality and internality’, the ‘incorporation and objectification’ is best understood, I guess, by the concept ‘habitus’. Bourdieu’s work on habitus, together with Giddens’ structuration theory, or Habermas’ theories of communicative action, is counted to be a theoretical advance relevant to identity studies resting on successful macro-micro linkages (Cerulo, 1997). The dialectical process implicit in the working of habitus is most clear in Bourdieu’s own words:

[T]he habitus, the product of history, produces individual and collective practices, and hence history, in accordance with the schemes engendered by history. The system of dispositions – a past which survives in the present and tends to perpetuate itself into the future by making itself present in practices structured according to its principles, an internal law relaying the continuous exercise of the law of external necessities (irreducible to immediate conjunctural constraints) – is the principle of the continuity and regularity which objectivism discerns in the social world without being able to give them a rational basis (1992: 82).

Habitus, in short, is the mediator between structures and practices. Better to say, structures are ‘in’ the agents, in the sense that, they are inscribed in the organism in the form of the constituent dispositions of their habitus (Liénard and Servais, 2000). This inscription is realized, indeed, through the embodiment of ‘necessary arbitrary’ structures by the agents. For instance, as Liénard and Servais argue, “within a class habitus, the social, economic, symbolic barriers are transformed into the logical, or better, sociological limits defining the unthinkable, i.e. discriminating between what can or can not be said or thought”; and being, in this way, “internalized by the agent, these discriminations are put forth as self-evident and suggest the illusion of freedom” (2000: 87). This is what Bourdieu calls the ‘sense of reality’.

I think such conception of sociality is critical with regard to the purposes of this study that is to understand the identity constructions or self-concepts of groups, which are, among others, defined by their ethnic/religious affiliations and legal status within the larger society. Its critical role stems from the fact that thinking through habitus, which implies a continuing interaction between circumstances, actions and perceptions, permits us to overcome the dichotomies of ‘determinism’ versus ‘freedom’; ‘articulation’ versus ‘assertion’; ‘structure’ versus ‘agency’; and

‘individual’ versus ‘society’/‘community’. It is not possible to understand the sides of these dichotomies as separate and distinct from one another, when we recall the mediating role of habitus as:

[a] system of lasting transposable dispositions, structured structures, predisposed to function at every moment as a matrix of the agents’ perceptions, appreciations and actions when confronting a conjuncture or an event produced by history which it has helped to produce (Liénard and Servais, 2000:88).

If habitus is a ‘matrix’, then not only ‘the perceptions, appreciations and actions’ of the individual agent, but also the very ‘logic’ of ‘groupness’ itself could be understood in terms of it. This is a well established projection of habitus by Bourdieu. He argues that:

Habitus could be considered as a subjective but not individual system of internalized structures, schemes of perception, conception, and action common to all members of the same group or class and constituting the precondition for all objectification and apperception; and the objective coordination of practices and the sharing of a world-view could be founded on the perfect impersonality and interchangeability of singular practices and views (Bourdieu, 1992: 86).

There is, thus, a ‘practical sense’ or a ‘practical knowledge’ at the basis of the workings of habitus. This practical knowledge follows from a commonsense world, owing to the “orchestration of habitus”, and “endowed with the *objectivity* secured by consensus on the meaning (*sens*) of practices and the world” (Bourdieu, 1992: 80). In other words, there is an assumed homogeneity of group or class habitus which “results from the homogeneity of the conditions of existence” and this “enables practices to be objectively harmonized without any intentional calculation or conscious reference to a norm and mutually adjusted in the absence of any direct interaction or a fortiori, explicit co-ordination” (Bourdieu, 1992: 80). Still, however, this does not mean to deny any ‘intentional’ or ‘strategic’ calculation, which would be “an estimation of chances assuming the transformation of the past effect into the expected objective” in Bourdieu’s words (1992: 76). The thing to bear in mind is, again, that these responses are defined in relation to a system of objective potentialities and cannot be conceived in terms of an ‘absolute possibility’ in Hegel’s sense (Bourdieu, 1992).

The notion of habitus as creating a practical knowledge of groupness, moreover, seems particularly relevant, as Bottomley argues, “to a consideration of the ways in which constructions such as gender, class, ethnicity, and race become literally ‘embodied knowledges’, operating largely below the level of consciousness” (1991: 5). This argument could well be supported with another, still voiced by Bottomley, that:

Habitus is the process whereby those who occupy similar positions in social and historical space come to share a certain ‘sense of place’ and develop categories of perception that provide a commonsense understanding of the world, especially of what is natural, plausible, or even imaginable (1991: 4-5).

No need to say that these categories are socially produced within specific contexts, and they continue to mediate the experience and interpretation of changing objective conditions.

What we have at hand, at this point, is that ‘ethnicity as a form of identity’ is an ‘embodied knowledge’ which derives from a ‘practical sense’ of ‘groupness’ or ‘commonality’ and which is produced by and dialectically reproduces its ‘objective conditions of existence’. What are these ‘objective conditions of existence’ for the two ‘ethnic’ groups specified in this study? For the purposes of analysis, I take these conditions under three broad categories: living in Ankara; being legally defined to be minorities by the Turkish republican state; and ‘being’ ethnic communities as Armenians and Jews. These categories, as they appear, need to be detailed in their references, to grasp a comprehensive understanding of the habitus of the two groups I have specified. I will try to do this as I continue with the analyses of the ‘research findings’. Still, however, there is a need to point to the categories briefly. Firstly, I understand by ‘living in Ankara’ the long history that these groups have been in the city and their identification with it; their multiple feelings and practices of belonging; their perception of the capital city identity; and their positioning of group identity within the opportunities and constraints supplied by the social and spatial relationships. Secondly, I understand by ‘being legally defined to be minorities by the Turkish republican state’ the complex relationship between ‘national identity’, ‘citizenship’ and ‘minority identity’ which these groups have been experiencing

since the formation of the republican state; their experiences and memories of ‘Turkification policies’; their daily life experiences as minorities and their self-definition of identity. Lastly, I understand by ‘‘being’ ethnic communities as Armenians and Jews’ their experiences in the occupational, religious, social life within the communities; the in-group versus out-group choices in their marriage relations; and the definition of ‘other’ appearing through the boundaries in interaction. I suggest that there is a need to understand the minority groups in Ankara within such a framework in order to have a comprehensive understanding of their self-concepts and complex identifications. There is a need, moreover, for thinking through their habitus which the above elements are a part of, in order to abstain from ‘‘regarding culture as only the sum of the articulated rules, traditions and ideologies’’ (Bottomley, 1991: 2). There is such a need, moreover, to escape from both the ‘totalizing’ rules of ‘objectivism’, and from the mere claim of ‘lived experience’ and ‘creativity’ of ‘subjectivism’. My attempt lies, indeed, in Bourdieu’s suggestion that:

To eliminate the need to ‘rules’, it would be necessary to establish in each case a complete description ... of the relation between the habitus, as a socially constituted system of cognitive and motivating structures, and the socially structured situation in which the agent’s *interests* are defined, and with them the objective functions and subjective motivations of their practices (1992: 76).

At this point, I will turn to another issue, which is also critical for the purposes of the current study: the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the ‘embodied knowledge’ and thus, habitus, for all the group members. Bourdieu argues that:

It is because they are the product of dispositions which, being the internalization of the same objective structures, are objectively concerted, that the practices of the members of the same group or, in a differentiated society, the same class are endowed with an objective meaning that is at once unitary and systematic, transcending subjective intentions and conscious projects whether individual or collective (1992: 81).

Following from this argument, are we going to imagine habitus as a machine to produce identical individuals as ‘members’ of a ‘group’? Supposedly, the answer Bourdieu would give to this question would be ‘no’. It is because he seems to speak more about likeliness of being identical in the process, rather than absoluteness of being identical as an end product. For instance, in his pointing to the relation between similar class position of individual members and class habitus, he claims

that “it is certain that each member of the same class is more likely than any member of another class to have been confronted with the situations most frequent for the members of that class” (1992: 85). Thus, what he talks about is not the exact similarity of experiences, but the probability of their being similar.

This probability, moreover, does not deny that there are individual differences of articulations and practices, though still being constraint by the objective possibilities referred above. What to do with them in terms of habitus? The principle of the individual differences, for Bourdieu, lies in the fact that habitus, “being the product of a chronologically ordered series of structuring determinations, [...] brings about a unique integration, dominated by the *earliest experiences*, of the experiences statistically common to the members of the same class” (1992: 86-87). Such emphasis on the earliest experiences, I assume, is a support for the methodology of the current study. I have collected life stories of individuals, and, through the narratives of the individuals, tried to understand their self concepts of identity. Life stories, to go on, provided me a whole account of individual ‘earliest experiences’. Oral history, I suppose, provided me with an opportunity to direct attention to the objective conditions producing habitus, but also to take into account the individual differences as they have implications on perceiving, conceiving and acting of identities. Life narratives, in short, reveale[d] the dispositions of habitus” for the communities the current study dealt with, as they did for Bourdieu himself in his famous study in Kabylia (Reed-Danahay, 2005: 132).

I stated beforehand that I understand ‘community’ as a symbolic construction. This is by no means a contradiction with the conceptualization of ‘habitus’, since the use of symbolic devices and the symbols themselves are, without doubt, defined by the conditionings of habitus, which in turn also contribute to the further conditionings. This argument gains further meaning when the weight of different ‘forms of capital’ in the formation of action in each specific context is accounted. Nazroo and Karlsen (2003) argue that the means of expanding the sphere of ‘reasonable’ behavior laid by the habitus is through increasing lifestyle choices available. Access to potential lifestyle choices, moreover, is through forms of capital, which are also delimited by

social position. I understand the relation of these arguments to any practice or assertion of ethnic identity to be that different articulations of forms of capital individuals have, namely the economic, political, social, cultural, and symbolic forms of capital, might bring different assertions and perceptions of identity within a 'group'. Another implication pointed by Nazroo and Karlsen in their claim that "while aspects of ethnic identity may be internally defined, the scope of those choices will be restricted and affected by external forces" (2003: 906). What is central to their point, as they refer to Bader (2001), is an identity "that is rooted in and draws upon a particular cultural context", rather than a culture "that is a construction of identity choices or discourses" (Nazroo and Karlsen, 2003: 906). I think both suggestions, of mine and of Nazroo and Karlsen's, could be understood to be indicating the danger of any totalizing definition of an ethnic group not only in terms of its internal homogeneity and uniqueness, but also in terms of its very boundaries.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND THE RESEARCH PROCESS

“Life is not the one you live,
but the one you remember
as you remember it
when you tell it”

Gabriel Garcia Marquez

...

“the problem of identity
is the problem of arriving at a life story
that makes sense”

McAdams 1985 quoted in Cornell and Hartmann 1998

3.1. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

The link between epistemological standpoint and the research method is a widely debated one. While, on the one hand, there is a tendency to view qualitative and quantitative research as reflecting different epistemological positions and hence different ‘paradigms’; there is, on the other hand, the suggestion that both of the research traditions are appropriate to different kinds of research problems, implying that the research issue determines which style of research is employed (Bryman, 1999: 46-47). As an example to the former argument, Filstead poses that quantitative and qualitative methods are more than just differences between research strategies and data collection procedures in that they represent fundamentally different epistemological frameworks for conceptualizing the nature of knowing, social reality, and procedures for comprehending these phenomena (Filstead, 1979 quoted in Bryman, 1999: 45).

Focusing on qualitative research Valerie Raleigh Yow argues that this kind of research is inductive, and a multiplicity of variables and their relationships are considered not in isolation but as being interrelated in the life context (1994: 5). Therefore, she asserts further, the qualitative researcher learns about a way of life by studying the people who live it by asking them how they think about their experiences. Yow establishes, in this way, a similarity between the “grounded theory” and the “thick description”, on the one hand, and the method and the aim of the qualitative research, on the other:

The many examples they offer in their testimony are of examples that yields the hypothesis is *grounded theory*, an approach originated by sociologist Anselm Strauss and Barney Glaser. *Thick description*, a term used by ethnographer Clifford Geertz, is the goal: not a single view of the experience, but a larger number of testimonies that give great variety in detail (Yow, 1994: 7).

Positioning myself on behalf of a social constructivist standpoint, I presumed the merits of the qualitative research for the purposes of the current study. To this end, moreover, I applied oral history, since it was “a powerful tool for discovering, exploring, and evaluating the nature of the process of historical memory” that helped me understand “how people make sense of their past, how they connect individual experience and its social context, how the past becomes part of the present, and how people use it to interpret their lives and the world around them” (Frisch, 1990 quoted in Bornat, 1999: 194).

3.1.1. What is Oral History?

As Ritchie put simply “oral history is too dynamic and creative a field to be entirely captured by any single definition” (1995: 1). Moreover, definition of oral history as a research method has changed considerably since its first use as a systematic method right after the WWII, which, in its earlier forms, was understood to be a mere ‘primary source material’ (Starr, 1977 quoted in).

To turn to the historical changes in its conceptualization in the following part, oral history may be defined technically “as a process of collecting, usually by means of a tape-recorded interview, reminiscences, accounts, and interpretations of events from

the recent past which are of historical significance” (Hoffman, 1996: 87). In other words, it “collects memories and personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews” (Ritchie, 1995).

The issue of “historical significance”, however, is rather a complicated one. Perks and Thomson (1998), for example, argue that oral history should not be understood in a system derived from the narrow conventions of written history. It is because oral history is understood, recently, to be not only a method but also a theory, “a way of conceptualizing history” (Okihiro, 1996); thus, “not strictly a means of retrieval of information, but rather one involving the generation of knowledge” (Hareven, 1996). Its main purpose is stated to be one of “historical reconstruction”, by “interviewing of eye-witness participants in the events of the past” (Grele, 1996). Such a reconstruction, however, cannot be understood as simply a re-creation of historical events; it is rather “a record of perceptions”, which “can be employed as a factual source only if corroborated” (Hareven, 1996).

Several terms are used interchangeably with the term oral history and among them are listed life history, self-report, personal narrative, life story, oral biography, memoir, testament, in- dept interview, recorded memoir, the recorded narrative, taped memories, life review (Yow, 1994: 4). I will be using, throughout the analysis below, the concepts of oral history, life story, narrative, oral history narrative, testimony and reminiscence interchangeably.

3.1.2. History of Oral History

Although, use of data from individual memory dates back to Thucydides (Yow, 1994); the revival of oral history, with the gradual acceptance of the usefulness and validity of oral evidence, and the increasing availability of portable tape recorders, was possible only after the Second World War (Perks and Thomson, 1998). The first oral history center was established in the United States, at Colombia University in 1948 (Dunaway, 1996).

Dunaway's classification of oral historians into generations is important for us to follow the historical change in the conceptualization of the method. He writes about four generations of professional oral historians (1996: 7-9). The first generation, led by pioneering figures such as Allan Nevins and Louis Starr, conceived of oral history as a means to collect otherwise unwritten recollections of prominent individuals for future historians, for research, and as a tool for orally based biography. With the second generation, coming of age in the mid-1960s, we observe a broadening of the scope of oral history research in terms of its "objects". This second generation viewed oral history to be more than a way to capture the accounts of important people of scholars; and employed it to describe and empower the non-literate and the historically disenfranchised. Throughout 1970s, moreover, many collectors of oral history used their research for documenting and promoting community cohesion and ethnic diversity. Still, however, prior to the 1980s the process of generating oral history was considered uncomplicated, with interviews presumed to have recorded, from a neutral stance, whatever material of historical use they could gather for the good of the future. In 1980s, a third generation emerged and this notion was challenged by more theoretically oriented researchers, such as Ronald Grele, Paul Thompson, Alessandro Portelli, who speculated that interviews – and their construction – themselves represent history. In the conceptualization of this third generation, oral history interviews come out of a negotiation between the interviewer and the narrator, and are compiled within a historical frame. Additionally, the negotiation within "contemporary trends" and "within certain definable conventions of language and cultural interaction" appears as the determining characteristic of the process. Thus, the debate afterwards was on the purpose of oral history: whether it was intended to be a set of primary source documents or a process for constructing history from oral sources.

Dunaway (1996) speaks about a fourth generation of oral historians, emerged in 1990s, who have been influenced by postmodernist critical movements of many disciplines. He argues that:

Today, oral history faces intellectual challenges posed by cultural critics who assert a previously unimagined complexity to its fundamental process, the recorded recollections of historically and culturally significant events or trends. Their audience-centered model of presenting history has prompted a more process-oriented reading of history and culture. As a consequence, oral history has experienced a surge of interest in subjectivity and in nontraditional sources. (Dunaway, 1996: 7)

The commonality between postmodernism and the recent theorizing about oral history, is also stated by others; however, more cautiously. Grele argues that “if we can agree that the postmodernist project is anti-essentialist, anti-totalizing, anti-reductionist, anti-naturalist, and anti-teleological, then we can see the similarities” (1996: 79).

The above definitions and the historical adventure of the conceptualization of oral history reveal, indeed, a crucial point. Utilizing oral history as the “method” of a study, necessitates, if it is not a result of, an “anti-essentialist, anti-totalizing, anti-reductionist, anti-naturalist, and anti-teleological” understanding of history, memory, and identity. At least this was what happened in my study. The social constructivist perspective I have in relation to the construction and reconstruction of identity, history and memory was very much in line with the perspective of oral history to produce the results of this study.

3.1.3. Relation of Oral History to History, Memory, Narrative, and Identity

As it is obvious in the definitions and the historical changes of the conception of oral history, there is a complex and multi-dimensional relation between history, narrative, memory, and identity, which is indeed crucial to grasp the theoretical ground of the current study. Grele’s paraphrasing Elizabeth Tonkin would provide, I guess, an interesting guide to grasp this relation:

[T]o understand the testimony we are helping to bring into existence, we must understand it as a literary mode, a narrative; to understand it as a literary mode, we must understand it as a part of the social action of the narrator; and to understand it as social action, we must understand it as history (Grele, 1996: 79).

The above quotation provides a simple summary of what I will try to do in the following pages. The relation between narrative, social action and history is an important one.

3.1.3.1. History

Portelli argues that “the first thing that makes oral history different is that it tells us less about events than about their meaning” (1998: 67). We can argue, following Grele’s classification that, the relation between “history as process” and “history as commentary on that process” (Grele, 1996) is an important one. Oral history has a factual validity, no doubt. Interviews are accepted to reveal often, unknown events or unknown aspects of known events. Moreover, they always cast new light on unexplored areas of the daily life of the non-hegemonic classes (Portelli, 1998). Yet, there is still the question: “is it not the meaning attributed to the facts that makes them significant or not?” (Yow, 1994: 22).

The process of meaning attribution seems to be a complex one, in which many, including the ones “who live it” and the ones “who study it” have a role. This is clear in Yow’s statement that “history is what people who lived it make of it and what the others who observe the participants or listen to them or study their records make of it” (Yow, 1994: 22). Such a statement reveals, I believe, the importance of the researcher’s position in relation to the oral history reminiscence. Oral reminiscence might be taken as “history as it really was” as the earlier generations of oral historians are stated to have done; or it might be asserted that memory -‘personal and historical, individual and generational’- should be moved to center stage ‘as the object, not merely the method, of oral history’ (Frisch, 1979 quoted in Perks and Thomson, 1998). Still, however, there is the need for a detailed elaboration of the relation of oral history to memory.

3.1.3.2. Memory

Since the main ‘object’ of oral history is memory, to understand its role is crucial to the research process. Memory, for many of the dominant oral historians, is accepted to be “an active process of creation of meanings”, rather than a “passive depository of facts” (Portelli, 1998). The process of meaning creation is detailed to include, on the one hand, an “effort to make sense of the past and to give a form to the[ir] lives, and set the interview and the narrative in their historical content” (Portelli, 1998: 69); on the other, a process, which “serves the sense of self and its continuity”, entertaining, shaming, and paining us (Robert Butler quoted in Ritchie, 1995: 11).

Moreover, understanding memory in relation to the role of the interviewer in her “contribution to the process of recall and recount” (Portelli, 2000: xiii) is critical in understanding the outputs of any oral history study, to which I will be turning in the following pages. It is still important, at this point, to state that memory, being a “multi-authored, textual and contextual event”, “contain and are contained by a narrative which orders, links and makes sense of past, present and the future” (Portelli, 2000: xiii).

We may observe a multiplicity of roles for the memory concerning the above arguments. Memory has a relation to the creation of meanings; to the sense of identity and its historicity; to the perception of past, present, and future; and to the context of any lived experience. Such a multiplicity of roles seems to be meaningful only if memory is understood in a broader context providing scope for the effect of the social. Friedlander’s (1996) argument that the structure of memory is related to the structure of perception, which is itself rooted in culture, education, and experience, might be interpreted as providing that scope.²⁰

²⁰ To understand this rootedness of memory in the social and cultural processes we should briefly point to a conception of social/collective memory. I will be doing this by reference to Connerton and Halbwachs. Taking memory not as an individual faculty but a social phenomenon Connerton poses a twofold conceptualization of memory: “that our experiences of the present largely depend upon our knowledge of the past, and that our images of the past commonly serve to legitimate a present social order” (1999: 4). This is to argue, on the one hand, that “we experience our present world in a context which is causally connected with past events and objects, and hence with reference to events and objects which we are not experiencing when we are experiencing the present” (Connerton, 1999: 2).

3.1.3.3. Narrative

It seems obvious that we have been deeply affected by what has been called the “linguistic turn”, the view that social reality is understood (perhaps can only be) through the discourse about that reality (Grele, 1996: 78).

The above quotation sounds like a brief summary of what we have been discussing so far on the recent conceptualization of the relation of oral history to history and memory. Grele’s argument, indeed, reveals a deeper assumption of the later generations of oral historians in that, “oral historical sources are narrative sources” (Portelli, 1998: 66). Portelli argues, moreover, that the analysis of oral history materials must avail itself of some of the general categories developed by narrative theory in literature and folklore.

Linda Shopes, similarly, asserts that much of the growing literature on the interpretive complexities of oral history “begins with the premise that an interview is a storied account of the past recounted in the present, an act of memory shaped as much by the moment of telling as by the history being told” (2002: 7). Shopes, points to the analytical importance of “the way narrators structure their accounts and the way they select and arrange the elements of what they are saying” for oral history which is understood to be an interpretive event (2002: 9). Shopes’ positioning of the individual narratives in relation to the broader tendencies of culture and hence the underlying assumptions people use to understand their experiences, is especially

Hence there is a complex relation between past and present: present is not independent of past; but past cannot be directly extracted from the present either. Their interaction is a mutual and dialectical one; and it reaches, moreover, into the most minute and everyday details of our lives. To come to the issue of shared memory and social order, on the other hand, Connerton argues that “absolutely new is inconceivable” and that “our mind is already predisposed with a framework of outlines, of typical shapes of experienced objects” which leads to an “organized body of expectations based on recollection” (1999: 6). Connerton refers to bodily practices or automatisms and commemorative activities as sites where this recollection is at work. In relation to the social construction of memory, Halbwachs argued, moreover, that it is through their membership of a social group – particularly kinship, religious and class affiliations – that individuals are able to acquire, to localize and to recall their memories (1992). The main argument of Halbwachs is that “social beliefs, whatever their origin, have a double character: they are collective traditions or recollections, but they are also ideas or conventions that result from a knowledge of the present” (1992: 188). I argue that there are similarities between Connerton and Halbwachs’ conception of social memory and Bourdieu’s habitus in their embeddedness in the dialectical relation between past and present, on the one hand, and society and individual, on the other, and this argument provides me with a framework in which I can place the individual oral historical reminiscences I have collected.

significant to be aware of the broader framework within which the oral history narrative is structured and which is always socially constructed.

3.1.3.3.1. Importance of the Structure of the Narrative

Until this point, we have emphasized that oral historical sources or narratives are important not only what they say but also equally, if not more so, for how they say it. Thus, the structure of the narrative gains a critical importance in revealing the meaning. This may be simply the rhythm of the narrative, the ruptures in the fluidity, usage of the pronouns, pronunciation, punctuation and indeed everything. But one structural element of the narratives that is mostly underlined by oral historians is the ‘silences’.

Shopes clearly affirms that as important as what is said, in the oral historical narrative, is what is not said; that is “what a narrator misconstrues, ignores, or avoids” (2002: 10). There may be many reasons to lead silences. “Silences can signify simple misunderstanding; discomfort with a difficult or taboo subject; mistrust of the interviewer; or cognitive disconnect between interviewer and narrator” (Shopes, 2002: 10).

Moreover, silences can also have broad cultural meanings, by listening to which we can get a deeper understanding about the influence of the past on the present identifications. Silences, especially in the case of minorities, can occur in relation to the memories of wars, deportations, discriminative policies appeared in the past, social exclusionary attitudes currently experienced in the everyday life, and simply in relation to stereotypical naming.

Considered within this broader framework, it becomes apparent that we can understand more from what is not said. Thus, as Thompson puts forward “the important lesson is to learn to watch for what is not being said and to consider the meanings of silences”. He argues, moreover that “what is typically repressed is also typically present” (Thompson, 1988: 156).

Grele argues that “the interest in narrative, language, and reflexivity is all a part of an interest in subjectivity, the ways in which desires, ideologies, visions, and above all memory formulate our histories as we construct them in the interview” (Grele, 1996: 79). This issue of “subjectivity” is in need of more elaboration, which will be done here partly within a framework of oral history’s relation to identity.

3.1.3.4. Identity

Subjectivity of the oral historical sources is defined to be a unique and precious element that no other sources possess in equal measure (Portelli, 1998: 67). The strength of the subjectivity that oral history provides is a widely accepted one. Yow argues in this line that “how the subject sees and interprets her experience, given her view of herself and of the world, can be gleaned in no better way than to ask in the context of life review” (Yow, 1994: 15). For Yow, it reveals the images and the symbols people use to order their experiences and give them meaning.

The value of oral historical sources, I believe, is more salient when its strength in revealing the practices and the evaluation of practices is appreciated. It is because, as Portelli argues, oral sources tell us not just what people did, but what they wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, and what they now think they did. Focusing on “practice” provides us with a broader view that oral history is not only “an expression of the personality of the interviewees”, and “of their cultural values”, but at the same time “of the particular historical circumstances which shaped their point of view” (Hareven, 1996: 247). Grasped in this way, oral history offers us a wider perspective to understand the social context.

An important characteristic of oral history, which makes such an offer possible, may be seen as its “retrospective construction of reality” (Hareven, 1996). Since, in Hareven’s words, oral histories are past experiences presented from the perspective of the present, we may think that we are endowed with a great opportunity to understand present identifications, affiliations and identity constructions of the narrators. This is so because, as Thompson argues, “for each of us, our way of life,

our personality, our consciousness, our knowledge are directly built out of our past life experiences” (1988: 148). Positioned in this way, importance of oral history for the current study becomes apparent. This is because I assume that in understanding the identity perceptions of the Armenian and Jewish ‘community members’ their present identifications and belongings are critical as well as their past experiences and practices.

The opportunity oral history provides for an understanding of the present identifications is affirmed by others, too. Shopes argues that “since the narrative draws upon the narrator’s linguistic conventions and cultural assumptions it is an expression of identity, consciousness, and culture” and, therefore, “what a narrator says, as well as the way a narrator says it, is related to that person’s social identity or identities” (2002: 7). This means, in other words, “who a narrator is, becomes a cognitive filter for their experiences” (Shopes, 2002: 7). Such an argument does not imply, however, that identities are singular or fixed. As Shopes states, “‘who’ exactly is speaking is defined by both the speaker’s relationship to the specific events under discussion and temporal distance from them” (2002: 8).

Nonetheless, many other identifications or “identities” define a narrative’s articulation. Gender, for sure, is one of them. Isabelle Bertaux-Wiame’s study on the migrants to Paris from the French countryside, for example, reveals differences in the usage of active and passive voices by men and women implying perceptions of their subject positions concerning their life experiences (quoted in Thompson, 1988: 155-156). Shopes also, points, that gender may lead differences in perception of time. According to her observation, while women usually “articulate their life stories around major events in the family life cycle, dating events in relation to when their children were born, for example”; men tend to “connect their personal chronologies to public events like wars, elections, and strikes” (Shopes, 2002: 7). Gender is one of the important elements creating differences in the perceptions of belonging in my case, too, especially in relation to the spatial identifications, to which I will be turning in the fifth chapter.

Age is another factor marking the articulation of narratives. It may affect, for example, “narrative coherence” reflecting a presentation of self. Such coherence, as Erikson argues, may be a search for integrity especially in the final stage of life; this may indeed be a search for ‘balance’ as opposed to ‘despair’ and a need for resolution and a settling of accounts among old-age people (quoted in Bornat et. al., 2000). In my study, too, the effect of age becomes apparent in some cases. Since I have studied with two generations, I observed different articulations of narratives regarding belonging, identifications and ‘traumatic events’ of the past. I will be turning to the point various times during the analysis of the narratives.

Ethnicity, doubtlessly, is an important factor defining the many characteristics of the oral history narratives. The effect of ethnic affiliation is further complicated by the ethnic community’s legal status within the broader society: such as its being a minority or the majority group in a country. Since, ethnic affiliation to a ‘community’ is one of the basic presumptions of my study I will be dealing with this issue in more detail during the analyses.

However, pointing merely to the affect of affiliations, identifications and/or “identities” on the articulation of narrative would be rather a missing, if not a mistaken, one. Therefore, we should be aware of another affect, which appears the other way around: the meaning of the narrative articulation for those who do speak. White argues that the origin of the word ‘testimony’, deriving from Latin for ‘witness’, offers us a clue in that “witness draws on notions of seeing and becoming conscious or aware; and to testify is, therefore, to make knowledge, both about oneself and about one’s world” (White, 1998: 177). Hence, she examines testimony as “a means through which individuals come to know themselves” and, further, as an act which “contributes to collective identity, to the group coming to know itself” (1998: 179). Taking a step further, we can also argue that oral history narrative is articulated, indeed, within an interactive moment, which bears important aspects also for the interviewee’s identifications; and to this, I will be turning in the following pages.

The effect of narrative articulation on the 'identity' of the narrator is discussed mostly in reference to the memories of traumatic events. The debate is around whether narrative articulation has a therapeutic dimension on the narrator. There are commentators who take the view that this process of recalling the events is not redemptive for the witnesses, and that they are inevitably living with fractured and fragmented selves (Langer quoted in White, 1998). The others, however, argue the opposite not only in relation to traumatic events, but also in reference to more daily perceptions. Paul Thompson is one of them.

Thompson (1988) points to the therapeutic dimension of the oral/life history interview on identity, drawing from the basic assumptions of psychoanalysis. This therapeutic process, which realizes through the release in of memory, however, is not a simple one. While, on the one hand, being interviewed might give a person, especially to an old person, "a new sense of importance and purpose, something to look forward to, even the strength to fight off an illness and win a new lease of life"; it may evoke, on the other hand, "tears, or anger and may recall memories releasing powerful feelings" (1988: 157). Thompson argues, moreover, that these feelings "arise, typically, from family experiences which are violent, shameful, or especially entangled and perplexing; or from the traumas of war and persecution" (1988: 157). This debate about the narrative affect on the interviewee bears important implications for my study. It is because, in case of minorities these memories of anger may be scattered within a wider spectrum including political attitudes and major policies regarding minorities, as well as 'mundane' activities of daily life such as asking one for the 'meaning' of her name. This was, at least, what I have come up with in my study to which I will be turning especially in the sixth chapter.

Oral History, I believe, grants a great opening in understanding the identity constructions and perceptions of people. It is much so when identity is understood as it appears in Hall's (1990) words as the name we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves in narratives of the past. Oral history gives us, in this case, the tool "to unpick the layers of memory, dig back into its darkness, hoping to reach the hidden truth" (Thompson, 1988: 150). "Hidden Truth" being a

questionable term, what Thomson wants to say is that “only the oral source allows us to challenge [that] subjectivity”, which every historical source derived from human perception, indeed, bears. Okihiro’s comment, in line with Thompson, suggest that “by being able to direct questions at the interviewee’s conceptions of history and historical change, the oral historian, unlike the archival historian, is able to arrive at a deeper understanding of the people and their history” (1996: 208). Thus, beyond supplying a ground for understanding multiple identifications, oral history gives us the chance to broaden the scope of that ground by the very opportunity that we have the living witness before us. This still, however, does not mean that it is an unproblematic and undisturbed digging for the truth, especially not in my study since I try to get the self-identity-perceptions of the people whom I have spoken to. Yow argues that “sometimes the narrator is just wrong”, and though the “respect for the living witness is necessary”, “this does not mean unquestioning acceptance of the veracity of the testimony” (1994: 109). I accept in my case the veracity of testimonies, since my main purpose is not a reconstruction of history but an understanding of self-definitions of identity. Still though, I have tried to develop a critical perspective in attributing meanings to the testimonies I have collected. I tried to manage this by giving references to multiple sources elaborating on the political, social, economic, cultural atmosphere of the periods I am interested in.

3.1.4. Weaknesses of Oral History and the Ways to Cope with the Weaknesses

The most often criticism directed to oral history appears in relation to its reliability and validity. Reliability can be defined as “the consistency with which an individual will tell the same story about the same events on a number of different occasions”; while validity is “the degree of conformity between the reports of the event and the event itself as recorded by other primary resource material such as documents, photographs, diaries, and letters” (Hoffman, 1996: 89). These problems of reliability and validity are seen to be linked mostly to “factors inherent in the narrative process”, such as forgetfulness, self-delusion, reticence of narrators; the biases of interviewers; and the inaccuracy of human memory (Cutler, 1996). Many argue that

these problems make the creation of history from oral sources a questionable proposition.

Oral historians, however, agree on the idea that oral history is reliable or unreliable, valid or invalid just as other research sources. Moreover, the memories of direct participants are sources far too rich for historical researchers to ignore (Ritchie, 1995). Therefore, they pose suggestions to deal with the problems of the method in detail. First of all, as Ritchie puts forward, the interviewers must be aware of the peculiarities of memory, adept in their methods of dealing with it, conscious of its limitations, and open to its treasures. To achieve this, however, seems to necessitate a threefold process: at the beginning, during and after the oral history interview.

Friedlander (1996) argues that it is important, before the interview, to get deeply into the documentary materials relevant to an interviewee's experience, to anticipate several strategies of questioning, and to be prepared with a battery of questions, which are derived from the historian's special understanding of social phenomena. This preliminary research is also necessary to address any seeming misstatements and contradictions in the testimony due to the old-aged people's difficulty with recalling names and dates; and, further, to give some context and structure to the dialogue (Ritchie, 1995). During the interview, moreover, one should "cross-examine, dig for details, and even confront the interviewee with contradictory evidence"; as well as "be alert to the possibility that an offhand remark may contain an important clue, the consequences of which may be totally unexpected and even contrary to some basic assumptions" (Friedlander, 1996: 158-159). The interrogative nature of oral history interviews (Bornat, 1999), indeed, may be assessed as a potentiality that provides for a deeper understanding of people, their everyday life and their perceptions.

The specificity of oral history however, is more apparent in the third process, and it is the most critical one in terms of the current study. This process is related to the question of how to approach to the oral history testimony. Shopes argue that "just because someone says something is true, however colorfully or convincingly they

say it, doesn't mean it is true; [and] just because someone 'was there' doesn't mean they fully understand 'what happened'" (Shopes, 2002: 5-6). This argument is very much in line with Okihiro's distinction between an individual's right to be heard and the writing of history, which implies that the individual's perception of history need not necessarily coincide with historical ultimate goal, which is the reconstruction of historical reality (1996: 205).

As we understand from the above statements, the third process is held in relation with the assumption of a "historical reality" or "truth", which may be understood in terms of "objectivity" or "factuality". However, my primary concern being to develop a sociological understanding of identity, and not a "reconstruction of historical reality" per se, and since, for this purpose, I deal first and most with a "subjective" process, that is the "self-perception of identity", I am not in apposition to accept some of the statements as being "true" and some not. What else, as Portelli argues 'wrong' statements, which are 'inconsistent' with the 'factual', are still psychologically 'true' and that this truth may be equally as important as factually reliable accounts (Portelli, 1998: 68), when their power to reveal the 'hidden meanings' are thought. Paul Thompson, also, gives us an important clue to deal with the problem in the current study:

If the study of memory 'teaches us that *all* historical sources are suffused by subjectivity right from the start', the *living* presence of those subjective voices from the past also constrains us in our interpretations, allow us, indeed obliges us, to test them against the opinion of those who will always, in essential ways, know more than ourselves. We simply do not have the liberty to invent which is possible for archeologists of earlier epochs, or even for historians of the early modern family. We could not have presumed that parents did not suffer deeply from the deaths of their children, just because child death was so ordinary, without asking (1988: 149).

Moreover, as Yow quotes one of the classical sociologists W. I. Thomas in his discussion of the "definition of the situation", I am for the idea that "if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (1994: 23). Thus, I assume first that people, whom I have spoken to, do "always in essential ways, know more than" I do about their lives; and then their "definition of the situation" is real in its consequences. Since I am dealing mainly with the self-perceptions of the interviewees, it is valid for me to use 'oral evidence' as the main source of my

analysis. Still however, being aware of the difficulties that the first two processes bear, as mentioned above, I utilized many other sources to “cross-examine and dig for details” during the study. Thus, I tried to develop both a “sensitive spirit” hoping “to learn the most from what is told to” me (Thompson, 1988: 148); and a kind of “historical and sociological imagination” to shape the interviews, without which I could “end up recording miles of meaningless information” (Hareven, 1996: 247).

3.1.5. Strengths of Oral History and Its Importance for the Current Study

I will try in this part, to emphasize the strengths of oral history for a sociological research process in general and for the current study in particular. It is already stated that the main contribution of oral historical sources is not their historical accuracy, but rather their contribution to an understanding of human experiences and social conditions (Hareven, 1996: 248). Concerning also the discussion around the validity and reliability “problems” of oral history, therefore, we agree the argument that “a sociological understanding of meaning is not simply the recognition of the validity of the subjectivity of the interviewee, but more a recognition and reconfiguration, particularly in relation to life events” (Bornat et.al., 2000: 247). I tried to understand the meanings the minorities of the capital city were attributing to the ‘life events’ that had been experienced.

Whether in the form of life history, family history, episodic interview or else, oral historical sources’ importance comes out first in relation to the perspective it provides for us to evaluate the broader social context. To understand oral historical sources as a product of the social context “include[s] their recognition as a profoundly social act linking personal meanings to broader social change” (Bornat et. al., 2000: 257). Thompson points to the visibility of this broader sociality referring to life story and family story. He argues that “telling one’s own life story requires not only recounting directly remembered experience, but also drawing on information and stories transmitted across generations, both about the years too early in childhood to remember, and also further back in time beyond one’s own birth”

(Thompson, 1993: 13). He points, moreover, to a more public history that could be found beyond such stories. Thompson's elaboration on the meaning of a life story "of this kind" reveals how multi-dimensional an oral historical source could be: as the raw material of social history and of the interpretation of social mobility; as both a personal self-analysis, and an example of oral literature; as true or as mythical; as a tool bringing together direct personal testimony with collective memory to build up an individual autobiography and identity (1993: 14-15). Such a relation of personal and social may also be apparent in the language developed during the narratives. As Gubrium and Holstein suggest, this might appear as a constant breach of the boundary between the public and the private, and people might increasingly use a public language to give meaning to their private lives (1995 quoted in Bornat et. al., 2000). Life-story narratives I have listened to have provided me a crucial perspective to understand this link between the personal and the social, in other words the personal was always the political.

Another importance of oral history for sociological research is its projection on the "ordinary people", which provides "the unique opportunity for the writing of a people's history" (Okihiro, 1996: 209). It is a new kind of history as Hoffman argues, "a history not of the captains, kings, and presidents but of farmers, workers, immigrants, and the like" (1996: 92). This new kind of history is important for its "providing information about everyday life and insights into the mentalities of ordinary people that are simply unavailable from more traditional sources" (Shopes, 2002: 3). Oral history, thus, reveals the daily life at home and at work, the very stuff that rarely gets into any kind of public record (Yow, 1994: 13). By the help of such a projection on the everyday life,²¹ I was able to walk into the very life spaces of the 'invisible' citizens of the city and tried to see in their feet; I tried to make them 'visible' by means of their own words, own perceptions and own practices.

²¹ At the descriptive level, I will be using the concept "everyday life" with reference to the daily activities of people in the family and community life, in relation to their neighbors; in relation to the city space; and in relation to the public sphere. However, the concern on 'everyday life' depends on a theoretical assumption for this study. That is, practices of everyday life are viewed as "arts of making"; in their adoption as "tactics" and "strategies"; in their capability as a "silent production"; and in their power to "making do" (De Certeau, 1984).

Recording experiences which have been ignored in history may be thought as a virtue in itself; but not, doubtlessly, enough for its sociological virtue. This latter one is better understood in its relation to the function of these so far ignored his/herstories. The most revealing assertion in this sense is that of Shopes'. She argues that:

[o]ral history does complicate simplistic notions of hegemony that is the power of dominant political or cultural forces to control thought and action, as individuals articulate how they have maneuvered, with greater or lesser degrees of autonomy or conformity, risk, calculation or fear, within the circumstances of their lives (Shopes, 2002: 5).

'Complication of simplistic notions of hegemony' is obviously critical for a comprehensive sociological understanding. As Shopes goes on the argument, it is apparent that oral history aims to achieve this complication making "the case for the active agency of individuals whose lives have been lived within deeply constraining circumstances" (2002: 3). Understanding the space of this agency is further important, in that they might be pointing to what Thompson calls "the areas where we can begin to see how social change is operating" (quoted in Yow, 1994: 13). I argue that narratives reached as a product of this study revealed significant implications which have the potentiality of complicating the hegemonic discourse on 'Turkish identity', 'minority identity', 'belonging' and 'home'.

Strength of oral history can be discussed also in its comparison to written documents. Oral history has a liveliness that is "the freshness and candor which is typical of direct conversation" to the degree that no written document contains (Hoffman, 1996: 92). This is the reason oral documents are generally accepted to be styled testimonies; whereas the written documents are often referred to be dead letters" (Okihiro, 1996: 203). This freshness, indeed, gives the researcher the opportunity to "observe human behavior firsthand in all its complexity and under varying circumstances; and s/he is able to engage in dialogue with the historical actor" (Okihiro, 1996: 204). Engagement, in this case, is also to the generation of knowledge, and thought in this way bears important implications for sociological research.

I have already, throughout the pages above, mentioned the importance of oral history for the current study. Nevertheless, there is still a need for a clear and specific picture. One way to achieve this is to refer the importance of oral history in relation to ethnicity and minority studies. Dunaway and Baum assert that:

When the methods of oral history are applied to research on ethnic and minority groups, the history, which emerges frequently, has a populist or self-consciously democratic cast. Ethnic communities tell their history among themselves, and textbook writers have rarely listened. As a result, such groups have lacked a nationally recognized identity (1996: 199).

The above assertion establishes an obvious link between being “listened to” and having a recognized “identity” in case of ethnic and minority groups. To speak for oneself and to have an audience, thus, is very much related to having an “identity”. What oral history tries to do in these cases is stated firmly to be “writing of a people’s history, liberated from myths and imbued with humanity; since, as Terkel notes, the absence of knowledge about the past perpetuates myths about it and contributes to maintaining of the status quo” (Okihiro, 1996: 210-211). It could be suggested, thus, that oral history has a concern with ‘power relations’ in its stand against the ‘status quo’. In line with this position, oral history in case of ethnic minorities tries “to see how ethnic minorities solved or failed to solve particular problems, how they advanced or resisted change, and how they made or failed to make better lives for themselves and their children” (Okihiro, 1996: 211).

Hareven argues that “to make oral history meaningful, one has to find a link between an individual life and a broader historical context” (1996: 249). Such a link was already there for me. I assumed from the beginning that in relation to the groups I was dealing with there was an already, though negatively, established link between each individual life and the broader historical, social and spatial context, owing to the very definition of the groups: the national minorities. The spatial context I have established an eye on is the capital-city-space. However, such a focus is meaningful only with its connection to a broader context including relations with different cities in the country, on the one hand; and “transnational” and “global” relations on the other. The historical context focuses mainly on the early Republican era with its lingering affects on the two-party period. However, this is not a historical study per

se, and does not merely focus to the mentioned period. It does, rather, tries to shed light onto a longer period including the late Ottoman period by means of the memories transmitted from one generation earlier, and the present by means of the narratives of identification and belonging in relation to the very recent developments in the political scene. The social context, moreover, tries to cover, on the one hand, the inner “community” life and the perception of “identity” among these “communities”; while, on the other hand, it tries to understand the codes, forms and the meaning of the interaction and interrelation with other “communities” within the city space.

The strength of oral history as a “subjective process” for the current study is that “it provides insight into how people think about certain events and what they perceive their own role to have been in the historical process” (Hareven, 1996: 247). I assumed that the owners of the narratives in this study were, by their ‘being minority’ and by their definition to be so, were parts, indeed the objects and the subjects, of the practices and discourses taking place on a wider social-political geography than their personal life-spaces. Taking off even from this assumption by itself was meaningful to call the “subjective process” into operation, and I did so.

However, conducting an oral history project with the minorities of Ankara was also valuable for other reasons. First of all, trying to hear the voices of the minorities was important to understand the city history as well as their history and life in the city and their identification with it. Though writing a city history was not a direct purpose of this study, we have collected a considerable amount of ‘data’ on the city, which might be enabling for future studies. More importantly, we observed that peoples’ personal stories or their family stories within the city were, indeed, the stories of the city: of the transformation of the city space and of the social mobility within it. Thus, it could not be possible to think personal narratives without a specific concern on the city.

Besides, implications of the narratives on identity, multiple identifications and belonging are valuable in the wider context of current debates in Turkey on

minorities, on the “sub identity-upper identity” and on the integration process to the European. Therefore, this study tried to be a part, though a minor one, of a broad concern of “complicat[ing] the history by collecting counterevidence and challenging simple answers, rather than simplifying the past” (Ritchie, 1995: 190).

Following Ritchie’s suggestion that “any definition of the oral history process, or any method of interviewing, must reflect the goals of the specific project, the resources available, and other practical considerations” (1995: 1); I tried to shape the research process within a framework in which understanding the events and policies of past which took place in the political, social, economic space of Turkey; as well as the current debates taking place on the issues of citizenship, minority, identity was possible.

3.2. HOW THE RESEARCH IS CONDUCTED

I have conducted oral history interviews with Catholic and Gregorian Armenians and with Jewish people. I have made a classification of generations among the people whom I have spoken to, by dividing them into two groups. I have called the ones who were born between the years 1910 and 1940 the “first generation”; and the ones who were born between 1941 and 1970 were called the “second generation”. This rather random classification reflects still a concern very much in line with the purposes of the study. The focus group of the study is mainly the ones who were born in the early years of the Republican period and thus lived the period in their childhood. The ones born after 1940 were those whose parents were born around 1920’s, but have passed away mostly. In a few case one of the parents were still alive, but were either “too old” or “ill” to speak to me, or, though being younger and healthy, did not accept to speak to me. The refusals were either because they were “afraid of such things”, or because they “did not know anything special to tell me”. However, taking the suggestion of Thompson, I have persisted in the face of such disheartening refusals and defined finding a sufficient range of informants as the key task of this part of the research (Thompson, 1988: 189-190).

I have conducted 16 oral history interviews with 8 first and 8 second generation person, of which 6 were Catholic Armenian, 5 were Gregorian Armenian, and 5 were Jewish people. Thirteen of the interviews were recorded by a tape recorder. I made sure that I have “the spoken consent” on tape (Yow, 1994: 88) and I promised for privacy about the public revelation of open information about the individuals’ identities. 3 persons did not want me to record the sessions. One -the first person I have conducted an interview who also did not want me to use the indicators of her name- stated her reluctance to be recorded without giving any concrete reason, but implying by her attitude that she was afraid of a possible ‘trouble’; the second expressed openly his distrust in my way of utilizing the records, stating what if he would have told anything he wouldn’t wish to be recorded; and the third emphasized that he trusted me, but still, since his attitude, towards the issue we would be covering, was a bit a mixture of “anger” and “tolerance”, it would be better not to record but catch the anger, which he would otherwise try to suppress and thus limit himself in his narration. Some oral historians argue that there usually remains little reason to conduct an oral history if it can not be recorded (Ritchie, 1995: 87). However, since each person was considered to be critically important for the purposes of the current study, I took notes as they have talked. At some moments the sessions tended to turn to a question and answer interview rather than a life-story narrative; but being aware that it was “better than nothing”, I tried to balance the situation with “writ[ing] down as full an account as notes and memory permit[ted]” (Ritchie, 1995), with all the details of my observations and inferences during the interviews. Moreover, the reasons of their reluctance to be recorded, open or hidden, gave me a deeper understanding of the perceptions of the interviewee, and, in their feet, of the broader group.

I have also interviewed with 2 first generation Muslim male, one of whom was an ex-neighbor, around 1930’s and 1940’s, of some of the Gregorian Armenian families I have met; and the other who, and indeed his parents, were ex-neighbors of the Jewish people living in the Jewish Neighborhood around 1950’s, and who still, with his family, is a resident of the neighborhood. Besides, I have interviewed with the two priests of the French Catholic Church.

I have also, conducted 7 questionnaires.²² This 7 people were all Armenian - both Catholic and Gregorian - all jewelers and all second generation. The questionnaire was prepared in response to the offer made by the respondents themselves, whom I have visited in their occupational places, and who argued that they did not have time to conduct interviews which would take quite a lot time; but still, if I could prepare a “written thing” they “would be pleased to help me” through filling it up. Thus, I have prepared a questionnaire, though it was not planned at the beginning of the research process. The questionnaire consisted of 113 open-ended questions, which could be grouped under the headings of “demographic information”; “life in Ankara”; “occupational life”; “ownerships and economic status”; “self and other identity definition”; “family, children, marriage”; “everyday life in the city and the perception of the capital city”; “community life in the city”; “migration”; “citizenship, minority identity, political attitudes”; and “the Capital Levy”. These headings were not written in the questionnaire, however, in order not to direct the respondents. The questionnaire was planned in order to get an overall idea on the perceptions and practices of the respondents to support the narratives collected through oral history interviews, however, its primary concern was with the occupational life of the community. Since all the respondents were of the same occupation, the questionnaires and additional chats with the respondents provided important knowledge on the situation of jewellery among the community. Moreover, I have reached most of the Armenian jewelers in Ankara and thus had the chance to observe more than what appeared in their answers to the questions.

I have met, still, with more people than the numbers above indicate. I met with some in the church and had short chats with; some during my visits to the houses of the respondents and had again short chats. Among them were some Syrian and Keldani Catholic Christian people, who were either the relatives of the Catholic Christians I have interviewed with through inter-marriages, or the neighbors in the occupational places of the jewelers. One Syrian Catholic man, who is a jeweler, had filled up the questionnaire. We had some stand-by talks from which I had a view about the lives

²² The questionnaire form is supplied in Appendix B.

and the “identity problems” of the group. Nevertheless, the members of the Syrian and Keldani Christian groups were not interviewed with, since the study at hand was limited to the ‘minority’ groups, which are defined, officially, to be so. Still though, I will be referring broadly to the perceptions of the ones I have spoken to when it is necessary during the analyses.

I have met also people who were not indeed ‘*Ankarali*’, but somehow, either for military service or for children’s education, has been in Ankara for a while and coming to church to worship. I have also had short chats with them and I will be referring to my inferences, too, since I believe they complement the view we should be having on the total “community life” in Ankara. One of them having converted to Catholic Christianity from Islam is also important for us to understand this religion conversion issue among Ankara Christians.

Below are three tables giving numerical details on the education, gender, denominational, and generational dispersal of the research sample.

Table 3.1: Generation dispersal according to educational level

	Primary Sch.Left	Primary Sch.	Secondary Sch. Left	Secondary Sch.	High Sch. Left	High Sch.	University	Ph D.	Total
1th Gen.	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	8
2nd Gen.	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	1	8
Total	1	5	2	0	2	3	2	1	16

Table 3.2: Generation dispersal according to community

	Catholic Armenian	Gregorian Armenian	Jew	Total
First Generation	3	3	2	8
Second Generation	3	2	3	8
Total	6	5	5	16

Table 3.3.: Gender dispersal according to community

	Catholic Armenian	Gregorian Armenian	Jew	Total
Women	3	2	2	7
Men	3	3	3	9
Total	6	5	5	16

3.2.1. Reaching the Interviewee

Oral History interviews were conducted between September 2004 and December 2005. Interviews with the Jewish population were completely based on snowball technique. I have got into contact with an ex-Ankara Jewish community member who lives in Istanbul currently and who has written her memories on “the Ankara Jews”. She became my reference point and I have started the interviews with the persons she has suggested.²³ I have reached five people with snowball technique and then it came to an end. This was indeed very much related to the total number of the Jewish Population in Ankara, which is stated not to exceed 15 families, some of which are composed of old-aged people living alone.

Interviews with the Armenian population were conducted, at the beginning, with the persons to whom I was addressed by the priests of the church. The priests have spoken to the persons whom they thought would be helpful for my study within the criteria I have explained to them previously and if the persons had accepted, gave me their phone numbers so that I could arrange an interview. Therefore, I have conducted the former interviews by turning to the church each time and waiting for another name. Only after a considerable period has passed -more than one year- the in-group addressing have started and I could go on with the snowball technique. The reference of the priests, however, should always be there for the respondents to trust me and the reference had in all cases worked. Some of the people stated that if there were no such reference they would not speak to me, or would just do small talks.

I have got into the Gregorian Armenian community only after a year, following my expressed intention to do so to the priests of the Church. Until that time it was “normally” the Catholic Armenians, the “Catholic Christians” in their own words, to

²³ She gave the name of H.A and told me that she had an old father who could possibly help me. We arranged a date at H.A.’s house where I was expecting to interview with A.K, H.A’s father, but soon it turned to be an interview all with A.K, H.A and her elder sister R., who was actually living in Israel and was in Ankara for a vacation. Seemingly a disadvantage at first, the situation turned out to be an advantage thanks to the rich narratives of H.A and R. They also contributed to the interview with their questions to their father who was a 1911 born person and thus, sometimes had difficulties of remembering. I included the narratives of R. because her “outsider” view supplying comparisons with Israel and her somehow “mythical perception” of the old neighborhood bore crucial implications for the analyses.

whom I was being addressed to, since they were the usual, though not the exclusive, ones who made use of the church. After I have established the preliminary link with the Gregorian Armenians by means of the church's reference, there established an in-group reference system and I could go on with the snowball technique.

To reach the persons by means of snowball technique provided "a social balance of the accounts which are being collected", as Thompson have suggested (1988). With this new entry, the heterogeneity of the "Armenian community" became more apparent in terms of denominations. Moreover, with the help of in-group addressing heterogeneity gained a deeper dimension in terms of class, gender, religiosity and various other identifications. And it was this "juxtaposition of lived experience, from all levels of society, which ma[de] the most telling and thought-provoking" narratives on belonging and identity (Thompson, 1988: 189). Therefore, though interviews could only be covered during a relatively long period, almost one and half a year, this seemingly disadvantage turned out to be an advantage in order to suffice the criteria Thompson has pointed.

3.2.2. Circumstances of the Interviews

All the interviews were arranged on the day, at the hour and the place the interviewees determined. We have conducted one, indeed the first, interview at the church, since the interviewee preferred to do so. This was a somehow 'strange' experience for me at the beginning; but soon it came to have an understandable ground since the interviewee was an old, 1929 born, woman living alone and, thus, it was quite possible that she had preferred to be at a rather 'safe' place to face this 'unfamiliar' occasion. Also it was quite clear that at this very beginning she presumed the aim of the research to be about her religious affiliation and thus the 'Christian traditions' and 'folklore'. Therefore, she probably saw the church a convenient place for such a research. However, her perception of the study was in time balanced with a more comprehensive idea of it.

The other interviews were conducted either at the interviewee's houses -10 of them- or at their occupational places - 5 of them. In some of them the interviewees were not alone,²⁴ which is, indeed, accepted to be an important factor determining the content of the interview and to be a constraint on the narrator (Shopes, 2002). However, oral historians define some exceptions to this rule of being alone with the narrator, and in my case the cultural factors, that is "the culture prevent[ing] an outsider from having exclusive conversation with the narrator" (Yow, 1994: 58)²⁵ may be seen to be the determining one. I was perceived, in these cases, to be a guest, and a guest should "culturally" be welcomed by the family members, 'family' pointing sometimes a wider framework.²⁶

Oral historians usually indicate that the circumstances and the location of an interview might affect what is recalled. For example, "physical comfort and adequate time help create the expansive mood and unhurried pace that enhances recall"; or interviews in a person's office may tend to be more formal, less intimate, with the narrator emphasizing public rather than private life (Shopes, 2002). Regarding the interviews that were conducted at the offices, nevertheless, I can assert that we came

²⁴ There are two couples in these 10 people. I intended to interview with the man in one case, since I knew that he was a key person within the Gregorian Armenian community; and in the other I was simply addressed to do so. However, in both cases I was welcomed by accompany of their wives. Though I started to conduct the interviews mainly with the men at the beginning, soon they turned out to be dialogues within the couples and these dialogues revealed important information as well as clues about the attitude of the couples in relation to the topics being discussed. Since these were sessions lasting 3 to 4 hours, I had the chance to comprehend on what the women were eager to talk about and this has led to a broader perspective. Therefore, I have counted each couple as a person to have been interviewed. Interview in accompany of the couple was repeated one more time when I was interviewing to a first generation Jewish man. This time, however, his wife was a French woman who settled in Ankara only after 1958, after the marriage. Thus, she was not interviewed comprehensively, since the study focuses on the perceptions and lives of the people living in Ankara since their birth, or at least childhood. Her presence, still, revealed important clues for me in that the "researcher's" perspective coincided many times with the "stranger's" perspective.

²⁵ Yow states the other exceptions to be the cases when you know the two people well; when the situation requires them to be together; when the situation requires them to be together; and when the presence of an interpreter is necessary (Yow, 1994: 58).

²⁶ One of the interviews at home was conducted in the presence of the single daughter of the woman I intended to speak to, the next-door daughter-in-law, two granddaughters, and a friend who came to learn how to knit a baby sweater. However, the interviewee's position was so dominant that, she did not seem to be constrained by the presence of the others. Still, I had the inference that the interpretations of the friend, who was emphasizing more on "differences" in comparison to the narrator's emphasis on "togetherness and similarity", became a source of uneasiness in some cases. The friend was a Keldani Catholic while the interviewee was Catholic Armenian.

over the 'formal' and more 'public' structure of the narratives, either through conducting the interviews in more than one sessions, thus, creating an atmosphere whereby both side of the interview had the opportunity to know and evaluate each other better; or through a preliminary meeting session whereby we had the chance again to know each other and to speak on the topics of the research's interest; or, still in other cases, by the help of the trust created by a reference which was accepted to be critical by the interviewee. Moreover, conducting interviews at the occupational places of the persons provided me the opportunity to observe the conditions and peculiarities of the occupation; the spatial arrangements and symbols reflecting the priorities of the interviewee; and the interaction with the others working at the same place. The interviews at the 'offices' lasted two to three hours.

Still, however, I am aware that the interviews conducted at home usually provided a more comfortable ground both for the respondents and for me, the researcher. Thinking the 'sensitivity' of the issues we were elaborating on, it is understandable that they felt better and safer at their home to speak on these issues. 'Home' turned for some to be a tool to show me how "normal" and "similar" they were; and for some how they were "different". Being at home, concerning the symbolic meanings it took upon, thus enabled me in observing the narrators' attitudes in the context of their 'life-spaces'. The practice and the narratives gained deeper dimensions in this 'private' space of everyday life.

Interviews conducted at home lasted three to five hours that were all accompanied with kind tea and cookie services, some of them turning to be small tea parties; and in two cases interviews were conducted during a breakfast and a dinner. Thus, we had usually adequate time to cover all the topics of the research's interest, as well as of the interviewees' interest. The latter were not only on the research, but also on the details of my life, including my education, my family, my residence place, my work, my marital status, my religiosity or denominational affiliation and my ideas or knowledge on a variety of topics that I have directed to them.

3.2.3. Organization of the Interviews

Interviews were conducted structurally in the form of life-story narratives. I have introduced the study and its main interests before starting and then, taking Portelli's suggestion, let the narrators tell what they wished to tell, saving the unanswered questions for the proceeding parts of the interview (Portelli, 1998: 70). I tried to explain the purpose of the study without using the terms 'identity', 'identification', or 'belonging', in order not to direct the narratives from the very beginning. This was, however, not altogether an uninterrupted process. I have, indeed, many times introduced some topics and issues formulated, mostly, as open-ended questions trying not to limit the interviews to those topics but to make sure that all the points of interest have been covered.

During the sessions I had an "interview guide"²⁷ at hand, which was not a questionnaire but a plan and which provided me "a strategy for following a line of questioning" (Yow, 1994: 35-36). The current study is actually a "subject-oriented" one (Ritchie, 1995), though the 'subjects' were pursued along a life-story narration. The interview guide was planned to cover these subjects in the form of three main and ten sub-topics. Main topics were 1) the city, 2) the state, and 3) the community; while the sub-topics were a) childhood, family, educational life; b) the old city/the old neighborhoods; c) the capital city, the city life in Ankara; d) minority, citizenship, political attitudes; e) evaluation of historical events concerning the minorities in the social, political, economic life of Turkey; f) occupational life; g) community life; h) language; i) inter-ethnic relationships; j) recreation and leisure activities.

Yow advices about placing the non threatening questions first in arranging the topics for the interview guide. She asserts that people generally like to talk about their birthplace, early childhood memories, and significant people and events in the years they grew up (Yow, 1994: 37). In the current study the city dimension of the research appeared in all cases to be an enabling one, neutralizing my stranger position to some

²⁷ Interview guide is provided in Appendix A.

degree, and giving the narrators a wider scope to speak on. When I explained one of the aims of the research to be a trial of understanding the past lives of different communities, which have been living in Ankara, this was always a welcomed idea. The narrators were often quick to start to tell about their life in Ankara, even before I had finished the explanation of the study. We should be aware, however, of the fact that I have formulated my preliminary explanation on their, most often also their families', being from Ankara, and sometimes used the term "the native of Ankara". I realized, then, that this term was appropriated by the narrators during their narratives as a "given" characteristic. Thus, we could think that one of the cornerstone terms of the study was established by my very introduction. This, however, does not mean that the narrators were pretending to be from Ankara, or they were insincere in their emphasis; but rather they seemed to have an appropriate channel to express their feelings and practices by this means. The research was usually perceived to be an opportunity to express their identification with the city. The city appeared to be a dimension, no doubt a strong one, of belonging.

The "invisible electrified fences" (Hareven, 1996) of the current study became visible when approaching to the issues of 'minority', 'citizenship', 'deportation', 'meaning of home', and 'leaving home/emigrating to another country'. Deportation for the Armenian community and the Wealth Tax for the Jewish community were usually the "prohibited zones" (Hareven, 1996), or the "troubled times" which the narrators sometimes had no desire to reminisce about (Ritchie, 1995: 190). These were the areas which the narrators kept "having to decide what to disclose, how much to tell, what to keep silent about" and thus, there was "always a kind of tug going on within the narrator and between narrator and interviewer" (Yow, 1994: 72). Fortunately, we overcame the ban on words by the help of time and patience as Ritchie (1995) and Thompson (1988) have suggested, while in all cases I kept to "sense" the position of the narrator "from the nonverbal response as well as from the spoken words" (Yow, 1994).

The process during which the interviewees were covering the topics in relation to their "communities" was also an interesting one. Ritchie argues that "oral historians

concentrate on recording the personal experiences of the interviewee, and folklorists collect the traditional stories, songs and other expressions of the community, fact or fiction” (1995: 16). I tried to concentrate on what “oral historians do”, however, not to the exclusion of what the “folklorist do”. There were a few reasons for this decision. Though I was not specifically interested in the “traditional stories, songs and other expressions of the community”, a sociological understanding of a community would not be achieved unless individuals’ interaction with and perception of these “traditional” elements were grasped. Therefore, I have listened in some cases detailed narratives on the festivals with a thorough description of the cuisine, the style of dressing, the practices, the rituals, and the myths on the origins of the festivals. These narratives were important, however, not only because they supplied a broad view of the communities in question; but because of the ways and reasons they were narrated. In some cases these narratives became a way out to the constraint of talking about the personal; in others an indicator of similarities with the Muslim society; still in others a ground to emphasize the ‘distinction’ of the community.

During the interviews, I tried to understand both the practices and the interpretations of the narrators in relation to the topics defined above. The life-story structure of the narratives provided me an enabling ground for this purpose, since speaking on a lifetime span necessitates a focus on practice. This gave me the opportunity to understand many experiences in their concreteness rather than exclusively as abstract evaluations. Life-story structure of the interviews also provided enough time to relate what both I, as the interviewer, saw as important and what the interviewees wanted to tell (Ritchie, 1995).

3.2.4. Interrelation between the Interviewer and the Interviewee

The relationship between the interviewer and interviewee is a widely referred one by the oral historians. The product of the oral history project is accepted to be a “dialogic” (Portelli, 2000: 23) and a “reflexive” (Grele, 1996: 78) one, which is indeed a “dialogue” (Shopes, 2002) rather than an interview. This idea assumes that

an oral history reminiscence is created not only “by what interviewees say, but also by what historians do – by the historian’s presence in the field, and by the historian’s presentation of the material” (Portelli, 2000: 23). They argue, moreover, that, “the interests, concerns, social attitudes, personal and collective ideologies of the interviewer affect the interview situation and the stories being told” (Grele, 1996), since the “narrators assess interviewers, deciding what they can appropriately say to this person, what they should not say” (Shopes, 2002: 8). Thus, not only the questions but also the social identity of the researcher is important in defining the content and the form of the narratives; “even if the interviewer tries to remain inconspicuous, the very process is intrusive” (Hareven, 1996: 247). These arguments make clear the importance of an assessment of my position, as the researcher, in the process of the study. To this point I have tried to give a picture of my intentions and behavior; and the assessment which would be done by the other side of this interactive process, I believe, would reveal rather more important implications on the narratives appeared as a result of the “collaborative venture” (Yow, 1994: 116). The narrators’ perception of me, which were in some cases expressed openly, oral or written; in others implied by gestures, mimics, and the very attitudes they developed in their relations to me may be valued as clues for this assessment.

Yow insightfully asserts that taking oral history as a “collaborative venture” does not “necessarily make the two people, interviewer and narrator, feel equal”. Rather she argues “in any interviewing situation, a vague awareness of the power relationships impinges, and the power relationship is based on age, race, class, status, ethnicity, gender, and knowledge” (1994: 116-117). Such awareness is critical for a sociological work I believe. Therefore, taking Okihiro’s suggestion, I tried to analyze carefully the relationship between me and the narrator to understand what kind of communication was taking place, what meaning was being conveyed, and what mutual influences were at work in the shaping of the conversation (1996: 207). Indeed the power relationship between the narrators and me was one of a shifting one being very much in line with their perception of me, which could take different forms throughout the research process but also during one single session.

First of all, I was almost in all cases an ‘outsider’ who did not actually come from the “subject community” (Ritchie, 1995: 189). They wondered how I could reach them and why I had chosen such a ‘subject’ to study. Answers to these questions could shape their perceptions of me. Such ‘outsider’ position, moreover, could strengthen my image as an observer of the tale I was excavating. Still, I was, more than usual, a “friendly” observer, educated and understanding, interested in “these issues”, that is their stories. Accordingly, I was usually perceived to be a curious student who wants to learn about the past. One of a sudden they felt themselves, and their families as important actors, at least as important elements within the history of the city, though this was not usually the feeling in relation to present. They were sometimes proud of their families’ wealth as well as social capital in the past; and sometimes attempted a detailed explanation of how difficult their families did this. Some of the first generation respondents got angry with me when I had forgotten, or could not just well understand something they had explained. My image of a student to be thought about the past provided them an occasion to shape the past as well as the present. Student image gained its concreteness when one of the respondents invited a neighbor who wanted to take a sweater model from her by stating that “Come of course, I have got already a student, you would be the second”. My age, being actually a student and attitudes towards them were factors, all, helping this image. My age, however, was perceived sometimes to be a handicap, which would potentially prevent me from knowing and grasping the past political era and the difficulties experienced by minorities²⁸.

My education was always an appreciated one. This is an understandable one since “lack of education” or “ignorance” appeared to be a key word in the discourse most of them developed in relation to the “problems”. One of them stated in relation to the religious differences that “for the people very rational, like you isn’t it, educated, knowing some things, these are not problems anyway”.²⁹ Another, after filling up the

²⁸ Concerning the emigration of Jewish population to Israel after the establishment of the Israeli state, L.N. stated that “Yani şimdi siz çok gençsiniz tabi, yani o dönemin kritiğini yapmak bu çalışmaya girmez herhalde... O bakımdan, mesela gayrimüslimin kolay kolay devlet memuru olması mümkün değildi. Bunları duydunuz mu bilmiyorum...Kimden duydunuz?”

²⁹ Interview with B.T, 09.11.2005

open-ended questionnaire, stated that such an interest in minorities could only be an indicator of an intermingle between education and political ideology, implying an affect of the university I have been studying and giving examples from another university in Ankara, actually the university he has studied, in that some students were “ignorant” even if they were educated. METU in other cases, too, came up to be an admired and appreciated university, which was identified with the city. One also expressed his appreciation constructing a link between my “young age” and the “knowledge” I had about past.³⁰ I was perceived to be an educated person and this provided me the status of an ‘understanding member of the other to make empathy with their experiences and feelings’.

The way the participants perceived me, however, was not always positive. One reason for this uneasy perception was my ‘researcher identity’. As Yow describes insightfully, I walked into a home; asked questions the person living there who has not thought to ask about a life; and suddenly, the process of analyzing, of answering someone else’s questions about a life, of standing outside it and looking at its experiences in a different way made the narrator feel strange (Yow, 1994: 117). So, I was sometimes perceived to be a stranger who was trying to poke her nose into some restricted memories of past as well as present.

Another reason, still more important, was in relation to the very construction of the minority vs. majority hierarchy. I was still, mostly, perceived to be a part of the ‘other’, if not a ‘representative’. This was the reason why one of the respondents got very angry when her husband suggested showing me their photo album. She got angry and asked if it was me to make the suggestion to see the photos. She stated that there were no reasons to see the photos, since their “dressing and so” were not different. I, one of a sudden, became the ‘other’ who tried to interfere with their private life and looked for a way of differentiating them.³¹ This ‘otherness’ was

³⁰ Interview with K.G, 12.11.2005, [“O yaşta kızım siz, benden daha iyi, bizden daha iyi şeyler tanıyor yani.”]

³¹ To have an idea on how the dialogue between three of us has developed and how did it osciliate between shifting attitudes see the whole text in the Appendix F.

implied in other cases too, however smoothly, while making comparisons between traditions of Islam and of Christianity and Judaism. Some narrators used statements such as “just as you do ... in this way, we do it this way”. Such statements were interesting in their dual structure one trying to construct similarities, while the other simultaneously underlining the difference and separateness of the two ‘communities’.

As a result of this perception of ‘strangeness’, moreover, some respondents developed a discourse on having “no problem” living in Ankara and Turkey, that is because of their ‘minority identity’. A narrative on the daily life could turn one of a sudden to a narrative stating “there is no problem”;³² or even in relation to a memory of WWI, which was a highly ‘problematic’ era for everyone indeed, one could state that they “did not have any problems”. The discourse on “having no problem” seemed to be an automatic one developed in the face of the other’s presence. Another automatic attitude was the showing of the ‘identity card’ to indicate that, ‘he’ was a “Turkish Citizen”,³³ and thus was a part.³⁴

How I was perceived, reflected also on the structure of the narrative such as the singular or plural usages of the pronouns,³⁵ affected also my position and how I felt during the interview sessions. Yow argues that “because of the very nature of the

³² Interview with K.G., 12.11.2005, [“Hacıdoğan, 1937 doğdum. Bir ağabeyim, başka kardeşim yok. Şimdi ağabeyim Avusturalya’da....Biz buradayız, üç çocuğum var. İki oğlan bir kız. İşlerimiz iyi, terziliğimiz iyi, yani hiç bir sorunumuz yok.”]

³³ Three male respondents have showed me their identity cards pointing to the “T.C” sign, to the “religion section” and to the “place of birth” which could be understood as a point on their identifications with the “national”, the “transnational” and the “local” respectively.

³⁴ Some reflections were not this automatic but my means of the written document -questionnaire- were more elaborated on. Since because the interviewees were not the only ones answering my questions, and the perceptions of the respondents of the questionnaire were also important in my research process I have added a last section of evaluation to the open-ended questionnaire and asked for the “criticisms and ideas on the questions” they have answered. To see the responses, only 3 out of 7 have filled up this section, see Appendix G.

³⁵ My position and identity were constanly shifting during the narratives. An address keeping a measured distance in the pronoun “siz” [“you” in plural form] could one of a sudden be replaced by a more welcoming call of “sen” [“you” in singular form]; and then again in a context where I was perceived to be “other” was changing to you in plural form.

main sources of information – living people – the oral historian or ethnographer has to delve into a study of interpersonal relationships in the research process; [and] during this process, both interviewer and narrator are changed in some way” (1994: 116-117). I changed no doubt not only through an “intellectual stimulation”, but also “through entering into the lives of others”, I feel I gained “a deep and moving human experience” (Thompson, 1988: 166).

3.2.5. A reflection on the Written Form of the Narratives

Thompson asserts that wherever the prime aim becomes analysis, the overall shape can no longer be governed by the life story form of the evidence (1988). Although each narrative was rich and advocating enough to be valued by itself, for a thesis to be written they should be quoted as brief quotations within a broader context of the analysis, “with evidence from one interview compared with that from another and combined with evidence from other types of source material” (Thompson, 1988: 238). Definitely, I tried to do this within an inner logic of sociological analysis, being equally aware of the “loss in the form of presentation”. Thus, the form of the current study should be viewed as one of the potential forms, and doubtlessly not the best one, that could be constructed with different perspectives. I tried, at least, “not to misrepresent the narrator’s meaning or change the sense of the words” (Yow, 1994: 108). Still, however, shifts in the meaning are unavoidable, not only because of the very characteristic of oral history that is “the tone and volume range and the rhythm of popular speech carry implicit meaning and social connotations which are not reproducible in writing” (Portelli 1991 quoted in Shopes, 2002: 16); but also because the new text, at the end, is of my creation and interpretation. Moreover, there is the inescapable affect of translation on the written form, since all the interviews were conducted in Turkish and translated to English by me. To compensate for the disturbance of meaning to a degree, therefore, I will be giving the original passages in Turkish in Appendix J.

CHAPTER IV

AN OVERVIEW ON THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF ANKARA AND THE EXISTENCE OF THE NON-MUSLIM POPULATION IN THE CITY

Ankara has been an object of various studies in terms of its historical background; the social and economic life in the city; its spatial organization and architectural construction; and its capital city status. Especially the recent studies on Ankara give enormous details on a variety of dimensions including the above. Drawing on the existing literature, this chapter will try to provide an overview picture on Ankara with an aim to construct a background to the further discussions of the research findings.

4.1. ANKARA IN HISTORY

Studies on Ankara make it clear that the city has a long and rich history which is usually denied in its representation as a ‘small, forgotten, poor town’ which was established out of ‘nothing’ only after it was declared to be the capital city by the Republican regime. The construction of Ankara is dated back, on the contrary, to 4000- 3000 years earlier (Atauz, 2004; Bahar, 2003; Aydın et. al., 2005). The city was permanently inhabited from its first construction as a settlement place and the reason for this is stated to be its crossroads position at the intersection between north-south and east-west axles of Anatolia (Aktüre, 2000; Atauz, 2004). This geographical position being also a pulling factor for invasion, also as a part of the general political history of the Anatolian geography, Ankara had experienced at least the Phrygian, Gallatin, Roman, Byzantium, Arabic, Seljuk and Ottoman rules until becoming the capital city of Turkish Republic (Atauz, 2004; Keleş, 1971; Aktüre, 2000; Bahar,

2003; Aydın et. al., 2005). Moreover, Ankara was many times a center of an administrative unit in its history. The capital city of Galatians, metropolis in the Roman period, and the center of the Ankara province in the Ottoman Empire which included the ‘sanjak’ of Ankara, Kayseri, Yozgat, Kırşehir, Çorum.³⁶ In relation to this administrative role, Ankara, which became a fortress-city in the Byzantium period, was also important as a military center (Atauz, 2004; Aktüre, 2000).

In addition to these political and military roles, Ankara had taken important socio-economic roles in its history. It is argued that in the Roman period Ankara became a center and a model for spreading an ideology of connection between the political and religious elements of the period (Atauz, 2004). There was a Jewish community and a synagogue in the Roman period Ankara and the period witnessed the spread of Christianity. In the Byzantium period it was one of the few Christian centers in Anatolia (Atauz, 2004), through which the ‘pilgrimage road’ of Christian world was passing (Aktüre, 2000). With the Seljuk hegemony, on the other hand, Ankara had completed its Christianization period and the Turkification-Islamization period started.

Aktüre argues that when Seljuk rule in the city started in 1073 Ankara had been a center of trade and industry, weaving and textile industries, for a thousand year (2000). We learn from various sources that Ankara was a center of mohair production and had the monopoly in the world for long centuries. Although during Seljuk period regional economy had receded due to the political struggles and Ankara was again important mostly for military rather than economic reasons; trade and production was reorganized by the ‘Ahi’ organization, which had governed the city for a short period before Ottoman hegemony started in the second half of the 14th century (Atauz, 2004; Aktüre, 2000; Aydın et. al., 2005). Aktüre states that from the early 14th century on Ankara’s function as a ‘frontier city’ changes and it becomes a

³⁶ It appears in Kemal Karpat’s detailed data on the Ottoman Population (1830-1914) that configuration of the provinces, so of the Ankara province, was not stable and the number of sanjaks could change regarding the administrative reorganizations (Karpat, 2003). Etöz, moreover, points to the changes both in the scope of the ‘administrative unit’ and in its definition in the 19th century (1998: 58-59).

‘trade city’ (2000: 19). What we learn, moreover, is that Ankara lived its second most brilliant period in the 16th century [the first being in the Roman period] and the city expanded out of the fortress whereby there were 85 neighborhoods in this period (Ergenç, 1995). We know that this characteristic of the city, as a trade and industry city, continued till the 18th century and lost its importance mostly in the 19th century (Yavuz, 2000).³⁷ From this point on, I will be focusing on these later periods, especially the 19th century of Ottoman Ankara, since having a perspective on this period is more important in terms of our study.

4.2. ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE CITY

We understand that between 15th and 20th centuries city’s economic basis depended upon mohair weaving. Atauz argues, nevertheless, that although the city had such an economical basis, the economy was not totally tied to it and variation in the economic activities made the city stood still when it faced problems relating to the weaving sector and the security of trade roads (2004: 122-123). There was, thus, a detailed expertise in production and this was reflected in separate streets and marketplaces for different works (Atauz, 2004: 95). Trade and production in the city were organized mostly at some bazaars called “han” which were gathered around regions called Samanpazarı, Çıkırıçılar Slope, At Pazarı, Koyun Pazarı all in Ulus district nearby the castle. Ortaylı states that although it is neglected or even opposed in Republican historiography, Ankara in Ottoman period is important economically and axe of Kayseri-Kırşehir-Yozgat is tied to the outer world through Ankara (1994: 110). It is also pointed that with the construction of the railway in the city, this dependency had increased and Ankara became much more important for its hinterland (Ortaylı, 1994).

³⁷ It is stated that there were around 1000 weaving benches [“dokuma tezgahı”] in and around Ankara, including its villages, at the end of 16th century (Ergenç, 1995; Kılıçbay 1994). However there were left only a few at the end of 19th century most being in Zir (İstanoz) village of Ankara, which were once an important center for weaving (Etöz, 1998; Galanti, 1950; Atauz, 2004). This decrease, moreover, is given to be a result of Ankara’s loss of monopoly over angora production and mohair weaving and the empire’s lack of competence in taking part within the changing economic relations in the world (Atauz, 2004).

There seems to be some kind of a division of labor among different communities in the city. I have stated earlier that it was mostly the Armenians and Greeks who dealt with large-scale trade. Exportation and importation were mostly at their hands especially from the late 1890s on when the European traders left the city due to the decrease in the importance of angora and mohair production.³⁸ There were also Muslim traders; but Muslims usually dealt with works relating to agricultural production and sale (Etöz, 1998: 95) and also with animal husbandry (Atauz, 2004: 100). In relation to the monetary accumulation and fiscal capital ownership bankers, usurers, moneychangers, accountants were also mostly Armenians (Etöz, 1998: 95). Professional occupations, moreover, are stated to be held mostly by Christians in that clerks/notaries, lawyers and doctors were mostly Armenians and Greeks (Atauz, 2004: 100). Tailors, shoemakers, watermen, jewelers, and blacksmiths, on the other hand, were both Muslims and Christians. The Jewish people who were among the poor of the city were mostly selling simple commodities such as office materials, wares and scraps, and dealing with ironmongery (Etöz, 1998: 96). Etöz argues that identification of some ethnic groups with some occupations should be seen as a necessary result of the system of heritage whereby economic capital, know-how and experience on many crafts was inherited across generations, which she called as “occupational habitus” (Etöz, 1998: 96).

Moreover, it is argued that since Ankara was the regional center of an administrative unit every period of its history, there had always been civil and military bureaucracy in the city; and even before it became the capital of Turkish republic, bureaucracy was an important subsistence resource in Ankara at least for the Turks and Armenians (Atauz, 2004: 100-101). Tradesmen, as entrepreneurs, and officials, thus, had a privileged position and were counted to be among the elite structure of the city (Georgeon, 1999; Atauz, 2004).

³⁸ Despite weaving industry had collapsed exportation of angora as raw material was still one of the most important exportation branches in Ankara and this lasted until the first quarter of 20th century. As mohair exportation decreased and was replaced by angora exportation European traders were replaced by Catholic Armenian and Greek traders and these became the well-off category in Ankara (Atauz, 2004: 185).

4.3. DEMOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE OF THE CITY

Giving an exact demographic profile of the city seems not to be possible since, as many studies on the issue have pointed, there are many estimations resulting from the observations of the travelers who have visited Ankara in different centuries and from the records called 'Şeriye Sicili' and 'Salname' (Atauz, 2004; Etöz, 1998; Aydın et.al, 2005; Karpat, 2003; Bahar, 2003; Keleş, 1971). The issue is further complicated by the fact that the first Ottoman population survey of 1830 (1831) enrolled only the men and there were many problems in the organization of the registers.³⁹ Still however, I will try to give some numbers referring the above resources. The first data on the population of Ankara at hand belongs to the beginnings of the 16th century. According to the 1522 registers there were 2150 household of which 2000 were Muslim, 120 Christian, and 30 Jewish. The total population of this year is estimated to be between 12000 and 15000 (Eyice and Aktüre quoted in Atauz, 2004: 199). The number of non-Muslim population in Ankara is argued to increase at the 17th century (Keleş, 1971). Being parallel to this argument the early 18th century ratios of the non-Muslim population is given to be 35 % by Cuinet, a traveler (quoted in Galanti, 1950) and the early 19th century being 46 % by Atauz (2004).⁴⁰ According to the 1830 population registers, which enrolled only the men, the amount of the Muslim and non-Muslim populations of the city are given, respectively, to be 6165 and 5177 (Atauz, 2004: 128). The total population at this date, moreover, is given, with an approximation, to be 22586 of which 12216 were Muslims, 10100 were the total of Greek, Armenian Catholic and Armenian Gregorian and 270 were the Jews (Etöz, 1998: 72). Since, however, there is a great

³⁹ There is a variety of estimations and records even for the same year in different resources. This variety is explained by some factors: the changes in the definition of the province in that Ankara sometimes referred only to the center, and sometimes included whole sanjaks in the province; registers recorded only the men and depended sometimes on the memories of the neighborhood headmen; and while non-Muslim population was recorded in detail as the tax group, the Muslim population were not recorded with the same care (Atauz, 2004: 123-130; Etöz, 1998: 78).

⁴⁰ Atauz states that the non-Muslim population in the city was at its highest ratio in the 1830 survey (2004: 126). Accordingly another traveler's estimation of the ration being 90 % at the beginning of 18th century is viewed to be exaggerated.

variation in the census data as they appear in different resources,⁴¹ I will suffice by giving some ratio. According to 1881 census the proportions of the communities in the city were 67, 30 % Muslim; 24, 59 % Armenian; 6.40 % Greek; and 1, 61 % Jewish; while the proportions for the 1914 census were 81, 58 % Muslim; 13, 29 % Armenian; 3, 93 % Greek; and 1, 21 % Jewish (Atauz, 2004: 131).⁴²

Despite variations and the difficulties of giving exact numbers, however, there are some points, which are commonly shared on the demographic structure of the city. First of all, from the beginning of 16th to the beginning of 20th century, population of Ankara is stated to follow a generally ascending graph. It seems to have increased steadily from an approximately 10000-12000 population in the city center to 23-25.000, and was nearly 30000 at the beginning of the 20th century (Ortaylı, 1994). According to this scheme, Ankara is argued to be a city whose growing speed is relatively high compared to the other Ottoman cities (Atauz, 2004: 122-123). Secondly, Ankara had a cosmopolitan population, which was traditionally composed of Muslim, Armenian, Greek and Jewish populations (Ortaylı, 1994). The Armenian population, being the largest non-Muslim group, was composed of Catholic, Gregorian and Protestant Armenians, the Catholic Armenians being the largest and the Protestants being the smallest of them. Moreover, Ankara is stated to be almost the only city in Turkey where the Catholic Armenians has been living as a large community, since Armenian communities except in Ankara are mostly Gregorian

⁴¹ The results of the 1881 census, for example, are given by Georgeon, to be 25.595 total population of which 7218 were 'Turkish', 1637 Greek, 5579 'mostly Armenian' Catholic, 413 Jewish, 236 Protestant, 725 Gregorian Armenian people (1999); while the same results are given by Karpat, however, to be 17218 Muslim, 1637 Greek, 725 [Gregorian] Armenian, 5579 Catholic [Armenian], 413 Jewish, 13 Protestant (2003: 166-167). The numbers Karpat gives, however, are for the Ankara city center, when it is for the whole sanjak, thus, including the towns and the villages the numbers change totally, the most important change being proportionally in the numbers of 'Armenian' category, which refers to Gregorian Armenians and of Protestants. This is because, Gregorian Armenians, till the 1915 deportation, lived mostly in the village Zir (2214 people); and Protestants lived mostly in Ayaş their number being 236. Aydın et.al. also noted that though most of the Armenians lived in the city there were Armenian villages few in numbers but crowded in population; among them most important one was 'İstanoz' village which was named to be 'Zir' later on and 'Yenikent' in the Republican period (2005: 214). This information is important in terms of the current study, because some of the participants are those whose families were among the people deported in 1915 from the village.

⁴² The above proportions, however, are given only to have a general view and not for a comparison, since there stated to be some problems in the census data (Atauz, 2004: 131).

Armenians. It is also stated that in the inner Anatolia Jewish population lives only in Ankara (Atauz, 2004: 130-131). Thirdly, though not being one of the cities whose non-Muslim population rate is the highest compared to the other Ottoman cities, by the end of the 19th century people living in the city were 1/3 non-Muslim and 2/3 Muslim (Atauz, 2004: 130). Lastly, it should be stated that, in the 19th century, the non-Muslim proportion was 13 % in the province [“vilayet”] while it was 46 % in the city center; thus non-Muslim population of Ankara was mostly an urban population (Aydın, et. al., 2005: 215). Moreover, Ortaylı states that non-Muslims in Ankara were better in conditions both in terms of wealth and in terms of a modern life style; and the culturally superior positions of the Armenian and Greek population in the city was reflected in the number of schools they had, which was around six or seven (1994: 111). They also took place in the administrative organizations of the city, in accordance with their population and wealth, to the extent no other Anatolian city experienced (Ortaylı, 1994: 111-112). Now I will turn to the three non-Muslim communities in the city in more detail.

4.3.1. Armenian Community in Ankara

Though the existence of an Armenian church in Ankara is thought to date back to Roman and Byzantium periods, the first concrete demographic information about the Armenians in Ankara is that during ‘the big runaway’ [“büyük kaçgun”] between 1590-1610 a large amount of Armenian population came from the Eastern provinces and the urban population had increased consequently (Atauz, 2004: 139). We know, moreover, that in 1828 around 6000 Catholic Armenian who were originally from Ankara but lived in Istanbul, were deported to Ankara, though we do not know how many arrived in the city since many died on road (Aydın et. al., 2005: 215). We know also that there were Armenians coming from Sivas, Iran and Caucasians to Ankara at different periods. We know, moreover, according to 1914 census that the population had already decreased before WWI; however, we do not have any data on the reason (Atauz, 2004).

Catholicism among Armenians started at the 18th century with a Dominican priest coming to the city and converting some families to Catholicism (Etöz, 1998: 73; Aydın et. al., 2005: 215). Protestantism, on the other hand, spread among Armenians due to the American and English missionaries coming to Anatolia in the late 1860s (Etöz, 1998: 73). The three Armenian groups are stated to have some different characteristics. For example, Catholic Armenians have always been the largest and the wealthiest among other Armenian groups (Atauz, 2004: 138); they took part in the city governance councils and expressed their ideas and discomfort openly (Etöz, 1998: 74). It is argued, moreover, that while the Gregorian Armenians were more traditionalist and willing to carry on and perpetuate ‘eastern culture’, Catholics were more ‘western sided’, lived in the city like Europeans, and wished the community modernize and integrate to Europe as soon as possible (Atauz, 2004: 140). This difference is supported, indeed, by the claim that Catholic Armenians of Ankara had chosen an idea and identity definition that they were not Armenians but Catholics only (Ortaylı, 1994: 110). Atauz states that though there was almost no problem between Armenians and Muslims, at least not in the court records, there seems to be problems between these two Armenian groups. Protestant Armenians,⁴³ on the other hand, are pointed to compose the most liberal groups of Ankara, together with the Greek population, the reason for this being their close contact with foreign merchants (Etöz, 1998: 74).

Ankara is stated to be a metropolitan center for both Catholic and Gregorian Armenians (Etöz, 1998: 159). While Aydın states that at the 19th century Catholic Armenians had two churches and two monasteries (2005: 215); Etöz gives the numbers for Catholic Armenian to be four churches, one Cathedral, and two monasteries (1998: 159-160). On the other hand, Gregorian Armenians had two and Protestant Armenians had one church[es]. The language used in daily life was Turkish; education at schools and ritual at churches were in Turkish with Armenian alphabet. However, at the Armenian school foreign language was also thought to a great degree (Ortaylı, 1994: 111). Etöz states, moreover, that at the Catholic

⁴³ Aydın, Emiroğlu, Türkoğlu and Özsoy, state that at the beginning of the 19th century there was a Protestant Armenian community in the city center which was composed of 1000 people (2005: 214); however this data is not shared by other sources.

Armenian monasteries Armenian language was thought, and, as a result, attitude of religious and educational institutions were influential on a certain degree of ethnic positioning (1998: 133). Catholic Armenians had four schools for children [“sıbyan mektebi”] and Gregorian Armenians had two (Etöz, 1998: 151).

4.3.2. Greek Community in Ankara

Greeks who lived in Ankara until the 1923-1924 Population Exchange are accepted to be the native /local Anatolian societies -Helens and Galatians- who have converted into Christianity (Atauz, 2004: 147). We learn, moreover, from Galanti’s quotation of Perrot, a traveler in 19th century, that the Greeks living in the city then were mostly the ones who came to Ankara from Kayseri in 18th and early 19th centuries (Galanti 1950 quoted in Atauz, 2004; Aydın et. al., 2005: 215; Etöz, 1998: 74). Ankara was a metropolitan center for the Greek Orthodox Church and there were a cathedral, a church inside the castle, and a monastery in Keçiören belonging to Greeks (Atauz, 2004: 147-148). Etöz gives the number of Greek Orthodox churches in the city in 19th century to be two (1998: 159) and Aydın to be three (2005: 125). Greeks were among the wealthy and liberal groups in the city, they dealt mostly with large-scale trade (Etöz, 1998: 74). They were the ones who gave education the most importance among other communities in the city having opened a secondary school in mid 19th century and sending their children to Istanbul and Europe for education, which made them distinct among other groups (Etöz, 1998: 151). Aydın states that they had three schools in 19th century (2005: 215). Like the Armenian community, the language both of education at school and of rituals at church were Turkish with books in Greek alphabet (Galanti, 1950). In addition, Greek had a special place at Greek monasteries with the same effect on ethnic positioning Etöz claims (1998: 133).

4.3.3. Jewish Community in Ankara

I have noted above that there was already a Jewish community and a synagogue in Ankara in the Roman period. Bahar states that when the “Sephardim Jews” - Jewish

people coming to Ottoman Empire from Spain in 1492 and from Portugal in 1497 - arrived Ankara at the end of 15th century, they met with this local Jewish community, called “Romaniyot”, which had already mingled with the “Ashkenazim Jews”, German and East European origin Jewish people who came before the Sephardim (2003). The local Jewish community spoke Turkish since Seljuk period and they used Greek as the language of the rituals in the synagogue, which was made compulsory during the Byzantium period (Bahar, 2003: 132). Although, with Sephardim and Ashkenazim Jews coming to the city there emerged three synagogues using three distinct languages –Greek, Spanish and Portuguese- in time there left only one synagogue with the language of the community becoming Spanish, which was called “Ladino”⁴⁴ (Bahar, 2003; Galanti 1950). Atauz points that this synagogue is the only worship place belonging to the local non-Muslim population of Ankara inherited to the city today (2004). Jewish community in Ankara is argued to be, at least in 19th century, the most conservative group among others, to be the poorest, to be the less educated and to deal with small-scale trade (Etöz, 1998; Atauz, 2004; Aydın et. al, 2005). The only group who did not have vineyards in the city, for example were the Jews and the reason for this is stated to be their poverty (Aydın et.al, 2005: 300). Bahar explains poverty and bad conditions of the community in relation to the effects of ‘Sabetay Sevi’ events in 17th century (2003: 48-49).

Ankara Jewish community had a school established in 1889, first only for boys and then including girls too, where French, Hebrew and Turkish languages were taught (Bahar, 2003: 54-55). In 1924, this ‘Jewish School’ became a mixed one including 25-30 Muslim and 2-3 Armenian children, which is explained by the quality of the school (Aydın et. al., 2005: 467). We know that this school existed until the late 1930s.

We know that according to the ‘Millet System’ each community had an autonomous organization of social, religious, educational and legal life in the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, a traveler in 19th century, naming “Turks, Catholic Armenians, Gregorian Armenians, Greeks and Jews” notes that each group had its own leader,

⁴⁴ ‘Ladino’ is stated to be a “jargon-language” consisted of 16th century Spanish, Turkish, Greek and French words (Bahar, 2003: 191).

own separate population registries, and autonomous organizations (Atauz, 2004: 132). We learn that non-Muslim groups have significant statuses in the city governance of Ankara and they participate equally in the provincial and local governance; for example in 1872 three of the six members of the Municipal Court are stated to be non-Muslims (Georgeon, 1999). Ortaylı points that non-Muslim population took part in the governance of province in accordance with its population size and economic activity (1994: 112); thus it is easy to understand Atauz's statement that when looked at the 1907 Ankara Province Salname records, it is seen that Armenians take part in various councils and state services in the Ankara city (2004: 142). What we have to this point is that Ankara has a complex ethnic and religious structure argued to be "not less than a portal city" (Atauz, 2004: 195). How this complexity and 'cosmopolitan structure' (Ortaylı, 1994; Etöz, 1998) was organized in terms of the city space.

4.4. SPATIAL ORGANIZATION AND THE NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE CITY

We know that smallest social unit in Islamic city is the neighborhood and the social life and the city space is organized around neighborhoods. Aktüre argues, however, that differently from the Arabic neighborhood, identity of the Ottoman neighborhood is not determined by a wall and its name and identity changes constantly (2001: 48). Similarly, Aydın argues that an absolute separation of the neighborhoods according to the Ottoman Millet system cannot be argued for (2005: 276). Still however, despite the changes in the ethnic organization and boundaries of the neighborhoods in Ankara, we observe some common principles in their organization. They are mostly gathered around a religious structure (Atauz, 2004; Aktüre, 2001; Aydın et. al., 2005) and sometimes come out as a result of the intention of specific occupational groups to gather together (Aydın et al, 2005: 267). Atauz argues that these neighborhoods should be seen mostly to be systems of neighbor relations, solidarity and control units, established around a religious core (2004: 126). Neighborhoods of Ankara were recorded in the registers under the titles of "Muslim" [including the neighborhoods where the Jews were living], "Non-Muslim" [referring

to Christian neighborhoods], and “mixed” (Atauz, 2004). It is remarkable that the largest neighborhoods of Ankara were Christian neighborhoods; and then came the “mixed” neighborhoods. Muslim neighborhoods, on the other hand, were mostly medium and small size, but many in number (Atauz, 2004: 128). In 1830, for example, there were 57 Muslim, 27 non-Muslim, and 23 mixed neighborhoods in Ankara (Aydın et. al., 2005: 267).

The city center and the trade axe was apparently nearby the castle and it was mostly the Christian or “mixed” neighborhoods around this axe (Atauz, 2004: 182-183). Though, the richest and prestigious people are stated to live in the castle area, Ortaylı argues that there was never a rich-poor neighborhood separation among Ankara neighborhoods and the usual tendency was defined by ethnic terms (quoted in Atauz, 2004: 186). Accordingly we observe that in Hacıdoğan, Bentderesi and Tabakhane neighborhoods mostly the Armenians lived; in the neighborhood called Hoca Hindi or Hacendi, which is currently known as İstiklal Neighborhood the Jewish people lived; and in Işıklar street lived the Greek population (Aydın et al., 2005; Bahar, 2003; Atauz, 2004). Such an organization of neighborhoods is stated to point an aggregation model rather than a diffusion model on the city space (Atauz, 2004: 183). We know also that most of the Armenians, Greeks and Muslims had vineyards especially in Keçiören, Etlik, Esat, Ayrancı and Çankaya (Aydın et. al., 2005: 189-190) and a great amount of high quality wine was produced in Ankara (Etöz, 1998: 90).

4.5. THE END OF THE COSMOPOLITAN STRUCTURE OF THE CITY

It is argued by many that the cosmopolitan and heterogeneous structure of the city, not only in demographic but also in spatial terms, was lost mostly at the beginning of the 20th century due to two crucial events: 1915 Armenian deportation and 1917 big fire.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ We know that the population exchange of 1923-1924 and the establishment of Israel in 1948 had also similar effects on the demographic structure of the city, though on the remnants of these previous ones. I will be referring these events during the analyses of the narratives.

4.5.1. 1915 Deportation

The most precise data on the Armenian deportation in Ankara is given by Aydın, Emiroğlu, Türkoğlu and Özsoy. They state, depending on the Prime Ministerial State Archives, that deportation of Ankara Armenians was completed in 17 September 1915 and 21.236 Armenian from Ankara was deported to Halep and Zor (Aydın et. al., 2005: 331). The archives indicated that there left only 733 Armenians in Ankara in the city center (Aydın et. al., 2005: 331). Atauz, moreover, states that according to 1927 census that there left 705 Armenians in Ankara. He gives the number deported, however, to be a little more than 10000, since 1914 census gives the total Armenian number to be 11.646 (2004: 146). Although he refers to another source giving the number to be 21.236 -exactly the same number Aydın et.al. give- he claims it to be suspicious following from the lack of precision in the definition of the area [that is whether the number is valid for the city center of Ankara or all the province], whose population is given to be 53877 and, when the city center included, to be 65523 (Atauz, 2004: 146). 1914 census data given by Karpát (2003), on the other hand, seems to clarify this ambiguity. Since Karpát gives the total Armenian population⁴⁶ to be 11246 in the city center and 53957 in the whole province - very close to the numbers given by Atauz - we might assume that the data given by both Aydın and Atauz are correct. In short, in 1915 more than 20000 Armenian people were deported from Ankara. We know also that these were Gregorian Armenians since the Catholic and Protestant Armenians were not deported (Aydın et. al., 2005: 331). We learn further that men were deported and the women with the children were dispersed to various Muslim villages of Ankara (Aydın et. al. 2005: 331)⁴⁷.

⁴⁶ Though Karpát does not have such a category in his classification, the aggregation of the 'Armenians', the 'Armenian Catholics', and 'Protestants' give the results indicated above (2003: 210). We may put, however, a reservation to the category 'Protestants' since it might be including Protestants other than Armenian Protestants.

⁴⁷ It is also stated that some Ankara Armenians returned to the city between 1918 and 1919 (Aydın et.al., 2005; Atauz, 2004). Aydın et.al. argue that the ones who had returned faced as in many other provinces, confiscated monasteries, and other property, children distributed to various institutions and households and with hunger (2005: 334).

4.5.2. 1917 Fire

We know that there were many fires in Ankara in the 19th century and at the beginning of 20th century. There was a fire in 1881 in which “Bedesten”, an important marketplace, was burnt to an important degree (Georgeon, 1999; Aydın et. al, 2005);⁴⁸ one in 1895/6 (Atauz, 2004); one in 1915/17 and then in 1922 and 1927⁴⁹ (Atauz, 2004). However, it is argued that the cosmopolitan structure of the city and its Ottoman city characteristics totally disappeared in 1917 fire.⁵⁰ In this fire, which lasted 3 days and nights, 2/3 of the city is stated to be burnt (Aydın et. al., 2005; Atauz, 2004). This fire, which is usually called ‘the big fire’, affected the most luxurious neighborhoods of the city and the trade center including Hisarönü, Çıkırıçılar Slope, Bedesten, Saraçlar Bazaar, and Atpazarı, (Aktüre, 2001: 55; Aydın et.al., 2005: 336). Hacıbayram neighborhood, where mostly the Muslims lived; Tabakhane neighborhood, where mostly the Armenians lived; and the northern part of the İstiklal neighborhood that is the ‘Jewish neighborhood’, were included in the fireplace (Atauz, 2004: 154-155).⁵¹ Although, in the existing literature it is pointed that Muslim Turks were also affected by the fire with reference to cases whereby the possessions of a mufti were also burnt (Bağlum, 1992 quoted in Şenol-Cantek, 2003); it appears that the biggest damage was actually in the neighborhood whereby Armenians had lived (Şenol-Cantek, 2003). Aktüre counts on the results of the fire on Christian population in that Armenian and Greek people whose houses were burnt in the fire moved to either their relatives or their Muslim neighbors; and after a while, most of them migrated to İstanbul, İzmir, and other cities, which caused the disappearance of the trade bourgeoisie in Ankara (2001: 56). The outcome of the fire

⁴⁸ Aydın et.al. state that this fire was influential on the outcome that the city could not take a role in newly emerging economic relations and reorganizations in the Empire which started from 1890s on (2005: 336).

⁴⁹ In the reminiscences I have collected the most often referred fire was the one in 1929. I will assume these two fires to be the same.

⁵⁰ There is a dispute over the exact date of this fire. For some the date is 1915 but others 1917. Although, knowing the exact date is important to understand whether it was related to the 1915 deportation or not; I will here refer the date as 1917 since it is the more frequently shared assumption.

⁵¹ We will see in the fifth chapter that these areas are among the mostly referred ones in the memories, which are recollected in relation to the ‘old city’.

for the city - in all spatial, demographic, economic terms- thus, was crucial. Aydın et.al. point clearly that 1917 big fire was one of the reasons providing the ground for the representation of Ankara as a forgotten and poor Anatolian town in the literature of the War of Independence and the Republican era (2005: 336). In this discourse, Ankara was represented as a city constructed out of ‘nothing’.⁵²

It is now time to look at how the Armenian and Jewish population in the city were positioned within this construction process and in what ways the ‘old city’ was reflected in their narratives.

⁵² This discourse of building a city from absence can, no doubt, be thought in parallel to the discourse of constructing a new nation, the “Turkish nation”. Ankara, as the capital city of the new state, would represent the basic principles and values of the new regime. Although, such formulation had no doubt an actual ground at the time of its declaration to be the capital city (13th October 1923), this was due to the reasons outlined above, which was also backed by diseases and poverty the city had experienced in the late 19th and early 20th century. Still, however, representation of Ankara as a “small town”, I suggest, tells us more than it seems. It apparently ignores the relatively rich history of the city and thus prevents the historicity of the city to be transferred onto the “collective conscious” which was, then, still a project, for the new regime, to be completed. Utilization of such discourse supported two conditions, I suggest. First, the “creation from absence” discourse legitimizes the very existence of the constructors of the Republic in the city and their project of building a “new” and “modern” capital for the new state. This legitimization, further, supports and strengthens the ideology and the values of the new regime. It is so because, constructing a new and a modern capital city out of an old, lonely and small town could only be achieved through the authority of power, hardworking, self sacrifice, self confidence and boasting, which could be claimed to be the rising values of the new regime. Such aim is important when thought also that the relation between the new and the modern on the one hand, and the old and the tradition on the other is an important axle through which the Republican regime builds its discourse. The other reason for the discourse can be extracted out of the claim that the Republican regime was in a “denial of the past”. It is to state that, refusal of the cosmopolitan Ottoman heritage took its concrete form in the refusal of the old capital city –Istanbul; and the new capital city was positioned (first at the level of discourse and then as a project in its concrete form) in opposition to the old one. In this opposition established between the cosmopolitanism of the former and the homogeneity of the latter, oppositions of ‘honor’ versus ‘dishonor’ and ‘cleanness’ versus ‘dirtiness’ were important symbolic dichotomies, whereby the former were attributed to Ankara and the latter to Istanbul (Bozdoğan, 2002). In this framework, it seems not possible to expect the “rich” history of Ankara and the cosmopolitan structure throughout this history to be emphasized by the Republican constructors, especially when this history was not, written by the ‘new comers’ (Cantek, 2003).

CHAPTER V

THE CITY:

POSITIONING OF THE ARMENIAN AND JEWISH

COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE CITY SPACE

“perhaps the only way for a minority to live here
is becoming a part, becoming a direct part of the city,
not building itself as a separate group and taking apart”
N.E.

I have argued in the second chapter that belonging has obviously a ‘spatial dimension’. I do not understand this dimension to refer to a direct spatial determination of identity, but take ‘space’ as articulated movements in networks of social relations (Yuval-Davis, 2001). Indeed, such conceptualization of space is very much in line with what came out of the narratives. Recollections of life in Ankara and city space were narrated with a focus on social relations, which bore crucial implications on identifications, self-understandings and belongings of the narrators. No need to say that the narratives were greatly rich in detail and I tried to gather them around some themes to reach meaningful results for the purposes of the study. In this chapter, I will follow somewhat a chronological order, which is, indeed, in line with the general path of the spatial transformation the city space in Ankara has gone through. In this way, I aim at drawing a picture, which reveals the relative positioning of the Armenian and Jewish communities within the city. Patterns of relative positioning in their historicity will provide us with the objective conditions these two communities faced with and whose construction they had a role in Ankara. Narratives on the ‘old’, on the ‘new’, and on the ‘capital’ city point to the dimensions of these objective conditions.

5.1. MEMORIES OF THE OLD CITY

‘Old city’ refers to Ulus district since it was the only permanent settlement area for various populations in Ankara until the establishment of the ‘new city’ in the early Republican period. I have pointed in the fourth chapter that this old city bore the traces of a long history, the most obvious being the traces of Ottoman period in its neighborhoods, its various worship places, its marketplace and so on. However, we also know that these traces were already erased to a large extent due to devastating events taking place mostly in the late 19th and early 20th century and the city space experienced an enormous transformation both until and in the early republican era. The temporal scope of this study includes the period during and after these transformations. The first generation integrated in this research had carried both the memories of the old city, and experienced the transformations in the city space in the early republican era. Here, I will focus on these memories and experiences with an aim to understand their identifications and belongings.

The below recollection of the old city provides us with a view of the old city, as well as its narrators perceptions and identifications. ‘1’, (1929, Cath.Arm., F), states that:

My mother used to show me the old towels and the remnants of the churches when I was a child. At my mother’s youth, at her childhood, all, there were many churches in Ankara. And they were separate...There were many churches. I mean, Catholic Church was different, Armenian Gregorian Church was different, so were there churches, many. But none of them remained, burnt, demolished and so forth... In my childhood we did not have our own local church, we came here [The French Catholic Church]. Still, we as the native Christians do not have our local Church. We are in the foreigners’ church, since they are also Catholics, thanks to them The French Church watches over us.

‘1’s narrative constructs an opposition between past and present, on the one hand, the old and the new city, on the other. In this opposition, the old city, providing space for a variety of churches, which supplied “satisfaction of needs” for different religious and denominational groups, is narrated with connotations of “feelings of belonging” (Hedetoft, 2004). Accordingly, ‘group identity’ defined through religious affiliation appears to be an important element of identification and belonging in ‘1’s narrative. The new city, on the other hand, after the loss of the “burnt, demolished” old city, does not provide differential spaces for different

religious groups. This is clear in her focus on the absence of a “local church”. Local/locality, with its point on ‘nativity’, appears in this focus as an important level of identification. However, the absence of a local church complicates the issue and points to a multiplicity of identifications. Pointing to “foreigners’ church” ‘1’ seems to be drawing on some level of belonging with connotations of the ‘national’; and, further, through pointing the “foreigners also being Catholics” she draws on a ‘transnational’ level of belonging. We see, as a result, that the recollection of the old city is narrated by ‘1’ in a form woven into multiple identifications of local, national and transnational.

Another memory on the old city belongs to A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M):

[O]ur, there is the Trade High school you know in Hacıdoğan, there was our Catholic Church, the church was there, and also, in front of it, such a wide, well, the graveyard was also there, then the government...our priest had died or something, the church was demolished, I think; everything has dissolved. Then, we didn't have priest or something here, this French, this thing, it was a school. Then they built a church there, so on so forth. And us, they took, the Ankara Catholics, us, they took. Then, well, we go on.

What is apparent in this narrative is that it constructs ‘the church’ as the integrating element of the ‘community’ since “everything has dissolved” after the ‘local church’ was “demolished”. The demolition of the local church is narrated as an end of an era - an era when they had their differential life spaces, an era when they belonged more. A.T.’s narrative conveys meanings also in its structure. As it appears above, he points to the “government”, probably as a factor in the demolition of the church, but does not continue that way and suddenly turns to a ‘natural cause’, the death of the priest. Such a narrative structure, woven with ruptures, could be seen as indicating some ‘electrified fences’ (Hareven, 1996) in relation to the ‘state’s operations, and to the current limits the community faces.

Above two narratives, doubtlessly, imply a ‘loss’, the loss of the old city which is understood to be a space of belonging and identification in its providing for heterogeneity and for spaces of ‘difference’. Another set of narrative on loss comes out in relation to the old possessions owned in the old city. Some of the interviewees had stated that their families had had houses in Ulus district, and vineyards mostly

in Keçiören, but also in Çankaya and some other districts. However, the properties were narrated to “have gone out of hand” either because of the fires in Ulus; or because their parents had not laid an overt claim on their fields and lost their rights on them in the enormous spatial transformation before and in the early republican era;⁵³ or else had to sell them ‘by force’. What became apparent in these narratives was that ownership implied, in a sense, to belong and to identify with the city. However, the narratives articulated a multiplicity of meanings other than this. The two quotations below, narrated by ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F),⁵⁴ lay an example:

The ones before us had lived very much difficulties. They lived in one or two rooms. Ours... So was it. My father’s family, so also my mother’s, had had all estates in Aşağı Ayrancı, in Kızılarpınarı, Dikmen, they had vineyards, houses. Well, my mother’s family in the Castle, my father’s in the Front Castle, as I told you, there they had winter houses; those were very esteemed places then. Well, they had had houses, many estate and property but nothing remained, all had gone. ... We lived in different rented houses in my childhood.

...

Apart from the houses in these neighborhoods, everyone had their houses in the vineyards in Çankaya, Ayrancı, Esat, Keçiören. My fathers’ vineyard house, for example, was uphill to Cinnah slope. It was the one with a star and crescent on it, the field they had was a very large one. But, in time, everything at hand was lost. Their Muslim neighbors wanted to buy the house to give it as a gift to the time’s leader of the Religious Affairs Institution. They gave it in exchange of 600 Liras; though there had been offers even for 1500 Liras before, they did not sell it. They [the neighbors] forced them a little I think.

The above narratives are mostly about the loss of old properties. We understand that there is a generational rupture in the property ownership of the Catholic Armenian group. Though the previous generations had properties they were, as it is understood, lost mostly during the war years (1914-1920).⁵⁵ It appears that the first

⁵³ M.T. (1928, Cath.Arm., F) narrated on the confiscation of some of her father’s estate who was not informed directly, and was late to prevent the confiscation since he did not read the paper which gave news on it. She narrated also on another case, this time her mother’s vineyards nearby Keçiören, on which she had the deed and applied to a lawyer to regain her rights over the field, but the lawyer had claimed in the process that he had lost the deed and, thus, she lost the land. What appears in these kinds of narratives is a somewhat problematical relationship with ‘law’, to which I will be returning in the following pages.

⁵⁴ I had three interviews with ‘1’ and the issue of past ownerships was recurrent in all of them. Therefore, there are convergences in the above two quotations.

⁵⁵ The Gregorian Armenians I have reached to, have all come to Ankara during and after these years following the ‘Armenian deportation’, to which I will be turning in the next chapter. So they were already ‘uprooted and dispossessed’ at the time of arriving in Ankara. The Jews, on the other hand, had possessions of their houses in the Jewish neighborhood but did not have vineyards as I have noted in the fourth chapter. They seem to have a relatively stable inheritance system across generations, however they were also affected by the fires, and later on by the ‘Turkification Policies’ to which I will turn in the next chapter.

generation became again property owners mostly after 1940s due to a re-accumulation of capital through work. Thus, the comparison made by '1', between her own childhood, when they lived in rented houses and in "difficulty", and her parent's childhood, when they lived in the most "esteemed places" of the district, becomes an important one. Note that she uses passive voice relating to the loss of property in the first quotation and the reason of this narrative structure becomes clearer in the second one, when she points to an 'unwilling' situation, the sale of the vineyard house by an implied 'force'. She seems to be abstaining an overt focus on 'force'; but we can state that implication of it relating the attitudes of the 'Muslim neighbors' and the aim in the 'force' with its connection to a state officer in religious affairs, all emerge as indicators of 'boundaries' and some 'electrified fences' in the relations to 'others'. Still, however, as I will be arguing during the whole analysis these boundaries and otherness are in no sense constructed as an 'absolute' and 'once-and-for-all' kind. Boundaries are contextual, they shift, and they are ambivalent in themselves. Ambivalence in the above narrative emerges from '1's reference to the symbols of "star and crescent". This reference is indeed to the 'sources' and 'feelings' of belonging, though not understood to the 'ascriptions' of it (Hedetoft, 2004). It might be read, with a possible over-interpretation, to be a complaint stating, "we are a part, but we are/were treated not to be so".

5.1.1. Loss of the old city in the fires

I have argued above that some people had lost their houses in the fires to which I have referred also in the fourth chapter. The fires and the memories of them seem to indicate, however, much more than the loss of property. They transformed the spatial organization of the city enormously; and more importantly they transformed the conceptual worlds of its residents, especially its non-Muslim residents, drawing new boundaries; attributing new meanings to their relations with 'others'; and deciding their statuses in the city which would, soon, emerge out of the ashes.

Recollections of the fires brought, in each case, complicated narratives. Most of the first generation narrators had listened stories on the 'big fire' of 1917 from the elders

-one lived it as a child- and some of them had experienced the 1929 fire as a child or a newborn baby. The narrators were mostly reluctant to speak on fires, but when they spoke their silences as well as words pointed to a complexity of perceptions. Thus, not surprisingly, recollections of fires were not narrated in a flowing structure but were woven into sudden ruptures. Our dialogue with A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M) is an important example of this. As he was narrating on a visit to Hagia Sophia and on his being informed by a priest about an old church in the inner-castle area,⁵⁶ A.T. stated that there had been, indeed, a Christian neighborhood in the castle, but then there was the ‘big fire’ and the houses were burnt totally. As soon as, however, my focus turned on the fire, his narrative was broken and turned to be a question and answer dialogue:

Ö: Was that fire sometime before you were born?

A.T: Before us, before us. [Silence]

Ö: Did your father remember that fire?

A.T: I don’t know. [Silence]

Ö: Well, what was told on that fire?

A.T: Well, an ordinary fire, I mean it was burnt.

Ö: I mean who did that fire; it was a big fire because, wasn’t it? They say that 2/3 of Ankara was burnt.

A.T: Yes. There, from the castle downward it was burnt.

M.T: Well, yes. In the Castle my... there were our fathers’, mothers’ fields, all had gone.⁵⁷

A.T: Even, to a Sunday, shall I say, it was coincid... don’t know to what ...

M.T: Yes.

A.T: Also a Tahtakale fire, of the Bazaar, of Hacıdoğan ... That Tahtakale fire was also old, many houses were old. Even, the now late, Atatürk also had watched it, if I don’t remember wrongly... I mean they looked that nothing could ... when the fire...it was very dense, and so...Tahtakale fire was also a big one in Ankara. That area too was destroyed in the fire... that’s... Concave, Hacıdoğan is concave you know, there the stairs downward...It was the same, that concave, then they filled it up, it was uplifted.

The breaking point in the above narrative, which, until that point, had the claim of speaking on “an ordinary fire”, is the implication that the fire had “coincided” to a Sunday, the vacation and the worship day for the Christians, and, thus, ‘could be’ an intentional one. However, this possibility was not expressed openly and the focus, one of a sudden, turned to another, a later [1929] fire. The flow of the narrative, this time, could be a result of direct experience, since A.T. was 6 years-old then, and

⁵⁶ I have noted in the fourth chapter that there was a Greek Orthodox Church in the inner-castle area.

⁵⁷ As I have noted above many had lost their properties in the 1917 fire. M.T.’s family was one of them.

remembers the fire. The implication that dense settlement and concave structure of the area could have facilitated the fire conditions, coming immediately after the statement that ‘Atatürk’ had watched the fire without ‘being able to do anything’, might be read as a sign of suspicion though.

Such suspicions and even claims of intention are also apparent in the below dialogue between K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M), S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F), and ‘1’, (1929, Cath.Arm. F), which is seemingly on the 1929 fire.⁵⁸ However, it appears in the flow of the dialogue that at least ‘1’ narrates on an earlier fire,⁵⁹ without being aware:

1: I don’t know about it. But, I mean, there was a fire in 1929.

K.S: The Tahtakale fire ... It was around, there is the new bazaar you know, the new bazaar, the big bazaar I mean, the only bazaar, in Anafartalar I mean, that is behind the Municipality building, the area including the bazaar is called Tahtakale. Tahtakale fire, then they bur....was burnt a lot, I mean, our house was also burnt; I was then one year old. Entering through the Juice Factory - I had been sleeping in the cradle alone at home - they saved me picking from the cradle. I know that, the fire in 1929.

1: Just a minute, that fire was somewhat on purpose, wasn’t it?

K.S: They say so, but...

1: Well, it was a fire on purpose, to have the area cleaned.

K.S: Well, there are such sayings that then they poured, well, gasoline rather than water on the fire, removed the area and so they say but we...

S.O: Well, not seen with eyes, that’s directly, or I mean living that period... They say, but we don’t know for sure, our eyes didn’t see it. My reason doesn’t accept such a thing. Then the monetary conditions were limited anyway, I don’t think there was the possibility to fill up a fire brigade tank with gasoline.

1: Even, my father, well, then was he single yet. My father... There were nothing like fire brigade or so, well, not yet developed then. My father, having people brought, well, water, that’s paying for it and having it poured. The waterman said to my father: “don’t try uselessly, here will be burnt; waste neither your money nor your effort uselessly”. I mean, it was such an intended fire, they tell so.

What becomes apparent in the above narrative is that some memory of ‘an intentional fire’ is a shared one by most of the first generation narrators. K.S. immediately breaks his sentence implying a deliberate fire and turns to passive voice narrating on the results. However, ‘1’ recollecting a “transferred memory” (Thompson, 1993) stresses clearly on this factor of intention. What is interesting, moreover, is that she uses the expression “to have the area cleaned”. ‘Cleanness’

⁵⁸ This dialogue was a part of the interview conducted by the Ankara Magazine journalists to which I was invited as a listener by one of the interviewees. The interview took place in the October 2005 Ankara Magazine. I have also interviewed with K.S.; ‘1’ and S.O., separately at different times.

⁵⁹ Since ‘1’ states that her father was single then, and since we know that ‘1’ was born in 1929 as the third child of her family we can assume that it was either the 1917 or 1922 fire.

calling its opposition 'dirtiness' is one important element of hegemonic nationalist discourses, which connotes in extreme cases 'purification' and 'ethnic cleansing'. Her usage of such an expression could be understood as reflecting a self-understanding of her group identity; in other words, as reflecting on the perceived meaning attributed to 'us' by 'others', by the dominant society, or by the 'state'. This usage, moreover, makes it clear that these recollections operate to draw 'boundaries'. This self-understanding, however, is not a commonly shared one as it appears above. We observe in the dialogue that S.O. refuses to accept the factor of intention in the fires and tries to rationalize her idea. One important element in S.O.'s rationalization, in addition to the ones in the dialogue -the impossibility of filling the tank with gasoline and the lack of direct witness- was her argument that "there are still fires that no one could do anything, even at this age". She pointed to the fire in Modern Çarşı in 2003, and stated that preventing a disaster "was obviously more difficult in the past". Additionally, I observed that memories of fires were not mostly transferred to the second generation; some second generation narrators getting surprised to hear that there were such fires in Ankara once. The second generation recollected more recent fires in Ankara which were completely accidental ones and altogether irrelevant to our point.

What is also important is that though we know the 1917 fire covered a wide area, each person narrated the fire as if it was only in the particular neighborhood of his or hers. Nobody seemed to have an overall view of the fire. A.K. (1911, Jew, M), for example, had experienced the fire as a child, and stated in the interview that there were no Armenians or Greeks at the fireplace; it was only the Jews whose houses were burnt. Moreover, in his narrative, too, the fire was recollected to be a deliberate one: "yes, at the fire, *they left* only one house, I.S.'s." We learn from his reminiscence, moreover, that not the whole Jewish Neighborhood was ruined at the fire, since he stated that many people, including his family, moved to other parts of the neighborhood after the fire.

I have argued above that recollection of fires operated as boundary mechanisms and pointed identifications mostly at the group level. The below narrative, seemingly a

recollection of the post-1917 fire, is interesting in terms of these group level identifications with references to ‘distinctive habits’ of the Armenian community, which are portrayed to have not disappeared even under discouraging conditions. It is also important for giving an idea on the life after the fires. ‘1’⁶⁰’s mother, who had the responsibility of mothering for her five sisters, was the latest to marry among them and was single at the time of the ‘big fire’, in which their house was burnt. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F) recalls a memory transferred by her mother in the words below:

After the fire they slept outside at nights, they didn’t have bread or such; they found a cupboard, some bread in it. They thanked God for sending it. Their house was burnt totally, they moved to a rent house. They had Muslim neighbors, who behaved nicely to them. The native Muslims of Ankara had been a little rude, not like the ones in Istanbul; they are very decent. At the rented house, they moved after the fire, since the table and all their furniture were burnt, my mother turned a basin upside down and putting a cover on it made it a table. They had put the dishes on it and sat for the dinner, a neighbor who saw them at the window called out “but Madam”, they called ‘Madam’ formerly, “you are sisters that intimate, and they are the nephews, why don’t you eat on the same plate?” They used to eat on a single plate, still we see on the films and so, they eat on a single plate.

What is interesting is that an immediate narrative of difference and distinction follows the memory of fire. While ‘1’ appreciates the Muslim neighbors’ nice attitude towards her mother’s family in hard times; she generalizes on “native Muslims of Ankara” in their being “a little rude”,⁶⁰ and compares it to the “decency of the Istanbulites”. Moreover, an immediate narrative of distinction follows such stereotypical generalization. ‘The culture of having meal’, even under ‘limited conditions’, is narrated to be a symbol of boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them’. References of ‘distinct culture’ as a ‘way of life’ will appear in many other narratives throughout the analyses.

5.1.2. Separate Neighborhoods

In the fourth chapter, I referred to the neighborhoods, which were organized usually around a religious core. Though neighborhood system had changed in great terms, the city center in the early republican era was still Ulus district and most of the

⁶⁰ This narrative of ‘rudeness’ should be understood as referencing to the ‘uneducatedness’ and ‘uncultivatedness’ of the ‘native Muslims of Ankara’ which is also apparent in some other narratives of ‘1’.

residents of the city including the non-Muslims lived there at least until the 1940s and 1950s. Obviously, there were not still neighborhoods where exclusively one community has inhabited. However, it appears in the narratives that there were still some concentrations where people with same religious, even with same denominational affiliations tended to live together. Accordingly, it appears that Catholic Armenians continued to live in Tabakhane and Bentderesi neighborhoods, while the Gregorian Armenians lived mostly in Hacıdoğan neighborhood. The Jewish people on the other hand, continued to live in the so-called ‘Jewish neighborhood’,⁶¹ that is the İstiklal neighborhood. The highest degree of residential concentration appears to be in the Jewish neighborhood, since although some Muslim families are stated to be living in the neighborhood, they were few in number; moreover, “almost all of the Jews in the city lived there”. The very few Protestant Armenians were never a part of this system of relations and the Greek people were not a part of the city population from the very beginning of the republican era.⁶² What is important in terms of our purposes is that the memories of these ‘separate neighborhoods’ composed important reference points for the identifications of the narrators.

5.1.2.1. Separate spaces-separate identities

I have pointed to the arguments in the second chapter that residential concentration increases the probability of interactions with in-group members and adds a spatial dimension to the ethnic boundary (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). Accordingly, I have observed in the current study that the experience of separate neighborhoods is narrated mostly to be an indicator of separate communitarian identities. What worth

⁶¹ I have observed that the narrators from the Jewish community have usually abstained from using the expression ‘Jewish neighborhood’. They have instead preferred to use ‘Samanpazarı’, which refers to a larger area including the neighborhood, or simply used “old Ankara”. The members of the Armenian community, on the other hand, did not reveal such a sign of abstention in using the expression “Jewish neighborhood”. Reflecting upon this observation we might think that the name for the neighborhood appeared mostly to be a code used by ‘others’ to delimit the boundaries. Being aware the sensitivity of the issue I will use the expression ‘Jewish Neighborhood’ to supply an analytical ease since it is also a commonly used expression in the existing literature on Ankara.

⁶² I have learnt that there were a few Protestant Armenian and a few Greek people in the city, but as I have already stated those were never a part of the spatial-communitarian relations referred above.

special noting is that the narrators, most of the time, referred to the once existed separate neighborhoods without being asked to do so, and mostly in the natural flow of their narratives on their birth places, the neighborhoods of childhood, or simply their religious identifications. Separate neighborhoods seemed, thus, to be a part of the 'practical sense' of the narrators even in relation to their current self-understandings. Memories of separate neighborhoods, moreover, were narrated in complex forms each pointing to a multiplicity of identifications. An example for this multiplicity comes out in a narrative by A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M) :

We, my daughter, we are Catholics, we are not Armenians, we are Catholics, Catholic. We do not have a language, except from Turkish. Perhaps, have you been to our church? Have you listened to the praying? Hah! All Turkish I mean. Therefore we... Tabakhane Neighborhood, so called, Catholics mostly lived, our neighborhood, it comes downwards to the Hacı Bayram Mosque, there lives, our Catholic nation ["millet"] lives there ... Tabakhane, Bentderesi. Right downwards to the Hacı Bayram Mosque, you know, ex-minibuses and such... Anyway... Well, just a little forward, there is a bakery, a mosque, right there. For example, most of us lived there. For example, there are Armenians in Hacidoğan, when you just passed Hacidoğan, do you know Sengul Hamam [public bath]? ... From the Sengul Hamam, there upwards, the Jewish Neighborhood it was. Muslims, moreover, Kayabaşı, Kaleiçi [inner-castle]... For example, my wife was born in the inner-castle, I mean she is also *Ankaralı*, I mean she is also native of it. What I will say is that, in sum that much area, we lived like that, all of us, as brothers, we lived in the same situation, we talked, chatted. Christian, we are Christians, and even if they were Muslim, we were all...⁶³

⁶³ The structure of this narrative also reveals some meanings on the perceptions and identifications of the narrator. We observe a detailed description of the place in the above narrative. The narrator makes us see the mosque, the bakery, the ex-minibus stop, the bath etc. What is more interesting, however, is that A.T is not the only one who defines the city space in these terms. L.N, N.E., K.S., B.T., also recollected narratives similar in structure. These narrators described the city space, especially where their 'earliest experiences' have past, with details of its neighborhoods, streets, slopes, corners, various places, even of the structures and outlooks of the buildings, and of various statutes which make up the capital-city furniture. Thus, the "paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks [of the city we]re all clearly identifiable and positioned relative to one another" in their "mental maps" (Lynch 1960, quoted in Holloway and Hubbard, 2001: 49-50). Such perception of the city space could be explained in reference to identification with it. One point, however, is to be indicated that the narrators of these detailed descriptions were almost all men; and this might be seen as an affect of gendered roles, that is, the frequency of appearance in the public space being higher for the men. Another explanation for such perception is in parallel to Şenol-Cantek's (2003) note, in reference to Lynch, that Ankara of the pre-Republican and the early Republican period is one small settlement place, which is full of familiar signs that make not possible for the native people to 'get lost'. While these signs for the pre-Republican period are composed of mosques, churches, the synagogue and various bazaars (Çıkırkçılar, Tabakhane, Samapazarı, Atpazarı, Hergele Square), they were mostly the statutes, parks, pools, restaurants, big hotels, and the governmental buildings (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 291). Upon drawing this explanation, we can conclude that in case of the non-Muslim population of the city both the symbols of the old city, whereby their feelings of belonging were defined in great terms, and the symbols of the new city, whereby they were integrated in various ways, acted important roles in the construction of their mental maps.

We are familiar with the argument that Catholic Armenians in Ankara have always had an idea that they were not Armenians but Catholics (Ortaylı, 1994). Narrators in my research, too, expressed the same idea and A.T. was not an exception. His narrative is constructed at some levels. At the first level, “Catholic identity” is clearly distanced from “Armenian identity”, the rationalization being that the Catholics do not have a ‘language other than Turkish’. Here is an implication of a community identity defined in terms of religious/denominational affiliation, and not of an ‘ethnicity’ with national connotations, denominator of which appears to be a ‘distinct language’. At the second level, different communities appeared to be converging with different neighborhoods, borders of the neighborhoods operating as the boundaries of community identities. In this case, “Catholics”, “Armenians”, “Jews” and “Muslims” are pointed in their separate neighborhoods; but still another dimension, which could be summarized as ‘separate but together’, is added. ‘Togetherness’ in A.T’s narrative, not much differently from the others’, referred mostly to the relations with the Muslims. It seems that even if A.T. says “all of us”, whom he actually points “as brothers”, are, namely, Muslim and Catholic communities.⁶⁴ At the third level, furthermore, there appears a narrative of ‘nativity’. Nativity in this case refers to ‘being born in the old city’. While this emphasis on nativity might have been understood to be simply a pointer of identification with locality, it appears in the flow of the interview that it has, at the last instance, connotations on the boundaries of communities, namely the two ‘Armenian communities’. M.T. (1929, Cath.Arm., F) stated that:

Indeed, our grandfathers and ancestors are all from Turkey, I mean Turk they are to be. We are from here... Armenians, for example, are from Diyarbakır, from Mardin, from, I don’t know, from all over, Kayseri, Yozgat, Sivas, from every part, they come to Ankara, they call themselves “Ankaralı” but their origins, their roots are different I mean, of the Armenians. However, the Catholics are all from Ankara, from the center of it. The natives of Ankara are Catholics.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ This focus on the relation with Muslims might be following the perception of my identity by the narrators. I was most of the time seen to be a member of the Muslim community. However, I will be arguing that such an emphasis is more an indicator of the claim of ‘being a part’.

⁶⁵ I have not any information on Gregorian Armenians coming from Diyarbakır or Mardin; however I have met with Assyrian people who have migrated from Mardin. M.T. might be referring to them.

First of all, we see that ‘being from here’, or ‘nativity’ refers to a wider territorial identification: ‘being from Turkey’ [“Türkiyelilik”]. Such a territorial identification, moreover, is a claim of right to be counted as ‘Turk’. I observed in most of the narratives that there is a convergence between such territorial identification and ‘national identity’. When we think, therefore, the above two narratives together, the A.T.-M.T. couple might be understood to be trying to say, “we are not Armenians, we are Turks”. Thought in this way there are two claims here: being a part of the larger society at the level of a broader definition -of, probably, a territorial definition of Turkishness- and being different at the community level. Following this second claim, we observe that ‘nativity’ operates as a boundary mechanism between Catholic and Gregorian Armenian groups. Catholic Armenian community in Ankara is a non-immigrant community, at least not in the contemporary collective memory, and this factor appears, in their narratives, to be a sign of ‘difference’. We know, moreover, that most of the Gregorian Armenians currently living in Ankara are the children or grandchildren of people who have experienced a great movement mostly upon the affects of 1915 deportation.⁶⁶ Rethought in this framework we might suppose that the boundary does not simply refer to the ‘natives’ on the one hand, and ‘outsiders’, on the other; but operates on the memories of this ‘problematic history’. Thus, emphasis on the ‘difference from Armenians’ becomes one, which is articulated to refer to the ‘neutral position’ of the ‘Catholics’. Such perspective brings us to my basic argument: that self-definition of communities, their identifications and perceptions should be understood in the broader perspective the concept ‘habitus’ provides for us. Viewed in this perspective ‘community identity’ becomes not a factor of ‘cultural difference’, which is understood by Bourdieu to be an artifact of particular fields of power (Danahay, 2005); but appears rather as an emergent property of particular structural, conjunctural and historical settings (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000).

⁶⁶ Birth places of the parents and grandparents of the Gregorian Armenians give an idea on these movements. Table 5 provides such data for the individuals who were integrated into the study. See Table 5 in Appendix E.

Other narratives pointed, moreover, that the distance was not only between the two Armenian communities; but also, and obviously more so, between the Armenian community, on the one hand, and the Jewish community, on the other. At the beginning, I had expected a degree of relation, even if compulsory, between the two communities, which stemmed from their inhabitation in the same district, since their neighborhoods, though ‘separate’, were physically close to each other. However, my expectation was not verified, and it turned out that except from a very tiny amount of shopping, the two communities were not in relation. This situation is very much in line with Bauman’s argument that physical and mental closeness did not necessarily overlap; but the key determinant in the relations was social distance (1998: 49-50).

Although, I will be pointing to the narratives on the relations between two communities in the seventh chapter; it is important, here, to state that “the sense of geographical segregation” following from the separate neighborhoods, often implied “a sense of social segregation” (Holloway and Hubbard, 2001: 77).

5.1.2.2. The Mythical Neighborhood

I have already pointed to the remembrance of separate neighborhoods as a sign of identity difference. Such remembrance might be viewed as following from ‘practical sense’, since the daily life in the city space was mostly organized in the neighborhoods. Most revealing examples of these recollections, moreover, were those whereby ‘the old city’ was identified with the neighborhood, and the neighborhood converged highly with the religious/community identity. A recollection in these terms was articulated by A.K. (1911, Jew, M):

Old Ankara is old Ankara. I was born in Samanpazarı, it remains as it was in the past, no change. There is, for sure, on the street side, new buildings are constructed and such. Ours is the beneath [“alt tarafta”], on the below side, it is the old neighborhood; it remains as it was in the past. That place, where our Synagogue stands, is the old Ankara; it remains as it was.

The above narrative is an interesting one, in that, A.K. seems to define the old city with the neighborhood, and the neighborhood with the synagogue. Thus, the synagogue appears to be the center of both the neighborhood and the city. Space, in

this narrative, emerges to be merged in the religious and communitarian identifications. Being an important one, though, this narrative seems to be exceptional in the degree of convergence between religious and spatial identifications, since the Jewish neighborhood was the most homogeneous among others, and the only one, which included the worship place of the communities at hand, at least in the period the narrators have experienced personally. Still, however, A.K.'s focus on "no change" might be assessed in reference to a feeling of belonging in the old city, which appears to provide for and strengthen the 'community identity'.

Being an extension of the separate space-separate identity argument, we can state, moreover, that in some cases neighborhoods were recollected in somewhat a mythical manner. Looking at these narratives is important, since we know that 'meanings' and 'statutes' attributed to the boundaries are crucial in identity constructions (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). '*Cleanness*', '*elegance*', '*oldness*', '*rootedness*', '*happiness*', '*togetherness*' appeared in the narratives to point such meanings and status. Not surprisingly, moreover, each narrator recollects the specific neighborhood s/he lived as one of the cleanest, smartest, most elegant part of the city. The most interesting example of 'clarity of the neighborhood' appears in a dialogue between two sisters H.A (1951, Jew, F, Secretary) and R.⁶⁷ (1945, Jew, F, Housewife,) who lived in the Jewish neighborhood to the age of 8 and 13 respectively, until when in 1958 their family moved from the neighborhood. While telling about the difficult conditions of life, due to the physical lacks of the period [e.g. absence of the refrigerator, fires on the stove-like braziers in the courtyard to get water boiled for washing up, water carried from the fountain in the neighborhood], the narrative, one of a sudden, turns to be a recollection on the 'happy, together and clean' neighborhood life:

⁶⁷ R. lives in Israel from 1963 on, where she has migrated after marrying a person who had migrated to Israel from Turkey previously. I think that her living currently in Israel has an affect on her mystification of the neighborhood.

H.A: I mean the conditions were very bad, but we were very happy in our childhood, weren't we? Because we did not know anything better, it was very nice, plays in the neighborhood...Neither television, nor anything then, for sure; all the children, we played in the neighborhood, I mean our childhood was very nice...

R: Every evening for once, in front of our house was watered, every evening we watered in front of our house, everybody, but everybody!

H.A: Of course, with that foamy water everybody washed in front of its house, especially on Fridays, especially on Fridays...

R: Then, everyone took its chair and sat there, like a café, chats, talks, it was very beautiful.

H.A: After the streets are washed, everyone gets her/his chair in front of her/his house, but spotless those streets, unbelievable, I mean with foamy water they were washed, chairs were set on summer evenings, everyone sat there in front of its house, chats and talks, it is one of the most beautiful things left in my mind on my childhood. For example, that neighbor chats, because we didn't have anything else.

The above dialogue is not only on the neighborhood but also on the community life; indeed the two seem to converge largely. In this sense, this narrative reflects an image of the 'in-group' with connotations of cheer, peace and security (Bauman, 1998). The articulation of space in relation to community identity is more apparent when we remember that the day after Friday, on which the street are "especially" cleaned, is 'Sabbath', the worship day for Jewish people. Thought by this reference, seemingly an everyday act, cleaning the front house, appears to be relation in relation to religious affiliations and gains a sacred meaning. The convergence between religious, communitarian and spatial identifications emerged in other narratives of H.A and R., too. In these narratives, they recollected on the special days for the Jewry such as Pesach/ Passover, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, Shavuot and Hanukkah, which were narrated not only in great religious details but also with detailed descriptions of the neighborhood on these days in strong connotations of 'clarity' and 'smartness' again. In these recollections, the focal points of the neighborhood appear to be the synagogue, the public bath ["hamam"], and the fountain; each being defined with their "beauty", "oldness", "rootedness", "solidness" and the "splendor".

To go on with the above dialogue, moreover, we see that neighborhood is narrated to be a somewhat public space through a similarity established with a café. However, when we look a bit carefully, we see that the street or the neighborhood is narrated as an extension of the house, thus of private life, everybody sitting in front of her/his house. There is a kind of "familism" objectified through an architectural metaphor (Bahloul, 1996: 31), the neighborhood. The neighborhood, moreover,

turns, in the narrative of H.A. and R., to be a “felicitous space” in Bachelard’s words; and this “topophilia” inscribed in the discourse of memory operates as a defense of community values as the moral values of the domestic group (Bachelard 1964 and Tuan 1974 quoted in Bahloul, 1996: 31). Therefore, it is clear that there is some kind of ‘mystification’ of the neighborhood in H.A. and R’s reflection upon it.

Another type of ‘mystification’ comes forward in the below narrative. It appeared during the research that while the houses in the Jewish neighborhood, having gardens, courtyards and being two or three floored, were each owned by a single family; the houses where Catholic or Gregorian Armenians lived, being similar in structure, were shared by usually five or six families. Armenians, except some well-off families, were mostly tenants in these houses and lived in one or two rooms. The below narrative provide us with detailed physical descriptions of these houses. K.G., (1937, Greg.Arm., M, tailor), recollects the house in Hacıdoğan where he was born and lived until 1960:

Three floored. Three floored, but in one house almost 5 family lives, 6 family lives I mean, you enter from a courtyard, on the right a family, up to it a different family; at the middle a family, up to it a family... I mean here, a single family, in Hacıdoğan, there was no such house ... [In the house] some were neighbors, and some were, I mean, our countryman [“memleketli”], for example the place of my mother and father’s birth, here, now, Yenikent... The houses were small of course, the houses were small. All... The ones who had two rooms were rare I mean. All were in one single room; and a kitchen, a toilet. The kitchen was not shared; a part of the room was made the kitchen. Toilets were shared mostly, I mean. But no neighbors’ door were locked, nothing. The street door was also not closed. Because who will come at what time? There are five families, six families; it is not definite who will come at what time. But, all... Whoever wished was closing, otherwise we never closed.

Besides giving a physical description, K.G., also points to a ‘moral atmosphere’ in the house by referring to the ‘never closed doors’ of it. The doors and windows being understood as the “narrative metaphors for the frontiers – geographical, social, and cultural”, the above narrative on the permanent openness of doors could be seen as an interpretation of “conviviality and security” (Bahloul, 1996: 32). Since Hacıdoğan is a ‘mixed’ neighborhood, whereby the Muslims composed at least “the half” of the population, as K.G. states, such an interpretation emerges as an important one in pointing to the inter-group relations.

B.T., (1957, Cath.Arm., M, jeweler), lived only his early childhood in Tabakhane until his family moved to Keçiören, recalls similar physical conditions:

The first place we lived was Tabakhane neighborhood. That, they called dead-end street, there was a square, in the dead-end street, do you know how it was, like a hotel room, I mean, I mean there are a few doors in the corridor, then even sometimes the toilets were shared, the toilets and such were outside of the house, there in something like a courtyard... The toilets were down to the courtyard; I mean you went out at night, we were afraid to go downstairs to the toilet, because we were children then.

He remembers the “doors in the corridor” were all Armenians, but states that “so was ours, but there were also Muslims in the neighborhood”. It is clear that the less the lived experience in the old city the less the mystification of it and the distant the language in its descriptions. Being another example of this, S.O.’s (1962, Greg.Arm., F, sales manager) narrative, who has never lived in the old city, is important in giving great details of the inner house and of the conditions in a later time. She remembers family visits to an old Armenian woman living in Tabakhane Neighborhood, in 1970s:

We had an auntie living there, we used to visit her, one of the old elders she was, my father [“rahmetli babam”] loved her much, so did my mother; she was a lady keepsake [“yadigar”] of my grandmother. Then, when I went there, I remember her house, all in primitive situation, the houses there ... Look, I tried to remember the toilet, where was it, I couldn’t remember the toilet, was it downstairs, I guess. I mean everything in one single room, I would tell you. One single room, heated with a stove, mostly slept on sofas, bottom of the sofas are mostly...as closets, all wooden, the oven, we had the two-sided or three-sided ones you know, them, or mostly with gas, on that single oven, the old-style oven; and very small, I mean, think of a one meter square kitchen. I mean at very primitive conditions, the so-called Tabakhane place. For example, the house of this auntie was two floored, belonged to her, there was again a single room downstairs, it was stepped up on stairs; she rented the down room to a university student.

There is no mystification, no longing for, and no spatial identification in this narrative. Rather there is a distance. This distance could be understood by reference not only to the ‘differential positioning’ in the life span, but also to the ‘relational setting’ in the social and economic relations (Yuval-Davis, 2001; Somers, 1994). In other words, economic, social and symbolic capitals of the persons have affected their narratives and the degree of mystification of the old city. Therefore, while it is meaningful to expect identification with the old city, which might also be understood as a ‘physical inscription’ in them since it was the ‘first universe’ of many narrators (Bachelard 1969 quoted in Bahloul, 1996); it is equally meaningful

to expect differential narratives in relation to differing degrees of capitals they possess. Still, however, the identification, especially for the first generation should be understood as a reflection of habitus they live through which bears the claim: ‘we were once an important part of this city’. In this framework, the mystification of the old neighborhoods, though bearing multiple meanings I have above referred, should be viewed not as a mere “nostalgia but a strategy [whereby] coresidents transformed [the] cramped space into a livable place” (Bahloul, 1996: 39). This is especially so, when we remember the oscillation between negative and positive aspects of the life in the neighborhoods -the lack of refrigerator and television, on the one hand, *clean, friendly, happy* neighborhood life on the other; or similarly the lack of single toilets and crowded houses, on the one hand, *togetherness, trust, and conviviality*, on the other. This is also apparent when we recall that the narratives of people who did not experience the life in old neighborhoods, and lived always at ‘better’ conditions have not revealed any sign of mystification. If otherwise, we could expect mystification only of the elders, but it appeared that the second generation also recollected similar narratives.

To understand relational positioning of these groups within the city, however, it is also important to follow them in their routes settling in the new city. This is because, as I have argued before, it was not only the ‘old city’, which composed a crucial part of their habitus, but also ‘the new city’. Now, I will turn to the dynamics of this latter component.

5.2. SETTLEMENT IN THE NEW CITY

Although here I use the expression of ‘new city’ to create a terminological contrast to the previously used ‘old city’; the expression is also meaningful since, together with the republican era, the first area established, starting in 1925 with the expropriation of the area south to the railway (Batuman, 2002), was actually named “Yenişehir” [the New city]. In 1930s, Yenişehir, including Kızılay district, had become the new residential area for both the bureaucrats and the politicians coming from Istanbul and other big cities and for the well-off residents of the old city who were in harmony

with the new regime (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 47). Thus, though Ulus was still the city center in the early republican years;⁶⁸ from the mid-1930s on, Kızılay became the center and the symbol of the capital city.⁶⁹ The crucial question for us is how this new era, which led an enormous change in the city space, was perceived and experienced by the non-Muslim residents of the city.

As Bahar points in her memories, from the late 1930s on and especially after 1940s the trade axe started to shift from Ulus to Kızılay (2003: 114-116). It seems that Kızılay was the center for many Jewish tradesmen starting from 1950s. Many tradesmen moved their shops to Kızılay from the old trade center, Samanpazarı; and in the 1960 there were many young who opened new shops in Kızılay. A.K. (1911, Jew, M, Self Employed), belongs to the former group. Having opened his millinery shop at the beginning of 1950s in Samanpazarı, he decided to move to Kızılay in the mid 1950s. Recollection of his daughter, H.A. (1951, Jew, F, Secretary), of the visits to her father's shop in Kızılay reveals important clues on the perception of the new city by the residents of the old one:

It was a big luxury to travel down to Kızılay from Samanpazarı; for sure, it was a big luxury. So much that, we were to Kızılay, when my father bought the shop we were still living in Samanpazarı, we came to the shop, sometimes, with my mother, I never forget my mother saying that "Ohh! From such a beautiful place, now, go if you can, there, the neighborhood". My mother did, never, want to go to the neighborhood from Kızılay. ... She didn't want to go back from Kızılay, I mean, she felt as if going from New York to Uganda or such. But she was always smart... Going to Kızılay, Kızılay was high class then. But we anyway, always already put on smartly, I mean while going out.

H.A.'s mother was a woman who came to Ankara after marriage from one of the most luxurious neighborhoods of Istanbul. Thus, it is understandable that she did not identify with the old but with the new city, which was established to be a symbol of modernization and civilization. Indeed, we know that especially in the early years of the republic Kızılay was like an exhibition place, which was not permitted to the

⁶⁸ Though all the ministries were in Yenışehir by 1935 the parliament was still in Ulus (Batuman, 2002: 49); and further, Ulus was still the trade center of the city in the early years of the Republic (Yavuz, 1973 quoted in Şenol-Cantek, 2003; Bahar, 2003).

⁶⁹ This process is pointed to start in 1934 with the application of Jansen Plan (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 45).

unfit people.⁷⁰ Looked in this way, H.A.'s narrative, though belonged to a later period, could be viewed as indicating that Jewish people had joined into the new life style of Ankara, in their "always already smart" clothing.

What kind of a residential pattern in this new city was experienced? We observe in the narratives that from the early 1950s on, an important 'evacuation' of the old city took place. This movement to the various other parts of the city continued mostly to the late 1960's. Now I will focus on the narratives of this period and try to point the residential choices of the Armenian and Jewish communities, the routes followed by them and the effects of these changes on their identifications.

We learn from Bahar's memoirs that there were already some well-off Jewish families who, having "foreseen the future", settled in the newly constructed houses in Yenisehir, especially in the region nearby the Ministry of Health in Sihhiye; and in 1950s "people coming from the neighborhood", also, settled in the Sezenler Street in the same area (2003: 117-118). She states, moreover, that a Jewish building contractor who lived in the Jewish neighborhood, and who was indeed from Istanbul, built and sold apartments in this area and the street soon "turned to be a Jewish neighborhood with at least two families living in one apartment" (Bahar, 2003: 118). Narrative of H.A., who moved from the neighborhood in 1958 as a child, supplies a total perspective on the movements of the Jewish community:

We moved to Sihhiye. Sihhiye, Necatibey. There is this Sezenler Street and Serçe Street. There, for example, were many Jewish families living; all of our relatives were there, there were the friends. Afterwards, they have started gradually to this area [Kavaklıdere, Tunalı Hilmi]. For instance, my mother-in-law bought this house in 1960. They had started to come towards these districts gradually. I mean, Samanpazarı, Sihhiye, Kızılay, then Kavaklıdere, Gaziosmanpaşa, such dispersion took place. Yet, when my mother-in-law bought this house in 1960, everybody had told that "Are you crazy? There, comes down the wolves in the winter". There had been a stream flowing here, cows were walking in the streets; I mean what it became today for instance. ... Usually the Jews have, always, such a thing to settle together, they have such an inclination, we don't know why ... Anyhow, then, some moved to Istanbul, some migrated to Israel, we have mostly scattered now, I mean.

⁷⁰ We know that, in the one party period Yenisehir was not permitted to the men who did not wear ties (Balcıoğlu, 1992 quoted in Şenol-Cantek, 2003).

H.A.'s narrative makes it clear that there were two occasions in the movements of the Jewish community: one to Sıhhiye in 1950s, second to Kavaklıdere in 1960s. We see, moreover, that some Jewish families, who immigrated to Ankara in the early republican era,⁷¹ also followed a similar path. Even if they did not live in the Jewish neighborhood, at least not too long, we learn from N.E. (1957, Jew, M, Academician) and L.N. (1924, Jew, M, Doctor), whose families were among the newcomers, that they lived first in Sıhhiye, Işıklar/Sıhhiye and moved to Tunalı Hilmi and Çankaya, respectively, following the same chronological schedule with other Jewish people. Thus, we can argue that there was a communitarian effect in the residential choices of Jewish people; and as H.A. stated "they had an inclination to settle together". We observe that this inclination was challenged due to the objective constraints of the conditions, such as migration.

There seems to be a similar communitarian effect in the route followed by the Armenian community. We know that Catholic Armenians mostly had vineyards in Keçiören, Etlik, Dikmen, Çankaya and Esat. This factor of previous possessions appears to be an important determinant for the Armenian community to resettle in the city. Many people moved to places already they, their family, or at least people they know, owned. B.T.'s narrative, a 1957 born Catholic Armenian, his family leaving Tabakhane when he was a 4-5 year-old child, points to this factor of previous possessions:

In Keçiören, in a vineyard inherited from the father; I mean, indeed, my father inherited from my grandfather. Well, some part to my uncle... They shared, I mean, after my grandfather have passed away. We had a vineyard house; in front of it 3-6 or more they may be, acacia/locust trees, a well in the front and such... We had such a stone house inherited from my grandfather. Then there was a 27 dönüm [27000 square meters], in 27 dönüm field... For sure we were not a well-off family earlier, my father selling the plots of his share [of the vineyard], he said once that "this cost us for 54 liras" he said, one house to 54 liras. A two-floored one, he had men built a two-floor house, with two shops downstairs. It was a house built in very difficult conditions, he had to work himself, I mean, daytime in his work, at night...

⁷¹ We learn from various sources that, with the establishment of the new state, employment opportunities increased enormously in the city and there were many people immigrating to the city from all over the country. Bahar, similarly, states that there were also many Jewish people among these newcomers (2003: 90).

In 1960s, Keçiören appears to be a district where many Armenian families have settled. Though not everybody had previous possessions, since it was the area many had moved to because of their possessions, it yet became the settlement area for the non-possessors, too. Many have bought fields, and constructed houses on them. A.T-M.T. couple lays an example of this group. A.T and his elder brother have bought a field, which was “a beautiful fruit-garden”, in 1957 and “working gradually” completed the construction of the house in 1965. Then, in late 1990’s they gave the house to a building contractor and from the apartment house built instead of the old house, they got two flats each.

There seems not to be an important differentiation between Gregorian and Catholic Armenian community in this path. Even if there are many Gregorian Armenian families who have settled in some other districts, mostly in Aydınlikevler, Etlik, and one family in Yenimahalle; there are also ones who have settled in Keçiören. K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Tailor) and his family are among them who left Hacıdoğan in 1960 for Dikmen and who in 1964 moved to Keçiören. His narrative provides for the communitarian effect in the movements:

Leaving these neighborhoods [the old city], we all, still, together, moved there, I mean to Keçiören... When we first went to Dikmen, we could live there only a few years, because, it was a vineyard house, one flooded; well, also, all were... sisters of my wife were in Keçiören... After a few years, why there, because your relative is there, both sisters of my wife were in Keçiören, well, when they are living there, you can not go to another district, because when you will visit them, when it is...Therefore, one went there, other relative followed him, another followed him, ours, mostly, all went to Keçiören.

K.G. and his family bought a house in 1970 in Etlik.⁷² K.G. states that an acquaintance constructed a building and permitted them a while to pay the money; and they, borrowing the preliminary payment from a relative, bought a flat there. He argues that if an opportunity at the same conditions appeared in Keçiören, they would have preferred it. K.G.’s narrative makes it clear that communitarian -at least

⁷² K.G. was single then, he engaged in 1963 and before marriage, they moved to Keçiören, since many relative of his would-be wife were there. His story is indeed an interesting one. He had a crowded family all living together, including his father and mother, his brother and his family [brother’s wife and child], his aunt and uncle, and after marriage his wife. K.G. states that this crowded family lived together for years, because of poverty and they always had difficulty in finding a house for rent, because nobody did want to rent a house for such a crowded family.

family- relations had an important effect in the choices of residential place. Equally, however, it made evident that relational settings of the individuals -economic and social capital in this case- could have prevailed over the community identification at the last instance.

‘1’s (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Tailor) experience of the resettlement in the city is a clear example for differing senses of belonging and self-understanding. We understand that in 1970s there were still few families living in Ulus. ‘1’s family was among them; with the evacuation of the old neighborhoods her family moved to Işıklar Street,⁷³ in Ulus. She recollects the process in below words:

We bought a three-floor apartment in Işıklar Street in 1953, mostly due to the savings of my sister and brother and moved there. It was also our workshop. We sewed there with my sister. But, it is expropriated by the governor’s office in 1982, to extend the next door primary school’s estate. They gave us a very small amount of money; it was below its value. My brother was already married then; we gave him his share. Me and my elder sister [their parents were already death] one of a sudden had to move to Keçiören. There were many “acquaintances” in Keçiören. But it had a town atmosphere. My sister, indeed, wanted to stay there, because there lived many acquaintances. But I didn’t like the place, I couldn’t live there; people were such of squatters, of villagers, of uneducated. Women were wearing baggy trousers and covering their heads; sitting, gossiping and knitting all day in front of their houses. ... Then, after giving my brother’s share of the house in Ulus, we could buy a small flat in Esat and moved there. It was an old flat; we did not like it first but...

‘1’s narrative on the life in Keçiören reveals important clues in terms of her identifications and self-understanding. It has worth noting that though a majority of “community members” were living in Keçiören, individual preferences outweighed the communitarian identifications for ‘1’ and they moved to another district where only a few other Armenians lived, but was a more ‘elitist’ place. It is clear that ‘1’ identifies with the ‘urban’, the ‘educated’, the ‘decent’ and such self-understanding was determinant in her choice of residential space. A crucial point in the sequel of ‘1’s narrative was her statement that the case had lasted longer than it should have

⁷³ I have noted earlier that Işıklar Street was a place where mostly the Greek population of Ankara had lived (Aydın et.al., 2005). However, it appears that after the Greeks had left the city to a large extent, in the 1923-1924 population exchange, the new residents of the street were economically among the well-off families of the time. (This gives an idea about the relative economic conditions of the Greek population) We learn for example that L.N. and his family coming to the city in 1929 from Istanbul first lived in the Jewish neighborhood for a few years but then moved to Işıklar Street. V.T., his father a Gregorian his mother a Catholic Armenian, also states that after living a few years in Tabakhane in the house his maternal grandfather owned, they moved to Işıklar Street in the late 1940s. We know that both of these families were managing their own businesses and were among the well-off families.

been, and her quotation of the lawyer in the words “obviously, your situation would be a little different from others”. Although she points that expropriation was not because they were Christians, since two next-door buildings, which were owned by Muslims, were also expropriated; she still perceives an injustice due to the length of the case and to the lawyer’s statement and claims that “we are officially equal, but difference is always there, even if in an implicit manner”.

To go on with the spatial movements, we can state that the movement within the city space continued in 1980s. Moreover, this latter movement was apparently related to the increase of economic capital. Thus, reflecting the class differentiation within the community some stayed in Keçiören, Aydınlikevler, Etlik, while others, independent of their being Gregorian or Catholic, have ended up in more prosperous regions of the city, such as Çankaya, Gaziosmanpaşa, Kavaklıdere and Bahçelievler. As a result of a more recent expansion in the city space, further, some still have moved to the suburbs in Çayyolu and Ümitköy.

We observe a somewhat general path in the overall framework of these movements, both of Armenian and Jewish communities. This path indicates that the first movement from the old city to Keçiören, Aydınlikevler, Dikmen, in the case of the former community, and Sıhhiye, of the latter, took place as a result of a huge transformation of the city space whereby Ulus turned mostly to be a business center and the old neighborhoods became dilapidated. The second phase of the movements, which ended up in the well-off districts of the city, took place mostly, due to the growth of economic status and to the differentiation of life spaces within the city space.

These two paths and the inner differentiation of the Armenian community⁷⁴ are evident in the below narratives of B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F, HW). B.E., leaving

⁷⁴ We observe the effect of class differentiation, particularly, within the Armenian community. It was not possible for me to make an observation on the internal differentiation of the Jewish community, at least not in class terms, since there are very few Jewish families living in Ankara currently, all in the well-off parts, and since our interviews do not supply enough data for such an analysis. Still, however, as we learn from Bahar’s (2003) memories, there were some families still living in Sıhhiye and Cebeci, whereby the second phase of the movement to the well-off districts was taking place. From

Tabakhane for Keçiören after marrying in 1964, narrates the change of the old city in terms of “corruption”, implying in particular to the establishment of brothels in ‘the old neighborhood’ and referring in general to the district becoming a business center:

After me, it [the neighborhood] started to scatter little by little; I mean the district started to become corrupted. Everybody, some to Keçiören, some to Aydınlikevler, even to Çankaya, Esat, Ayrancı we were dispersed ... My parents also came buying a house, then the district was already corrupted, everyone I mean, it was turned mostly to trade, you know the atmosphere of Bentderesi, everyone had removed anymore.

Though she states that the “dispersion does not mean that they are “broken out” but “still visit and see each other especially among relatives”, her narrative points to the importance of class differentiation within the community which is narrated in terms of the respective residential spaces:

[T]his is perhaps the difference between inhabiting in Çankaya and inhabiting in Keçiören. Do you get what I mean? [“Anlatabiliyor muyum?”] Here are people of every income, of every tradition and custom; the ones there are more selected, wealthy, cultured people. Perhaps me, or even them [“the ones in Çankaya”], in a visit to them, will try to do more different things, to catch up with them I mean.⁷⁵

Still another observation of mine is that though they both ended up in the similar well-off regions of the city, the different routes followed by the Armenian and Jewish communities, in the first instance of movements, revealed meanings on their differing forms of integration to the city and so on their differing habitus. I will argue that Armenians followed the footprints of their traditional life in the city, through settling the familiar old vineyards and around; while the Jews followed the footprints of modernization, settling through the line of routine development of the new city.⁷⁶

this note, we can estimate a similar internal differentiation within the Jewish community, though only in some caution.

⁷⁵ This was indeed a narrative on how she has perceived the manner of her Muslim neighbors in their having meal on the ground and not on a table. B.E. argued that they got used to each others customs and habits and acted in a due manner. She articulated the above narrative as a reason for this situation, accordingly she commented on this condition of ‘getting used to’, probably as different from the ones in Çankaya, in that “but we here, began with this and go on with this, that’s why we see this neither much nor little, we see this as it is”. I will turn to the point of internal differentiation within communities in the seventh chapter.

⁷⁶ Bahar recollects in her memoirs that the newly constructed houses in Yenişehir were also appealing for the wealthy Jewish families who were able to foresee (2003: 117); and Şenol-Cantek claims that Yenişehir become the new residential area both for the bureaucrats and the politicians coming from

However, in the latter instances of movements, it was mostly the economic capital, which decided the route for the individuals, and the well-offs of the both communities have ended up in the same area.⁷⁷

Interestingly, there were some narrators, who have explained the latter movements in terms of the enabling conditions, the well-off districts provide for themselves: ‘*invisibility*’ and ‘*anonymity*’. I will elaborate these narratives in the following part, since those enabling conditions were articulated also in terms of the city life in general. Independence of the residential space, moreover, the republican era had important traces for the identifications, belongings and self-understandings of both groups and one important site to look for these traces is their relation to the ‘capital city’.

5.3. ANKARA: THE CAPITAL / ISTANBUL: THE REFERENCE

We know that Ankara, as the capital city, did not only reflected the urbanization policies of the nation-state, but at the same time was projected to be a space whereby ideal Turkish citizen would appear and an everyday life in which the republican aim of modernization and westernization would be practiced. It would also be a source of homogeneous population, which would enable the construction of nation-state as an imagined community (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 42). Bearing in mind such ‘mission’ of the capital city, I assumed at the very beginning of the research that living in Ankara would be perceived and experienced by the so-defined minority population as an uneasy thing. However, at the end of the research, I came up with a wide range of narratives providing a complexity of perceptions and experiences, which could not be subsumed under a one-dimensional one. I will be pointing to the narratives

Istanbul and other big cities and for the well-off residents of the old city who were in harmony with the new regime (2003: 47).

⁷⁷ A degree of residential proximity is still observed in the current life spaces of these well-offs. However, this time it’s mostly the closest members of the family who lives nearby to each other. Many narrators and respondents have stated that at least one member of her/his family lives in the same apartment/site/quarter with her/his. Family seems to replace the community in the acts of daily life; and this has certain effects on individual identifications and belongings. Moreover, in most of the narratives, city life, being in line with modernization theories, appear as a factor weakening the community ties. I will be elaborating on community relations in the seventh chapter.

reflecting on the perception and experience of imagined community, Turkish national identity and citizenship in the next chapter. Therefore, here, I will suffice focusing on the narratives on Ankara, which have articulated it as home, as a big city and as the capital city. Moreover, since a comparison to Istanbul was constantly implied or expressed in these narratives, its reference status will be pointed during the analysis.

5.3.1. Ankara the Home

A strong articulation in the narratives reflected on Ankara as “home”. Elaborating on the narratives about the old city, I have already referred to the identification with the city as the birthplace of the narrators. The city in these narratives appeared, indeed, to be somewhat a genealogical space, which has been carrying the traces of the family and community life. In other words, as Mallet argued “the boundaries of home seemingly extend[ed] beyond its walls to the neighborhood, even the suburb, town or city” and the home was experienced as a place but also as “a space inhabited by family, people, things and belongings -a familiar, if not comfortable space where particular activities and relationships are lived” (2004: 63).

Perception of home was not, obviously, in relation to the ‘old city’ only, but the city in general emerged as the space of belonging. Mallet argues that an association between home and family has been noted by many researchers and some, especially the so-called traditionalists, suggest that the link between home and family is so strong that the terms are almost interchangeable (2004: 72). Accordingly, when conceived as inter-related or overlapping terms, home typically symbolizes the birth family dwelling and the birth family or family of origin. Such conception of Ankara was highly recurrent in my study. The city, by many narrators and also by the respondents of the questionnaire, was defined as the place where they “were born and bred”, “had all family members”, “had memories of elders”, “had all friends”, “had earned their life”, “are familiar with” and “have inhabited since birth”. All the narrators and respondents, without exception, answered affirmatively when they were asked “do you feel home in Ankara”. Some have supported their statements with a following narrative of “habits and familiarity”. Although this level of

conception seems to be an emotional, unreflective and uncritical one, when the concepts of “leaving”, “migrating” and “preference for another city” were introduced into the narratives, the answers turned to be more critical. Almost all the narrators and respondents stated that they wouldn’t prefer to live any other city in Turkey, if not compulsory. B.T., (1957, Cath.Arm., M), for example, answered the question “do you think if it were another city your life would be different”, in the following words:

I haven’t thought about it. But, well, I have never, for example, thought moving to Istanbul. I have there brothers-in-law, I have many friends... Well, we are in Ankara... That is, I am a bit like, a person who likes living more in the place where my elders had lived, you know. I like living with their memories. That’s why I haven’t thought of going.

Ankara appeared in some narratives “a place of origin and return, a place from which to embark upon a journey” (Mallet, 2004: 63). When I asked the meaning of Ankara for her, ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F) stated that:

Here is our home, our place I mean. It is so much that, when we go to vacation, if we see a 06 plate-car, saying ‘Ohh! Our fellow citizen’ [“hemşehri”], we feel close. You feel love on the way back to Ankara. My cousins in France, for example, when they were coming, their mother said to them “go to our house, our neighborhood, take its pictures”. People living in the house were surprised about what they were doing, they have explained.

Holloway and Hubbard claim that even if it might be concluded that home places are “those ordinary, everyday places, where for most of the time you carry out relatively mundane everyday activities, they are nevertheless places which are saturated with meaning” (2001: 76). ‘Meaning’, in the above quotation, becomes a critical one with the introduction of ‘away’ into the narrative of ‘home’. This is so when we bear in mind that the “cousins” ‘1’ talks about are the children of her uncle who fled the country “during the WWI”.⁷⁸ Thought in this framework, we might argue that home which was a ‘cramped’ space once, became reconstructed away. Home becoming a ‘space of longing’, in this way, emerges also in the narrative of B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F), stating that “when many relatives who went abroad come, the first place they want to see is the old neighborhoods around”. I argue that

⁷⁸ ‘1’ is a Catholic Armenian, but she has many relatives who went to France, Marseille, Argentina, and Uruguay at the time of the WWI. Though she never expressed that their going was related to the deportation, she implied this with the words “well, it was those times”. We can think that people even if not were effected by the deportation directly, they feared of being effected and fled the country.

these narratives, when pointing to the experiences of those away do at the same time construct and reconstruct the narrators' own conception of home as a livable space, since there is always an ambivalent relation between 'those who stay' and 'those who leave'. Ahmed states that:

It is not simply a question then of those who stay at home, and those who leave, as if these two different trajectories simply lead people to different places. Rather 'homes' always involve encounters between those who stay, those who arrive and those who leave... There is movement and dislocation within the very forming of homes as complex and contingent spaces of inhabitance (1999 quoted in Mallet, 2004: 78-79).

We observe in the above quotation that Ahmed rejects the idea that home and away are oppositional experiences and concepts. Moreover, as pointed by Mallet, Ahmed understands home as "not a pure bounded and fixed space of belonging and identity that is familiar", and the away "as both strange and inhabited by strangers" (2004: 78). Indeed, home encompasses both movement and strangers. Home, conceptualized in this way, can be experienced as strange and/or familiar. K.G.'s (1937, Greg.Arm., M) narrative is interesting in these terms. It blurs the boundary between 'here' and 'there', 'home' and 'away', 'the familiar' and 'the strange'. When I asked him whether he would expect any difference if he lived another city, he answered that:

Then you wouldn't know here, you wouldn't know here, there you would...Else, my daughter... If anything has our people ["bizim millet"], it is that it gets used to everywhere it goes so easily, gets used to so easily.

K.G. seems to understand 'home' as a matter of 'adaptation', and not reflecting any special meaning on it. However, when we think that K.G. is a Gregorian Armenian whose grandparents had lived once in Istanoz village of Ankara and experienced the deportation, his statement that "our people gets used to everywhere it goes easily" gains further meaning. Thus, drawing on his statement, we cannot easily argue that space has not an effect on the perceptions and identifications of K.G.; rather it seems that spatial relations through their historicity had a crucial trace on his feelings of belonging. It is however, not only this historical trace but also, and perhaps more so, the current economic conditions of K.G which shapes his perception of home. He is not a well-off person, and tried once to migrate to Australia "for economic reasons", but could not achieve. His answer to the question where is the home/land for him reflects his current self-understanding: "we stayed here anymore, we stayed here".

It appears that conception of home becomes a more reflective and critical one when the concepts of “going”, “living another city or country” are introduced. Moreover, it is also apparent that conception of home has always connotations of ‘homeland’ and though I have collected a rich amount of narratives on the conception of homeland I will, at the moment, keep them for the next chapter and return to the ones on Ankara.

5.3.2. Ankara the Big City

I have argued above that one set of narratives on Ankara focused on more ‘emotional’ factors of identification with it; the second set of narratives, I will argue, lays ‘rational’ and ‘comparative’ factors of identification. In these narratives Ankara appears to be a city which is “ordered”, “proper”, “clean”, “quite”, “familiar”, “practical” and “manageable”. Individuals’ relational settings apparently played role in the articulation of these factors. For instance, as cultural capital of the narrators increased, the above ‘characteristics’ were articulated to be tools for the city to “leave time and create space for socialization”, and to “provide the city life opportunities”. Without going into details of these narratives, I will suggest that these might be seen as the indicators of an embodiment, by the narrators and respondents, of the logic which lies behind the construction of the capital city: a modern, functional, hygienic urban culture that aims at creating a modern, social, and hygienic/healthy citizen. Following this suggestion, it seems, perhaps paradoxically, that the non-Muslim citizens of the city, who were not much counted among the “owners of the city” (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 113), at the very beginning of its construction, are now in a position to have embodied the logic of it; at least, they are in harmony with the “more neat, much more regular, less saucy” life it provides. This last expression was asserted, by L.N. (1924, Jew M), in a comparison of Ankara and Istanbul, in which the former was represented “once as the biggest village of Turkey” but currently “starts to find its place as a metropolis”.

Meanings attributed to Ankara in this comparative framework are important also in terms of ‘community identity’. It is because Istanbul is the city where the largest

'minority' population in Turkey lives, and where the 'community life', both for the Armenian and Jewish groups, is certainly more visible. Thus, if we had supposed a 'thick' account of 'community identity' for the groups in Ankara, we could expect a high degree of identification with Istanbul. However, we observe instead a variety of narratives revealing different meanings. E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M), for example, marked that the community life in Ankara compared to Istanbul was "certainly less fanatical and much more innate". On the other hand, A.İ. (1953, Greg.Arm., M), noted that he "wouldn't prefer to live in any other city" but if he had to, he "would have liked it to be Istanbul, since both business and community life, there, is more frequent and commonplace".

Indeed, comparison between Istanbul and Ankara is a highly recurrent one in the narratives. Istanbul stands to be a 'reference' whether Ankara would be praised, or be criticized in comparison to it. I have been pointing to the comparisons made by the Ankara 'side', and will continue to do so. However, when such comparison is made by people who have migrated to Ankara from Istanbul, it becomes more interesting in terms of the meanings it reflects. I have referred above one such example in the case of H.A's mother. L.N. (1924, Jew M), moreover, is a person whose parents have migrated to Ankara from Istanbul in 1929, and, though, therefore, he has been living in Ankara for almost a life-time he states that he does not much define himself as being "Ankaralı". This is, it seems, not because he is not happy with living in Ankara, but because he refers to his birthplace as 'home'. This simple assumption, however, is complicated due to L.N.'s reflection upon the relations his family had with the rest of the Jewish community in Ankara:

Our relations with the 'Ankaralı' happened to be always in a distance ... I mean the relations with Ankaralı Jews. As I said, neither they nor we did accept each other much. I mean, how I could express, it is especially for my mother's side... they viewed Ankara Jews somewhat as villagers. I mean they, the Istanbulite see them as rather backwards. Especially, in such a closed locality, a neighborhood...

The above narrative is important in reflecting an outer look -the look of the Istanbulite Jews- towards the neighborhood life in Ankara which was mystified by its once inhabitants -'Ankaralı Jews'- and pointing to the differing self-understandings within the 'Jewish community'.

5.3.3. Ankara the Capital

In the questionnaire, questions were posed in a manner making a differentiation between the usage of ‘Ankara’ and ‘the capital city’. While I utilized the former in asking questions about the ‘life spaces’ in general, I utilized the latter mostly in relation to the ‘community life’ and the ‘expression of identity’. I made such a differentiation since I assumed that living in the capital city, in its homogenizing connotations and its symbolic references, would lead negative impressions and experiences for the ‘minorities’. However, no respondent made such a differentiation in answering the questions in that they referred ‘Ankara’ and ‘the capital city’ interchangeably in their answers, and further, they did not attribute to ‘the capital city’ the negative meanings I assumed they would have done. Rather, Ankara, as the ‘capital city’, appeared to connote ‘big city’ or ‘modern city’ in the respondents’ answers to the questionnaire. A.İ. (1953, Greg.Arm., M), for example -though he referred the enabling conditions in Istanbul for the ‘community’, as it appears above-indicated that:

Since the capital city provides more variety and is more intellectual, compared to some other cities, it affects the community life in ways that are more positive. There would sure be a difference [in my life, if I were living another city, since] everybody could know you in small places; but in big cities the situation is not like this. The cultural structure of the big cities is usually more appropriate for us.

A.İ.’s emphasis on ‘anonymity’ is understandable when we remember that “minority groups find in the city both a cover of anonymity and a critical mass unavailable in the smaller town”, since in the city these “groups do not stand in relations of inclusions and exclusion but overlap and intermingle without becoming homogeneous” (Young, 1990: 265-266).

Similar articulations were also narrated in the interviews. For example, when I asked S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F), if she thinks there would be any difference between life in the capital city as a Christian or an Armenian and life in some other city of Turkey, her answer was appealing:

For sure, for sure! Well, it is over all a good question, but has an obvious answer. If something is very rare, it would be striking [göze batar], if it is plenty, would be less striking, the same thing. I might not perhaps walk around in, say, Artvin, stating that I am a Christian; perhaps I might not in Kars. I don't know, I don't say this because I have lived there, but there might be such a criterion, I wouldn't know that. The people you speak to, the people you are having chat... I mean we see the murders committed within the families; in a place where this kind of logic is present, I don't think that Christianity would be accepted ... Ankara, for sure, has a different culture.

When I asked about Istanbul, however, she has stated immediately that it was “*much better*”. What is common in the narratives of A.İ. and S.O. is that Ankara appears, in both of them, somewhere between ‘*other cities*’ and Istanbul. This ‘in-between’ situation was indeed recurrent in many other narratives. The above narrative is revealing, moreover, in that though the comparison appears seemingly between the cities where the ‘Christian’ population is large in number and where it is less; it is obvious, indeed, that there is an actual comparison between the western and eastern regions of Turkey. Ankara having “*a different culture*” emerges, in this narrative, to be a ‘modern’, ‘civilized’, ‘western’ city where the community life, at least, the self-expression of individuals is enabled, even if through ‘*invisibility*’. Other cities, on the other hand, come up to be some ‘fundamentalist and conservative places’ where ‘difference’ would not be appreciated.

The way in which the effect of city on ‘community identity’ is articulated, moreover, depends on the degree of identification with community. T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F), for instance, have written down about the effect of capital city on the community life that “I don't know anybody from the community. Very broken off. I am not much interested anyway. Friends of mine suffice for me”. I will be elaborating on the factors affecting the degree of community identification in the seventh chapter, thus, for the moment, I turn to continue with the other perceptions of Ankara/the capital city.

I have noted above that living in Ankara was appreciated, by some narrators and respondents, thanks to the anonymity it provides for. It is apparent, however, that anonymity might lead to invisibility in the public space, and this is a critical point in terms of the current study, since I suppose that visibility of ‘difference’ should to be acknowledged as an important condition for an equal and democratic social

existence.⁷⁹ Moreover, it is obvious that there is a difference, in terms of visibility/invisibility in the public space, between the minority populations in Ankara and the ones in Istanbul. Accordingly, in order to express their perceptions of the ‘invisibility’ in Ankara the narrators articulated comparisons between the two cities. S.O’s (1962, Greg.Arm., F) narrative is one of them:

There is for sure a difference. There, they are more social, more comfortable; but the reasons for this, I guess, a bit the material conditions, together with the establishedness there; existing more visually. Well, as I have already said, when you just look around in Istanbul, you see the name-boards belonging to Christian lawyers and doctors; here, in Ankara, we don’t have people who have come somewhere through education, once we had a dentist I guess. ...Since there are schools in Istanbul, since there are Christian Schools too, education there comes forth a bit much. Since, here, education is completed in the normal state schools, all the children are directed to their father’s job.

Invisibility, which could be explained by many factors one being the respective size of the populations in these cities, is explained by S.O. in reference to the respective ‘education levels’ of the communities in two cities. Lacking people “who have come somewhere through education”, moreover, is explained by the absence of “Christian Schools” in Ankara; and necessity of continuing education “in the normal state schools” is narrated to be an impediment for further schooling. This narrative of S.O. could be taken as an explanation for her evaluation of community life in Istanbul as being “much better” –as it appeared above.

A narrative on the ‘invisibility in public space’ should always be thought, doubtlessly in its potential connotations on the ‘accessibility and availability of social institutions’, on the differential ‘power relations’, on the resultant ‘cultural site of meanings and understandings’ and on the ‘daily life encounters’. To turn to the former two in the next chapter, I will now try to point the latter two in a framework of comparison which is elaborated by N.E., (1957, Jew, M), to refer to the respective perceptions of the Jewish community by the ‘outer society’ in Ankara and in Istanbul. N.E., who defined himself not to be a religious person and emphasized that he had been to Synagogues only for compulsory reasons, be it for wedding or funeral ceremonies, narrated his observation in below words:

⁷⁹ Batuman, quoting Arendt, states that political participation is possible only with social actors taking place in the public space, in Arendt’s words, with their “being simply visible” (2002: 44).

Now, in Istanbul, it is an observation of mine, but I don't know whether it is valid now, since the dates are not similar. The people living around the Synagogue in Istanbul have adapted the existence of the Synagogue, they don't regard the people coming strangely; but they look at you, for sure, because, well, a huge group is coming, but people would look anyway to see why they are coming. Still, however, they have adapted more to being together, for example. I could never feel this in the Synagogue in Ankara, because in the Synagogue in Ankara... It was in the past the place which was called the Jewish Neighborhood. But afterwards, at least, when I was a child, it was not the Jewish Neighborhood anymore. And there were the people who came afterwards. They had never, indeed, adapted there, for sure. There is a big difference, in fact, between their conceptions, because one understands nothing, the ones in Istanbul understood. They understood that 'different, but, well, these are also people, similarly'. The ones here were looking just like they were looking at tourists. I mean there is such a difference.

The encounters of day-to-day life sent out messages telling people who and what they are and who and what they are not; and the boundaries between groups are most clearly drawn or reinforced through daily experience (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). The above recollection is on one such encounter. However, we should be cautious in making manifestly delimited comparisons; since N.E.'s observation in Istanbul belongs to a recent date -late 1990s or early 2000s- while the one in Ankara to his childhood, 1970s. Still, however, the narrative strongly points to N.E.'s perception of respective 'cultural sites' in which the 'community' was attributed some 'meaning': "different but familiar" in the former case, "totally strange and tourist-like" in the latter. The Jewish neighborhood, in 1970s, was already being inhabited by people, who have immigrated to Ankara mostly from 'other cities'.⁸⁰ This factor is also appreciated by N.E.; however, he pointed mostly to the restructured city space, in which Ulus have already become the periphery in 1970s, emphasizing that it was not only immigrants but also people "from Ankara" who lived in this peripheral places. What is more interesting still is that these factors, in N.E.'s narrative, appear not to be the fundamental rationale for the two 'different cultures' in Istanbul and Ankara. The fundamental rationale in N.E.'s narrative is

⁸⁰ I have visited the Jewish neighborhood in July 2005 and met with some of the current inhabitants of the neighborhood. One was a man, who with his family, has immigrated to Ankara from Bayburt in the late 1940s. He has been living in the Jewish neighborhood from the mid 1950s on. He remembers some Jewish people who were still living in the neighborhood then, and stated that his parents were in contact with them, though he "was very young and dealt only with his work." I have also met some children, at the age of 10-12, whose parents have immigrated from Mardin and Tokat, 1 and 7 years earlier respectively. When I asked whether they knew who the old inhabitants of the neighborhood were, they answered "yes, gavur ['infidels'] lived here". When I asked if 'they' still come to the neighborhood, the children stated "yes, they have a *church* over there, they come and pray there".

that Ankara is a city “which was established lately and it never had a cosmopolitan demographic structure”:

I was telling you that this city was established later on, thus these kinds of things came here later on, because these weren't here, a small place was here, and you cannot seed them indeed, well these cannot be seeded easily. That's why people, perhaps, as a choice, choose to move to Istanbul. To the places where more of them are together, that they think they would be regarded more warmly. If they are, is a different issue, for sure.

Ironical though,⁸¹ his rationalization is important in terms of the meanings it reveals. Ankara, in N.E.'s narrative appears to be a young and always already homogeneous city, in contrast to the old and cosmopolitan Istanbul. His rationale, apparently, is very much in line with the discourse of the early Republican era. This matching is, moreover, understandable when 'relational settings' of N.E. is taken into consideration. He is a highly-educated person who does not define himself, predominantly, with 'community identity'; his parents in his childhood and he in his adulthood, always had a distance towards communitarian relations;⁸² and as he inserts in his words, from his childhood on, he “was already thinking as the city had demanded”. Cornell and Hartman argue that “residential concentration has certain real-life consequences on the boundaries it establishes” (1998: 166). Reflecting upon this argument, I will claim, though for a larger context of city space, that 'homogenizing logic of the capital city' had its real-life consequences especially on the perceptions of the second-generation non-Muslim inhabitants of the city. A more direct reflection on the effects of 'Ankara the capital city' on the lives and identities of minority populations was, again, articulated by N.E. in a somewhat historical and comparative analysis:

Ankara, in my opinion, shares the fate of the other cities that became the capital city in the 1920's. I mean, it was a time when the state grew up in itself and tried also to make that growth apparent physically and numerically. Those were the time such an understanding was common, thus Ankara developed in that way, so did Warsaw, and so did perhaps Paris traditionally, but Paris had always other axis of development. ... Therefore, Ankara in a way is the crucible of that cultures which constructed it. But, at the same time it had to be

⁸¹ The statement is ironic when the cosmopolitan structure of the city I have detailed in the fourth chapter is recalled and since N.E. is a 'member' of the communities which have once established this structure.

⁸² N.E.'s father was an engineer in a state institution, and this appears, seemingly, to have effected his perceptions of the city and of the population inhabiting in the city. He states that: “In my childhood I always thought that mostly the ones who are closer to the state lived in Ankara”.

“unified”,⁸³ so did Warsaw. Thus, indeed such spaces cannot be the centers of culture “eventually”. I mean, they could be “up to a certain extent”, because melting in that pot does not let those “indigenous” cultures much, I guess. Istanbul, however, is not so, it was once a capital city but in a very different period; the reason for it to be the capital city was itself its complexity, and the characteristics of a metropolis. Istanbul, still, has that characteristics of a metropolis, but Ankara does not. I love Ankara very much, I live here, but it does not have characteristics of a metropolis. Therefore, *perhaps the only way for a minority to live here is becoming a part, becoming a direct part of the city, not building itself as a separate group and taking apart.*

The above narrative is an important one in terms of my arguments. Here ‘homogeneity’ and ‘uniformity’ is articulated as a natural, if not an affirmative, consequence of the ‘ideology of time’, namely 1920s. This reflection, supported in a comparative manner, claimed on the necessity for minorities “to be a part of the city” in order “to live” there. This is a very strong claim I believe. I have argued above, though in a different context, that the minority populations of the capital city have embodied the logic of it. Here, N.E’s claim lays this as a natural consequence, if to ‘survive’ in the city. I will argue that this natural consequence follows from a “process whereby those who occupy similar positions in social and historical space develop categories of perception that provide a commonsense understanding of the world, especially of what is natural, plausible, or even imaginable” (Bottomley, 1991: 4). This process is called habitus, whereby those people come to share a certain ‘sense of place’. The sense of place shared in Ankara, I have been arguing, is one not only once these groups made up a crucial part of, but also one very construction of which they have engaged, whereby they have positioned themselves and became a part. Thus, ‘embodiment’ does not necessarily point to a passive reflection, but an active reconstruction of the city. This construction and reconstruction, I suggest, was realized through putting their cultural, economic, social capitals into the city space and city culture; through their social relations, daily acts, residential and occupational places, their definition of it as home, and opting out for continuing to live in it.

⁸³ N.E. utilized some English words during his narrative. I will be giving these words in quotation marks.

5.3.3.1. Becoming a Part of the Capital City through Recreational Spaces

To this point, Ankara appeared, in the narratives and the responses of the participants, as a modern, ordered, decent and modest metropolis. Such perception is indeed very much in line with the projections of the constructor elites who engaged in the process of discursive and physical construction of the capital city. We know that one crucial set of symbolic device utilized in this process was a focus on civility, modernity and westernization, an icon of which became the construction, mostly in 1930s, of a series of parks, recreational places, restaurants and *gazinos* (Aydın et.al, 2005; Şenol-Cantek, 2003; Bozdoğan, 1992). I will be suggesting here that one crucial way of becoming a part of the ‘new city’ for the Armenian and the Jewish population was actualized through these spaces whereby they took place not only as the customers and the citizens, but also as the servants; and through their recreational habits, and social and cultural capital they have.

The iconic status attributed to these spaces was very much related to the symbolic meaning attributed to the capital city. Şenol-Cantek (2003) points to the relation between the recreational spaces, whereby western style of entertainment was experienced, and the citizen of the modernization and westernization era, which was projected to have the good manner, music and dancing taste, relations with the opposite sex, clothing and life style, and modern eating habits. In these places, she argues, the conditions of a laboratory were prepared to create the modern individual and the ideal citizen (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 261). In this vein, Ankara Palace, Karpıç Restaurant, and the Club Anatolia served for the elites of the city (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 278); and were burdened with the mission of being models to make people get used to western entertainment style through the dancing balls in which the deputies and high-level bureaucrats were involved (Arslanoğlu, 2001: 328). Accordingly, public spaces served as schools, which made ‘citizens’ out of ‘people’ through socializing them (Bozdoğan, 1992: 92). Bozdoğan (1992) states that youth and health were being idealized in this newly established city, in a manner to signify the new revolutionary regime as opposed the old and the ‘sick’⁸⁴ regime of the Ottoman

⁸⁴ ‘Sick man’ was the expression utilized by the European countries to represent the Ottoman Empire in its late period.

Empire. In view of that, Ankara was projected to be the concretized form of the ideals of youth and health and these characteristics found their direct expression in the recreational spaces open to public, a well representation of which were the Youth Park, Atatürk Forest Farm, and Çubuk Dam Picnic places (Bozdoğan, 1992: 91). Bozdoğan claims that starting from the 1930s the public spaces, especially the recreational parks and municipality gardens played an important role in the construction of the nation (1992: 94). In this argument, *gazinós* also are important in that they are the strong expressions of an imagery of people who has the republican eating manners, who listens jazz and dance freely, who is completely westernized, and who as men and women came together in these activities (Bozdoğan, 1992: 95). Arslanođlu (2001) states that these *gazinós* reflected modernism not only with the social life they provided for, but also with their architecture; and they were represented in the print media of Ankara then, as elegant, modern, clean, decent places being compared to their counterparts in the European countries.

In this study, it appeared that the Armenian and the Jewish population of Ankara took part in these spaces either as guests or as servants. A.K. (1911, Jew, M), for example, recollected involving in the new years balls organized in Ankara Palace⁸⁵ with her sister when he was single and with her wife after he got married. A.K.'s daughter R. (1945, Jew, F) stated that her mother used to start having made her costume three months before the ball in Ankara Palace. This is very much in line with the news printed in the media of the period then, stating “all the elite class⁸⁶ prepares for the ball for weeks” and with the narratives of the Turkish-Muslim participants of the balls who have stated that they dated tailors a month earlier before the ball (*Hakimiyeti Milliye*, 1932 quoted in Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 271, 276). H.A.

⁸⁵ One important purpose for the construction of these recreation spaces as well as hotels was to serve for the guests who would come to the capital city of Turkey from foreign countries in addition to the elites of the country. For this purpose and upon the personal will of Mustafa Kemal Ankara Palace is built in 1928 as a complex, which serves in western style (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 262). Ankara Palace serves as not only a hotel but also one whereby meetings and shows took place, and various balls, bearing the names “flower, children, Noel, Republic” (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 263), takes place.

⁸⁶ ‘Elite class’ is my translation of “kibar sınıf” in the original quotation. Şenol-Cantek details this ‘elite class’ in the balls to be composed of bureaucrats most of whom resides in the city temporarily, deputies, members of the army and a small number of notables [“eşraf”] (2003: 271).

(1951, Jew, F) also recollected the balls narrating on her mother's costumes that she perceives to be a sign of 'another era', which was more 'decent' and more 'elegant':

What an elegance it was. I remember my mother's costumes; long dresses are made, hair is made, it is curled. It was very elegant. Always long dresses, heeled shoes... It was different really, elegance... Ankara was really a different place then.

It appears that H.A.'s perception of the era is very much in line with the perceptions and projections of the constructor elites. However, we know that those newly emerged habits, and all those 'elegant' dresses, elite balls, and western music was not so easily accepted by the 'ordinary' '*Ankaralı*' of the time, who are usually represented as 'villagers' in the literature of the time. This population usually watched these happenings, strangely⁸⁷ but curiously. R.'s recollection on one New Year's night, when her father (A.K.) and mother were in the ball in Ankara palace, points to an encounter whereby a non-Muslim children also is not much familiar with 'what happens' in this new era of life:

I remember. One day me, my brother, Deyzi, Yusuf... came after 24:00. We were children but. Not children but young. We were around twelve and fourteen. It was the New Year. We went after 24:00 to see them... We were shocked, we could not understand what was happening, what was it. It was a dancer. She was a very famous dancer. We have never seen before for sure, we were surprised a lot.

It is necessary here to note that no Armenian had stated that they were involved in the balls in Ankara Palace. Only A.T (1923, Cath.Arm., M) stated that his sister probably went to the balls in Ankara Palace, who was "very keen on dancing". '1' (1929, Cath.Arm., F), on the other hand, implied that Armenians did/could not involve in those balls stating "to the balls the foreigners, diplomats, high rank people... No one among the Christians went; they lived in their own world, did not have a pretentious life".

⁸⁷ To see many cases whereby encounters with the elite and ordinary people are quoted see Aydın et.al (2005) and Şenol-Cantek (2003).

'1's perception of the balls as being related to another group, seemingly the elite, could be accepted as an indication that 'Christians', here Armenians, were not a part of this elite. How the involvement of some Jewish people, on the other hand, should be interpreted? One way of doing this could be to state that Jewish people were among the elite of the capital city and were closer to the state cadres. Although, we know, as I noted above, that Jewish people were integrated to the 'new city' in their residential places as early as 1930s (Bahar, 2003), we do not have much evidence to support such claim that they were a part of the city elite and were close to the state cadres. Moreover, A.K. (1911, Jew, M) was a shop assistant in a milliner store, at the time of his involvement into these balls. He owned his own store only after 1950, so that we cannot count him in the category of 'notables' to which Şenol-Cantek refers. Another way of explaining this might be that A.K. and his wife, and as implied some more friends, were willing to engage in these balls and upon buying tickets⁸⁸ they appeared in Ankara Palace. A third explanation, to which I am closer, might be in relation to the fact that many Jewish people served in Ankara Palace from the very establishment of it. Bahar states that at every phase of Ankara Palace both Ankara Jews and the ones coming from Istanbul⁸⁹ had worked (2003: 88). She states that the first two people who started working at the checkroom in the year Ankara palace was opened -one being the community leader of the Jews in Ankara in the following years- supplied for other Jewish people to be employed in Ankara Palace. She names overall six persons who worked at the Palace, one being an accountant –not L.N.'s father- and one being a manager. Thought within this framework, it could be suggested that Ankara Palace was not so much a 'strange' place for the Jewish people in Ankara since people from their community were working there. This might have helped their willing to appear in the balls in the Palace, and might have facilitated this involvement. Posts occupied by Jewish people also can be thought in relation to the fact that the management of Ankara Palace was at the hand of a company whereby French had the highest hand, since there were yet no capital owner who had the "good manner, talent, and the fiscal

⁸⁸ We learn from Şenol-Cantek that to many balls in Ankara Palace, tickets were sold and people, still the ones who have enough money, could involve in them upon buying tickets (2003: 269).

⁸⁹ We know that L.N.'s (1924, Jew, M) father, who has migrated to Ankara from Istanbul worked as the accountant of Ankara Palace for a period.

power” to handle this management in the country (Şenol-Cantek, 2003: 263). In view of that, we might think that Jewish people were among people who were seen then to have the necessary ‘good manner’ and ‘talent’ to be employed in Ankara Palace.

A similar case seems to apply for the Armenian community, this time in relation to Karpıç restaurant and *Gar Gazino*. To supply for the need to serve for the deputies and foreign guests, a restaurant was opened, again on the will of Mustafa Kemal and upon the call of Juri Georges Karpovitch (Karpıç) who then worked in Istanbul as a restaurant manager -a Russian immigrant Georgian for some (Aydın et.al, 2005; Şenol-Cantek, 2003) and an Armenian of Iranian origin for others (Çağatay, 2003). Karpıç Restaurant, which was financially supported by the government, became a symbol not only of European restaurant tradition and eating habits, but also of European culture itself. Cantek quotes Nurullah Ataç stating “Karpıç had taught his customers how to eat”; and states that this argument was also a sign of proud Ataç feels in getting closer to European culture (2003: 281). Karpıç Restaurant was the place whereby the high-level bureaucrats, deputies, writers, and journalists in the city spent most of their time; and a place not only parties were organized but also important meetings and daily political discussions took place intensely. Karpıç, which soon became an indicator of prestige as well as an opportunity of recreation, is defined to have a seal on the Republican culture (Şenol-Cantek, 2003). Aydın et.al. state that Karpıç gave much importance to train his personnel and trained more than hundred persons most of whom were from Hemşin (2005: 417). What we could add to this information upon drawing our study is that Karpıç also trained and employed many Armenians in Ankara. Ankara Armenians define Karpıç to be an Armenian who had fled from Russia at the time of 1917 Revolution and be actually named Kevork Keçeci. A.S.’s (1940, Greg.Arm., F) father was a waiter at Karpıç’s and established his own restaurant in Kızılay in 1950s. K.S.’s (1928, Greg.Arm., M) maternal aunt worked as a cleaning servant at the house of Karpıç, and his elder sister worked nearby a tailor who sewed for the wife of Karpıç. His narrative reveals the privileged position of Karpıç, the conditions of the Gregorian Armenian population then, and the relations established between the two:

We call him “Father Karpıç”⁹⁰ Kevork Keçeci; his wife’s name is Margarit, and they had a son, twenty years old, named Aram, he died of tuberculosis at the age of twenty, and he is buried in Ankara to our Christian graveyard, here in Cebeci Asri Cemetery. My father-in-law worked there; the most special thing in my knowing them, my mother has a younger sister... This aunt of mine used to work in the house of Karpıç Restaurant, nearby Ms. Margarit worked as a servant, she worked there, made the cleaning, cooked meals and so. That house is still in Ulus, Kediseven Street, an apartment building. ... And they had a tailor named Ms. Çaba, she was also a relative, they were brothers’ children. Ms. Çaba was a tailor in the now Posta Street, Şabanzade apartment, at the flat now is notary; she was women’s tailor. By chance, my elder sister worked with them. As the tailor’s apprentice. For that reason, I know all the Karpıç restaurant, Karpıç himself, his wife. While my elder sister was working there, she was single then, Ms. Margarit naturally coming and going, she liked my sister very much. When my sister was engaged, she said to her, “I will do your wedding ceremony in the Karpıç restaurant; but we have a condition”; that time her son was already death... We are then poor, is there a chance of having a wedding ceremony at Karpıç’s. My uncle-in-law is men’s tailor, has a tailor’s shop in Susam Street. We got very happy, but the condition is this, since her son was death, twenty years old Aram, “if your child is boy you will name him Aram”. They said okay, they had the wedding there, it was a wonderful ceremony. That time, there was an American lady, like a chanteuse, named Carmen Miranda, she danced, artists from China and those dancers from Brazil⁹¹...

K.S. also adds that “most of the waiters working at Karpıç’s were Armenians”. He names five persons including a woman. What was also interesting in the sequel of his narrative was his statement that many people refrained from getting there although prices were low.⁹² The reason for this refraining was implied to be that Karpıç restaurant was modern, prestigious and decent place that people should be fit to get there. K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm. M), similarly, recollected his childhood whereby “Father Karpıç was calling” them and “serving food” to them, “otherwise it was not possible to get into there”.

Another place, which was narrated in the same references of luxuriousness, decentness and modernity, was *Gar Gazino*. The chief waiter in *Gar Gazino* was also an Armenian, who was the great maternal uncle of A.S. named Gimes and was called ‘*Hacı*’. K.S. states that:

⁹⁰ We learn from Aydın et.al. that Karpıç was called “Father” by everyone indeed (2005: 417).

⁹¹ We know that both Karpıç Restaurant and *Gar Gazino* were important night entertainment places in Ankara for years, with the revue and music groups that came from foreign countries (Arslanoğlu, 2001).

⁹² K.S. stated many stories on Karpıç restaurant. One was in relation to these low prices in that upon Karpıç’s complaint to Mustafa Kemal about his preventing any rising of prices and about his wish to close the restaurant, Mustafa Kemal organized a dinner calling all the deputies and their families and paid not the actual bill but a very higher amount of it. K.S. stated that this was the way the restaurant kept running.

It had a degree in Europe, it was perhaps the best *gazino*; it had exceptionally beautiful shows, a very very rare restaurant, *gazino* better to say. There also worked the uncle of my mother-in-law. Even know there is no person among the old-age Ankaralı, who would not know Mr.*Hacı*; he was the chief there. To everyone, to Atatürk, to all... For example in 1960 we were there with my wife, at the garden, there came the members of the Committee of National Unity, and they could not get in, because they were not wearing ties. They were all given ties, and only then, they could get in. Pay attention! The members of the Committee of National Unity! It was a very disciplined place... was a decent place.

Arslandoğlu states that Gar *Gazino* was established in 1937 to provide a clean, decent place for the people who will visit the centre of the state; and to be the meeting and amusement place for the city (2001: 330). She quoted a representation of *gazino* in the print media in 1939, which described it to be “a place whereby white linen tablecloths and cleanly-uniformed waiters wearing white jackets, looked like the doctors in a hospital corridor” (Arslandoğlu, 2001: 331). She also adds that until 1950s these *gazinos* served mostly for the elite.

A.K. (1911, Jew, M), too, remembers going out for Gar *Gazino* on Saturday evenings and listening to an Italian singer there. Since his daughter H.A. (1951, Jew, F) also remembers them going to Gar *Gazino* we can state that in 1950s, both the Jewish and the Armenian families were involved in these entertainment spaces, which they were still perceived to be the most “elegant” and “decent” spaces of the city. A.S. (1940, Greg.Arm., F) stated that “we don’t have such places in Ankara currently, very limited”. In 1950s, one other place whereby Armenians⁹³ were employed was the Sureyya Pavilion. Mr. Sureyya was also an immigrant from Russia who fled to Turkey at the time of revolution, worked in Karpıç Restaurant and then established his own place. K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M) recollects the Pavilion and refers to its distinctive status in below words:

When Sureyya came here, to Turkey, he had worked nearby Father Karpıç as a worker; then he established his own *gazino*. But there was no Turkish music or so there... Jazz, dance, foreign chanteuse women. Foreigner, all were foreigner, who came there. The customers were Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Fatin Rüştü Zorlu, all such persons I mean. The elite. That is, there was no other place more luxurious in Ankara. The Night Club.

⁹³ As will be referring this point in the seventh chapter, K.G.’s maternal uncle worked at Sureyya pavilion as a waiter; and his mother and aunt washed its tablecloths and waiters’ costumes at home.

The customers were still from the state cadres, but this time of a different era. K.G. points to the distinct status of the place in reference to the ‘distinct’ customers and that there was no Turkish music but all foreign music. This was, indeed, a recurrent expression in the case of Karpıç Restaurant and Gar *Gazino*, too: “all foreign artists were there”. Thus, very much in line with the constructor elite’s perception and the ongoing official discourse in Turkey, ‘modernity’ was equated with what is ‘western’.

We know that in the early Republican years, dance was being supported by Mustafa Kemal personally, in order to overcome gender obstacles, since entertaining in a gathering which was composed of men and women was treated to be a signifier of the civilization level the society has reached (Aydın et.al., 2005: 422-423). We learn, however, that these novelties were not always consistent with the conceptual schemes of the laypersons, and many *Ankaralı* could not easily get used to the scene whereby women and men danced together cuddling each other (Şenol-Cantek, 2003).⁹⁴ It is important to note, here, that inter-sex relations among the Armenian and Jewish populations of Ankara were already different from the Turkish-Muslim *Ankaralı* and was in harmony with projections of modernization target. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F) pointed to such difference between the Armenian and Turkish-Muslim societies recollecting a wedding ceremony, whereby her paternal aunt Matilt was dancing with a man. She tells laughingly that a neighbor seeing this, stated in surprise, “she is dancing with a man cuddling him, how comes it!”. An important narrative which reveals the role of dancing in the recreational habits of the Armenian people, which pointed to the flexible gender relations and, in this vein, to the distinction between the ‘Christian’ and ‘Muslim’ populations belongs to A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M):

What I will say is that we went to the *gazin*os to dance; we had meals there, nice. ... We went to the *Çiftlik*, there were recreation places and so... For us my daughter, the thing records but anyway⁹⁵, for us alcohol is free you know, say for the Christians, beer for

⁹⁴ To see many stories quoted on the problematic process of changing gender relations not only among laypersons but also among the elite of the time see Şenol-Cantek (2003) and Aydın et.al (2005).

⁹⁵ The existence of the tape recorder became a source of uneasiness for A.T. when he would tell about things that he perceived should not be told openly. Having alcohol was one of them, since it was

instance, we opened the beer *fiçı* and we drank, Çiftlik there is the brewery⁹⁶ you know, next to it there was a nice garden, the beer park we called it. There eight liters, ten liters my daughter, they brought beer in *fiçı*... Either you took food with you from home, or you order there. There were such places in the Youth Park, too; so we used to entertain. ... Well, it was nice, in many places there were *gazinolar* opened... Dancing places, there was the Bomonti family garden in Kocatepe. ... Very nice places there were to dance. Our, now the wedding ceremonies are, my daughter, “şikkıdı şikkıdı” [with oriental dancing], in the past the wedding ceremonies of our Christians, the Muslims had drum and pipe played. For us it was all dances. Even if we were at home, even if not a place out, we sat, as the family we ate and drank, both the girls and the boys can drink in our [community] I mean according to our thing... Then we sit here, if, even if it was the radio we would dance. Later on, gradually it turned to be this ‘şikkıdım’ play. That’s why in the past such *gazinolar* to drink beer, raki ... There was the Esenpark *Gazino*. There was also the Gar *Gazino*, just nearby the Station. ... We went there to dance. ... My, the now late, mother used to like *gazino* very much. That old aged, “I shall cook you meatballs, take tomato and so, come let’s go if you want”, she watched us as we danced. ... All family, because for us drink in the family... Since it is family my daughter, since we sit here, neither we should say bad words, nor curse, that’s why we are all; yet I introduced the alcohol to my son. Come on my son, because... My daughter-in-law also drinks, really, we come together and drink; there is nothing [restriction] for us. We sit, we talk, and in the right manner, because there are the children also.

A.T.’s narrative is important not only in giving details of recreational habits of the community, but also in comparing the ‘oriental dance’ common among the Muslim community and ‘western style of dance’ common among the Armenian community in a seeming reference to the superiority of the latter. A.T.’s reference to his mother who was keen on going to *gazinolar* is also important in pointing that these recreational habits were common among not only the young but also the elder generations of the Armenian community in Ankara. The same conclusion is also valid for the Jewish community drawing on their narratives.

It should also be noted that apart from *gazinolar*, preferred places for recreation were the various public parks, gardens, and picnic places in the city. Youth Park, Atatürk Forest Farm, Bomonti family garden were among preferred recreational places for both communities. Moreover, Çubuk and Bayındır Dam, Kayaş for the Armenian community; Ayaş, Kayaş, Mamak and Haymana for the Jewish community⁹⁷ were

forbidden in Orthodox Islam. Above he grounded his words, noting that Christianity permits having alcohol. However, his uneasiness in this case did not lead him to ask for the tape recorder to be stopped. In some other cases, whereby he told about intermarriages, and whereby he reminisced his witnesses of the usage ‘*gavur*’ he wanted me to stop the recorder and I took notes as he narrated.

⁹⁶ We learn from Bozdoğan (2002) that Brewery [Bira Fabrikası] was established in the years 1933-1934 within Atatürk Forest Farm and it had a garden nearby.

⁹⁷ H.A. and R. recollected picnics they had in these places. H.A. stated that one of the most luxurious habits of the Jewish community in Ankara was going to Haymana for the thermal springs. She also

among the preferred picnic and amusement places in the city. Karadeniz swimming pool and Marmara Köşk in the Forest Farm were also among places whereby people went for recreation. A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M) remembers going to the farm by train in his youth. What appeared during the study that recreation was an important part of the daily lives of both the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara. It was so much that some narrators (A.T. and K.G.) articulated the community life almost completely in reference to entertainment habits. For K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M), for example, ‘being keen on entertainment’ defined the Armenian identity despite internal class differences among community. This was apparent in his narrative whereby he criticized people who, moving up to an upper class which is reflected in the change of their residential places, distance themselves from the lower class community members, but still continue their recreational habits, which is defined by K.G. to be ‘a good’ they still have:

This our *millet*, this is in our background, in our biography as the nation I mean. ... For example, someone who has similar conditions as you now, will not call you again when he becomes wealthier a bit I mean. I say this always. ... You wouldn't see him again. ... These are, for example, now, live in Keçiören, you are neighbors for ten years, and when they move to Çayyolu, or go to Çankaya, you won't see them again in your district; even if they come to the upstairs neighbor, they won't give you a short visit passing through. ... I have lived this very much.... Among the relatives and so... This is always there. ... [Do they establish relations to the Armenian who are better-off?] To the more... No; religion does not make a difference for them. I mean for me, for us it also does not make a difference. They will never discriminate in terms of religion. I mean where recreation is, where those good things are... What happens then, for example, when he was here... if he was going somewhere in Kızılay, to a restaurant; now he will go with his friends somewhere upper [class] there. They won't give up it I mean; won't give up the recreation, they have that good.

The above narrative gives clues about the internal class differences and tensions among the Armenian community. It, moreover, points that recreation is one thing that no Armenian would ‘give up’ whatever class position they occupy. In a similar

recollected he mother telling about the ones going to Haymana for honeymoon among the well-off Jewish people. What was important in H.A.'s narrative in terms of intra-community relations and recreation activities was that she remembers a long period (starting when she was at the second year of the primary school -1957/1958- ending when her son was two years old) whereby “all the community went to Erdek each summer”. She stated that “all the Jews we went there; But, how much we were entertaining!” The reason for going Erdek was explained in the words “some had gone before and they liked it very much. ... It was also cheaper, that's why it was better”. Whatever the reason, we might expect such an activity whereby “all” community members were involved to have an important affect on the symbolic construction of the community identity (Cohen, 2000), at least in terms of socialization.

manner, but at another context,⁹⁸ K.G. also stated that “among ours, what I will say, when they find some time left out of working, immediately a way of recreation, going out, picnic... They have this “come on let’s go” thing. They don’t like staying at home much”.

Drawing upon the above quotations, which points recreational habits as a pointer of identity, we might suggest that recreation acts as a factor in the symbolic construction of Armenian community identity (Cohen, 2000).

Arslanoğlu notes that another phase in the construction of the recreational space of the modern capital city was the establishment of Ankara City Theater in 1938 (2001: 328). She states, moreover, that there were only two movie saloons in the city and they were not sufficient for the demand. We understand from various narratives of both the Armenian and Jewish narrators that in the late 1940s and early 1950s going to cinema and theater was already an established habit in the daily lives of the non-Muslim population of the city. B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F) recalls her parents going to theater very often, when she was only a child who was looked after by a neighbor in those nights. She also stated that her father did not miss any play of various theaters coming to the city from mostly Istanbul. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., M), also stated that:

We went to cinema and theater very often, especially when there was not yet the Television. We went despite all the burden of our work. We were then in Ulus and used to go to *Küçük* and *Oda Theater*. We almost did not miss any movie at cinema... When we were young we used to go with our brother, we thought two girls couldn’t go alone, then the mentality was not like today. Then my mother stated that “you don’t have to wait for your brother, go by yourself”. Especially, after he got married we always went on ourselves. There were many movie saloons in Ankara, but there were not many people who went to theater. The ones who went to cinema, yet, went mostly to the local films; we didn’t go to them, we were not satisfied with those films. So, we paid attention the film we were going to watch to be not dubbed, but subtitled. We went to the originals and we followed the film both from the subtitles and from the dialogues.

‘1’'s narrative is important in that it points to a perception of distinction in relation to her and her sister’s preferences of movies; to the gender relations of the time and to

⁹⁸ To have an idea on the context and the sequel of the narrative, which also provides an interesting story revealing the physical descriptions of the women in K.G.’s family, their perception by the larger society in a picnic atmosphere, and perception of various identities by K.G. see Appendix H.

the 'democratic' and 'modern' stance in '1's family in these terms. Similar pointers of distinction were articulated in other narratives, too, mostly through the expressions of 'different style', 'different tastes', and 'more open-minded relations'.

I tried to point in this subsection that the Armenian and Jewish communities were integrated in the construction of the 'modern' and 'western' capital city space, one crucial way of which was to establish places whereby citizens, without differentiation of gender, would have a daily life that would support this image all with their entertaining, eating, dancing and socializing manner. This integration, moreover, was actualized through both the recreational habits they already had, and the social and cultural capital they had, which made them active agents in the very construction of the symbolic spaces of the capital city.

CHAPTER VI

THE STATE: IDENTITIES CONSTRUCTED THROUGH THE ENCOUNTERS WITH THE STATE POLICIES

“Where is my home, daughter?
Where should I go?
We are from Anatolia!”
A.T.

This chapter will mainly deal with the individuals’ self-understandings, identifications and belongings on a ground provided by their encounters with the ‘state’. State, here, is understood in a broad framework referring to the official identity definitions, institutional practices, as well as legal provisions and prohibitions. To understand how the encounters with various policies, enactments, and discourses of the state are experienced and perceived by the ‘subjects’ of the current study is an important one; since one crucial aspect of their identity was defined by their being a member of a ‘minority group’. I have already pointed to the details of this definition in the introductory chapter. It is now time to turn to the ‘practical analysts’ (Bourdieu, 1992) of this study and see how do they perceive, embody and assert this ‘categorically ascribed’ (Barth, 1969) identity. Narratives on the encounters are evidently shaped by three references of ‘identity’: ‘minority identity’, ‘national identity’, and citizenship. Although, these references were not clearly separated and meanings attributed to them might have overlapped to a great degree in the narratives, for the analytical purposes there is need for such a classification. Below, I will be engaging in an elaboration of these narratives.

6.1. MINORITY IDENTITY

There emerged two main, and seemingly opposing, discourses on being minority. One is on “not being and feeling as minority and being a direct part of the larger society”, the other is on “being and feeling as minority” because of religious-communal affiliations/ascriptions. However, neither position was this clear-cut, as reflected in the structure and language of the narratives. There came forward the multiplicities, complexities, ambivalences of identifications and belongings which inescapably drew on the memories of the past and experiences of the present. Memories of the past, which were signified usually in the words “those times”, gathered around the memories of the 1915 Armenian deportation, 1923 Exchange of Populations, ‘Citizen, Speak Turkish!’ campaigns, 1941 “Incident of Reserves” [Yirmi Kur’a İhtiyatlar], 1942 Capital Levy and the September 6-7 Events of 1955. These, namely the ‘Tukification policies’, composed important sources of experience which had crucial affects on the current perceptions, self-understandings and identifications of the narrators.

6.1.1. Reflections on the Concept Minority

In order to get a direct reflection on the usage and perception of the term ‘minority’ I have asked how the narrators and the respondents felt at the face of the usage of the term in reference to their communities and if and in what cases they felt themselves to be minorities. It appeared that ‘minority’, as a term pointing themselves as ‘different’ communities, was understood mostly in negative connotations. Moreover, the attitude towards the term emerged to be bearing a communitarian affect; in that it was mostly the Armenians, whether Gregorian or Catholic, who have argued that they did not accept the term to be used in reference to them. The Jewish narrators, on the other hand, pointed mostly to the reflections of the term as a concept and as a ground of experience. However, it was not only a matter of different communities, but also, and most importantly a matter of cultural capital one had. The more the well educated the narrators the distant the language and the larger the framework of the narratives were. There was also an apparent generational affect on the evaluation of

the concept minority in that while the second generation had rejected the term as a denominator of their identity, or reflected a more 'intellectualized' evaluation of it; the narratives of the first generations were cramped by the memories of past and thus oscillated between various feelings of belonging.

The six of the seven respondents of the questionnaires have stated that they do not feel themselves to be minority and one did not answer the question. However, reservations put to some answers were revealing. A.İ. (1953, Greg.Arm., M, University), for example, stated that:

I don't accept the minority definition. The citizens who were born and bred here are not minorities. This is a wrong expression.... I don't feel myself to be minority. However, if something against us is written or expressed in the media, this does not cause a positive situation for us.

Similarly, N.P. (1957, Cath.Arm., M, University) noted that "the term minority should not be used" and he doesn't feel to be a minority. C.E. (1969, Cath.Arm., M, Secondary Sch.) and R.M. (1950, Cath.Arm., M, Secondary Sch.) have also written down that they do not see themselves to be minorities and there weren't any such case that they felt this. In these answers 'minority' appears to be somewhat degrading which connotes '*separation*' or '*inequality*'. A.İ.'s point on "the citizens...are not minorities" is a good indicator of the idea that citizenship, at least at the ideal level, provides equal membership to the political community, in this case the state, and there should not be a need for other, 'differentialist', terms to point these citizens. The perception of the concept 'minority' as something to be a degrading and unequal one appears also, though as an implication, in T.T.'s (1968, Greg.Arm., F, University) answer in the questionnaire:

What does minority mean?!!! ... I am very lucky. I never felt [myself as minority] thanks to my friends. But, in the state institutions there are different treatments. Although I don't feel it in my own environment, when I go somewhere else (a place where I am not known) I get across expressions that make me sorry. Our people have too many stereotypes.

T.T.'s note points the encounters in the state institutions and day-to-day interactions 'in an unfamiliar environment' to be sites where 'minority' as an ascribed identity waits for her. In other cases "thanks to [her] friends", she does not feel to be a

minority. 'Feeling minority', thus, is seen to be related to the (un)equal official treatment, on the one hand, and belonging as a part in the larger society, on the other. One such grounding is evident also in B.E.'s (1946, Cath.Arm., F, Secondary Sch. left) narrative:

No, I mean. Such thing, we have never felt. That is we are minority only in name. We never use the name minority; we say we are Christian and go on. We never call ourselves minority. I mean if cannot deal with the questions "what is the meaning of your name" and so, we say we are Christians. ... The term wasn't used in the past, it appeared recently. In the past it wasn't used; that time it was not also told that "s/he is a Christian", but they called "you are Armenian". But whatever you are, you are an Armenian, that time it was so. But now, even in our identity cards it is written Christian. But in the past it was written so, written Armenian, written Catholic, was written your denomination; now it is not, it is written Christian in all of ours.

It is apparent that the concept is not, mostly, a part of the narrators' self-definition. B.E.'s narrative can also be read, at least between the lines, that the contemporary official treatment regarding the information in the identity cards is perceived to be a more equal one, compared to past, since at least it does not make a differentiation between denominations or 'ethnies' and that uses one common term 'Christian'. When we remember that B.E. is a Catholic Armenian, and that Catholic Armenians do not define themselves to be Armenian mostly, her emphasis on Christianity as an equalizing identity in contrast to 'ethnic' identity is a more understandable one. Thus, we might argue that in B.E.'s narrative there is an implication that 'Christians are a part of the larger society and the political community and, thus, are not minorities'. It is also apparent in B.E.'s narrative that the concept minority, as a 'name' for self-understanding, is encountered only with the recent agenda on the media and thus, not a yet accepted and embodied definition. This is also apparent in M.T.'s (1929, Cath.Arm, F, Primary Sch.) narrative, which states that "I don't know for what reason they call us minority, they refer Christians as minorities but I don't know depending on what, well I am really not interested in it anyway".

There were also, however, approaches that are more 'critical' in their articulation towards the concept 'minority'. E.Ş.'s (1963, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch.) remark is an example reflecting on the experiences, though still moving on the similar ground of degradation-integration:

I find this term [minority] to be a bit insulting and even a bit humiliating. ... [But] as I have referred previously, of course there are times when you feel to be [a minority]. For example, at the military they came to choose for the occupations. And for sure if you have an occupation or a talent, a bit more comfortable; and you spent your days doing a job you like. But, when the non-Muslims are announced to set aside during the selection, you are not left with any chance anyway. Having experienced that despite the distribution of all, in the recruitment unit ["acemi birliđi"], was made to Ankara-Istanbul and Izmir, only 13 non-Muslims were sent to Diyarbakır, Malatya and Erzurum, shouldn't be a chance. I wonder if any other example of high-school graduate soldier, other than us, could be shown, who cannot be a corporal, put aside a sergeant. You cannot be the driver of the commander, you cannot be a batman, you cannot take charge of a duty at the officer's clubs, etc. etc. We even know from our uncle or grandfathers that once the color of military uniforms for the non-Muslims was different. But, when we look now, we observe in our setting that these kinds of things are a bit more softened anymore. I hope these would continue being bettered.

We observe in the above narrative that the encounters during the military service appear to be an important site for the construction of 'minority identity', especially for men; and this was apparent in most of the male narrators' evaluations. Although, different personal experiences in the military led to different narratives, the reference stayed stable. K.S.'s (1928, Greg.Arm., M, High Sch. left) narrative provides one such example:

The treatment towards minorities, as our dear patriarch was also telling, and as I know also that there is no discrimination; if you look for a real discrimination this is in favor of us. You, coming here and having an interview with me, giving value to me, is this a bad or a good thing? ... For example, in the military ["asker ocađı"] they gave me to the canteen, you will deal with it. Well, canteen is a place of money, I said I didn't want, "no, you will deal with", and more you will be responsible for the restaurant ["gazino"], and more you will be responsible for the table d'hote, they said. Well, I don't know what did the ones previous to me; but I in the years 1948-1949, in Istanbul, in Yarımburgaz... Well, here "you will do it", "you use to be honest", it is not my honesty, it means the Armenians are honest, it means that. ... Do you get what I mean? Now come and say minority! I fired weapon also ... No. I anyway don't like the word "minority". Why I don't, why are you doing discrimination, what difference you and I have. When you use the word "minority", sees me, in other words, as lacking, as "ekalliyet", I am not "ekalliyet"; I am too, a true child of this country born and bred.

We know that the meaning attributed to the line between 'us' and 'them' is seen to be related to the perceived position of the ethnic group in the larger society, which could be associated, among others, to a position in a stratification system related to distribution of power or to an ascription of a status (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). K.S.'s narrative provides important clues for the meanings attributed to this line. "Honesty" and "trustworthiness", for example, appear to be communitarian characteristics in a framework of personal experiences. On the other hand, the meaning attributed to the minority position of the community with connotations of

'lack'⁹⁹ and inequality, is complicated by a claim on equality drawing on the perception of 'homeland' as it appears in the words: "I am too, a true child of this country born and bred". A similar feeling of belonging appears also in the narrative of A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M, Primary Sch. left) which, however, complicates both the conditions of being minority and this feeling of belonging:

Well, the thing who has a small population, and who is not Muslim. But there are many, who are not Muslims, in Turkey. Christianity, Christianity too, look, it is said that there were Christians at every region. Every region, there are in Yozgat, there are in Samsun, in Sinop, every region had its Christians. ... We thought there weren't but there are Christians in all parts of Turkey. ... Still, what I am saying, look we are, with everyone here, "what is your name?" "A.", "well Uncle A. how are you, are you okay", that is. Nothing else, no refrain..., what use if I refrain.

A.T. collects a narrative which seemingly points to the 'objective' denominators of minority status -size and different '*religious/cultural/ethnic*' characteristics- and to the 'unproblematic relations' "with everyone" around. However, the complication arises, at the first level, with A.T.'s emphasis that there are many non-Muslims/Christians spread all over the country, which might be understood, in this case, as creating an ambiguity in the first objective criteria: size. At the second level, and between the lines indeed, A.T. points to the 'subjective/psychological' connotations of 'being minority' which implies refraining/fearing of the majority. Implication of refraining or fearing in the relations to the 'other' could be seen as the meaning attributed to 'the line between us and them', that is the probability of a 'danger', or at least the existence of a degree of 'distrust'. In sum, A.T. might be arguing in his narrative that "we are small in number, but we are not that small", as well as, "we get on well with the majority society around us, though there might be reasons for refraining".

I have referred above to the perception of citizenship as an equalizing ground for the differences of identities and the idea that there was no need for another term. This perception is, apparently, very much in line with the official construction of the

⁹⁹ K.S.'s reference to the word "ekalliyet" is important; because the word being the Ottoman-Turkish version of "minority" was used mostly in reference to a "problem", "The Problem of Minorities" [Ekalliyetler Meselesi], in the official discourse. Such expression emerged in relation to the non-Muslims with the start of War of Independence, who were then already imaged as the "inner-enemy" (Okutan, 2004: 66). Looked in this framework, K.S. seems to be rejecting these negative connotations and being represented as a "problem", while rejecting the expression "*ekalliyet*".

discourse on citizenship. We know that Turkish citizenship point to a monist phenomenon in which the uniformity is tried to be supplied through ignoring the differences in the society, through even assuming their non-existence; and this has prevented any emphasis on religious difference and the expression of it in the public space (İçduygu et.al., 1999). We also know that Turkish citizenship maintains a strong constitutional emphasis on duties to the state such as voting, paying taxes and doing military service (Keyman and İçduygu, 1998: 177).

An important narrative reflecting on the concept minority in relation to such understanding of citizenship belongs to B.T., (1957, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch. left):

Well, for once, I do not accept this ‘minority’. I don’t accept in that way: I have settled here, I pay tax to this state, I do my military service, I get my child educated at Turkish schools ...Well, that’s why there shouldn’t be a need for such a differentiation I think. There shouldn’t be, I am telling the same thing constantly but, I mean a Muslim, a Christian, a Catholic, a Greek, I do not accept these differentiations, indeed. Yes. It is humanity for me, most important of all is humanity. Nothing else I mean, religions all, for ins... One goes to the mosque... All are the houses of god my dear; one goes to the mosque, prays there, the other comes to the church and prays here; could you see a difference, for me there is no reason for difference. Our friends here, for example, they are curious sometimes, then, they know, at the Christmas, at the Easter and so, I take them to the church. ... My neighbor across said “I want to see”; for sure! Right away! We went together, we sat, there; did you go to the church, for example? [I approve] Hah! Nothing *too much* anyway [the emphasis is mine], we went, he liked very much, then whoever wants I take him...

Above again there is the implicit suggestion that the concept ‘minority’ points something ‘less’, at least ‘different’, than equal citizen. B.T. claims strongly for ‘equal’ membership of the society referring not only his satisfaction of the obliged duties (paying tax, completing military service), but also to the engagement in the idea of the society (inhabiting here, and schooling in the Turkish schools). This latter emphasis is important when the migratory movements -not only the enforced, but also the ‘voluntary’¹⁰⁰ ones- and the existence of the community schools, -even if only in Istanbul- are remembered. B.T’s reference to “humanity above all” should be understood, indeed, as a reference to ‘tolerance’ in the larger society, and not as a

¹⁰⁰ The term ‘voluntary’ is used here only to refer the not officially enforced migrations of the members of the minority groups in Turkey; otherwise it should be clear that all emigrations are, to a degree, related to the general political, social, cultural and economic atmosphere of the sending country as well as the receiving one, and in this sense an absolute voluntary emigration, especially in the case of minorities, is a less probable one.

reference to an identity, which has stripped of its religio-ethnic ties. This is apparent, I will argue, in the sequel of the narrative which implies a differentiation between public sphere and private sphere in which the former is understood to permit an ‘upper-identity’ defined by citizenship, while the latter is open to ‘sub-identities’ defined by the differences of religious/ethnic affiliations. B.T. collects, no doubt, an ideal-typical model of democratic political community, which might not so easily be equated with the current socio-political state. This current situation is also implied in B.T.’s words there is “nothing too much” in the church. Thus, seemingly a narrative on the equal and unproblematic relations with the general socio-political community becomes an ambivalent one with the introduction of the implied care for not being *too much*. This point of ambivalence will be a recurrent one in also other narratives whether by implication or expression.

A similar narrative, though a more explicit one, belongs to ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Primary Sch.):

I think it was arranged in Lausanne, though we have many rights, it is not so in practice. We, yet, have accepted, we got used to this. Our youngsters do military service, we pay tax, and we should have the same rights. ... I did not pay attention to the report [The Minority Report].¹⁰¹ But the rights were opposed basically; we do not claim any rights, anyhow. We know our place. [“haddimizi bilip oturuyoruz”]

Drawing upon the discussion by Cornell and Hartmann (1998) about the ‘meaning’ attributed to the line between ‘us’ and ‘them’, it could be suggested that ‘1’s narrative reveals the ‘perceived position’ of the community in the larger society, and it is seemingly an unequal position. Such perception emerges due, on the one hand, to the rights and duties balance the citizenship implies; on the other, to ‘being aware of the place’ the community has within the larger society. The meaning, thus, is apparently related to the power relations between the majority and minority societies.

Before going on with the experiences as a minority, two more narratives should still be pointed, one reflecting on the ethnic community attitude in the face of the attitude

¹⁰¹The Report of Başbakanlık İnsan hakları Danışma Kurulu “Azınlık Hakları ve Kültürel Haklar Çalışma Grubu” was published in October 2004 (Oran, 2005a). At the time of the interview with ‘1’ (3.10.2004), the report was hotly debated in the media.

of majority society; the other posing an evaluation of the minority status on more personal terms. L.N. (1924, Jew, M, University) narrates on what kind of a feeling minority status leads to:

Always a negative feeling; because, all the issue is whether you are treated equally or not. If you are, you wouldn't feel yourself as minority, anyway. ... I did not have much problem in my life; I was not looked upon strangely ["yadırganmak"] and I didn't feel strange, either. Therefore, I did not experience this problem. However, I have known many who have experienced. I sometimes found them to be mistaken, because they also isolated themselves. I mean, to stay in such a limited thing, to stay in the ghetto¹⁰² is because of fear, because of inculcation, the elders', the parents' inculcation; staying there is because it affects them. I did not do that, and that's why I didn't have a problem about it. But a minority, as long as feels him minority, I mean if they make him feel so, it is a difficult job. And many people feel this, yet sometimes don't bother...

L.N.'s narrative oscillates between the ascription and assertion of identity. On the one hand, there is the unequal treatment of the state or the larger society; on the other hand, there is the self-isolating community in the face of 'fear'. These two poles are perceived as equally strengthening the minority position; but though the former is seen as the ultimate cause of the uneasy position for minorities, his reflection on his own position as not an isolated one and, thus, having not a problem is creating an ambivalence in the perception of ascribed and asserted identities. However, it should be apparent that L.N. had a strong symbolic capital in that he was a doctor in important state institutions and this was an important factor for his feeling of belonging as to be integrated to the larger society; other factors being most probably the cultural capital and the distant religious-communitarian relations he had.

S.O.'s (1962, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.) narrative reflects further on the personal position:

Well, yes of course, if it is looked in terms of identity card, right minority. But, additionally, there is the word, well, "where is a man like Ahmet Taner Kışlalı, there are very few people like him"; like this, I am too a minority, they were too. Do you get what I mean, I am not uneasy about this. The word was never a degrading one for me. ...Well, let me tell this, I haven't explored on that [Minority Report] for once; if it was for me and if I were a governor I would, anyway, demolish the borders besides everything. This, first, stems from my worldview, for sure, for me there is first the world, there is the respect for the world. No such respect for land, land is free. I, as a human, as a servant/man of god ["tanrının bir kulu olarak"], am free. All the land of the world are mine, the world has accepted me, would not a border on the edge of it; if I live on the world today, if I can step on here today, I would, too, on Australia, on Russia, or on India. I mean this is different for me, so I shall better say nothing on this, because I haven't read it. But they would, certainly, find a trick in it, too.

¹⁰² He refers to the 'Jewish Neighborhood' in Ankara.

S.O. seems to perceive minority status drawing on her personal identifications, which could be seen as pointing to an intellectual and transnational/global position, rather than on communitarian affiliations. This narrative is, moreover, an important one since it does not bear any trace of the discourse on 'integrity to the larger society', as was observed in all narratives to this point more or less. On the contrary, it seems to be a narrative on 'taking apart of the larger society' through identifying with a small group of intellectual elite. In this way 'minority' becomes a concept connoting 'superiority' and this is the breaking point with the earlier perception of the concept as a 'degrading, humiliating' one. S.O. seems to reverse the superiority/ inferiority discourse. What is more interesting, in terms of our purposes, is that such a reversal might well be an indicator of the meaning attributed to the line between 'us' and 'them', which is always related to the perceived position of the ethnic group in the larger society (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). Thus, S.O's narrative could well be read as a narrative on distinction and the assumed 'difference' with which the position is associated, in this case, seems to have connotations of 'superiority', 'good' and 'trust' in contrast to 'inferiority', 'evil' and 'distrust'. I will be turning to the narratives on distinction during the next chapter.

To this point, it was the narratives reflecting on the concept minority. It appeared that though the predominant reflection was on 'the integration' and 'being a part' of the larger society, the narratives were complicated by the perceived 'inequality. Feeling of minority status, on the other hand, appeared mostly in relation to the numerical proportions of the respective communities. H.Ö. (1953, Cath.Arm., M, Secondary Sch. left) for example, states that "yes, I perceive myself as minority. Numerically, 90-95 % is Muslim, our Christians are minority".

6.1.2. Experiences as a Minority

More important than the evaluation of the concept from a distance, however, are the narratives, which reveal the experience of minority status on the encounters with state. These encounters might realize at seemingly more everyday grounds such as banks and hospitals, as well as direct institutions of state, such as schools and the

military. We know that these are social institutions availability and accessibility to which by all populations within a society is related to the power relations and thus to the definition of ethnic identities. We know, moreover, that the denial of institutional access, on the basis of ethnic identity, is a powerful boundary mechanism, whether that access has to do with jobs, housing, political participation, schools or some other institution (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998).

We have discussed previously that minority groups in Turkey had faced discriminative policies which are defined mostly to be Turkification policies (Aktar, 2004) mostly during the one party period, and have continued to face some ‘differentialist citizenship practices’ (Yeğen, 2004) at also the later periods. In the narratives, it appeared also that there are still some points of uneasiness emerging in the more mundane encounters at the banks, tax offices and similar social institutions, though these do not point, at least at the outset, the denial of access to these institutions –uneasiness emerging out of questions about the ‘different’ names and the ‘origins’ of persons. We can see the former two as attempts of homogenizing the “community inside” through a national enclosure (İçduygu and Kaygusuz, 2004); and the latter as a reflection of the result of this attempt within the larger society. I will start with the Turkification policies and while doing this I will follow somewhat a chronological order.

6.1.2.1. 1915 Armenian Deportation

I have pointed previously that Gregorian Armenians living in Ankara are mostly the people whose families have somehow experienced the 1915 Deportation and thus these events, due, also, to the recently culminated agenda on the media, have had important traces on their memories and self-understandings. Indeed, the narratives on deportation were the most tragic ones both for me to listen and for the narrators to tell. In order to point the mood the memories were recollected in, I will give a dialogue between me, K.S (1928, Greg.Arm., M, High Sch. left) and A.S. (1940, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.), whereby the transferred memories on the deportation came out, though the question was not in anyway on it, but on the family members’ occupations.

Ö: What did your grandfather do? Do you know what his job was?
A.S: My grandfather, well, he went to that, to slaughtering...
Ö: What slaughtering?
K.S: But you did not eat something my daughter!
Ö: I did, they are delicious, thank you.
K.S: Delicious! You don't eat because they are delicious!
A.S: They have taken, then, my grandfather. My grandfather, his father, they have collected all. That period, there were no men left in the village.¹⁰³
Ö: You mean the period of deportation?
A.S: Yeeeee!
K.S: The deportation, of course, then there were many things happened I mean.
A.S: Of course, no one left, I mean. ... They had gone. Then, anyway, they have taken my mothers ["annemleri"] and so out of the village. To another place of Ankara, I mean still in the city.
Ö: So they have come to Ankara on obligation...
A.S: On Obligation, obligation, yes, yes.
Ö: Had any of those men come back?
A.S: No, no one, no one had returned.
 ...
Ö: And you heard them to have died?
A.S: Yes. I mean, they weren't back.
K.S: It is not certain where they went. ... It is not certain whether they died in the deportation or what; but they weren't back. ... At the time of deportation; more correctly it was, ["daha doğrusu"], what the name of that period was: genocide. They have taken, and went... They have collected the men and slaughtered them. This is not in any other way, this is this.
A.S: I mean, kil..., die... I mean they have killed.

In the above dialogue, it is apparent how an undecided, refraining, and ambivalent language is used, and how it oscillated between the words 'killing', 'dying', and 'slaughtering'. There is an apparent anger, on the one hand, and a constant trial to avoid an open articulation of the tragic dimension, on the other. And more, the usage 'they' is always there, but is never clarified. Understandably, deportation had affected not only the deportees, but also the lives of the remainders in great terms. Most prominently, the villages they had been living were evacuated and they had

¹⁰³ A.S.'s family was from 'İstanoz' village of Ankara, which was named to be 'Zir' later on and 'Yenikent' in the Republican period. The village had an exclusively Armenian population before the deportation and was one of the few but crowded Armenian villages of Ankara (Aydın et. al., 2005).

experienced forced migration.¹⁰⁴ One such transferred memory is articulated by K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch.), again in a similar undecided language:

Well in 1914, this First World thing, War, at the time of warfare, they were distributed; say, they sent the women to a different village, they had evacuated the villages. ... My family, here in Sincan, to a village of Sincan they went. ... Yes, my aunts, my two aunts and my mother came here to Beçenek village. ... Together with their mother; no men, however. Men, at the time of war, or that Christians, for example, the non-Muslims they did, they sent from the village, or enrolled for the military. ... I mean, they constantly say those Armenian things, you know, I mean those times. Just a few minutes ago, a friend came here; they had also gone to Aydın village of Ankara. ... Yes, all I mean, they had not given the women in our Zir to the same village, they had all distributed them around Ankara. All distributed. ... I think they gave each village one family. [He remembers visiting the village when he was a child] But, it was such that, whichever family had stayed in which village, their relations were not over I mean. ... There had so good things I mean, so good impressions. ... They did not forget those relations; they were looked after so well. ... In the village they went, the villagers or the agha of the village [looked after them]. There was an agha of each village; I mean all the responsibility belonged to him. For example, when I was, say at the age of 8-10, we always, each summer, went to Beçenek village I mean, with my mother, for years.... They invited, I mean, they invited. The friend who came just a few minutes ago, for example, is from the village my master ["usta"] and her sister had gone, Aydın village. If I go to that village giving my master's name, for example, I will be regarded. I mean the relations were not over. For instance, when we lived in Hacıdoğan, the ones in Beçenek village, the ones my mothers had stayed with in the village, they slept in our house when they came to Ankara for the hospital and so.

The ambivalent structure of the above narrative appears not only in relation to the language, which cannot decide whether to name the period openly or not, but also in relation to the themes that would be focused on. K.G.'s narrative apparently oscillates between the description of how the deportation and the following evacuation took place, on the one hand; and how well the relations were in the Muslim villages people were sent to and how well they were looked after. K.G.'s emphasis not on the tragic dimension but on the good relations seems to be an indicator of, or a trial to indicate, the perception that there were, indeed, no problem between the societies then; and more 'those times' did not create enmity between the Muslim and Armenian society as the relations continued on. A more explicit

¹⁰⁴ We know that the many Armenians, mostly women and children, in the area around Ankara (Yozgat, Kırşehir, Haymana, Sungurlu, Nallıhan, Keskin and Kalecik) were distributed to the Muslim villages of Ankara (Aydın et. al., 2005: 331-334). Table 5 (See Appendix E) provides for the birth places of the narrators, also for their parents' and grandparents'. The traces of the movements, whether due to official reallocations of the population or otherwise, could be followed in the Table. To give an example, T.T. has noted down that "my father's family, from Yozgat around, in the years 1910s, because of some events in the east had come to more west and thus to Ankara".

articulation of such perception, whether attempted or not, emerges also in K.S.'s (1928, Greg.Arm., M) narrative, which further provides for the consequences of the movements for the family organizations and the perceived reasons for the deportation event:

My father is from Uşak. He also, afterwards, at this deportation time, had ridden his horse and came to Kalecik. But my mother [living in Kalecik] was then at the age of 17-18; my grandmother, there were no men in the house, no men left, they had gone to deportation, that's why she had taken this man, I mean my father, because my father is literate ["eli kalem tutuyor"] then. Well, they had met there somehow, my grandmother had said "this man will be to us both a son-in-law..."; four sisters my mothers, the eldest is my mother, my father had wanted her, my grandmother had accepted immediately, she said "he will be both the man of the house, and the son-in-law", she said so. In that way they had married. My eldest sister is 1922 born, the eldest of all, she was born in Kalecik, then after 2-3 years my father came to Ankara, I mean the family came to Ankara -my father guided the family and my [maternal] aunts and uncles also came- and the latter four children were born here. We are five. ... Indeed, our parents did not tell us anything about the past and I am happy about this I mean. We don't know that deportation time and so. ... They didn't tell us. Thanks to god they didn't. Otherwise, naturally my friends, associates... For sure, there are Armenians too, but more of them are Turkish friends. We have lived with them as brothers. Perhaps my mother and father... Thus, I love them more, God bless them ["nur içinde yatsınlar"], they did tell us nothing about those conflicts, deportation and so. Otherwise, could I love you this much, or a neighbor of me, for sure there would be unease, but now no such things. ... Deportation, of course it had been lived; to state not being lived ... I don't know, we learn it now that they had lived, there happened such things; there is no possibility for knowing the reasons. But it should be certain that nothing happens one-sidedly, there happened some things; it means that. Rather, as far as I understand... For sure, I am dealing with these too, now I want to learn how it happened; because it is appropriate in today's conditions to learn them, everybody speaks on these now. Then, I am telling that, to my opinion, I believe in this, there is huge influence of foreign countries; they might have acted upon these influences ["dolduruşa gelmiş olabilirler"]. But this might not be the Armenians all over Turkey; I don't think it could be so. For instance, I never ever accept that my mother or father could have a fault; they were always saying that they had lived here very comfortably. ...

K.S.'s narrative, in an effort to estimate the reasons, apparently reveals traces of the official discourse on the deportation, which claims for the 'Armenian aggressions', and the 'cooperation of Armenians with the external forces' (Tuğal, 2001: 145). K.S., accepting the 'two-sidedness' of the events, refers to 'the influence of external forces' on Armenians, however, not in the form of cooperation but of being influenced. What is more important, however, is that by distancing his own family from such 'aggressive' attitude, K.S. lays a ground for his perception of following 'peaceful relations'. Thus, we again come to the emphasis on the 'fraternity' discourse in reference to the minority-majority relations. Such a discourse, I will argue, serves for achieving a *livable present* in the light of a *smoothed past*,

following Bahloul's claim in the strategy for transforming a 'cramped space' into a 'livable place' (1996).

Another important point in K.S's narrative appears to be the affect of the media on the recollection and the knowledge of the past. The recent agenda on the media, providing for the debates on the issue, emerges, in this case, to be an enabling one, which supplies a ground, if not an 'excuse', for dealing with it. The reflection on the influence of media, however, was not always in such positive terms. For instance, when I asked H.Ö., (1953, Cath.Arm., M, Secondary Sch. left), if he heard anything about deportation from his family, he answered as "I haven't heard. Well, now we hear it from the televisions. It was the ASALA in the past, now it ended, and the genocide started". H.Ö.'s reflection on the reemerging of the 'Armenian issue' in a 'new form' on the media seems to be somewhat a distant and an uncomfortable one.¹⁰⁵ Another reflection articulated in similar, though more expressive, terms belongs to B.T (1957, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch. left). It is important to point that the below narrative was collected following my question "what are you thinking about the debates on deportation and genocide which are recently recurrent regarding the discussions on the EU process":

Yes, this might be the thing of European Union towards Turkey, the policy to make it accept. In my opinion, it is useful for them not to accept, or if it had happened, to make it go ["geçitirmek"] saying "okay, it had happened"; I mean I am not on behalf of its being recurrent [üzerine gidilmesinden yana değilim]. I am not on behalf...Because, it is not the way dear ["efendim"], even if it is, there are conflicts; this and thus, no need indeed. ... For sure, there emerges hatred; one says "you did this", about an event that happened years ago... For instance, now for example, they are saying, well the Armenians once, well, from Trabzon, well, this from Van, I don't know where, well Kars and so, were our land; Turks took them, they seized, this, this... Well, go and live there then, let me see, go and live in Kars, see if you can...Not, well, I mean, thinking some things, you should also do some things, you know; well, you cannot, you don't have such a right, well it was like that then, it happened, it ended, all... I mean nothing else than making one feel unease, nothing else...

¹⁰⁵ We can understand this uncomfortable perception when we call back the political and social era the ASALA (Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia) terrorism had caused; and remember also that in the official discourse the Armenian minority was pointed to be "native foreigners" who "would be considered as potential saboteurs" (Yumul, 1992: 73). The era was described by Toktaş in that "political terrorism was becoming more violent in the late 1970s, causing an ideological polarization of society. The non-Muslim minorities suffered the insecure environment with their Muslim counterpart but the attacks of the ASALA on Turkish institutions and embassies were additional sources of tension for Turkey's Armenian minority" (2005a: 411-412).

Could it be? I mean now you live in Ankara, could you live in Kars, if they have taken you there. I mean, these are difficult things, now there are scenarios like this. Well, don't know, those were ours, let you go and live there then, can you; can you take it, let you take, take it. There is nothing such, I mean...

Besides reflecting a nationalist discourse that EU, or the foreign powers are responsible for the provocation of this kind of problems, B.T.'s narrative –which came out perhaps due to formulation of my question but still reflected the readiness to take a position in such discourse- is an important one to see the way the debates are perceived within the Catholic Armenian group. The uncomfortable situation about the return of the debates in such a culminated manner is an apparent one in B.T.'s fear of 'hatred' and 'conflict' within the society. We know that the Catholic Armenians were not among the population deported in 1915 and so it is understandable that they reflect on the issue with a distant language and in an uncomfortable manner, revealing an anxiety that Turkish Public opinion would be prejudiced against them. Moreover, B.T.'s language is an ambivalent one, which reduces the claims of the 'Armenian side' to the impossibility of living in the 'eastern provinces', on the one hand; and pointing for their not having such a 'right' anymore, on the other. Thus, a visible anger at the face of the 'unease' caused by the debates goes hand in hand with an understanding attitude of the claims evident in the words "well it was like that then, it happened, it ended".

The anxiety about the debates were also implicit in the first generation Catholic Armenians words who rejected to talk about the issue altogether. A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M, Primary Sch. left), for example, stated that:

Well, I cannot figure out these, nothing ["bunlara kafam basmaz"]. That's why we cannot know, we cannot weight...We cannot do it. So we cannot tell anything. We can tell only ourselves. Otherwise, now so many things are happening, so many things... ["Yoksa şimdi neler oluyor, neler oluyor"]

6.1.2.2. 1923 Population Exchange

Although the population exchange was a recurrent theme in many narratives, I could not reach anyone who would recollect any direct experience of the period. This is partly because the date was before almost all the narrators were born; and partly because the number of the Greek population was already small in Ankara that no one

remembered a specific story transferred about Greek neighbors. Still, however, the fact that the Greek population as a group was ‘sent’ or ‘made gone’, composed a crucial reference point for the narrators to establish similarities between many other ‘Turkification policies’. L.N. (1924, Jew, M, University) who migrated to Ankara in 1929 narrates his observation and perception in the below words:

There were no Greeks in Ankara; there were no remainder. After the independence war, it is understood, they all had gone, had gone compulsorily, Anatolia was evacuated. ... They did not leave any Greeks except from in Istanbul. In exchange of them, that is the Exchange as we call, there was a replacement with the Thracian Turks.

L.N. seems to be reflecting on a broad framework regarding the policy of ‘evacuating/homogenizing Anatolia’. However, a more comprehensive and explicit narrative on the issue comes from N.E (1957, Jew, M, University):

I am afraid, however, those events such as exchange of populations and so are bad events, I mean if we “intellectualize” exchange is bad. Because these are factors constantly delaying the integration of these elements; even making it impossible. I mean exchange... Because what are you doing then is that you sent people you have indeed lived together, and bring people whom you do not know. ... Such things make people fear; I mean the fleeing of people, departure of the Armenians, departure of the Jewish and so on. These prevent us, this society, to understand each other better on this issue. Because these are indeed symbols I mean; if you think we live in Anatolia for more than 500 years, others, some live for a shorter period, some for longer; names are changed and so on. I mean, grouping people with names only, such things should end I believe. Of course, events such as exchange delay this. People start thinking that ‘so they were strangers since they went’; they start to say this. Nevertheless, such things of going and coming, dynamics of these are not much, that easy dynamics I mean.

N.E. articulates an important narrative indicating the symbolic meaning of the policies like exchange or any other forced migrations, deportation or not. Accordingly, these policies make the remainder minority populations fear a possible replicate, on the one hand; and make the majority people think that the ones who have left were strangers/foreigners, since they left or, otherwise, made to leave. Both cases are evaluated to be obstacles for integration. N.E. seems to draw on the factor ‘having lived together for centuries’ for any understanding of ‘community inside’; and, thus, also criticizes the discriminative attitudes within the society which approach people at the face differences, such as names and such.

Still, one important point to make is that the most comprehensive evaluations on being minority, not only drawing from self-experiences but also on the general state of experiences, mentalities and policies, were articulated by the ones who have the cultural and symbolic capitals most, as it appears in the above examples. This is valid also for the below narrative.

6.1.2.3. The Campaign of “Citizen, Speak Turkish!”

We know that the unity of language emerged as one of the fundamentals of nation-building during the Early Republican Period (Toktaş, 2005a). Accordingly, it is argued, the issue of language in the Republican Turkey has evolved around the two basic principles of official ideology: secularism and nationalism (Çolak, 2004). For the purposes of this study to point to the latter, that is “the official language policy intend [ing] to create a unified national language to help form a homogenous national community (Çolak, 2004: 67), is a critical one.¹⁰⁶ Such policy was reflected in the arguments that “the unity of language was the strongest element in creating a unity of idea and sentiment among the children of the same country” (Yunus Nadi quoted in Bali, 1999: 132). The era, however, viewed much more exclusivist articulations of such argument, which appears in the words, that:

The true Turkish citizens had to speak Turkish. ... Let those who did not want to be Turkish citizens by means of their languages and deeds, those who did not want to adopt the *umumi hayat* (the public life) of the country, be visible and exclude themselves from the whole like an *ecnebi* (foreign) element (Ahmet Emin Yalman quoted in Çolak, 2004: 81).

One of the main targets of these words was undoubtedly the non-Muslims whose different languages made their ‘difference’ became more obvious in the public

¹⁰⁶ Çolak explains the former, stating that “from the beginning language policy has included attempts to purify Turkish by purging it of Arabic and Persian words which are regarded comprising religious meaning and understanding. Although the importance of this movement has diminished during the past 20 years, the Turkish Language Society (Turk Dil Kurumu – TLS), founded in 1932 as an official body, still determines the state’s language policy and continues its work of seeking appropriate terminology” (2004: 67). Çolak, moreover, asserts that the change of script in 1928 was the first phase in the state’s language revolution; and the new Turkish language came to symbolize a conversion from imperial-religious to national-secular culture (2004: 68-70).

sphere, then.¹⁰⁷ One important reaction to this ‘difference’ was culminated in the campaign of “Citizen, Speak Turkish!” which was “launched in 1928 by a group of students at Istanbul University’s Faculty of Law”. It, “quickly spread[ing] to other segments of society through press endorsements and generat[ing] a mass reaction against minorities for their language differences”, lasted until 1940s¹⁰⁸ (Toktaş, 2005a: 400-401). Though, as we know, the campaign was directed towards all the non-Turkish speaking communities, and mostly the Armenian, Greek and Jewish populations, Bali (1999) and Toktaş (2005a)¹⁰⁹ argue that the main target was indeed the Jewish people who were speaking ‘Ladino’ then.

It appeared during the study that in Ankara speaking Turkish in the public sphere had always been the main tendency. Among Catholic Armenians only ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm, F, Primary Sch.) had stated that her mother had written Turkish with Armenian script; all the others have asserted that even the elders spoke Turkish and they have never had another language. Among Gregorian Armenians, on the other hand, it appeared that almost all the elders knew Armenian and some had spoken Armenian among family members in the past; few first generation narrators knew the language partially, but it was not mostly transferred among generations. Besides, no one among the Armenian group remembered a campaign called “Citizens, speak Turkish”. Among the Jewish community, however, Ladino was the commonly used language at home and among the family members. The first generation knew it; and

¹⁰⁷ Levi points clearly that it was the Ottoman *millet* system, which did not necessitate the Jews [non-Muslims] to learn Turkish, and even did not create opportunity for them to learn it fluently. Thus, it was not the Jews who were responsible and guilty for their fluent accent and not knowing how to write in Turkish. He states, moreover, that though it was natural to expect Turkish Citizens to speak Turkish, it was not meaningful to try to realize this by force. It was, further, a dilemma that while the ones who did not speak Turkish were accused of not loving Turkish, the ones who tried to speak were the subject of caricatures because of their accent (Levi, 1998: 57-58)

¹⁰⁸ Aktar notes that the campaign was repeated until mid-1960s through various reasons (2004: 130).

¹⁰⁹ It is argued that, the “Citizen, Speak Turkish!” campaign received the support of not only the Turkish-speaking masses but also intellectuals and leaders of the Jewish community such as Moiz Kohen (Tekinalp) and Avram Galanti (Landau, 1996). Speaking in Turkish was considered a sign of loyalty to the ideals of the republic, while speaking Ladino was thought to be an obstacle to the Jewry’s unification with society and integration with Turkish culture; thus to this end many associations were founded by the Jews, to facilitate the spread of Turkish amongst themselves (Toktaş, 2005a). Still, however, there were also reactions against the campaign and many conflicts resulted with the non-Muslims being filed under Article 159 of the Penal Code – the “Insulting Turkishness” clause (Toktaş, 2005a: 401; Bali, 1999: 136-137).

the second generation, though were better at language in the past could still understand it. However, only L.N. (1924, Jew, M, University) have remembered the campaign and narrated on the reasons of it:

For example one of the things I have in mind is the campaign of “Citizen, Speak Turkish”. That time these closed non-Muslim communities.... Since they were closed societies, the men knew Turkish more or less in the work life, though their accent was not so fluent; but among women it was very few who knew Turkish, who knew it well. Therefore the Jewish women, who were always in their closed home life, had difficulties in speaking Turkish, and were criticized outside, say in shopping, or when they had to go out for something else. The word “Citizen, Speak Turkish!” is a remainder of those days. Because their inclination was to speak... they did not know Hebrew, but spoke Ladino, a Jewish language made up from Spanish. ... This was a characteristic of the Jews in Turkey; because all of them, you know, are the Jews who, in 1492, at the time of II Beyazıd, migrated from Spain, most of them to Salonika first and then to Istanbul and Izmir ... That’s why it was a closed society. But since we started primary school at Turkish school, I don’t know if our accent... it was not disturbed; but my mother too could not speak Turkish well, she spoke a little better as the time past, otherwise did not know much, she spoke Spanish at home; my father, for sure, did know and spoke Turkish. ... We have always spoke Turkish between brothers, my brother did not know Spanish. So it is an issue of speaking Turkish at home or not. If it is Spanish spoken at home, one cannot speak Turkish well, it is not easy, because their phonetic are different.... It is the same for French and Italian, those are not in accord with Turkish, but German is in accord for example, it is phonetically, so a German could speak Turkish better.

It is important to put it clearly that language is understood to be an indicator of ‘national identity’, as it also appeared in the above discussion through expressions of “unity of idea and sentiment”, “foreign element”, “loving Turkish”, “want to be Turkish citizens”. And this brings us to Hall’s argument that national identity is a ‘representation’; and a nation, more than a political entity, appears to be something which produces meanings, a system of cultural representation (1992a). In this framework of nation becoming a representation, people, too, become “not only legal citizens of a nation; [but ones who] participate in the *idea* of the nation as represented in its national culture” (Hall, 1992a: 292).

I will argue that as ‘speaking Turkish’, and ‘speaking Turkish well’ emerge as crucial representations of nation, the emphasis of the minorities, at least for the ones in Ankara, become also on ‘speaking only Turkish’ and speaking it ‘well’. S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.) narrative is an important example:

Well, perhaps it has taken your attention, and others have told you, that we speak Turkish very well. We speak Turkish very well; I mean we do not have a dialect in our Turkish. No intonation of words, no accent, we speak Turkish very well. This is, we born and bred, I mean we grew up with this. It is a mother tongue; a possibility of another language has never existed anyway. [In Istanbul] they speak a wrecked [“kırık”] Turkish, they can’t speak it fluently. Because there, speaking Armenian is frequent, there is Greek...

As it is seen ‘speaking Turkish well’, ‘without accent’ appears, in the narratives, to be a sign of ‘belonging’. There is once again a stress on being ‘born and bred’ here. But perhaps most important stress is that Turkish is the mother tongue. This is a recurrent emphasis. For example, E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch.) had noted down that:

The family of my mother [a Gregorian Armenian] knew and spoke Armenian; besides my mother could spoke French also. But though she had two mother tongues she did not transfer Armenian to us. We do not know it.

I suggest that the constant focus on speaking Turkish well –of all the three groups- and on having ‘no other language than Turkish’-of especially the Catholic Armenians- was, indeed, a claim that they were ‘participating in the *idea* of the nation’.

6.1.2.4. 1942 Capital Levy

The 1942 Capital Levy is seen to be the last stage of the process of Turkification of the economy, which had started in the establishment years of the Republic (Bali, 1999: 424). The main aim of the tax is stated to be attempt of the “Turkish state [to] curbe non-Muslim minorities and redistribute their capital to other sectors of society so as to create a national bourgeoisie (Keyder, 1989). The law regulating the Capital Levy (Law No. 4305) is argued to be issued as a part of the economic measures taken during World War II, “to provide additional resources for the Treasury and to discourage war economy market speculation and profiteering” (Ökte, 1987 quoted in Toktaş, 2005a). Such aim was expressed, also, in more nationalistic words pointing the tax to be one of a “blood price”.¹¹⁰ Consequently the tax which was directed

¹¹⁰ In the Ottoman Empire the non-Muslims were free of the military service until 1909 in exchange of the price they had paid. Bali states that though recruitment of the non-Muslims started after the declaration of 2nd Constitutional Government [II. Meşrutiyet] the instances that some Jewish people

seemingly to four groups, namely the Muslims, Non-Muslims, Converts and Foreigners (Aktar, 2004), turned to be one of an unequal one against the Non-Muslims and also for the Converts (Oran, 2005a: 90). For the application of the law Tax Assessment Boards were formed which were made up of governmental, commercial and local authorities from each city, town or district and they calculated the tax bill owed by individuals in that region. Those unable pay their taxes were sent to the Aşkale Work Camp in Erzurum; and the Capital Levy was abandoned in 1944 with a new law, no. 4530, ending the levies and forgiving former tax debts (Toktaş, 2005a).

During the study, it appeared that the Capital Levy composed a very crucial reference point for the narrators, whether for the first generation, who has experienced the event personally, or for the second generation, who has listened stories about it. The memories of the tax indicated an open resentment to the government of the period and an expressed feeling of injustice at the face of ‘enactment’ of the law. The tax, further, emerges to be a “breaking point”¹¹¹ in their identifications. Now, I will turn to these narratives.

Before going into details of the narratives, it could be illuminative to look at the responses given in the questionnaires, since all the respondents were of second generation, which could supply for a contemporary perception of the ‘past’ events. The question about the Capital Levy was formulated as: “Have you heard anything from the elders about how the period of Capital Levy was experienced; could you tell about them?”

have emigrated to European countries and became citizens of those countries, were regarded as examples of not having paid the “blood price” of the ‘homeland’ and this had become the general attitude towards the Jews/ non-Muslims in the republican years (Bali, 1999: 507-512).

¹¹¹ Aktar states strongly that the Capital Levy appears to be the ‘breaking point’ in the process which has started with the Turkification Policies in the early years of the Republic. He uses the term ‘breaking’ in reference to its double meaning. First, regarding the emotional dimension of ‘resentment and offense’ he states that with the enactment of legal procedures like the Law of the Capital Levy, the position of the ‘semi-citizenship, guest-hood, and Civil Code Turkishness’ for the non-Muslims was reinforced. As to the second reference of the term, he asserts that the economy was ‘Turkified’ and the ‘Muslim/Turkish trader’ had entered into the market, though this entrance was actually realized in a relatively later period. For the details of the enactment and consequences of the Capital Levy see Aktar (2004).

A.İ. (1953, Greg.Arm., M, University) noted down that:

I have heard. Since our families were in Ankara, they faced the Capital levy but it was not as heavy as the one in Istanbul. This tax was a totally injustice tax; it was an abnormal tax since it was taken only from one segment [of the society]. God forbid such a thing again.

Similarly, N.P. (1957, Cath.Arm., M, University) marked as “I have heard. At the time my father was a shop assistant, though he was having difficulty to live on, he paid capital levy, he had aggregated it very hardly”. Some have rejected to tell about what they have heard about the period. E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch.) stressed that:

I have heard. I don't want to tell about these. But let me say this only. If a tax amounting 200 Liras is laid on the 1 Lira Capital people have, it shouldn't be much difficult to guess, anyway, what had been experienced or what could have been experienced. ...Here is Turkey; no one knows what will happen when!

Similarly, T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F, University) noted that “I have heard. I prefer not to tell. They are not so nice things.”

It is apparent that the memories of the period were transferred to the second generation; but, also, that it is a period people want to forget about. Feeling of injustice is an important cause for this attempt. This was indeed not much different for the first generation, too. However, they had many things to tell when they were asked; and their language became, in many cases, an oscillating one indicating the complexity of their identifications and feelings of belonging.

We learn from the narratives that not only the self-employed tradesmen, but also people working as employees were taxed.¹¹² We learn also that the amounts of taxes people were charged to pay were in no way in proportion with their incomes. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Tailor) for example has stated that:

¹¹² We learn from Aktar that this was not only for the Capital Levy but also for other discriminative economic policies. He states that “the Turkification Policy starting in the 1920s were not only performed against the capital owners, but also against the non-Muslim or foreigner workers and officers who were employed in these firms” (2004: 118).

We feared also, though we were living at rent. My brother was an apprentice then, we were in need; still, we didn't need anyone. That time we also became anxious, because they had then taxed another tailors' for quite a high amount.... If you have watched the film ["The Jewelry of Ms. Salkım"],¹¹³ yet it is even a lightened version. ... Still, however, there were not that big problems in Ankara; Istanbul was rich and the population was large there.

Reference to the film and a comparison between Ankara-Istanbul is a recurrent one in the narratives. One interesting narrative belonged to L.N. (1924, Jew, M, Univ., Doctor) who was a university student in Istanbul at the time of Capital Levy. His narrative is important not only for his direct witnesses, but also for his reflection on the policies of the era:

Haaaa! I did not want to go in that story. Yes, yes, we have the Capital Levy story. My father was yet alive. Well, it was one of the biggest shocks of the İsmet Pasha period. I mean, if you ask the non-Muslims there will be a big difference in the evaluation of Atatürk and İsmet Pasha. İsmet Pasha is for sure an accepted man, adopted the principles of Atatürk, achieved beneficial things for Turkey, granted Turkey not to engage into the War and so on. But also for negative sides of him, non-Muslims should be listened to. One of them is the one you told, the Capital Levy story. Well there is the Recep Peker period, the period he was the prime minister. Well, Recep Peker had a little fascistic character. The Capital Levy was probably a means to transfer Turkish economy, mostly, to the Muslim group. It was applied. My father was not harmed by this. After my grandfather's death, the workshop had passed to my father, my father managed it. That's why we could have been taxed. All the Jews in Ankara were affected by the Capital Levy more or less. ... [We paid] only 500 Liras. It was a big money, but everybody was taxed 500 Liras anyway; Muslims were also, it was for show. ... We could not explain this situation. But after a year, a half a year, the ones who could not pay the tax, were exiled to Aşkale. You know Aşkale, in the east. My father searched for the reason with the help of some of his friends; and the fate! It is strange; in the list, -my father's name was Israil- it was written as "İsmail". I mean seeing this "İsmail" they have laid the amount had done for everyone, the Muslim 500 Liras. It was laid for the Muslims also. The fate! I mean it was by chance. Otherwise, there is no single non-Muslim in Ankara who has not paid this fine. And it has broken down many families; there were many that have been broken down. I was a student then, I was in Istanbul. By the way, I remember a very funny event, so funny to make one cry ["ağlanacak kadar komik"]. I was staying with a family in Galata, I witnessed it myself, it is not a story I have listened to. ... There, a man called "Oilman Mişon", was taxed a huge amount, the Capital Levy. And the man started to dance one of a sudden. This Oilman Mişon was there, working in a very small place like a hall downstairs, to oil the shutters of the shops. Very primitive I mean, no capital or something, he lives on people's tips. But since he was called the "oilman", he was taxed by a fifty thousand or sixty thousand liras, I don't know, a big amount for that day; and the man runs mad. I knew that men. I mean I witnessed this event by chance, but there were many events similar to this. Who have decided, how they... There were some injustices. I mean this is a weak aspect of İsmet Pasha Period. For myself, I don't know your inclination or so, but I am a man who thinks himself as being Atatürkist ["Atatürkçü"], and at the point we have arrived today, I mean the enactments of the current government, when I look for the beginning of it I go as far to İsmet Pasha Period. ... There were not many [who

¹¹³ In the narratives on the Capital Levy one crucial reference point was to the movie called "The Jewelry of Ms. Salkım" ["Salkım Hanımın Taneleri"]; it is a historical film based on a novel by Yılmaz Karakoyunlu, which caused many debates on it, and which spurred the then [1990s] already culminated discussions on the Capital Levy. It concerned the impact of the Capital Levy on one Armenian family, some of whose members were forced to sell off their property just in order to pay the tax, and others who ended up being sent to the Aşkale Work Camp (Toktaş, 2005a: 415-416).

were exiled to Aşkale from Ankara]. They were anyway not too crowded here then. But there were the ones who had gone, there were the ones. The ones who could not pay had gone inescapably. Indeed, they helped each other very much; I mean the ones who had money gave the ones who did not have; I don't know this is a feature of closed communities I mean. The Jews have it, perhaps the Armenians too, I don't know them much.... Indeed, you see the rich-poor division clearly; I mean this is not a socialist community. It does not have this in its structure, the rich is always higher. But when there is an outside pressure, there is always the inclination to hold the community together. I mean the ones, who could not pay, have paid for its price ["bedelini ödediler"]. Ankara, for sure, is not very crucial in this issue; the real trouble was in Istanbul.

L.N.'s narrative presents a picture on the application process of the tax, which is understood not to be a proper one. The tax is perceived to be an 'injustice' one both in the very legislation of the law, and in its application process. The narrative also indicates L.N.'s political identifications. Despite comprehending on the purposes of the tax, he does not, indeed, reflect on the incident as part of a general official ideology, but as a matter of period. As it will appear in the other narratives, this is actually a commonly shared idea among both the Armenian and Jewish communities. L.N.'s narrative is also important in pointing his communitarian identifications, which appear to be loose ones; and in his reflection on the Jewish community organization in a somewhat class analysis. Still, however, one crucial point in L.N.'s narrative should be stressed: the narrative structure. Connerton indicates a difference between the narrative structures of the 'dominant' and the 'subordinate' group members' reflections on their life histories. According to this, the "perceived capacity of making a personal intervention", in the former case, "makes it possible... to conceive [the] life retrospectively, and frequently to envisage it prospectively as a narrative sequence in which ... individual life history [is integrated] with ... [a] sense of the course of an objective history" (Connerton, 1999: 18). On the latter case, he states that:

[W]hat is lacking in the life histories of those who belong to subordinate groups is precisely those terms of reference that conduce to and reinforce this sense of a linear trajectory, a sequential narrative shape... The oral history of subordinate groups will produce another type of history... Different details will emerge because they are inserted, as it were, into a different kind of narrative home. For it is essential in perceiving the existence of a culture of subordinate groups to see that this is a culture in which the life histories of its members have a different rhythm and that this rhythm is not patterned by the individual's intervention in the working of the dominant institutions... The life of the interviewee is not a curriculum vitae but a series of cycles... Here is a different narrative shape, a different socially determined structuring of memories (Connerton, 1999: 19-20)

Though it is not an easy step to draw clear lines between dominant and subordinate group membership in L.N.'s case, when we take into account the cultural, symbolic, economic and social capitals he has had¹¹⁴ we could expect the affect of such a retrospective understanding in his narrative. Thus, now it is time to grasp the 'different rhythms' of the narratives and the 'different socially determined structuring of memories'. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M, High Sch. left) collects a narrative which is woven into an undecided language which reveals multiple levels of meanings:

I know the Capital Levy. My sister, my sister was apprentice, tailor's apprentice, she was taxed 500 Liras. We could not pay, of course. Then, they, the ones younger than 18, were forgiven after a while. The people had spoken to the governor then. The governor of Ankara, the famous, well-known Nevzat Tandoğan!¹¹⁵ He discharged the ones below 18 in Ankara, it was but in Ankara. In Ankara more or less [everyone], for example, my uncle was taxed for 5000 Liras;¹¹⁶ we have paid it in shares. I have even the receipt of it, but I could not find. ... I mean that was indeed; you know we still pay something similar to Capital Levy. Who pays, both you pay and I pay. What you pay, you pay income tax. ... Income tax is also, more or less, the tax of your earnings. Not of your capital, but of your income. ... [When I insist that they are different] Don't confuse the Capital Levy. Put it aside. ["But it is important for me"] Ok, if important I will say. Well, the state had processed such a law to take from the wealthy. Indeed, for example, it was taken also from Vehbi Koç, many ... Muslims I mean were taxed; we are all Turks that's why I make such a differentiation, both from non-Muslims... Non-Muslims and Turks. I was then fourteen, I know it. There was a company called Aron Araf; they were famous. They could not pay the tax and their company was sold in exchange of their debt. It was sold but, they have recovered again; again... They were Jewish. Non-Muslims were taxed, not a big destruction in Ankara was, not was extreme I mean. Now this is the law of the state, but ...I think the job was given, in some neighborhoods to people, who knew the place well, to people, I guess, at the level of headsmen in the neighborhoods; they decided. But they decided in such a way that if a non-Muslim's wealth was 100 Liras, totally, let's say 100 Liras in the conditions of that time, they taxed him for 200 Liras, 250 Liras. The aim was to destruct, and they destructed mostly. Then there was the exemption and so on. There is the film "The Jewelry of Ms. Salkım" ["Salkım Hanımın Taneleri"] for example, it is elucidated there very well. ... I don't remember anyone going to Aşkale from Ankara. But there were many in Istanbul, that's why I said the real damage was in Istanbul... For example, they have settled and laying taxes, the Capital Levy, these were printed in the press and so. Someone called "Oilman" in Istanbul... ["He was Mişon I guess"] Mişon or Andon, doesn't matter; non-Muslim at the end. They lay tax to the man, since he was an oilman; do you know who this was, it is famous, there were shutters, there still are, to close the shop-windows and so,

¹¹⁴ A detailed profile of the narrators could be found in the Appendix C. Still, we can state here that L.N. has been an important doctor in the respected state institutions and he has had a social network which included important politicians, litterateurs and scientists of the country.

¹¹⁵ There are also other recollections about the attitude of the then governor of Ankara, Nevzat Tandoğan. Bahar wrote for example that his father believed the governor to have prevented the degree of injustices, in relation to the amounts of taxes, to go as far as the ones in Istanbul and Bursa. She states for example that while tax levied for the agency, to which his father also hold a share, was 60.000 Liras it was reduced to 6000 Liras due to the governor's intervention (2003: 167).

¹¹⁶ His uncle had sold automobile items in a shop he owned in Ulus where also K.S. was working.

someone who was oiling them, with a tin cup at hand goes for oiling; an unreasonable tax since he was thought to be an oilman... He was not a trader; no relation. Such mistakes...Oilman, lay the tax! Don't know, merchant, lay the tax! The capital levy led some such mistakes. But then the non-Muslims again, better or worse, have started trading, even if only at the margin.... Many emigrated after the Capital Levy. So did also after the 6-7 September events. Then, did also, in the exchange of the Greeks. For example, in the exchange of Greeks, their real estates in Istanbul were sold not to a half, but to one five, one eight of the price. Some bought some did not; I mean there were such things. ...There can be such things, in a life time many things happen I mean; it is even not possible to claim for the bad will of the government, well the administrators, who handles that job, well, say four headmen. ... It was at the local level for sure ... otherwise no minister would sit and lay the amounts of the taxes for each person. The decision could not have been this cruel, I guess, not to this extent I mean; there is the well-known September the 6-7 events in front of us. It was also decided by the government, but in practice it was very heavy-burdened; I suppose something similar happened in the tax too, nothing else could have happened.

The undecided and oscillating language in the above narrative is apparent. Above all there is the indecision of telling and not telling about the events in detail, where a decision appears only after my intervention. Then, there is the indecision about the main causes of the tragic events: the oscillation between the factors of the 'local enactment' and the 'central decision'. K.S. makes it apparent that he does not want to think that the 'injustices' and the 'cruel' enactment of the tax be determined by the central authorities, but a work of the unfair attitudes of local level administrators. This, I will argue, follows from a feeling of belonging. As Hedetoft puts it, feeling of belonging refers to a positive identification with the "sources of belonging", that is "space, sensual experience, human interaction and local knowledge", and "interiorization of them as determinants of homeness, self-identity and socio-psychological security" (2004: 24-25). What is more, such identification is seen not necessarily as a conscious process, but rather a category of practice, which is mostly unreflexive and embedded (Hedetoft, 2004). Following Hedetoft, I argue that the undecided language, as they determine the character of the most narratives, comes as a result of an attempt to imagine or assume a "socio-psychological security" and "homeness". This claim is not far to my previous arguments about turning the cramped pasts into livable presents.

One important complicating point in this picture, however, emerges in relation to 'self-identity'. This is the point whereby a perceived 'minority identity' incorporating the other non-Muslim communities, here specifically the Jewish community, comes to fore - in the words: "Mişon or Andon, doesn't matter; non-

Muslim at the end”.¹¹⁷ This expression is important since such a perception of shared minority identity was not a recurrent one in other narratives, either of the Jewish or of the Armenian narrators. Thus, it could be argued that a perception of a shared ground which is stepped on by all the non-Muslim minority groups emerges only in the face of a threatening ‘other’ -the state or in a lightened version the ‘local administrators’ both representing the dominant majority- which in this case attempts to ‘destruct’ the very existence of perceived ‘self-identity’.

Another reflection of oscillating language appears as conclusion comments in the expressions “many things happen in a life time”, on the one hand; and “the heavy-burdened results of the decisions”, on the other. Still, one important point in the above narrative is the perceived parallelism between the events of the Capital levy, the September the 6-7th events and ‘the exchange of Greek population’,¹¹⁸ at least in terms of their outcome: emigration. Such statement on the consequences of the ‘policies’ is important not only because it reflects the real situation,¹¹⁹ but also because it complicates the ‘feeling of belonging’ in the remembrance of many, who have had to flee their ‘homes’ due to the perceived and experienced lack of “socio-psychological security”.

¹¹⁷ It is, here, necessary to point that ‘Mişon’ is a Jewish and ‘Andon’ is an Armenian name. It appears that this is an important story within both communities, and each community prefers to tell the story representing the main character as a member of its own community.

¹¹⁸ Though K.S. used the term “exchange” he probably refers not to the 1923 exchange of populations but to the latter deportation of the Istanbul Greeks which took place in 1964, since he names the incident after the others and since he narrates on the sales took place after the Greeks departure as a more recent occasion. For the details of the 1964 deportation of the Greek population in Istanbul see Demir and Akar (1999). K.S.’s words, still, reveals another implication of ‘otherness’ in relation to these sales: “some bought and some did not”. This time ‘other’ points to the ‘lay’ members of the majority society who have ‘bought’ the remnant properties of the exiles.

¹¹⁹ Toktaş argues that the tax caused a number of Jews to emigrate from Turkey, and their capital was transferred to the Muslim bourgeoisie (2005a: 403-405). Capital Levy is assessed to be an important event to have an effect on the migrations of the Jewish people to Israel after the establishment of the state in 1948. Aktar gives the number of the Jewish people migrating to Israel in the years between 1948 and 1949 as 30.000 (2004: 207); and Akgündüz gives the number to be 33.159 for the years 1948-1950 (1998: 114).

6.1.2.4.1. Capital Levy- The War Conditions- Reserved Forces

Indeed the memories on the capital levy cannot be thought in isolation from the general conditions of the time. I have briefly referred above to the conditions in Turkey during the World War II and the influences of these on the policies taken. The war conditions, though Turkey did not take part in the war, appeared to have a crucial role in the memories of the narrators. This was especially so for the Jewish narrators owing to the ...Germany. Reflecting the official discourse, the Capital Levy in the war conditions could even be excused in some narratives. R., (1945, Jew, F, High Sch.), who lives currently in Israel have stated in an approving manner that:

I have studied at the İsmet Pasha Girl's Institute, the now Training High School ["Olgunlaşma Enstitüsü"]. There I had a teacher whom I loved very much. We used to speak political issues of the country at the lessons; one day she stated that 'yes there was such a thing as the Capital Levy in this country, but do not forget that the enemy boots were not also let in'. I have never forgotten these words.

However, it was not only a perception of "insecurity" which laid traces in the memories of non-Muslim minorities, but also the very experience that they were enrolled for the military service as 'reserve forces'. Toktaş argues that during the World War II, the policies of the Turkish government on minority issues were dominated largely by the paradigm of national security and defense (2005a). One 'militaristic measure' taken by the government to isolate the "untrustworthy" elements, at a time when the war had already spread close to Turkey's borders and was drawing nearer, was realized by recruiting the non-Muslim men -age 26 to 45- to the military as reserve forces (Toktaş, 2005a; Bali, 1999).¹²⁰ The recruitment, which is known as "Incident of Reserves" ["Yirmi Kur'a İhtiyatlar"], appears to be significant for the history of non-Muslims in Turkey, not only because this reserve force was set up solely to serve a particular support branch which had been disarmed

¹²⁰ We know still that in 1939 it was decided that minorities serving in the military or due or conscription would not be given arms training but would instead be enlisted in support services. Such decision was, indeed, enacted in previous years, too and this time was in effect until the end of the war, in 1945 (Toktaş, 2005a: 404; Bali, 1999: 408). Toktaş argues that despite this decision desegregation was the active principle in the recruitment of non-Muslims – that is, although they were present in the support services, they worked alongside Muslim soldiers; and the only occasion whereby the principle of segregation was applied was in the recruitment of reserve forces in 1941 (2005a).

and deployed for civic purposes such as building national parks and roads and collecting garbage, but also for forming a reserve force composed solely of non-Muslims (Toktaş, 2005a; Bali, 1999; Güven, 2005¹²¹). Moreover, it is argued that such recruitment had caused distress among the non-Muslims at a time when concentration camps were in widespread use by racist regimes in Europe (Bali, 1999; Toktaş, 2005a).

The non-Muslim soldiers served the military as reserve forces for nearly a year and were released from duty in 1942,¹²² thus in many cases the memories of the Capital Levy coincided with the memories of military service as reserve forces. For example, when I asked B.T., (1957, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch. left), about the Capital Levy, he asserted that:

Well I don't know about the tax; I mean it was not an issue at home. But my father had a reaction, what he had said all the time you know; he was angry to İsmet İnönü a bit. In the military to us... Then the uniforms of the non-Muslims and Muslims' were different did you know; he resented to it indeed, they were in military for four years. ... He did his military service in the Youth Park ["Gençlik Parkı"],¹²³ he used to say that they had implanted most of the trees there. ...In [19]40, at the time of war, he said he did military service for four years. I mean "no bread, no whatever, no beds and no pillows, that is we had put weeds into the coat on back of us, we squashed them not to hurt us, and so we slept" he said. I mean a very hard military stage he had experienced.

A narrative of resentment against discrimination on the basis of 'different military uniforms', going hand in hand with a narrative of devotion and self-sacrifice in the face of hard conditions is evident in B.T.'s recollection of the transferred memory. Indeed, 'hard conditions faced' during wartime and military service would appear in other narratives, too, as I will argue implying the 'devotion' and 'fidelity' of the non-Muslims to the 'Turkish state' and 'nation'. It appears, also, that for many non-Muslim men the military service had lasted longer than it did for their Muslim counterparts', since they were recruited as 'reserve forces' even if they had already

¹²¹ Güven gives the number of the exiles to Askale to be 1229 (2005: 116).

¹²² Bahar recollects in her memories that the reserve forces were discharged from duty in July 1942 and in November 1942 the Capital Levy was laid (2003: 167).

¹²³ We learn from the narratives and from the written memoirs (Bahar, 2003) that "Incident of Reserves" in Ankara, who were not sent to other cities, say to Yozgat or Istanbul, were charged in the marshed areas where they had implanted trees; the area was named as the Youth Park, after the World War II.

completed their “regular” [“Muvazzaflık”] military service beforehand. A.K.’s (1911, Jew, M, Primary Sch.) recollection makes it clear:

For sure I had worked until I joined to the army; then I was a soldier, I served as a soldier at the Regular services in Ankara. It lasted six months because I did it on price [“bedelli”]. Then, again, we were collected as Reserve forces; there is a place called Hadimkoy in Istanbul, then I went there, I served there, it was six months or so. ... Yes, then I was a shop assistant in the neighborhood, and though I was a shop assistant, I was, too, charged a tax. I have also paid, I have also paid. ...Property owners paid more, I was an assistant and I paid in that proportion. ...They had sent some people [to Aşkale] as far as I remember. ... They returned, they returned. ... We were young then, and the ones who had gone were elders, they did not talk to us, they did not, these were not spoken. ... But neighbors and friends had gone.

An interesting narrative was recollected by A.T., (1923, Cath.Arm., M, Primary Sch. left), who was already at the military when the capital levy was laid and the ones who could not pay were sent to Aşkale work camps:

I was taxed for 500 Liras, but I was then a regular soldier [“muvazzaf”] at the military. I could not come back and pay the tax. Nothing happened. How come a soldier pays the tax? We were just around those places in the military, in Erzurum. One day, we were on the hill, we saw them coming, somebody near me said ‘they are the ones coming because of the Capital Levy’. They were wearing the uniforms similar to ours. I don’t remember if they were so. Ours were brown, such light brown; there was an earthquake then, Greece had sent cloth to be used for tents. When they enrolled us for the war, the army had made up uniforms from those cloths.

The unreconciled stance towards the memories of the capital levy is reflected sometimes as a matter of humor. Such reflection serves, I suggest, as a strategy for the reconciliation of self-identity and feelings of belonging, which seems to be possible, however, only if a certain degree of cultural, economic and symbolic capital is accumulated after the experience of such discriminative attitudes. V.T, (1943, Gerg.Arm., M, University, Self Emp. Jeweler), for example transfers in his narrative some dialogues reflecting humorous approach to the past:

We did not have any chance of speaking these with my father.¹²⁴ We talked about them with friends only in a latter time. I had a very close Jewish friend, called Vi. It was the time when İnönü was deceased, there were the preparations for his funeral; we were together with Vi. and he said that ‘my dear V.’, he spoke like this, ‘I wonder if İnönü had bequeathed us a part

¹²⁴ V.T’s father was among the ones who were exiled to Aşkale from Ankara. He was a taxi driver in and the owner of the first ‘Phone Taxi stop’ in Ankara before 1942. After returning from Aşkale he had established the chief mineral water selling office in Ankara. But Since V.T. had left Ankara at the age of 13, for schooling in Istanbul and since his father died at a young age, he states that they did not have much time to talk on these issues.

of what he has taken from us?'. I mean there was such a joke between us. Again another Jewish friend of mine, he was a civil engineer, had to go to Aşkale for some job; the same Vi. said to him 'I have the receipts, if they ask, when you get there, you can say that we have paid for everything!'. He was a humorous man; these are ["karamizah"] for sure.

Such reconciliation for others, who have less cultural, economic and symbolic capital, is achieved through a reflection on a perceived friendliness of the current relations with the members of the larger society, mostly in relation to the neighbors both at the residential and occupational area, and through a optimistic projection on future which is believed not to witness similar occasions. K.G.'s (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch., Tailor) narrative provides for one such reflection, though again in an undecided language, interpreting on all the matters we have pointed till this point in regard to the Capital Levy:

Many things happened. It was enacted irrationally I mean. For example, my aunt's daughter's husband was 7 years old then, he was working at a tinsmiths' somewhere here; they have written him a 500 Liras tax, too. I mean they did not do anything to the ones who did not have the money; they could not take, but most of them... Perhaps there was a film, have you... Those things had happened I mean. ... My father was not charged; he was probably at the military then, they were at the military. ... Yes, the brown uniforms... But, they did not give importance to these things; they thought it was the law. Because, yes, there was the Capital Levy, but there were also such things, for example, say in this First World War and so, it was so much that the Greek soldier had come nearby to Polatlı. One of our relatives was working there, the agha had called him and said "the situation is this, if your side wins, you take care of me, if ours get it, I will back you". I mean this much they were tied to each other, but what time brought and took, I mean. ... [The tax] was because of the poverty of the government I mean, the poverty of the government... There were the ones who had gone [to Aşkale] ... The government had sent them ... Again the Armenians had gone, no one among the Turks... We had no relatives among them, but I know some rich people who had gone for example ... They said it was the law of the government, and they went. What could, what if they had said something? What could you do? Let's say, now they issue a law stating "the non-Muslims..." I am working now for instance, what could you do if they issue a law for the non-Muslims now? Could you do something, you can't. ... Well, since we have not lived it, I can't say anything. I don't know. Now, since there is no problem, I cannot say anything about my neighbors here; perhaps then, people had done those, but people today won't do those. Because you know people now are getting tied to outside, there is the European Union, there is the world things; here even a Muslim you see when faces an injustice, to outside, what court do they call it, [the European Court of Human Rights], Europe...they apply to it, then there were no such things. Therefore neither the government can do such things, neither people will accept these.

To conclude, Capital levy emerged to be one of the most crucial events for the minorities of Ankara,¹²⁵ memories on which had the power to reveal about their multiple identifications and feelings of belonging. One other such event was the September the 6-7.

6.1.2.5. The September 6-7 Events of 1955

The relation between the September 6-7 events and the 1954 conflict between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus is a highly referred one. However, Güven argues that the events should better be understood as a part of the Turkification policies and asserts that the real aim was to evacuate Istanbul, after Anatolia, from the Christian and Jewish population through evaporating the economic conditions of their existence (2005: 141). Thought in this way, it could be understood that not only the Greek population, but, indeed, all minorities were targeted in the events (Güven, 2005).¹²⁶ Damaging attacks took place in Istanbul and Izmir,¹²⁷ however, the period was again a reference for all the minorities in Turkey, and the ones living in Ankara are not

¹²⁵ One important point was that even if they have not experienced the period, or was not sure about the dates of some events they have heard about, they connected them to the Capital Levy and this was revealing in order to point the period's significance as a reference. S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F) and H.Ö. (1953, Cath.Arm., M), for instance, have recollected their parents having silver rings which bore the sign TR [Turkish Republic] on them. They remembered their parents stating that "our marriage rings which were of golden were collected once and instead these silver rings were given to us". H.Ö. stated that he heard it was in İsmet İnönü Peirod; and S.O. guessed it was for a tax. They were both not sure if it was for the Capital Levy or not. We can assume that the incident was a latter one, most probably in the early 1960s, since S.O.'s mother was a 1941 born lady and was then a married woman. S.O., moreover, have recollected his father stating that the rings were used in the construction of the houses for deputies in the Kumrular Street and the houses were called "Rings-Houses" ["Alyans Evleri"].

¹²⁶ Güven gives the proportion of the damaged work places in the events as following: 59 % Grek, 17 % Armenian, 12 % Jewish; and lays the reason for the Greek workplaces having the largest proportion in their composing the largest group in Istanbul then, together with their image in the eyes of political elites being more "dangerous" than the Armenians and Jews for the time period (2005: 141).

¹²⁷ Güven asserts that in Ankara there were only student protests, and no violence took place. She gives one important reason for this to be the small number of minorities in Ankara, and the other the emergency decision of the governor Kemal Aygün who prohibited all the meetings overall the city. Güven also refers to the preventions taken in Bursa and Samsun; and to the small scale protests took place in Adana and Eskişehir (2005: 29).

exception. During the study, the events were referred mostly together with the capital levy and were pointed as an important cause of the emigration from Turkey.¹²⁸

Moreover, one mostly shared assumption on the reasons of the September 6-7 events was the “jealousy” [“çekememezlik”] of the Muslim population towards the non-Muslims. Below is a narrative, which lays an example of this assumption. It repeats, further, the previous argument that though there was a central decision in the cause of the events, the real damage was due to the practice “that could not be presupposed and could not be prevented once it started”. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M, High Sch.left) stated that:

I will tell you some other things. You give me an order, from above, “go and do this and this”, you don’t know what will be my attitude then; why I am telling this, let me tell and you see. Menderes and Bayar gets into train from Istanbul; that period all trade is at the hand of non-Muslims in Istanbul. Then, they say, “touch these non-Muslims a bit”, do what, well, do something, I mean, “do intimidate a bit”, they say, and getting on the train, they are coming back. Upon this, the famous, the September 6-7 events, well, that happens. They cannot yet prevent...I will come and say, “Look at me!”; but then it goes so far to beat you, to rob you, to throw the commodities at the streets and so on. I mean there were such tiny bad things [“ufak tefek kötü şeyler”] ... [The reason for the events become so destructive “in practice” was] to answer in one word, jealousy! Life-style of all non-Muslims, their expenditures, outlook, in comparison to their similar incomes with others was seen to be higher. Living standards of them were better; naturally, there could be people who have resented it. Still not everyone might bear every other. ... [Is there still a similar jealousy?] ... I don’t think so, not anymore, the world has become civilized, ideas have changed, and everyone knows that the ones who work will get higher up. For sure, [in Turkey, too] there is so much difference compared to the past. Some groups still keep their sharpness perhaps, but I shall say immediately that we as minorities do not face any, as far as I know, discrimination in Ankara. We do also nothing extreme, so the ones we are faced, I mean our Muslim friends do not have any, bad pressure. Nothing they have. Yet I, on my behalf, both in the military and in work life, was always appreciated.

In K.S.’s narrative, as it appears, there is again an undecided language, which oscillates between the central and the local; between the intended and unplanned; between the past and present. However, there is one expression, giving clue for K.S.’s self-understanding and his perception of the community’s current position within the larger society: “we do also nothing extreme”. In this expression, I guess, is hidden the perception of a “limited, conditional, at the margin, and ‘who are not anyway from us’ position of citizenship” (Parla, 1995: 209).

¹²⁸ This is supported by the detailed numbers, Güven gives, of the Greek, Jewish and Armenian émigrés after 1955 (2005: 142-152).

Reference to jealousy, moreover, could be understood both as a ‘meaning’ attributed to the line between ‘us’ and ‘them’; and as an attempt to point the events as isolated ones, which is apparent also in the expression “there were such tiny bad things”. A parallel reflection emerged also in K.G’s (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch.) narrative, which referred the events as “a work of plunderers”:

Well, in that, in that I mean, even the government is said to have permitted it, I mean. For sure, it was the plunderers, but, you for example, I do not also but, in the events those times how many Muslims also, how many kept their neighbors, how much they protected I mean. But of course this was not reflected to everyone, only the ones who have heard did; they backed them so much, they helped I mean. ... They were all the plunderers. Even now, to those plunderers be a leader, say lets do these in Istanbul, to the addicted [“tinerçi”], and see what they would do.

“Helps of the Muslim neighbors” through was also referred by a narrator who witnessed the events as a child during a visit of his parents to his uncle in Istanbul. He¹²⁹ stated that a shop neighbor had put a Turkish flag on his uncle’s shop and stating that he was a Muslim had rescued his uncle from attacks.¹³⁰ Importantly, he stated “I feared a lot then, we all grew up with that fear”. He, moreover, asserted his belief that such things would not repeat once again since there were anymore connections with European Union.

There were also one other narrator, V.T (1943, Greg.Arm., M, University) who witnessed the events in Istanbul since he was secondary school student in Istanbul then. He stated that the houses of the non-Muslims were marked with crosses painted over them and although his aunt’s house was also marked, they were not attacked.

To conclude, as I have already discussed, in the third chapter, this study depends on an understanding of memory not as an individual faculty but a social phenomenon (Connerton, 1999). Such understanding of memory could be seen as supplying us a ground, in the light of the above narratives on the ‘experiences as a minority’, whereby we can argue that remembrance of “those times”, that is the mostly violent

¹²⁹ He is a second generation man who is a jeweler at present. I do not give the capital letters of his name since I did not have interviewed with him, but only had a short talk during which he has narrated on his witness.

¹³⁰ We learn in Güven study that such cases were not exceptional (2005: 23-25).

discriminative policies or ‘happenings’ towards minorities, serves as a ‘tool’ to ‘imagine’ the collectivity, or more expressively the collective identity. Remembrance as a tool seems to serve, as it appeared above, to the construction of an ‘imagined community’ at the face of an ‘other’;¹³¹ and, in some cases, a common ‘shared minority identity’ at the face of the discriminative ‘majority’. However, understanding memory in such an ‘instrumentality’, though being an important one, might provide only a partial view. To achieve a comprehensive view, it is equally important to remember that the interaction between past and present is a mutual and dialectical one, which reaches into the most minute and everyday details of our lives (Connerton, 1999: 5); and that memory has a central role in the making up of the social meaning (Skurski 1991 quoted in Tuğal, 2001: 144). The central role of memory in the construction of social meaning, Tuğal argues, makes the understanding of remembrance in only its political and instrumental dimension somewhat problematical (2001: 128). Such role, indeed, points something more than the claims, in some memory studies, indicate: that both the attacking and the attacked ‘sides’ have the inclination to repress or forget the painful memories, in order to build a peaceful and safe life (Levi 1986, quoted in Tuğal, 2001: 144). Such role of memory became apparent in the current study, through the ‘undecided language’ of the narratives I have pointed above.

Looked in this way, the ‘undecided language’, becomes more than a simple act of diverting and hiding ‘reality’, or deceiving me, as the ‘representative’ of the ‘other’. The undecided language, I will argue, stems from the articulation of habitus, traces of which becomes evident in the feelings of belonging to a space/‘the homeland’. The homeland in this case is understood, on the one hand, as an articulation of social relations, on the other, as ‘home’ being born and bred, having identified with, and attributed with meanings, not only of past but also of present and future life.

In the previous chapter, I have already pointed to the role of having been lived in Ankara in construction of this habitus. Still, however, the current conditions of

¹³¹ For an analysis of how memories of 1915 Armenian deportation constructs an imagined community as they appear in the memoirs of the deportees who have fled to Americas see Tuğal (2001).

minority communities in Ankara –namely the relatively small amount of population and the lack of differentiated spaces for social and cultural lives of the minority groups- could be argued for causing the undecided language, or the aspiration for an integrated present. This has a role for sure.

However, I will argue, that the factor preventing the closure of the undecided language as a mere strategy to build the present life in peace, is the evidence of understanding the ‘other’ not as a homogeneous totality even in the ‘violent memories of past’. Existence of memories of ‘helping neighbors’, of ‘caring villagers and aghas’, of ‘people who did not buy the sold properties of the exiles’, in the narratives, and not only an emphasis on the ‘good relations with the current neighbors’, makes a closure of the meaning of ‘other’ problematic I claim.

6.2. NATIONAL IDENTITY

At the outset of this chapter, I have stated that the second reference of identity, through which narratives on the encounters with state are shaped, was the ‘national identity’. Moreover, I have already pointed in the above discussion that the narrators had a claim that they were ‘participating in the *idea* of the nation’ in their articulation on, for instance, ‘speaking Turkish well’ or ‘speaking only Turkish’ and on the ‘devotion’ and ‘fidelity’ in relation to the ‘Turkish state’ and ‘nation’. In this section, I will try to detail this argument.

Turkish national identity, as Yıldız described in reference to its ethno-secular dimension, appeared, in the Kemalist period (1924-1938), to be referring:

Everyone who is a citizen of Turkish Republic and has adopted the ideal of Republic, who is tied to the westernized Turkish culture, who is speaking Turkish and is a Turk in terms of origin, is a *complete, real or true Turk*. The ones, who do not suffice for these parameters fully, have to apply to the compensating instruments such as strengthening racially and gaining purity, seeing Turkish as her/his mother tongue, to have adopted the westernized Turkish culture which has a uniform character together with the Republican ideal, and to have been stripped of religious values (Yıldız, 2004: 18).

One group, the expression “the ones who do not suffice for these parameters fully” indicates, is undoubtedly the non-Muslim minorities. And the “compensating

instruments” for them to apply are named clearly above. In addition, as we have referred already in the introductory chapter, the importance of ‘loyalty’ in terms of national identity is apparent (Yeğen, 2004). It is not a long step to detail these ‘instruments’ by referring to the significance of an ideal of ‘homeland’, of the symbols such as ‘flag’ and the figure of ‘Atatürk’ for the discursive construction of this national identity. Below, I will point the references of the narrators on these ‘instruments’ as a part of their claim in ‘participating the idea of nation as it is represented in the national culture’ (Hall, 1992a) or in other words in the ‘collective national memory’ (Hedetoft, 2004).

The below dialogue between S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.) and ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Primary Sch.), which was articulated in relation to a question on the ‘Armenian issue’, is an important one within the framework of above discussion:

S.O: As I have already stated, we are Turks first, and then continue our Christianity. And further in this, that is Armenian, that is Catholic, that is that, no, we are Christians, it is finished. I mean no need to make this...we are, for instance, above all Turks, I mean never and never for such a thing...

‘1’: I mean we see ourselves to be Turk, Turkish-Christian, and I mean, unfortunately the Muslims don’t see us such, to tell the truth; I mean as Turks and as Christians... I mean they don’t accept us as Turk; whereas we see ourselves as Turkish-Christians.

S.O: I will tell you that way, one day, do not hesitate going -I mean you don’t have to make it ready for your thesis- it might be October the 29th or be April the 23rd and so, on your behalf -because I have done it to make myself grow- go and look at the houses where Christian families live, there would be the flag hanging, that flag is very important.

‘1’: Of Course, it is our flag.

S.O: My [“rahmetli”] father, had constructed, both to his shop and house, somewhere to hang up the flag, you know. To raise the flag. In case we are sleeping in the morning, the stage was reached through our room, if we were sleeping, he would go to the shop and make a phone stating, “if the children got up, hang the flag”. If he did not forget, he would have hung it anyway at night, but if he forgot and went out, or did not get into our room since we are sleeping, he would make a call saying, “today is the April 23rd, the flag will be lifted”. I mean, there is first Turkishness in this word, and then there is the Christianity.

Here, as we see the importance given to the Turkish *flag* is articulated as a sign of Turkishness. One crucial point in the self-definition of identity, moreover, is the hyphenation achieved through the expression of ‘Turkish-Christian’. As the literature on identity points ‘hyphenated-identity’ along with multi-layered, and ‘hybrid’ identities are the forms ethnic identities take in the multi-ethnic world (Bhabha, 1990; and Modood, 1992 quoted in Bradley, 1996). Hedetoft, moreover, points, in relation to the hyphenated model of American identity, that:

[It is] based on the assumption that the core of identity is undivided loyalty to ... constitutional values, but that this can be orchestrated, individually or collectively, in a variety of ways, and that attendant forms of cultural belonging and homeness can be multiple as well (2004: 39-40).

Following Hedetoft, we can claim that hyphenation of Turkish national identity in the expression of “Turkish-Christianity” points, on the one hand, to the ‘undivided loyalty to the constitutional values’; and to the multiple forms of belonging, say national and religio-communitarian, on the other. Moreover, we should add that ‘1’s claim in being a “Turkish-Christian” is also a claim in ‘being an equal part’, in ‘integration’ and not ‘exclusion’.

As I have already referred, *loyalty* of the non-Muslim minorities to the state, which was constantly tested by the statist approach (Bali, 1999), has been a constant tension point in the discursive construction of respective identities; and doing military service (Üstel, 2004), or ‘having shed blood for the homeland’ (Bali, 1999) are not infrequent references of such discourse. As a consequence of such discourse, I will argue, there was a continuous mention, in the narratives, of “military services completed in long years”, “grandfathers wounded in the WWI and died soon after return to home”, “the difficulties faced during the state of warfare”. Male narrators, moreover, have articulated long stories about their military services, and a repeated story was how much they were ‘trusted’ and ‘honored’ by the senior soldiers at the military. All these narratives seemed to be collected in order to point ‘the proved loyalty to the state’ and within this framework it could be argued that official discourse and representation were important reference points for the identity constructions of the subjects of the current study.

Many narrators had a story to tell about Mustafa Kemal *Atatürk*. We might think that having been lived in the capital city made an occasion for many first generation people to have a direct experience with or in relation to him. We observe, moreover, that these stories were transferred to the latter generations and were narrated in each case very willingly. As it will appear below, many narratives are very much in line with the common representation of Atatürk in the national culture.

S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F), for example, have recollected a transferred memory in the following words:

I remember my father telling; he used to tell very happily that he had seen Atatürk. He was selling water then. He used to sell water with his pitcher at the train station and he saw Atatürk; and he always said 'I have never ever seen such a beautiful person'. This was something he shared with us as he remembered about his childhood; he used to say 'the sun have risen onto Ankara when Atatürk had declared it to be the capital city'. He used to say this. Because it is meaningful, when you give something its value, it will be striking, otherwise not. Consequently Ankara became much better he said.

'Ankara becoming a developed and a modern city owing to Atatürk' was a frequently referred theme. In these narratives, Ankara was represented as a "town", stating that "it was Angora ["Engürü"] previously" and "it became Ankara owing to our Atatürk". Stories about Atatürk having somewhat a relation with the "community" also were among transferred memories. A.I (1953, Greg.Arm, M, University), for example, noted down in the questionnaire that:

Since the parliament of then was around Ulus, Atatürk used to have his meal at the then famous Karpic Restaurant; most of the employees there, including its owner, were from our community, as they have told.

One such story came out in an interesting dialogue between A.K. (1911, Jew, M, Primary Sch.) and his daughters H.A. (1951, Jew, F, High Sch.) and R. (1945, Jew, F, High Sch.):

H.A: Atatürk offered a dance to my aunt. She always told it, in a proud she told, "I have danced with Atatürk, I have danced with Atatürk!" She was beautiful; she was very nice; she was always proud of saying "I have danced with Atatürk in Ankara Palace".

A.K: Yes, I remember him seeing in a ball in Ankara Palace. We haven't spoken; we haven't spoken, but well that is we have been there. A night, it was a new years night; I had gone to the ball with my sister. Well, there, Atatürk used to dance with everyone, the turn came to my sister; they danced a while. It is an important memory.

R: Oh! Support your Atatürk very well. ...I have always been a lover of Atatürk. ... I have read the books ["Gölgedekiler, "Sarı Zeybek"]. ... I mean I have always been a fan of Atatürk, I don't know. Keep him well, keep I mean, he is not only for Turkey, believe it, one of the rare persons for the whole world. No, such a person will not come every occasion. Not come every occasion, not be vouchsafed to every nation; keep this holy person I mean. ... Keep, because when the Ottoman Empire was an empire, it was very nice, very large, very magnificent, but at the end, if it weren't Atatürk there would be no Turkey. He is a big person, a very clever person.

H.A: We are admirers of Atatürk.

‘Being an Atatürkist’ is, as it appears above, a frequently expressed statement. E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch.), for example, noted down in the questionnaire that:

I don’t remember listening [from the elders] any story about Ankara becoming the capital city, or the establishment of the Republic. But when the issue is Atatürk, for sure, I am a serious Atatürkist, as much as each Turkish person should necessarily be. When you look at what he had done, you see that he had achieved the difficult things, which were almost not possible. Is it possible not to be proud of such a person? The only thing I am sorry for is that I believe him passing away at least 15 years earlier than he should have. If only he had lived a bit more, I suppose we would have been at a very different condition as a country now.

One interesting narrative was articulated by K.S (1928, Greg.Arm., M, High Sch. left) in reference to a memory on the death-day of Atatürk:

For example, ‘God bless him’, when Atatürk was death I was at school, I heard it at school and... Crying in tears we got out of the school, we did not know yet what happened. In fact, I had seen Atatürk, for once, at the opposite of my father’s office, in the Çıkrıkçılar Slope among a crowd, but I had seen vaguely. In [19]38 we were at school, we were having class; we got out, crying in tears, I never forget, I came throughout the street... wherever I looked all the people were crying in tears I mean. Immediately it was heard I guess; I don’t know if we got out at 10 o’clock or 11, I don’t know; but they have ended the classes, and I came home walking and crying, then got out again and went to the shop... One day, later on, we were at school, we were requested to memorize a poem about Atatürk; I got, by chance, ill and stayed at home; there is a poem by Behçet Kemal Çağlar named “In Your Footsteps” [“İzinde”], a very long poem, I memorized it, but it is very long. In your footsteps/ the world on the earth/ be shackled, be teared and leave off/ make yourself appear, whoever you are/... continuing so, it was a beautiful poem. And there are many, I mean we are getting some lessons in it; for example in one quatrain [kıta] of it said: be broken down, torment yourself for sure, / Timur, Atilla, Yıldırım, Fatih!/ the hundreds passed away before/ get up in your tombs and stand in rank/ stand, the coming is the greatest person/ stand, Atatürk is coming! It goes like this. And the end was like this: for how many years the language of God in Turkey/ for many years the language of God in Turkey/ in a moment seventeen million we are orphans. Seventeen million, when Atatürk was death population of Turkey was seventeen million. I mean it was a very nice poem; it belongs to Behçet Kemal Çağlar. Well, I had time because of my illness, I had memorized it at my bed, it states very nice...In fact was flesh and bone the appearance of him/ his look was but equal to the sky/ his hair was of fire, his spirit was of fire/ the entire world admired to him. A very, very nice poem...

It was surprising that K.S. at the age of 77 have read the poem on memory. It appeared, to this point, that ‘the strong paternal figure of Atatürk’ (Şenol-Cantek, 2003), as it was represented in the ‘national culture’ was, for the narrators, an important element to be referred to point their ‘Turkishness’. Some other narratives were revealing about the presence and conditions of the minority groups within the city. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Primary Sch.), for example stated that “The first house Atatürk used belonged to the family of my aunt, the Kasapyan family; bought from them it was given as a present to Atatürk”.

An important narrative revealing about the social presence of the minorities within the city in the early years of the Republic belongs to L.N. (1924, Jew, M, University). His narrative also provides for the integration/exclusion of the minority groups in the institutions of the newly founded state:

The Center Restaurant [“Merkez Lokantası”] was usually, at its first founding, the place Atatürk had his lunch. He took a seat upstairs. My father came [from Istanbul] as the accountant of that restaurant, he worked there. That’s why we had the chance of seeing Atatürk closer in our childhood. Say in 1933s ... my brother was then 5 years and so. We have always a memoir about Atatürk. My brother established friendship with Atatürk, Atatürk was very keen on children. Well, one day again, there is the Marmara Palace [“köşk”] on the hill, Atatürk had a Palace there, people also came and sat there, they ate and drunk, and Atatürk joined to them. Again, on such a Saturday -since my father worked there we used to go there at the weekends- my brother goes and sits there; well, he gets closer to Atatürk; my mother listens at the back and so... Atatürk shows interest, takes him to his table, and asks “what is your name?”, “Izzet”, his real name is Izzi, but he makes up a name by himself “Izzet”, there was an inclination to take Turkish names. He says “okay”, and asks “what is your father’s name?” he says “my father is Israil”. “How come?” he asks, my brother answers “don’t look at him he is Jewish!” Atatürk likes this very much. ... I think this shows the psychological mood then. ... When these things happen, my mother sits behind in fear, cannot do anything of course. ... They service to my brother, he refuses saying “I won’t take, my mom will get angry”. Then [Atatürk] says, “Oh! Is there anyone higher than me”, he says “I am Atatürk”; “ooooo!” says this [my brother], “who?” asks him, “look” says him pointing upwards, he [Atatürk] says “I don’t see anyone, there is nothing there”, he [brother] says “don’t you see, there is the God!” This likes him very much, too. This meeting has role in the establishment of their friendship. ... Then every week he looked for my brother, took him to the zoo, took to walk around, liked him very much.... And my brother, at the age of 4-5, I mean I am telling you for this discrimination and such; my mother was a working woman, she was a tailor; I had started school, but my brother, it is difficult, a five year old boy... There is the Child’s Protection Institute [Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu], it was once in Anafartalar Street; we wanted to put my brother there, but they did not accept him; you need a backer/supporter, difficult of course... It was Mr. Fuat, I guess, one of the men of Atatürk... Anyway ... And then, immediately, Mr. Fuat the one who did not accept my father to his presence [“huzuruna”], the next day accepts my father tying up his jacket/ in respect [“önünü ilikleyerek”] and my brother, till the age of primary school in the Child Protection Institute, going day time and coming back to home in the evenings... such a... Well, now here, I mean at that period, it is something difficult to get into there, there is no one else, only my brother. I mean those times were not as today, I mean your generation wouldn’t know it, I mean such discrimination, such discrimination at that time, it was difficult for a Jew to get into there... This is somewhat an answer to, perhaps, the youngsters migrating to Israel, if it is difficult to find a job, to be a state officer...

Besides laying down stories on the everyday interactions or encounters with the ‘father of the state’, L.N.’s narrative provides also for the ‘differentialist practices of citizenship’ to be a reason for the emigration from Turkey.

‘Migration’ appeared, indeed, to be a theme articulation on which supplied with conceptions of *homeland*, however, mostly in a manner under tension. One of the clearest expressions of this tension emerged in relation to ‘feeling minority’. K.G.

(1937, Greg.Arm., M) have argued “I don’t, I don’t [feel minority]; for example, if not comfortable, if you feel yourself as minority, there are that much state, that much countries, go away. Go away then, why do you stay. One can go everyway”.

‘Going away’, ‘leaving’, ‘migrating’ did not, however, refer to that much an uncomplicated process. Below, I will try to point the complexities of these processes, with a special focus on the articulation of ‘homeland’ as an element of ‘participating in the idea of nation’.

6.2.1. The Migration Patterns of the Armenian Community and the Perception of ‘Homeland’

I have referred, previously, to the perception of Turkey as the ‘home place’ for the narrators. However, a significant factor complicating a straightforward reflection on home appeared around the themes ‘going’, ‘migrating’, ‘preferring to stay’, or ‘the ones who have already left’. These themes made the meaning, attributed to home more, clear. I will point to the general patterns of migration for both the Armenian and Jewish communities first, and then focus on the Armenian community in this part.

It appeared that almost all narrators had some members of their family migrated from Ankara to other countries. Some of them, even, composed the only family left in Turkey among their relatives. France, Canada, the USA and Australia appeared to be the most frequent destinations of the migrations. There were also migrations to Argentina, Uruguay, though these were related to an earlier epoch, to the period after the Armenian deportation. Israel, alongside the USA, was the country most of the Jewish people have emigrated. The Jewish departure seems to accumulate just after the Israeli State was established, in 1948, but continues in 1960s and 1980s also. Migration of Armenian communities emerged to be accumulating between the mid-1970s and mid-1980s. Additionally, Istanbul emerged to be the unique destination for the in-migrations, both for the Jewish and the Armenian communities.

The reasons for the migrations were articulated mostly in economic terms, but also in relation to marriage patterns (mostly for the women). However, there were also narrators mentioning discriminative attitudes, or the political “anarchical era” in Turkey as the causes of the migrations.

Even when the causes were articulated in more personal terms, however, the narratives made some points of uneasiness appear. S.O.’s (1962, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.) narrative provides one such example, laying also connotations about the perception of homeland:

Mostly because of marriages, they went upon marriages. I mean, nobody in my household had gone. But three daughters of my aunt got married, and their husbands were in Germany, in France; so they have to go, they have nothing else to do. [Others] All had gone after they have completed their military service. Until that age they stayed, they tried to do something, when they saw that it doesn’t go, then, they tried out, again by means of a previous contact, a relative... Because, either they would continue their paternal occupation, or they will create a setting for themselves; well, when it is not possible to keep going in economic terms... When it is for your labor, it is difficult to manage something here on your labor... The ones, who have established there, the elders who had gone previously... Or, the ones, who were entrepreneurs in some way, preferred to go out. The ones who saw that their job was more valuable there; for example, I know many tailors going for this reason. While they were sewing in Istanbul, there were many families who thought if went there they would be better, I mean would earn a better life for their children and so. One of them, well, daughter of my aunt, for instance, she went to Istanbul from Sivas on marriage, they lived for long years in Istanbul, but then they realized such a thing, the job was more valuable in France, thanks to god, now they really at better conditions than they were trying here.... It was economic [reasons]. No one went because it was ‘enforced’. I mean nothing such, ‘I cannot live on here, I am this and that; everything is taken of my hand’; nooo, no one went due to force. Only, in order to choose a better life for themselves, I mean I waste effort here, there nearby my uncle, my, well someone, they preferred to do this.

S.O.’s narrative gives important clues, especially in relation to the implications of ‘men migrating after having completed their military services’ and ‘people opting out for migration only after they had tried in Turkey a lot’. In the former emphasis there seems to be an indication of ‘satisfied duties for the homeland’; and in the latter ‘the unlikelihood of leaving if the conditions were otherwise’. Thus, there appears a constant trial to give rational reasons on the personal ground, and an abstention of an implication of discrimination in terms of ‘identity’.

The responses given in the questionnaires were interesting in these terms. In the questionnaires, the questions, aiming to understand the respondents’ attitudes

towards migration, were formulated in the following words: “Have you ever thought of migrating to another country? Where? Why? What was the reason for you to prefer staying in Turkey?”; “Do you have family members or relatives living in other countries? For what reasons did they migrate to those countries? Do you perceive any differences between you and your relatives’ standards of living in those countries; could you tell about them?”

T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F, University) answered some the above questions in the following words:

I have thought [of migrating] to Australia, since my uncle is there [and] for a better life. After I have seen Australia, I have realized that my friends and my life in Turkey were more important for me. Here the friendships are nicer. If you really work, you also keep going. What could I want more? ... They live perhaps more freely; but there is no friendship, no acquaintance there. Economic difficulty is everywhere on the world.

The meaning of ‘home’ becomes in T.T’s narrative one of ‘close relations’ and ‘friendships’, despite the ‘the less freedom’ and ‘the less economic opportunity’ one has. Meaning of ‘home’ was in other cases formulated directly in terms of ‘national identity’. C.E. (1969, Cath.Arm., M, Secondary Sch.), for example, noted that he did not thought of migrating any other country; and gave the reason for the preference of staying in Turkey as “*we are already Turks*”. Still, another reflection of ‘homeland’ emerged in N.P’s (1957, Cath.Arm., M, University) words in his reason for staying in Turkey: “All the family is born and bred in Turkey and more it is our homeland”.

One interesting response belonged to E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch.) which reflected an oscillating language in the evaluation of the ‘pull’ and ‘push’ factors of migration:

The ones in Australia went totally for reasons of migration. However, the husband of my other cousin [in Canada], if I don’t remember wrongly, had decided not to live in this country after he was jailed for two months, because of the one or two bottles of whisky found in his shop. ... [I have thought of migrating to another country] in order to live in a more civilized country. The place is not that important. As I have said already, it is for the sake of living in a more civilized country; for the sake of understanding that you are really a human being. Do not anyway relate this with religion or so; because there is no relation, only go out to street, walk or drive a car, it is enough....[The reason for us to stay] our settling conditions here, that all our order, friends, acquaintances are here. Do not forget that even if you have enough money to buy a country, if you don’t have your friends and the ones you love with you, you will never be happy. ... [The respective conditions] There is

the expression you know, “regrets the one who went, regrets the one who stayed” [“bir giden pişman bir gitmeyen”]. It is just like that. I have spent four years abroad; there is not a very easy life there, as it seems from away. Yet, if you are used to the ‘irregularity’ here this much... Turkey is a country where you can do everything, but everything in some way; thus, it is not so easy to leave it and go.

Mallet argues that journeys away from home, for no matter how trivial or routine a purpose, constitute both home and traveler; especially in their establishment of the thresholds and boundaries of home and the experience of being at home (2004: 77). One such reestablishment of the meaning of home was apparent in the above narratives. ‘Home’, in other words, turned, one of a sudden, to be “less about where you are from and more about where you are going” (Mallet, 2004: 77). However, notions of ‘leaving’, ‘staying’, ‘migrating’ were not always accepted as ‘easy’ notions as to be a matter of ‘preference’. Generation and community affiliation seemed to be affective in this difference. A.E. (1953, Greg.Arm., M, Secondary Sch.), for example, got angry with me stating “What preference? We were born here!” This reaction could perhaps be explained by the memories of ‘forced migration’ the Gregorian Armenian community had experienced. In another case which was wholly irrelevant to the migration issue, while narrating on the voting patterns and participation in the elections, A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm, M, primary Sch. left) avowed the below words in a visible anger:

We vote every election, we should; it is ours! Where we were born, where...If, for example, they expel us now, where we will go, we don’t have a homeland! We, the Catholics, we don’t have a homeland; neither France would accept us, nor Italy, nor don’t know what... We see Turkey...In Turkey... We are Turk thing! ... [The ones, who have migrated to France, are accepted as Turks] They call them Turko, Turk... Where is my homeland! I don’t have a homeland! Is my homeland France? Is it Italy? Is it Germany? ... My brother [in France] says ‘come here’; I said ‘I won’t come’; you went there and now you say ‘you are like the kings there compared to us, we are poor here’; I said ‘I wouldn’t know it, you have gone! You have there the children. You are registered there; don’t know what, you will stay there!’

It is clear that dynamics of leaving or staying are not that simple and straightforward for the minority groups. There is a constant reference to the notion of homeland; the notion of homeland, moreover, is interwoven with the articulation of different references of identity: being a minority, being a citizen, and being a national. The more the experienced position is ‘undecided’, ‘in-between’, ‘partial’ and ‘limited’ in these terms, the more the feeling of belonging is blurred.

The multiple feelings of belonging, however, seem, in some other cases, to have found a channel to be expressed drawing on the recent debates on upper vs. sub-identity. V.T. (1943, Greg.Arm., M, University) stated in this line that:

They still discuss, I don't understand what they are discussing for. I have always said I am a Turk. I agree with what Tayyip Erdoğan had stated the upper identity, the sub-identity; they ask abroad "where are you coming from?", "from Turkey"; Turkishness is my upper identity, what are you, I am a Turk, but I am Armenian origin. ... Many people know me as a nationalist. Some even say "is it possible, a nationalist from an Armenian, is it possible?" ... There was a discussion on TV last night, the man would say 'I am a Kurd', why he should, you are a Turk, but you are Kurdish origin; it is meaningless, in my opinion, to say a Kurd living in Turkey. ... Turkishness is a nation, a people, the ones who carry its rules, its passport, plus I carry its identity card, my graveyard will be here, my family is buried here. But I am not Muslim as of religion; I mean it is a religion, indeed, the religion should not interrupt with all these; it is a different thing.

Although, V.T. draws on the 'upper identity-sub identity' debate, he seems not to be talking on "being from Turkey" as the upper identity, but "being a Turk". Still, however, he seems to be referring the relation with state, that is to citizenship, while he argues for 'Turkishness' since he points to the rules, the passport, the identity card etc. Religious and ethnic identity, on the other hand, is interwoven with each other. One important point, in terms of V.T's conceptualization of 'home', moreover, is his reference 'to be buried here', indicating not only a space of origin but also a space of the destination for the life span.

There is still one point to be made on the Armenian community's perception of homeland; that is their relation to a sense of 'diasporic identity'. In terms of migration patterns, it appeared that, there was a visible distance towards the idea of living in Armenia, in the articulations of both Catholic and Gregorian Armenian narrators. When they were asked about their idea of living in Armenia they expressed that they would not, in any way, prefer it. One set of reasons focused on the conviviality of the relations in Turkey as I have already pointed; and the other focused on the 'bad economic conditions of living in Armenia'. K.S' (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch.) narrative is an example of this latter one:

I mean they are not happy; the ones visiting there are telling so. Some people we know go for visiting; you know there are the tours and so. Well, it became so that more than a half of the people are starving, the other side is very rich. Indeed, it is here also like that, but it is more there.

To conclude on the migration patterns of the Armenian community in Ankara I should also add that the narrators and respondents pointed that the ones who have migrated abroad worked in those countries mostly as jeweler or tailor; but there were also managers, doctors, academicians, designers among them. It appeared, though in the limits of the study, that the ones who have migrated to Australia were exclusively Gregorian Armenians and they worked in the construction market, some as unqualified workers, but some as engineers. Moreover, it became apparent during the study that not only the poor and the unqualified labor force, but also the well-educated professionals -i.e. doctors- have emigrated from Ankara.

6.2.2. The Migration Patterns of the Jewish Community and the Perception of ‘Homeland’

While discussing the consequences of the Capital Levy, I have already referred the numbers of Jewish people emigrating to Israel after the establishment of the state. Akgündüz argues that the departure of Jewish people was because of ideological-religious and economic ‘pull’ factors, notwithstanding the existence of some ‘push’ factors; and that while the first group of these emigrants, who constituted the majority, were members of the poor and the lower class Jews in Turkey, the second group were those, quoting Weiker (1998), ‘who could be called the young idealists’ (1998: 114). The absence of ‘push’ factors, however, becomes somewhat complicated in the below narratives.

H.A. (1951, Jew, F, High Sch.) narrates on the reasons of the migration from Ankara and though referring mostly to the economic reasons, points also to the general political atmosphere of the country:

Well, now, a part, a large part went in, the state was in [19]48 isn't it, I mean they went after the establishment of the Israeli state. Another part also in 1980s, you know there was a period of great anarchy here. Then, a group had gone. Well, first the children went, following, the families could not stand their absence, the families went. I mean Ankara had decreased much in that way; but I mean there is in Istanbul and such a big community, of course, I guess 20.000 people more or less, I mean I don't know the exact number, in Izmir it is around 2000. In Ankara it was already small. Some of them have moved to Istanbul, I mean most of them have decided to stay in Istanbul; there was a decrease in that way. Depending on that... [Why Istanbul] I guess, to search out better life conditions, in terms of

occupational conditions I mean, we have more opportunity in Istanbul compared to Ankara; they preferred because of this ... There is no other reason!

N.E's (1957, Jew, M, University) narrative, gives a broader view on the migrating groups from Ankara:

Well, that's difficult [to estimate the reasons] but, I usually interpret in this way, now an important part of the emigrants, there was a poor group, we did not know them much however. My estimation is that they lived around the Synagogue, the reason, for them to go, is obvious; I mean as the economic conditions in Turkey got worse, as the unemployment had increased, they found a new way out for themselves. Because [in Israel] they were giving buildings [to the newcomers], indeed; that's why they went. It was natural for them to go, in my opinion. ... Another group, I guess, was the bankrupt traders, who went. I know some going in that way... Besides, I mean some large scale traders moved to Istanbul from Ankara; because the working environment, it was a bit more appropriate there. ... There were also people who went [to Israel] for university education, those were the years whereby entering to the universities got harder. ... I don't know any other. ... If you ask me, the poor had left mostly, I mean proportionally; others, on the other hand, had done what they had to do regarding to business concerns; I mean they moved to Istanbul, they left for Israel and so. That's I mean, there might sure be people going with the idea of "Home, Nation, Sakarya" [Vatan, Millet, Sakarya!], "my home is there" but at least I do not know those.

The bankrupt traders -most probably bankrupt due to the capital levy- the university students, and the poor had migrated to Israel; while the large-scale tradesmen to Istanbul. The push factors, in this narrative, are articulated in relation to the general economic and educational conditions in Turkey. L.N.'s (1924, Jew, M, University) narrative, however, emphasizes, more specifically, on the 'differentialist practices' towards non-Muslim citizens, in general, and towards Jewish citizens, in particular:

Not many have stayed in Ankara. There were around 100 families those times [before 1948], as far as I remember. Currently, they say, 16-17 Jewish families live in Ankara. Most of them have left. Many, who were not well-off, have left for Israel, at the time of establishment. I know that period well. Not many have stayed behind, all have fled. Most of them have fled to Istanbul. Those who have a bit recovered economically, or who could transfer his business went to Istanbul. The poor... And the youngsters also, they had gone with their fathers. [The ones who went to Israel] were many and were mostly the young ones. For instance, I have met with the ones who went closely, because then the clever Israeli state sought for the younger ones. New in the establishment process, they did not want the ill. Thus, they wanted the people to be inspected, and I did this inspection for years. These young boys, I mean to seek a new future there, for sure, they went. There was such a period I mean, it was a voluntary service. I did. It lasted perhaps two or three years. When it was the elderly they [the Israeli state], for sure, they were too watchful. [Was it economic reasons?] For sure, for sure. ... I mean the establishment of the Republic. What were the conditions of the non-Muslims at the establishment years? Of course, a state, being established upon the collapse of an empire. The first tendency predominated in the Republic, lets say, was nationalism. Yet was it harsh nationalism. That's why, for instance it was not easy for a non-Muslim to be a state officer. I mean it was possible for the doctors and

such perhaps but, for the well-educated only; I have never known a high school graduate state officer. I knew, however, an engineer, for example...

A more personal reflection of N.E (1957, Jew, M, University), moreover, makes the meanings attributed to 'home' more clear. His narrative is striking in pointing to the operation of 'ethnic identity' as a social constraint (Barth, 1969).

No, my family never thought of [migrating to Israel]; I don't remember such thing to be an issue at home. Because, we, indeed, feel ourselves belong here. I mean, there are occasions we feel different, ...my mother would emphasis those things more often, I mean she would say 'these are not like us in terms of this and this'; but I mean this is the feeling of sameness, I mean I can be different, but anyway anywhere I go people wouldn't be so heterogeneous. I mean I certainly belong here; there is no reason for me to be there; and more so if I think through the conditions I have currently, there is no tiny reason for me to be in Israel. I mean I could live in America very easily, in Europe very easily... I went once to Israel, I wouldn't go there, I mean why a person should go somewhere at the middle of war, I don't feel in other terms... I would not want, also, to live in Arabic countries, it is clear, because there that "bias", that bloody "bias" will be there; I mean not categorically so, but there is the strongest probability to be so. I wouldn't like North Africa because of the same reason; I wouldn't like Israel because of the same reason. I mean there shall not be such a "bias". Moreover, there are many countries in Europe and world in general that did not go further away from the mentality of Turkish Republic; I wouldn't like them, either. ... I am still aware that I "operate" here the best. I mean if you say me 'go and live in America', I can, but there I can not "operate" that comfortable I guess. I do it here the best. ... I mean here is the place I am most familiar with. So if it is to feel home, of course I feel here home, I mean, it is natural. But those kinds of uneasiness always do happen. ... This [the discriminative attitudes], I guess, does not disturb people who have chosen to stay here, people like us. We, indeed, do not have a place to go, if you think, where I shall go now for example, I mean if I think that here is not mine. This is my way out; I mean thinking in that way. Where will be my place? Let me think as a more conscious people that they do not want me here, where will I go? But I do not think in that way; I mean, I think it is not so, because with people, I mean with enough people I have got in contact and I know that people do not "predominantly" think so.

'Home' becomes somewhere practical and familiar in N.E.'s words; it gets rid of all nationalistic connotations. Such reflection, moreover, makes itself appear in his articulations of 'Turkish identity' since he asserts that he calls himself "Turk", but in order to put a reservation to the "different connotations" of the term, he would prefer to call himself as "being from Turkey" ["Turkiyeli"]. He states, moreover, "if otherwise, if it is Turkish citizenship, I mean if citizens of Turkish Republic are called 'Turk' I am of course a Turk, clearly". At such a conclusion, seemingly, there is the affect of cultural, social and symbolic capitals, together with a loose communitarian-religious identification.

Drawing on the last emphasis of N.E, which is on citizenship, I will turn now to the last reference of identity as it appeared in the narratives of the subjects of the current study: Citizenship.

6.3. CITIZENSHIP

As Üstel pointed, Turkish Citizenship, from its early definition on, has demarked not only the legal and political relation between the state and the individual, but also a position, which depends on a systematic of devotion-sacrifice-submission (2004: 142). I have tried to refer some of the elements revealing the perception and articulation of such systematic in the previous part, on ‘national identity’. To understand the former dimension, the legal and political relation between the state and the individual, however, it is necessary to look at the sites, as they emerged in the narratives, whereby minority citizens encounter the state.

6.3.1. Reflections on the Citizenship Position

I have already pointed to the position of ‘Turkish minority citizenship’ as it was defined to be “limited”, “conditional” and “at the margin” (Parla, 1995) and to the “differentialist citizenship practices” which laid the ground for such a definition (Yeğen, 2004). Such position leads, without doubt, a tension in the perception and practice of citizenship for the minorities. One example of such tension was articulated by ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Primary Sch.) within a framework of comparison, between the citizenship positions of her relatives who have emigrated to European countries from Turkey and of the minorities in Turkey, in the below words:

They have more freedom. They are viewed as fully French citizens. We, too, are so on the paper, but we are treated as minorities. There are many deputies who had gone at our time; Turkish origin deputies in Germany, in Belgium, in France. ... I would like to study very much, but I couldn't. My brother and sister said ‘we can't afford your education’, they said ‘you can't be a state officer anyway’. At that time, you couldn't be a state officer, still you can't. I watched on screen recently, an Armenian journalist have said, openly, that a non-Muslim cannot be a soldier; I mean of course we do military service, our youngsters do their military service, but as a job they can't be, can't be a state officer. ... It means there is no trust to the ones who are not Muslim. They don't accept us as Turk, but the foreigners call us Turks. They have the idea that a Turk would be Muslim. We got used to it anymore. ... They have documented on Gagauz Turks on TV. They are Christians indeed. Their Turkish is bad but they are accepted as Turks.

Above narrative makes it clear that rights and duties of citizenship, constraints of minority position, and perception of national identity cannot, indeed, be separated from each other in the experiences of the narrators. '1's reference to being disallowed full citizens by the 'treatment as minority' is an indicator of differentialist citizenship practices; and these practices seem to have a 'real life consequence' for her educational life. On the other hand, still, there appears a claim on 'Turkishness', at least more than the 'Gagauz Turks', in reference to language abilities.

It could be argued that, in line with the general representation and practice of citizenship as "a duty-based-passive identity" (İçduygu and Kaygusuz, 2004) in Turkey, the subjects of this study, too, understood 'citizenship', mostly, in references to rights and responsibilities, the latter pointing paying taxes, performing military service and voting, while the former the equal rights. There were only two cases where the 'right to complaint' was asserted in relation to the citizenship position; one (N.E., 1957, Jew, M, University) claiming that he was utilizing this right extremely, the other (V.T., 1943, Greg.Arm, M, University) complaining that his 'religious identity' often impeded him to utilize this right. However, even in other narratives both sides of the rights-duties formulation appeared to be problematic.

To get the respondents' reflection on their position as citizens a question formulated as "Do you think you can utilize the rights you have as a citizen? Please tell, if 'yes' how; if 'no' why you cannot utilize" was posed in the questionnaire. The answers were revealing. While some affirmed the question stating, "I pay tax, I do military service, we take charge at the state offices" (N.P, 1957, Cath.Arm., M, University); others put some reservations to their answers.

T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F, University) have pointed to the differentialist citizenship practices:

Not all. In civil life, I utilize my rights just like all citizens. I make use of health services as everyone. I pay my tax, I vote; even if I have the right to choose, I don't have the right to be chosen. There is a special treatment at the military. The last person at the parliament from my "community" was at the period of Atatürk!

E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M, High Sch.), on the other hand, noted down that:

I want to answer this question stating both yes and no. For sure, there are some rights we have got, and we utilize them. But whatever you say, some things experienced in the past, makes you hesitate what or whom you will trust in what way. I mean you continue your life a bit fearing and in suppressed feelings. That's why I suppose there are very few non-Muslims who will not obey the rules.

Interestingly, the 'lack of trust', appearing as directed towards minorities in the previous narrative, turned, in this narrative, to be directed towards the majority society. It becomes clear that to perceive 'citizenship' as an individual matter is always difficult for the minority groups and it, drawing constantly on the minority identity, is experienced on an 'insecure' ground.

The psychology led by such insecure position affects, obviously, the decisions people make. S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm, F, High Sch.) recollected an incident whereby this psychology comes to fore:

A family friend of us had got married to a Muslim lady, and she was about to become the manager at work, then I don't know which government period was it, but since it was learnt that she was married to an Arm...a Christian she was charged in the warehouse. And there she had to retire. I heard...I mean this is not something I haven't heard; at last he is a very close family elder; we used to hear this kind of things. Therefore, we were always a step backwards; how to say, I mean I never was stubborn to break and do it... I mean I didn't try...In case I can face such a ... Because you will make an effort, you will work hard, everything will be okay but only because of this reason you have to get one step backwards; this is not something one can accept ["içine sindirmek"]. Unfortunately, there are these kinds of attitudes.

We know that denial of access to dominant institutions has an effect on identity in that "populations have to find alternative solutions to life problems, repercussion of which will vary according to the 'variety of capitals' the population has" (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 169). Accordingly, it appeared during the study that such experience or even the probability of discrimination was effective in people's direction towards occupations, which they could achieve through communitarian relations. This was especially so for the first generation, and though made itself appear, mostly, in the 'decision' to continue the education or not -to which I will turn in the next chapter- there were still cases where such denial had role in the

construction of communitarian identity. L.N. (1924, Jew, M, University) recollected one such example:

I was graduated at Istanbul Medicine Faculty in 1947 ... And I looked for a job, I couldn't find a job. Nobody was giving me a job, or there was no job, it was difficult. ...And just after I was graduated, we have lost my father; I had to work ... I can't say one by one, but according to the notes I have taken, almost sixty job application. This is after 1951, after graduating I have taken my expertise and in 1951 started to look fore a job, no job. Everywhere, to hospitals, wherever; because having your own clinic, it was difficult. One of these jobs was the most interesting, I mean the role of religion, I didn't believe it then, but the elders used to inculcate so, well "since we are of a different religion we are treated differently", they used to say so. I could never believe this; *I was so Turkist; I was so Turk*. How to say, I never was related to religion. Nevertheless, I have finally found a cadre, because I have learnt about a cadre that would be freed before it was freed. Staff at the [...] Bank. There are three doctors in the [...] Bank, I have learnt that one would... I applied. I have also a ["tanidik"] in the Bank. Despite this, I was rejected. Then, I was shaken for the first time. Because, it was always "we don't have a free staff", you would believe it; ... I said "you have a staff that would be freed, it would be freed in a four day; I am applying for that staff". Then I was rejected being told "we have already recruited someone there". Annd! The one, who was recruited, was a Tatar girl, who was a student when I was having my expertise; she was recruited. For sure, these were very weighty at that age; I was in a condition not knowing what to do. Because I needed a job, I had lost my father, subsistence for us was difficult, we were not rich, we were never rich.

Despite L.N's illuminative example, civil service appeared to be somewhat less problematical for the Jewish narrators. N.E. (1957, Jew, M, University), who is an academician at a state university, for example, stated that there was "no such problem", and it was not only a privilege provided by universities, or a matter of generations. He supported his claim pointing that both his father and grandfather were also state officers -the former being an engineer at a state institution and the latter an accountant at a/the state bank- and that they did not also face any discrimination achieving this position.

For the second generation of the Armenian community, also, the perception about being employed as a state officer seems to have changed in the light of the examples where a relative or an acquaintance has become a civil servant. I was informed about persons, who were teachers, were working at the then not prioritized banks or academicians. Despite these cases were few in number, the perception they have led to is an important one. Accordingly, second generation's reflection, on the probability of their children being a state officer, was focused more on 'rational' calculations. Here the "life guarantee" or the "certain degree of life standard" that

civil service will provide were given as reasons for them to wish their children become state officers. On a similar ground, the reason that the state officers “don’t have the opportunity of progressing at their occupations; they always stay the same” was articulated as an explanation for the reluctance for their children to be state officers.

Such a generational affect, for sure, should be viewed within the broader legal-political framework in the country. We know that 1926 Law of “State Officers” [“Memurin Kanunu”] which laid the condition for being a state officer as “being Turkish”, was abandoned in 1965 and the condition was redefined as “being Turkish citizen” (Aktar, 2004: 119-120). Thus, it is understandable that due to the absence of a legal prohibition there were cases whereby non-Muslim minorities could become state officers.¹³² Still, though, this legal condition should be approached in caution since it was a common assertion, in the narratives, that not every office was ‘open’ to the non-Muslims in practice. This could, probably, be understood in reference to the argument that “there is a remarkable correlation between the different levels of state apparatus and different degrees of Turkishness; indicating a gap between the categories of Turkish citizenship and Turkishness” (Yeğen, 2004: 56).

6.3.2. Representation, Elections and Voting

Being aware of the broad framework the above subtitle denotes I will try in this part only to point some of the findings of the study; since I believe this is necessary for us to grasp the perceived positions of the subject groups by their members. This position will be about the political representation here. It is apparent that election in itself is not a sufficient condition for political representation, though still a necessary one. Though still, voting is usually argued to provide one of the richest sources of

¹³² Bali states that for the professional military cadres, during World War II the military academies set forth “being of the Turkish race” as an eligibility requirement for admission; whereas as of 1945 non-Muslims could be admitted to military academies, and they began to be recruited to the professional cadres of the Turkish military (2000 quoted in Toktaş, 2005a: 406). Yumul, also, asserts that in 1947 following Prime Minister Recep Peker’s statement that “the idea of considering the Christians second class citizens is part of history now...and if in our legislation there are anti-minority provisions they will be amended”, members of the minorities were allowed to serve in the army as reserve officers, whereas in the past they had been able to serve only as privates (Yumul, 1992: 72).

information about the interaction between individuals, society and politics (Heywood, 1997: 221-223). In sociology, voting behavior is linked to group membership; and social alignment is understood to reflect the various divisions and tensions within society, ethnicity and religion being among the most important ones (Heywood, 1997: 225).

Studies on the minority groups in Turkey showed that transition from one-party to multi-party period in the political era was of crucial importance in terms of the alignments of minority groups. Bali (1998) and Yumul (1992), similarly, argued that the Democratic Party coming to power in 1950 was able to harvest the votes of the non-Muslim minority groups promising equality and freedom and by advocating a policy of moderate nationalism. Karpat suggested, moreover, that 'Istanbul, which had the largest number of minorities, became one of the strongholds of the Democratic Party' (1959 quoted in Yumul, 1992: 72). This support is usually explained as a consequence of the Turkification policies, and especially as a protest of the Capital Levy imposed by the ruling RPP (Akar, 2000 quoted in Toktaş, 2005a).

In relation to the representation, moreover, it is stated that while there were already non-Muslim deputies in the Assembly during the 1930s (Yumul, 1992: 70); the number of non-Muslim deputies in Parliament rose under DP rule (Toktaş, 2005a: 405). However, from the 1960s on, no non-Muslim deputy has been elected to the Assembly, among the causes of which are stated the substantial decrease in the number of non-Muslims and their self-isolation from the political life of Turkey (Yumul, 1992; Toktaş, 2005a).

In order to get a view on the issue, I have asked, both during the interviews and in the questionnaires, to whom their parents (and for the first generation themselves) voted for; and if they thought they were represented in the parliament or not. I have also asked if they were thinking for the necessity of a political leader or a party that would represent the religio-ethnic communities of them.

In line with the above assertions, it was apparent that in both the Armenian and the Jewish community the main pattern, in 1950s, was to vote for the DP until 1960 and for AP then. It was also recurrently stated that it was mostly not to vote for “the leftist parties” but for “the rightist parties”. There were, no doubt, exceptions to this general pattern. In these cases, the RPP was pointed as being “Atatürk’s party” or a “modern party”. Voting patterns of the first generation, however, seems to have affected directly at the last governmental election in the face of the strongest alternative JDP [“AKP”]. Some first generation narrators have stressed that though they have usually voted for the rightist parties say for Homelands Party [“ANAP”], in the last election they have voted for RPP. A general voting pattern for the recent elective periods, however, cannot be pointed for and it appears that individual preferences account in the elections “according to the day’s conditions”. K.G.’s (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch., Tailor) narrative was a good example of this:

They didn’t vote for a leftist party. I, for example, I vote for every party. I don’t vote for the same party twice. Always to a different one. And now it is the JDP period, when it was for it, I decided not to vote, I would seal all the parties and let [the vote] be invalid. But since [...] put forward his candidacy for the JDP, I voted for JDP and made all my family to do so. Well, why so, because I have never had a benefit from the others, but my benefit from [...] was that I sewed dresses for him, I got my money, I have earned my bread at least.

An important narrative, which reflects upon the reasons for the voting patterns of the first generation, belongs to N.E. (1957, Jew, M, University):

My father used to vote for the RPP. ... As far as I remember from my family, there was a split between the Democratic [Party] and RPP. I mean, mostly, the ones dealing with trade liked the Democratic Party, then the Justice Party, and then they liked Özal very much; there was always such a split. The ones dealing with trade, but now the numbers are very small so that “sample” is not valid. Still, that was wholly, the reason was wholly economical. Because usually the things encouraging the small traders came at that period, I mean the taxes were reduced and so. I mean it was mostly because of “short-term reasoning”. ... Not ideological. The otherwise is also habitual, I guess; for example, my father voting for the RPP was also habitual, I guess. That is the educated would vote for the RPP; the ignorant would to DPP; that was so. I mean the ignorant, the illiterate, and the tricksters who would exploit them would vote it, and so.

N.E.’s narrative points to the different voting patterns within the Jewish community in terms, mostly, of the cultural and economic capital, and in terms of occupational patterns.

Since my aim in asking the questions about voting habits of the first generation was due, mostly, to understand if the general pattern among the minorities in Turkey, emerged in the two-party period, was reflected also among the Ankara minorities; the questions were not directed towards the second generation. And the answer of my inquiry was affirmative.

Moreover, the most recurrent emphasis, both the first and the second generation narrators and respondents made, was that they voted every election definitely. This could be understood, partly, due to their attempt to be represented and to have a word in the general political era of the country. To come to the point whether they thought they were represented in this political era, the answers were mostly oscillating. They alternated between “we are represented in proportion to our votes”, on the one hand; and “we are not represented” on the other. On the latter account E.K (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Primary Sch.) asserted that:

We don't think we have a word in the governance of the country. We are not considered. There were a few deputies at the time of the September 6-7th, from then on there isn't. ... We don't need a leader. There is the Armenian Catholic Cardinal Bishopric in Istanbul. The religious leader of the Armenian Catholics in Turkey, he has the highest word. Mostly for the ones in Istanbul. ... We don't want a party. It wouldn't work anyway.

There were also narratives, moreover, which implied that representation could not be thought separately from the overall problems of the political system. T.T (1968, Greg.Arm., F, University) have stated that:

Even if there were a leader or a party, I don't think something will change. First, there should be a change in some minds. Let there be a proper party that will govern the country, it is not important for it to represent me. The system is corrupt.

The most revealing narratives, however, were articulated in relation to the attitude about being candidate for the elections, both the local and the governmental. There were not a single case of such candidacy in both the Armenian and the Jewish communities. The reasons stated for this were as following. S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.) stated that:

There was never such a thing for our groups. ...First of all, there is the need for more education, but as I have said there were mostly craftsmen, the masters all around; I mean the people both my father and I know were artisans. They were not people who have completed

their education, associate professors or so; there were no such people. And when my father had recollected about the past deputies and so, he always told them to be more cultured people. I guess, it was because of this; neither in Istanbul was felt the necessity of such candidacy and being elected, nor in Ankara there was such thing as far as I know.

Though S.O. stated the reason in relation to education, her point in the “lack of such necessity” even in Istanbul, seems to be indicating another dimension of the matter. A discourse on “necessity” or “need” was a recurrent one indeed. The respondents of the questionnaires, for example, also have noted down that “we didn’t feel a necessity for it”, “we never thought of it” or “we don’t have relations to such things much”. The reason was in some cases more expressed “we don’t have such a right”.

The apparent abstention in these answers was also pointed by ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F, Primary Sch.): “There was no such thing. There is an abstention among the Christians, thinking that we would not be preferred. Everybody lives in his own world”.

The abstention from ‘politics’ appears to be a norm within the minority communities; and despite the high cultural, symbolic and economic capitals persons have, the norm seems to have an affect, though its degree could be discussed. N.E’s (1957, Jew, M, University) words are a good example of this:

I mean no, I have not thought of it, because I have always had inculcation indeed, there was always the inculcation of the elders: “no such things!” My parents were concerned about such things indeed, they warned me “don’t be at the forefront much!” ... I, also, did not think of such a thing, to tell the truth, I am not the person of it. I had such chances, but I did not want.

In some narratives the oscillating language pointed clearly the tension between being citizen, being represented and being minority. A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M, Primary Sch. left) collected such a narrative:

No, No. ... Now there is not such thing anyway. The Christians such a thing ... In the past there were Christian deputies at the parliament, now there isn’t. There were also Jewish deputies, Armenian deputies, Catholics, Mus... There were some denominations, those Kurds, don’t know the Dersim Kurds and so, Atatürk had collected them all to the parliament; there were those, there were deputies at the time of Atatürk, now no one. Now there are Muslims and nothing else. I mean that’s why neither in municipalities, nor any other... Perhaps there are, they say in Istanbul Sisli municipality ... the one was Armenian or what. ... Well, what I will say, there are, but we should here manage ourselves. Since we are normal men, we the politics and so; we ‘lets make the day go’ [“biz bugün karnımızı

doyuralım”], now the government, it shall raise our salaries and we will spend them. Nothing else I know. ... For sure, we are also Turkish citizens; our words, too, should be listened to. ...I mean all... If this home is ours we will all work here, all with our effort, with our thing, we will work.

In the above narrative, ‘politics’ emerges, most probably in the light of the discourses on the ‘untrustworthiness’ of the minorities as ‘native foreigners’, as a staff that “normal men” would not be involved in. Engaging in politics, apparently, had negative connotations, but its salience had somewhat a relation, I will argue, to the capitals one had. The less the education, the lower the class and the less the social networks, the more the identity became a factor of ‘blame’, or at least something to be ‘defended’ in the appearance of ‘other’.

Another interesting narrative interwoven into an undecided language appeared in K.G.’s (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch.) words:

For whichever position I am candidate now, I will gain. I was once the administrator at the apartment. Similar at the workplace, I will gain it. [Candidacy at local elections?] Well, since our society loves entertainment a bit, it wouldn’t like such a staff necessitating responsibility. I mean if I am the headman now, I will have duties, won’t I; so long as to do that, I will go somewhere for a visit, I will go out. ... [A party] to represent the Christians? No need for such a thing; I wish if only, in such a Muslim country, they would charge me in the parliament, what more I shall wish for! ... There were once the deputies. ... But now, to be a candidate you will either be a man whose word is paid attention to in the party, or you will have money, there will be something. ... Now you will ask if there is no non-Muslim who has money. But well, then, it means they don’t want to be involved in politics.

The context whereby the above narrative was articulated should be pointed here. K.G. stated the first sentences to point the reason why he would not, currently, prefer migrating to another country. He stated that “if I am a candidate I will be elected, why should I go”. Such connection established between the probability of ‘having power’ -it seems to be K.G.’s perception of the post he mentions- and preference to stay, or at least being easy with the situation of having been stayed -recalling back that K.G. once wanted to migrate to Australia but could not- might be viewed as pointing to a ground whereby minorities would feel ‘belonging’: being able to take role in the undertakings of society as an ordinary member of that society. The undecided character of the language in the flow of narrative appears in the following. K.G. explains, on the one hand, the abstention of minorities in being candidates at local elections as their preference of entertainment pointing their distance to the idea

of taking responsibility instead. On the other hand, he yearns to be a deputy in the 'Muslim country' as a 'Christian' with the implication that it would be appreciation of his 'equal' status as a member of the political society. These two seemingly contradictory statements, I suggest, are not actually contradictory when a previous narrator stating "we would not be preferred even if we are candidates", is called back. This idea was so common among the narrators that being involved in politics was perceived naturally as something minorities would abstain from. This, inescapably, was a reflection of another perception that the ground for being an equal member was not yet there for minorities in Turkey. At this point, turning to the narratives recollected on the European Union integration process is important to see how these perceptions are affected in relation to this framework.

6.3.3. Reflections on the European Union Integration Process

We know that the debates on minority rights and the non-Muslim minority groups in Turkey have augmented in relation to the EU integration process. Starting, mainly, with the 1993 Copenhagen summit of the EU Council -which set out the protection of minorities for the accession of candidate states as a 'sine qua non' condition; and amplifying with the monitoring of Turkey's progress in protecting minorities by the EU Commission from 1998 on (Toktaş, 2005a)- the debates are continuing within the legal, political, intellectual grounds, finding their reflections also in the media. It is previously noted that Turkey's European Union integration process is evaluated by some to be one of the two revolutions in relation to the identity definitions in the country -the other being the establishment of the republican regime in 1923 (Oran, 2005a). In this framework, it is important to look at the reflections of minorities on the EU integration process, to see their expectations of the process and their projections on the related future developments. To this point, I have already pointed to some positive reflections on the probable integration of Turkey into the EU, as they appeared in the earlier narratives within different frameworks. At this point, I will turn to the narratives which were collected in the face of the questions "What do you think about the EU integration process"; and "If the integration is completed what kinds of changes do you expect in Turkey". It is still important to note that the

manner narratives were articulated revealed more than simply the answers to these questions. They were articulated in a flowing, continuous, and uninterrupted sequel leading an implication that the narrators were intensely related to the ongoing developments on the issue, and they were already decided what to expect out of the process.

One set of narratives, in this context, emphasized nothing but the supposed positive consequences of integrating into the European Union. Although there was a constant reference to economical benefits, the main expectation appeared to be ‘the change in the minds of people’. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M, High Sch. left) asserted below:

Well, first of all our country will develop in my opinion; we will overcome many taboos; always will be directed towards the good; what, for instance, if you ask, we will be more respectful to each other; we will obey the rules more; we won't spit at the street; we won't throw away the cigarette ...

A similar statement belonged to A.İ. (1953, Greg.Arm., M, University):

Turkey will be at a much better position. ... If integrated, I am sure, as much as it can, the minds of people will be more positive; in the social, economical and the cultural areas higher degrees will be reached.

The same emphasis on the would-change attitudes of people were tied, in N.P.'s (1957, Cath.Arm., M, University) note, to the would-be-increased levels of ‘culture and conscious’:

We need to get in. Raising up the cultural level and making people more conscious is beneficial for every society. ... There will be more investments. The investment will remove unemployment. The prices won't rise. The income levels will rise.

Identification with ‘civility’, ‘culture’, ‘economic development’, and with the EU, as the waited for agent to achieve these, is apparent in the above narratives. Here, the implication is clear: ‘we’ are not civilized enough and integration to EU will be significant to achieve it. What is not that clear, however, is the definition of this ‘uncivilized we’. Though drawing on the same parameters with the above, the below narratives, moreover, give some clues on this ‘we’. A.T (1923, Cath.Arm., M, Primary Sch. left) collected his reflection on the integration to EU as following:

It is really good if it realizes. Because, why it is good, we say it is really... But I guess we will also ruin ["batırırız"] it too. The case we did in Germany, it is the same. I mean we don't know the thing [attitude] properly my daughter. I mean, that is we have many jobless people out ["boş gezen"]. Forgive me, we have many vagabonds. I don't know, there they might be too, I don't say there isn't, there is but... Otherwise, really we shall get into the European Union. Must! Because why: if we get into European Union the economy will be better ["işler açılacak"], from there to here; look they say Russia does not buy vegetables from us because of a fly. ... Really, our Turkey was once selling crops to the world. Now we buy crops outside, don't we? We buy crops. That's why we should get into the European Union. ... That is, I will go there to work; they will come here to work; then our houses... they will buy here, perhaps I will go and buy there; now they are buying, there are many coming to Turkey from Europe, say summer resorts from don't know where... this will be good, I mean there will be expansion, everyone could go freely. I will to ...Germany, to France, to Spain as if going to Ulus; they will come here. At least their money will come to us, ours to them. We presume some changes in terms of this currency. I mean it will be good, in my opinion it will be good.

A.T. seems to mention the migrants to Germany, the 'vagabonds', and the jobless people as the bearers of this 'uncivilized' manner. With a possible over interpretation it could be argued that the expression 'we' simultaneously contains an implication of the 'other'. And the meanings attributed to the EU come to point the meanings attributed to the line between 'us' and 'them' in terms of communitarian identifications. Still, however, there is the discourse on the 'good of the country' as an encompassing whole. In the below narrative, too, the line makes itself evident. K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Primary Sch.) stated in relation to the EU integration that:

If it would make a good for the country, let them get in. But I am getting angry with this: that's some mistakes our society has. I say let's not be ashamed against the European Union, I mean as the Turkish nation, let them not take us and let us be not ashamed. ... It is because my daughter: I am waiting to cross the street, waiting for the [traffic] lamps, it is red, ... there is 20 seconds, 15 seconds left for it [to turn to green]... a gentle man and a lady beside, holding at hand a child, try to get across in a hurry...If you ask they would turn to be university graduates! The lady wore up smartly, beautiful, the man is handsome...I mean why is he getting across hurrying up when there is 15 seconds left, and there the automobiles are coming, ...I am getting very angry. That's why I mean, not to be ashamed, otherwise I am at this age, what if we integrate, what if we not.

K.G.'s narrative on EU seems to be one utilized, more, to point to the 'other'. This time it is the people in 'our society', who do not obey even the simplistic rules. While, on the one hand, EU becomes a 'high reference' in the face of which there is danger to be 'ashamed'; there is, on the other hand, a more 'nationalistic' attempt in this argument: to protect the proud of the nation. Thus, the 'good' of the country, the

uncivilized ‘other’, the image of the ‘highly prestigious EU’, are all interwoven in the narrative in an oscillating manner.

Another indicator of the ‘other’ within ‘us’ appears to be ‘uneducatedness’ in E.Ş.’s (1963, Cath.Arm. M, High Sch.), narrative below, which retains the reference-image of compelling EU and the discourse on the ‘benefits of our country’. E.Ş.’s narrative is important, also, in pointing the integration as a process rather than a fait accompli:

I don’t believe such thing will be realized before at least 15-20 years. ... Still yet, even its name seems to have provided for some changes to be realized. But the major dissimilarity of us is the uneducatedness. I suppose it is very difficult to overcome this discrepancy. People may not anyway respect for others, without, first, respecting themselves. If we could succeed the 70 out of a 100 that they laid before us as musts, with the idea that we will get into the European Union one day; it will be very beneficial for our country even if we don’t get into the union. This is, in my opinion, will be the thing they also try to do for us anyway.

To this point, the image of the EU has emerged as a wholeheartedly believed and a liable one. Though there was no direct reference to the ‘benefits’ in terms of minorities, it is understood that the overall advances in economic, social, cultural arenas, which are believed to be realized with the integration, are identified with; and there is the implied expectation that the perceived position of minorities will be enhanced in this way. Though there were also narratives, whereby the attitude of EU towards Turkey was criticized for its “insincerity” within a framework of enthusiastic belief in “Turkey’s capacity”, the referred problems and the expectations seemed not to have differed. T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F, University) stated that:

I think that the EU is not sincere. I think that it puts Turkey off, totally for its profits. I believe Turkey can reach those levels without being integrated to the EU. Turkey has that potential; if it is only for sufficient education, and honesty. ... [If integrated] I believe there will be many changes socially. Our people do not take a step in some cases if they are not enforced. If, for these developments to take place, there is a need for a shrew “EU” [“eli sopalı AB”], let it be. Otherwise, we cannot make some people understand. We are a very conscientious country, but live very irregularly [“başına buyruk”]. The simplest is the traffic. Go out into the traffic, look, everybody applies its own rules. We don’t know to respect other people. I suppose there will be an order in our lives; but it is certain that we won’t go further economically.

A more reflective narrative on the issue of minorities is articulated by N.E. (1957, Jew, M, University), whereby ‘the symbolic status’ of EU regarding the values of human rights and equality is appreciated; but, simultaneously, its mystified image as

an all-pervading power is broken down and it is comprehended through its heterogeneity:

I believe in the process of EU integration; I believe in the process itself. Indeed, it is not perhaps important whether we got into European Union or not; ... if you live the process properly then the benefit will come up. But the process, I mean it is necessary to look at the meaning of the content; stating to do it properly does not imply to do what they say. That is to understand the “key points” and to develop behavioral patterns or to take precautions accordingly. Doing this properly, I believe, will speed up that process [the mutual understanding of different ethno-religious groups and integration] in Turkey, that’s why it is positive. But whether integrating into the European Union will be that positive in economic terms, I am not so sure about that. ... The Europeans have too many double standards, especially on the issue of minorities. ... They have not “resolved” it yet. The best is France. Netherlands stirs up the religious discrimination; Netherlands is a place where nationalistic discrimination is stirred up. ... [But] the political criteria are different, they should be discussed differently. Development of humanity; not discrimination of religious, racial, linguistic differences; equal application of law; the more we adapt, the more it is positive. ... Let’s live the process and when it is the day, I wish they would have asked us, whether you want to get in or not. Perhaps we will say no.

What is important in the above narrative, for our purposes, is that it reflects the integrating process as an enabling one regarding the multi ethnic, religious and linguistic structure of the society in general. Moreover, EU appears not to be a magical but to be a practical tool in this target if only it is utilized willingly and rationally.

The most interesting narratives on the integration into EU, however, came to be woven in a more complicated language. S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F, High Sch.) has articulated that:

I expect something not in terms minorities, but in terms of what it will bring for Turkey. There is only one thing I want, wholeheartedly; ... I think a lot why I have become to this situation while I could live on without begging for. ... Because Turkey, okay, we could seemingly be small in economic terms compared to other countries according to the statistics and so; but, I would like to close all my borders, give me a five years, I, as a Turk, will work and overwhelm all, I won’t yearn anyone for money; if only you don’t bring discord into [“nifak sokmayın”].

The above narrative, collected through connotations of ‘dependence vs. independence’, ‘hard working and the power of the Turk’, could be read in reference to the ‘nationalist’ discourse. However, the genuine intention behind such language, I will argue, is the omnipresent focus on ‘integration’ and ‘being a part’ of the minority groups, in this case the Armenian group, into the larger society, the disputes

to which are implied to exist because of the ‘exterior forces’. This discourse of ‘being a part’ is apparent also in S.O.’s emphasis that her expectation is not in relation to the minorities, but to the whole society. Indeed, a similar emphasis existed in some other narratives as they appeared above, though it was not this explicit and usually was prevailed over by a discourse on the ‘other’.

One set of multiple-identifications appeared in the reflections on EU belonged to L.N (1924, Jew, M, University). I will point a part of his narrative to indicate this multiplicity:

The non-Muslims would want it ... because the conditions of European Union are more democratic, more modern, and this is something all the non-Muslims would like to. There will be less discrimination; I mean, take the simplistic example, it is forbidden in Europe to state the religion in the identity cards. At least in France it is so. ... Because you can change your name but what will you do with your identity card, there is stated your religion. ... That’s why getting into European Union is something all the non-Muslims would like to. ... But it is a different issue if it is right or wrong for Turkey, and it should be at stage of the state. ... It is important if you believe in the way taken now, and the policies of the current government. ... It is necessary to believe that it will accept us into. If I had a word in the European Union, I would not let Turkey in, for once. To get enter into the EU, first of all, my words shall not be misunderstood, it is necessary to be fitted [“layık olmak lazım”] for it. To be fit means not only to know the rules, but also to adopt them. Turkey does not have maturity yet, in my opinion. In terms of equality. The simple is, in terms of the equality of women. A country where the equality of women is not accepted, how it can claim to enter into EU. Is not covering women’s head to limit their freedom? Because it is because the men want it to be so, otherwise, not because voluntary. Perhaps there are volunteers, because if, from the childhood on, goes to the Koran Courses, this is what happens; but otherwise because the men want it ... In these conditions what is the place of Turkey in the European Union. Personally, I am for it; I would like Turkey to enter but it is also necessary to be fitted for it. ... I don’t believe this government will enter into the EU. Neither, to that they would take. They deceive. Or else they want to take such a government only on conditions of special status and so. ... It is only to exploit Turkey, a way for it. ... Today, for example, they are the ones who profit from the Customs Union. Today in Turkey agriculture is dropping off; you cannot seed cotton, they say you cannot exceed the certain limits. As a matter of fact, today Turkey, the country which exported wheat now imports wheat. ... This brings us gradually to become a colony. ... Well, we did not grow up like this, besides “Speak Turkish!” we grew up through assertion “use home product!” [“yerli malı kullan”]. Using European commodities was almost shameful. Now it is completely different ... I want to enter into European Union, but it is not possible with this government. ... If we enter perhaps, we could gain what we have lost in the recent years. But for this Europe should adopt Atatürkist Republic. Now they made up something like ‘Global Islam’, they go on with this. It means their intention is bad. ... In these conditions, it is not for the benefit of Turkey, it would be weakening of Turkey gradually.

The sequel of narrative was made up of statements on “globalization”, “Atatürkist nationalism”, “laicism/secularism”, “Cyprus Turks”, “Orthodox claims in Istanbul”, “Koran courses”, “religion classes” and so on. L.N’s narrative made clear, on the one

hand, his distance towards the current government and the Islamist ideology –which was also articulated by some other narrators- and on the other, his identification with the idea of ‘independent, laicist, modern, republican Turkey’. These identifications are, as we know, very much in line with the identifications of middle and upper class laicist and republicanist segments of the larger society. Though within this very limited framework, it might be argued that Turkification policies, to which also L.N. has pointed, have been far-reaching in determining L.N.’s identifications and self-perception.

To reflect on the overall narratives, it is possible to claim that what the narrators have articulated, in regard to the Turkey’s integration to EU, were their identifications with ‘modernization’, ‘civility’, ‘progression’, ‘economic wealth’, and ‘education’. The structure of their narratives, moreover, pointed the meanings they attributed to the line between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Thus, the narratives were revealing in terms of belongings and self-understandings too. While, on the one hand, ethno-religious identities were reflected upon, on the other, positioning towards the larger society and national identity was articulated.

To conclude, in line with my outset argument that in order to understand the current identifications and self-concepts of minority groups, we have to take account a wide range of historical and spatial sites, whereby identities were constantly enacted, negotiated, reformulated, drawing upon past experiences as well as of current relations; what I have tried to do in this chapter was looking at the encounters of these groups with the state policies. In this framework, not only their memories on the discriminative policies, but also their present time affiliations and future projections became important. It was apparent, moreover, that present and future drew, constantly, upon past; but, also, the past was rearticulated and perhaps regenerated in the light of current affiliations and networks. Such interaction took place not in a free-floating space, but in the light of practices, enactments and embodiments.

CHAPTER VII

THE COMMUNITY: CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY IDENTITY IN EVERYDAY LIFE ON THE LINE BETWEEN SELF AND OTHER

“you had to hide yourself in order to exist”
V.T.

...

Anyway, we were together for whole life;
we were never separated.
Our home is here I mean, I explain you.
K.S.

To this point, I have tried, first, to position the Armenian and Jewish communities of Ankara onto the city space in order to reflect their relations with/within this space and, thus, put an eye on a part of their habitus in the city. Second, I have tried to reflect upon the encounters with the state policies, ascriptions, and utterances in order to point these encounters as a construction site of habitus and thus of identifications, belongingness, and self-understandings. In this chapter, I will try to look at the everyday life construction sites with an aim to understand how the community life is organized and how collective self-understandings are constructed within Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara. I will do this with a special emphasis on the meanings attributed to the line between ‘self’ and ‘other’. The various construction sites, as they appeared in the narratives, were occupational life, marriage relations, religious life, and daily experience.

7.1. OCCUPATIONAL LIFE

To have an idea on the business life organization as they appeared for the communities at hand is important to understand both the dynamics of labor concentrations and the inter-ethnic relations within this organization. We know that a degree of “ethnic division of labor in which certain occupations, industries, or kinds of work become, for a time at least, the province of a particular group” is not an unusual feature of multiethnic situations (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 160). Moreover, whatever the reason, be it discrimination, particular circumstances of migration, skills and backgrounds of individuals, such occupational concentrations have obvious identity effects, sustaining, at least, a sense of being somehow different.

7.1.1. ‘Occupational habitus’

I have already pointed in the fourth chapter that in Ankara, too, a degree of division of labor in terms of the ethnic-religious lines, was the usual pattern in the organization of business life not only in the 18th and 19th centuries but also even before. It was also already noted that Etöz (1998) suggests such division should be understood as a necessary result of the system of heritage whereby economic capital, know-how and experience about many crafts was inherited across generations, which she called as “occupational habitus”. Such occupational habitus, in other words, emerged for the individuals, as a possibilities and impossibilities universe in business life and played out as the ground of their occupational acts (Etöz, 1998: 96).

Table 4¹³³ provides a view on the occupations of the individuals integrated in this study and of their parents. The table makes it clear that there are cases, of both the first and second generation, whereby we can talk about the ‘occupational habitus’; I suggest that in other cases, too, there is the influence of the cultural and economic capital of the family. In order to have a detailed perspective on the internal dynamics of these patterns, however, we should turn, at this point, to the ‘practical analysts’ of

¹³³ See Table 4 in Appendix D.

the study. During the interviews and in the questionnaires the respondents were asked a variety of questions about how they started the job, about the occupational life of their parents, and, in cases of existence of a family business, whether they would like their children to continue the business.

The general patterns, as they appeared in the narratives, regarding the occupational alternatives of the individuals were as following. The first was in line with the differentiation Etöz (1998) pointed between the Armenian and Jewish communities in the 19th century, according to which the former dealt mostly with crafts, large-scale trade, including export and import, and some were bankers and accountants, while the latter dealt mostly with small-scale trade in the market of the city. Also in the current study, it came out that there was a high occupational concentration, for the Armenian community, in crafts such as jewelry, tailoring and carpentry, independent of the generation factor; while there were also still traders of angora and leather, especially in the first half of the 20th century, in the workshops remaining few in number. Although the Jewish people integrated in the study are few in number, and thus, the findings should be approached with caution, the general pattern among the population, though not reflected in the table, emerged to be dealing with trade of mostly ready-made clothing, drapery and millinery [“tuhafiyecilik”]. The general poor conditions of the Jewish population in the 19th century Ankara, as it was pointed by Etöz (1998) however, seems to have changed both in the first but, especially, in the second half of the 20th century and some large-scale businesses were established. Moreover, for the second generation especially, high education and professions were not unusual. The second pattern, I have observed, reflected a difference between the Gregorian and Catholic Armenian groups, but only for the parents of the first generation. We know that this former generation Gregorian Armenians, as a result of the great de-locative and re-locative movements experienced in the early years of the 20th century, mostly have immigrated to Ankara from nearby regions. Thus, we cannot speak of any inheritance of capital or know-how for this generation. It appeared that these people, usually, took part in the service sector in the city and they were usually waiters, cleaners, and taxi drivers; in some other cases, they were auto-electricity mechanics,

auto-spare parts sellers, repairmen, or dealt with small-scale trades. However, their children, namely the first generation integrated in this study, were incorporated in the usual alternatives the occupational habitus of the Armenian community in Ankara had provided for, in that they became mostly tailors and jewelers being trained by the previous generations already doing these jobs.

The general pattern for the first generation was to start working at the early ages of childhood nearby an artisan, usually a relative, or an acquaintance. Men usually worked there until the age of military service and had established their own business after completing it. K.G's (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Tailor) narrative supplies a closer look at the internal dynamics of this process:

My father was a waiter. ... This Süreyya Pavilion, my maternal uncle was retired from there. ... He was a waiter. We used to...for instance the tablecloths, costumes of the waiters, of the cooks, the ones...we used to wash them. My mother and maternal aunt washed them. ... I started working when I passed to the third class, completing the second class [at the primary school]... For instance, in our time the students could never spend those four months freely ["boş gezemezdi"]. They would certainly work somewhere, whether... There are doctors, lawyers, actors among our friends. But these would work either nearby a tailor, or a shoemaker, or else another job he would do, there was not an opportunity of being free. ... I worked nearby a tailor's.... [He was not a relative] but he was again from Yenikent, I mean from Zir he was. When I was graduated from the primary school in 1949, I was a four-year tailor. ... Now give some bread to a child, who has completed primary school, he wouldn't know how to eat it. ... I worked there until going for the military service in 1958. After I returned, I have established my own workshop. ... First, at home we established it. I sewed at home. Then, I moved to the (...) Han [big commercial center] in [19]60-61, then in [19]65, I came here to (...) Han, and from [19]65 on I am here.

For men, education and work life usually went hand in hand at the beginning, and at some point, the education life was cut off. As it was noted in the fifth chapter, their residential and occupational spaces, and the schools they have attended were in the same district, Ulus, and this seems to be an enabling factor for the individuals engaging in the work life at earlier ages. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M) have stated that:

Before starting to primary school, I have started to go to the shop at the age of six. I have started school at the age of seven or eight ... But I have left the high school in the second year, because I was working. ... That time, at the primary school, we were having three classes in the morning, and had two classes more. I used to go to the school early in the morning; then we came home and had our lunch. It was close anyway, as soon as you went down the slope you got in Hacıdoğan. After the lunch we again went to the school, after having two classes I got out, at the beginning of Ruzgarlı Street, at the opposite of Ulus printing-office, there was the store of my maternal uncle, that is the store I still run ... Auto-spare parts.

It appears that when there was an established business of a family member, inheritance of the business by the following generation was the usual pattern. For the first generation, however, one preventing factor for such inheritance appeared to be the changing market opportunities. As we know, some branches of handicraft, which were once the most important occupations in Ankara, lost at the beginning of the 20th century their value as employment areas. In these cases, employment in more valid branches of crafts took place. A.T.'s (1923, Cath.Arm., M) narrative is an example of such case; which points, moreover, patterns of finding a job, realized in this case through inter-community relations:

My father used to make spinning wheels, hand-lathes, he worked that way. He used to make peg-tops, the peg-tops the children play with, he made even coffins, he was a carpenter I mean, he worked in that old style... I am a jeweler, an artisan, I have retired from it. I was working as an assistant nearby a Jeweler's. ... I started working when I was a child, before going to school. My brothers were tailors, they worked at home, and I was helping them as an apprentice. In our [community], the children will both go to school and work. I mean we went to work in afternoon; we went to school in the morning. That was the way... Then in [19]38-39, I started in the jeweler's. ... There was a friend in our neighborhood, Ali *Usta*, while I was working with my brothers, that man had his trousers in our workshop; he was working in Zeynel's, the biggest store of Ankara... it was the unique one then. ... Well, in the past, when I started as a jeweler, there were four jewelers in Ankara. ... Only one was Christian: Pier. Zaki, Zeynel, and the man, one from Bleacksea Region, İbrahim Hololu, there were four stores. ... Then the man said "come and work at Zeynel's", I went and started as an apprentice.

It was already discussed that habitus laid the objective conditions and the sphere for reasonable action; and the means of expanding this sphere was through increasing lifestyle choices available, which was again delimited by the forms of capital one had (Nazroo and Karlsen, 2003). '1's (1929, Cath.Arm., F) narrative on the occupational life of her family members provides a good example, whereby she tried to increase the choices for her but the 'reasonable action' turned to be defined by the capitals she had:

My father was a tailor. Not normal, he made villager dresses. Those *Seğmen* costumes [folkloric costumes] I mean. My mother also helped him in the accessories of the dresses. ... When he was at military he fell down of a horse, and was injured, he could work for a while; we had many difficulties. ... My brother was, before going for military service, there was a *raki* factory here, it was a private factory called "Beautiful Izmir" [Güzel İzmir]... My brother was an accountant there... He had studied in the Trade High School, and he had left after completing the secondary school. ... He was very talented. He was good at accounting; he had ability in arts. If he had studied, he would have been an architect. After turning from the military service, he started working as a carpenter, for years he worked as a worker, and then together with his partner owned his work. Even, my brother made all the furniture of this church; he planned décors, he planned the interior of many houses in Ankara. he even planned the décor of Air France airlines ... My sister was a tailor, and I, also, became a

tailor later on. I wanted to study very much, but they said they couldn't afford it. ... I resisted much; I didn't want to be a tailor. I attended embroidery, flower, and drawing courses at the Evening Arts School ["Akşam Sanat okulu"], I didn't attend sewing courses. One day my sister wanted my help for a work which has to be made ready; it was before a festival or a special day. And I helped, that has been the start for me. We have trained many apprentices, both Muslims and Christians; we have made suits and very special wedding-dresses. People used to come out to the streets to see the wedding-dresses we had made. ... We had once prepared a wedding dress for the [...] family; they were fundamental Islamists. The man was exiled to Bozcaada of being against Atatürk. Women were covered; but they were very rich, they have ordered laces from France. The chief of the Ankara Arts School said that she did not see a wedding-dress like that. ... We made dresses for the whole family.... Some tailors of the time were of small scale. We had very distinguished customers. ...

Lacking the opportunity of studying after primary school, and the economic difficulties the family had, point to the cultural and economic capitals defining the affect of occupational habitus in this case. The tension between education and work was pointed also by M.T. (1929, Cath.Arm., F) as below:

I have completed primary school, but many had left those times. I don't know why. Did the parents not give importance to studying ... When he could not learn, could not study, failed at class, they took the boys and sent them nearby a jeweler, tailor, they were sent as apprentice. The girls, also, were apprentices nearby a tailor. ... I have completed primary school, and then started to work as a cashier at a shop, a drapery. I worked for twenty-six years in the same shop and I then retired.

B.E.'s (1946, Cath.Arm., F, HW) narrative points also, in general, to the occupational habitus among the Catholic Armenian community and, in specific, to the work conditions of the female tailors:

In Ankara generally all the Catholic Armenian women were tailors, they earned money in that. To help their husbands, no one was free ["kimse boş durmazdı"]. Most of the women were tailors, my mother, maternal aunt, aunt-in-law, paternal aunts, all. They sewed for others; I mean they were real tailors having tax boards. ... They sewed at home, one room of their houses was tailor's shop, but they paid tax. I mean not only for the neighbors and for friends in order to earn a small amount, they were real tailors.

One important point appeared about the tailoring occupation was that there were different branches of it, and people were occupied in these different branches, such as shirt-makers, jacket-makers, trousers-makers, waistcoat-makers and so on. We can suggest that this complementary division was an enabling factor for the market to absorb that large amount of tailors. These different branches, pointing to the different parts of a man's costume, reflected, moreover, a gendered division of labor since men, usually, occupied them; and women sewed, usually, the women's costumes.

However, some women also worked at home as assistants for sewing men's costumes. This was articulated by K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M):

Now, earlier, the trousers-makers sewed the trousers; I mean there were no [specific] machines for [various parts of the pants, e.g. buttonholes, legs, etc.]. The women at home did these by hand. For example, if one couple of trousers were sewed in three hours, it needed another three hours of handwork; the women at home did these. ... There were girls doing this job, like my wife. ... She doesn't work now, but she was graduated from the two-year department of the Girl's Art School. ... Then she had attended a special sewing course, there she had a ten-month certificate ... But she did not work, she helped me. ... When, for example, now I take a jacket to home, she would do at least a 6-7 hours work there. ... If my works were demanding here, my wife will come and do the entire job an apprentice would do, either ironing, or machine work.

Before continuing, I should point that in every household I have made an interview, there was at least one woman who had attended a technical school for girls, either The İsmet Pasha Girls' Institute, or the Girl's Art School as it was called. I have counted ten women in the families of the narrators, both Armenian and Jewish, only as they were named in the narratives. I did not direct a question to the narrators to find out such data. However, upon reflection on the number ten women in eight households, we might assume that it was a common pattern for the women, in both communities and independent of generation. It is because not only the first and second-generation women attended the institutes, but also the third generation young women were also named to have attended some technical schools for girls. It was only that in the latter case women did not attend to the sewing courses, but to the courses on child development. We can suggest upon such observation that the 'occupational habitus' of the communities and gendered division of labor were affective in determining the education choices of women.

To continue with the occupational habitus, we can suggest that for the second generation, too, occupational inheritance was not an unusual pattern. E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M, Jeweler) who shares the business with his brother stated that:

We do the job since 1988. From our school times on at every opportunity we were at the store. It is our paternal job. The one who directed us to this job was our father. He wanted his job to be continued, and we accepted it since the work was interesting and special for us. We own, now, a 59 years old company and we think that this is not a fortune that everybody could have, because we have a good reputation.

The occupational concentration and the influence of occupational habitus on this are clear for the Armenian community. However, there emerged cases during the study indicating that such situation was not only due to the inheritance patterns but also was enhanced by the inaccessibility of other opportunities. This is important since we know that denial of institutional access on the basis of ethnic identity is a powerful boundary mechanism; and has effect on identity in that populations have to find alternative solutions to life problems which will vary according to the variety of capitals the population has (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 169). A.T (1923, Cath.Arm., M) stated in this line that:

That's most of our Christians were artisans, jewelers and so. I mean we never thought of civil service, thinking that we couldn't be. I will be an officer, I will be a manager, nothing such. In the past, were not even accepted to the banks and so. Since we are Christians. ... That's why we were not keen of such posts. ... Ours is, women are tailors; men are jewelers, carpenters, tailors and so... Because if your friend is jeweler, he will hire you, I will hire others, that way...

Another such example belongs to T.T (1968, Greg.Arm., F) who is an architect, and works in the family business as a jewelry designer. Her points, both on her own and her father's experiences, reflect perception of such institutional denial:

[I chose the occupation] to help my father. My father needed someone he could trust. I am the only child, and this could be no one other than me. I would have liked to continue my own job. I have worked in the private sector for a while. Unfortunately, the private sector in Turkey was very negative that period. Since I do not have the right of entry into the state offices; and since I could not get the return of my education working at the private sector, I was directed to the family business. I am very pleased with my job. ... My father started the job at the age of 10 in Anafartalar Street [Ulus]. While he was a very successful student, because of his teacher's different attitudes towards him regarding his name and the society he was a member of, my father had decided not to continue studying after the primary school. He decided to deal with arts and he started to learn arts nearby his, the now deceased, maternal uncle, who was then in the Anafartalar Street.

One more point to be made in relation to the occupational habitus of the Armenian community, is their reflections about their children's inheritance of the family business. It became apparent to this point that when there was an established business, say a Jeweler's store, or one on selling auto-spare parts, it was common for the second generation to inherit the job. However, when it was not such an enterprise, when it was a tailor's workshop for example, the first generation parents usually were not content with the idea of such inheritance. The reason was best

reflected in K.G.'s (1937, Greg.Arm., M, tailor) words, one of the two sons of whom is working in a jeweler's store, the other has his own store selling silver jewelry, and his daughter is a shop assistant: "I didn't want [them to be tailors]; and I constantly kept them at distance from here [the workshop]. They would not have any life here; they would not have a life in the manual labor".

The respondents to the questionnaire, who were all jewelers, were also asked whether they would like their children to continue the job. Only two have answered the question in an affirmative manner; two have asserted that they did not want it; one has stated that his children were continuing their education and were planning to do some job in line with their education; one has noted that his children were 'girls' so that they could not carry out the job; and one was undecided on the answer. Although I have observed during the study that some Armenian jewelers, integrated or not integrated to the research, had their sons working with them, these were not many in number, and the general pattern for the third generation was to have university education planning to do some job accordingly. Upon this finding, it could be suggested that 'occupational habitus' of the Armenian community in Ankara is on the edge of somewhat a rupture for the coming generations. In this rupture both the discontent of their parents, namely the second generation integrated in this study, with their occupational conditions, which was reflected mostly in the statement "our job is about to end anyway"; and the increasing education level for the third generation seem to be influential.

To reflect on the occupational state within the Jewish community, as they appeared in the narratives, it could be suggested that the common pattern of work life for the individuals, in terms of working age, emerged to be similar to the Armenian community. In this line A.K. (1911, Jew, M) stated that:

I was graduated from primary school. Then I started working, as an apprentice in a milliner store. We were selling goods by retail. In that way we grew up. ... I worked until I went for the military service. I did not have an occupation. I worked as a shop assistant in the milliner's. ... I decorated also shop windows. ... In 1957, I established my own store, a milliner store.

H.A.'s (1951, Jew, F) narrative, on the other hand, points to the 'occupational habitus' within the Jewish community and the heritage patterns for the second generation in terms of business life.

Since there was not much opportunity for education all turned to trade, I mean the Jewish community. Then, after a while they have started to buy shops in Kızılay. That is, in the past most of the stores in Atatürk Boulevard belonged to the Jews; those were all on ready-made clothing. ... There was a furniture shop, a curtain and a few baby stores. All ready-made; the Armenian minority, for example, were mostly jewelers. ... Ours concentrated on ready-made clothing and so... Tailoring, also. My mother-in-law for example, had sewed shirts with her sisters, three sisters, ...Ankara of that time all, for sure there were no ready-made shirts then, all the deputies, high level bureaucrats and so, they made all their shirts. ...They had a workshop in Kızılay, they were called "shirt-maker sisters". ... I mean the boys, if their father owned an established business, a store and so, they completing the high school, preferred also working with their fathers. For example, my brother had always wanted to be an engineer, he studied in Istanbul, at the Technical University, and he became an Electrical Engineer. But, as I have said he never liked trade, my father used to want him come and help at the store, but he never thought of doing trade...The ones who had intention, interest in trade, and also if an established store or something had their father, they worked, father and son together. There are many like this.

The above narratives provide somewhat a model, which was common for the Jewish people established in Ankara. However, as it was already pointed in the fifth chapter, there were families migrating to Ankara in the early years of the republic in order to profit from the newly created markets, and working opportunities. L.N.'s (1924, Jew, M) narrative gives an example of such case:

My grandfather migrated from Istanbul in 1929. To establish a business here, well it is the new government center, there are some business areas. ... He brought with him his daughters also, two were single then, and the eldest, my mother, was married. He has established a workshop, tin producing. My father worked as the accountant of that business, my grandfather was in the production part. That time there was a yogurt producing workshop in the Forest Farm ["Atatürk Forest Farm"]; there were produced yogurt in half or one kilogram tin cups, it was the most welcomed place producing the best yogurt in Ankara. My grandfather's workshop produced the tin cups and gave them to the Farm. ... My father, afterwards, has established a store selling tools and implements on its own, in Samanpazari, because then it was the only busy place. ... Then he was the accountant of the Center Restaurant in the Forest Farm. ...Apart from this, again for a while he worked in Ankara Palace... as an accountant.

One other occasion of settlement in Ankara in the Republican era, though at a later period, appears in N.E.'s case. His narrative is important in pointing the importance of cultural capital inherited from the family and another pattern of occupational habitus, in which he is the third generation state officer in the paternal family. N.E.

(1957, Jew, M) is an academician, and so are his brother and sister. N.E's narrative points, moreover, the relation between education and occupational habitus.

My father's father had worked at the Ottoman Bank, he was an accountant. That's why, my father was born in Samsun, while my uncle, a year afterward, was born in Trabzon; they were moving constantly. I was born in Ankara. My father worked at the Turkish State Railways ["Türkiye Devlet Demiryolları"] as an higher engineer. ... My maternal family is from Istanbul. In Istanbul Harbiye Modern Mefruşat is established, my mother's father worked there. Then, for a period, they came to Ankara and established the store Modern Mefruşat, here. While they were in Ankara my mother and father gets married, and then the father of my mother returns to Istanbul. ... My father was graduated from Istanbul Technical University; he was one of the first graduates. They, I mean the paternal family is more modest; my mother's father is wealthier, dealing with trade and so... But my paternal side is, traditionally, all educated. Maternal side is not so, it is less educated. Paternal side, look his father was an accountant, my father is engineer, and my uncle is doctor, doctor of medicine... They are more modest but, maternal side is better, dealing with trade; that is more traditional, I mean our Jews, the Jews in Turkey usually deal with trade.

7.1.2. Identity Effects of the Occupational Concentration

It is argued that collective identities offer potential bases for the distribution of persons into categories, which are offered by the patterns of division of labor and the possible outcome of such process is the group identity construction (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998). Occupational concentration, as it was already noted, reinforces a sense of being somehow different. Such process seems to have occurred also for the Armenian community of Ankara and, at this point, I will turn to the articulations of such perceived 'difference'. It is not possible to do the same for the Jewish community because the small number of narrators that could be integrated to the study did not provide for such an evaluation.

In the questionnaire the respondents -all jewelers- were asked if they thought the community they were a member of, had an affect on their occupational life and what kind of an affect was it; if their customers knew which community they were a member of, and if they asked questions about it; and if they knew customers preferring especially them [individually], and what did these customers tell about the reasons of their preference". The answers were revealing.

All, but two, noted that they did not think that their community had an affect on their occupational life. T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F) and A.İ. (1953, Greg.Arm., M), on the other hand, answered the question, respectively, in the following:

Sometimes yes. Our job is the ancestors' job...We are really an apt community for this work. It is a work, which necessitates hand-skill.

...

The occupation our community deals with is mostly jewellery. Since we are artisans/artists there are many people who appreciate us.

All, but one, stated that their customers, at least some, knew which community they were a member of; and they had customers who especially preferred them. The reasons their customers stated to them were in all cases similar: their “*artistic skills*”, “*honesty and correctness at work*”, “*truthfulness*”, “*reliability*”, and “*competence about the details of the job*”. “*Friendliness*”, “*kindness*”, and “*cheerfulness*” were added to the above in two cases. One of these latter respondents stated that these reasons were not related to the community or religion, because the customers, independent of their knowledge about ‘their’ identity state these; and the other stated that his customers did not know about their identity. These statements, however, should be understood more as an emphasis on ‘individual attitude’ rather than disregard of ‘community identity’, which is defined by ‘talent’; since the other statements of the same persons do not point otherwise.

The narratives, articulated mostly without a direct question on the issue, were more complicated in the meanings they conveyed, though still similar perceptions appeared as boundary markers of the community identity. These boundaries, more than often, pointed to a distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’. K.G’s (1937, Greg.Arm., M) narrative is important in this sense:

All [my customers] know [that I am an Armenian]. To the ones who don’t know, I would say it. We get make use of it I mean. ... For sure. They say “people of this religion are correct, honest”, that is “they don’t trick”; they respect us more I mean... Yes, they think so. All of them think so, all think so. Because, it is so that, for example, there are many correct people among Muslims but well, since the population is large, there are incorrect as much as corrects. ... Since we are less, it is striking. ... For instance manual labor in Christianity [among the Christians], for example in our Armenians let’s say the manual work; among Greeks let’s say food works, they are so in such food, in restaurants; among Jews trade works; and among the ones [Muslims/Turks] agricultural work for example. Did you see any Christian, any Jew, any... growing crops; at animal husbandry for example? Well, the

God gave everybody something. A talent he gave; everybody had chosen something I mean. ... There is something like that, that is our *millet* is skillful in this work [tailoring], these Muslims, the women were not much skillful in this work. Ours, I mean the non-Muslims, whether it was the Greeks, or well, ours, handcrafts was much more... All did the non-Muslim women. Say if there were twenty manual workers in this Hacıdoğan, nineteen out of this were ... the non-Muslims I mean.

K.G. articulates on a line of ethnic division of labor clearly, and the meaning attributed to this line is the ‘god-given-talent’. The Armenian identity in this articulation turns out to be one of skillful, talented, honest, correct and respectful. A similar set of meanings appear in K.S’s (1928, Greg.Arm., M) narrative, too. Here, moreover, there is the emphasis that the community members were so good at their occupations that they served for some ‘special’ persons. Indeed, this was a recurrent emphasis in many other narratives, too:

I am proud of telling, I hope you will also be so, that I face compliments, as “you are right, you are honest” and there are preferences I mean. For example, K. S., God bless him, he is deceased, was the tailor of Dear Mr. [...],¹³⁴ there are many examples of it. For example, in the past, in the middle of Hacıdoğan, there was a sir named O. I.T., Armenian origin; he was a marvelous tailor, men’s tailor, those times that is sixty years before, he made the dresses of all the ministers, deputies of the parliament.

There were many other cases whereby one of the family members sewed for a politician or for an artist; played violin for Atatürk; had work relations with the most famous businesspersons of the country; or served for the various consulate members. These narratives pointed to a perception of social distinction and superiority. S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F) provided for one such example, with a special focus on the occupational habitus of the Armenian community that they were once the masters at the Ottoman Palaces. We observe, in this narrative, that the prestige of the community is perceived, indeed, to be “an ascribed status depending on one’s predecessors” (Yumul, 1992: 134). S.O. recollected that:

My paternal aunts, both my aunts used to sew at home. Even my elder uncle, the one is younger than my father helped them. ... He had also skill; he had made men’s trousers. ...Even, for a short period he had gone to France to have training. Then, for a while, he worked with my aunts, but then he turned to be a tradesman, stating the job was difficult and necessitated a lot effort. ... My aunts were famous all around Ankara, people from the consulates used to come for having their dresses made. ...They used to make a date on phone. From the consulates, usually the secretaries called, and they asked if she could come at this hour or not, my aunt decided the dates and they came. ... I guess it was something

¹³⁴ One of the ex-presidents of Turkey.

left from the past, say a heritage. I guess so, it means there was such knowledge and they could find them so. Because as far as I remember people with special automobiles used to come, they got in, tried their clothes on and went. ... My aunts had learnt tailoring in Istanbul. In Istanbul, the grand aunts, paternal or maternal I don't know who were there; they were tailors in the Palace. My aunts had learned it from them. ... Those grand aunts, now deceased, had migrated to France; and were coming to Istanbul to visit their old house in Sarıyer, when I was at primary school my aunts used to go to Istanbul when the aunts came. They renewed the memories. ... Those times in the palaces, you know, there were all Christian origin masters working, either in writing or as blacksmiths or so, that period my [grand] aunts, too, were tailors.

Another recurrent narrative was on how hardworking people were the family members. V.T.'s (1943, Greg.Arm., M) narrative provided for such an example:

My father was a very hardworking man. I don't remember him getting up later than 5 a.m. He was, unbelievably, hardworking. The brickfields were in Imrahor Valley; he worked with his partner. Before there were yet anyone around he went there also taking us at the back of his pickup. I have liked trade very much. The lunch had been served in exchange of a recipe in queue; I was dealing with that job. ... Yet I remember, the martial law was on process then; he would have dressed always very smartly, he was dressing starched shirts and waited, waited for the martial law to be removed. If it was removed at 5 a.m. at 5 a.m., if it was removed at 6 a.m., at 6 a.m. he went to work, there had been no one coming before him and he got very angry about this.

Another narrative on hardworking was articulated by B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F), again in relation to her father. The narrative reflected, moreover, on the relations with the 'other' and the self-understandings of the people in business life:

My father thought that he should open his shop before his neighbor; if opened the shop after his neighbor, he said, "I would be embarrassed". "I should open before my neighbor". That is, he thought that there would be no affluence if it was opened late. Even he said, "The sun will not rise on it". He said you would go to your work in the morning, before the sun rose on it. And, that time, perhaps there is still, there was a bazaar in the At Bazaar square, Tuesday bazaar, he would have certainly sent our foodstuff from there with the workers in the shop, or with the porters. That porter, coming to the house, should certainly have a drink or had eaten something. When he returned he [my father] would ask him "what has your aunt-in-law ["yenge"] served you", if something was by chance omitted one day, if there wasn't any service for the one who took the stuff to home, it would turn into a catastrophe in the evening. Because it was "you could serve anyone any other time, but the talent is to serve the worker I have sent you home". And they [the workers] loved [my father] very much.

B.E.'s narrative, seemingly on everyday actions and interactions, conveys a web of meanings on the perceived 'social status' and 'prestige' of the 'family'. We are familiar with the argument that in Middle Eastern cultures serving to the guests usually acts as a social code; and "the social code is based on the close association of hospitality with honor, and the perception of honor as a finite quality, almost a

tangible commodity, which is maintained or lost through public behavior” (Tilley, 1997: 504). The ‘guest’ in the above narrative is the worker in the family business or a porter; thought in this way, ‘hospitality’, indeed, turns to be an act of ‘mercy’, and in that a marker of the boundary demarcating the family prestige and status through the relations with the ‘other’. ‘Other’, in this case, could be simply a member of a lower class; however, it turned in many narratives that the workers –and in this case the porters undoubtedly – were mostly Muslims who were employed by the Christian entrepreneurs. Indeed, narratives on ‘generosity’ and ‘leniency’ in relation to others and in various contexts were recurrent during the study. I suggest, thus, that the meanings conveyed in the above recollection do not only refer to the ‘class status’ of the family, but are attributed also on the lines delimiting the ethno-religious community identity.

I will suggest, moreover, that, to this point, a sense of community identity appeared referring to “a system of values, norms and moral codes” and such perception of community is very much in line with Cohen’s argument that “people construct community symbolically, making it a resource and repository of meaning, and a referent of their identity” (2000: 128).

7.1.3. Inter-Ethnic Relations in the Occupational Life

Ethnicity is defined to be “an aspect of social relationship between agents who consider themselves as culturally distinctive from members of other groups with whom they have a minimum of regular interaction” (Eriksen, 1997: 39). Since labor market provides an important ground for that ‘regular’ interaction, looking at inter-ethnic relations as they appeared in the occupational life turns to be an important task.

As I have already referred in the previous chapters, the relations between Jewish and Armenian communities have been very limited in Ankara and business life emerged not to be an exception to this. The social distance between the two communities was reflected in A.K’s (1911, Jew, M, Milliner) words at the face of a question asking

about the relations between the Armenian, Jewish and Greek communities in the business life “We did not have relations at business. I mean not. We were neighbors. It was nice; there were no problems. It was normal. Everybody dealt with his own job”.

Other reflections, on the distant relations, were articulated by the Armenians, pointing mostly that they were not related much to the Jews and that the Jews were mostly retailers; or, especially in the case of the second generation, stating simply that they do not remember m/any Jews in Ankara. Some recollections, however, reflected the meanings attributed to the boundaries between the two communities. B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F) recollected her memories, at the face of the question whether they had neighbor relations with the Jewish people, as following:

No, we only did some shopping. They were, for example, electricians, drapers and so. I mean, they were not like us sewing or something ... They were not artists, but shopkeepers all. That is buying and selling. I guess they were a little cleverer. ... I remember very well, there was a Jewish store; since my mother was sewing; I used to go there to buy zipper, silk thread, buttons and so. There were electricians too; I remember them. But, now, they are very few I guess.

‘*Cleverness*’ in B.E’s words seems to reflect the wide-range stereotype, in Turkey, about the Jewish community that they are “*cunning*” people. Another stereotype on the “*richness*” of the Jewish people was collected by K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M, Tailor) who reflected on the relations between the two communities in class terms. When I asked whether he knew any Jewish people or had any business relation to them, since both occupational and residential places of him were almost at the edge to the ‘Jewish neighborhood’, K.G. stated that:

There is no one. We couldn’t accord with them, I don’t know why. I mean it is not much with other religions. The Jews were more tradesmen I mean; ours were yet on labor. We did not have much thing I mean. Perhaps our poor ... because the Jews were richer, I mean. Since they were all owners of stores, their incomes were more perhaps; ours were less, since it was labor. Perhaps it was because of that they did not accord with each other I mean. I don’t remember any Jew coming to our house. But there was the landowner [Muslim] of us, for example, whenever she went somewhere, the woman, her husband had died a bit young, put the children to us. I mean nothing... But never a Jewish had a relation to us.

‘Other religions’, interestingly, does not refer to ‘Islam’ in K.G’s narrative, whereby ‘good relations to Muslim neighbors’ are recollected. It appears that the only ‘regular

interaction' between the communities in Ankara in terms of business life, took place between the Jews and Muslims, on the one hand, and between the Armenians and Muslims, on the other. Still, however, to reflect on the former seems not possible in the light of the findings of the research, because of the already pointed reason of the small number of Jewish narrators integrated into the study. I will be pointing to pointing to the latter case in the sequel of the following narratives.

Both during the interviews and in the responses to the questionnaire it came out that the partnerships, in the business life of the Armenian community, were established almost exclusively intra-community; denominational affiliation accounted to a great extent, however, there were few cases of Catholic-Gregorian partnerships. Still, the most common pattern was to establish partnership with a family member. Many narrators among the jewelers stated that they established the jewelry store together with their brothers, brothers-in-law, or uncles but after a while, they had separated their works and established their own store, because of either a dispute, or, most commonly, because of marriage. In the latter case, it was stated that the enterprise was not sufficient anymore for the subsistence of two families, and one partner had to establish his own business.

In the questionnaire, the respondents were asked if they had to establish a partnership they would prefer their partner to be someone from their community; when they hire someone as a worker do they pay attention that the person is of the same religion/denomination of theirs; and if in the past their fathers or relatives paid attention to this and they were asked to tell about the examples they know in relation to the last question. All respondents noted that it would not make any difference for them that their partners or workers were of the same community. However, in some cases answers were revealing especially in the comparison between the past and present attitudes towards the issue. E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M) noted, in relation to the above questions, the following:

As I have said before, we do not evaluate people according to their religion or communities. If the person I am facing is one that we can trust, it doesn't differ for us whatever his religion is. For sure; if it also doesn't differ for him. ... [Workers] Certainly not. In our store, especially nearby our father, there worked so much Muslim people that I can't remember the number. From our community, however, I remember only one person. ... I

think in Istanbul they were stricter on this matter, but I guess that strictness also become more flexible. ... I don't remember any example. But, of course the art is of Armenians and the intelligence is of the Jews. Nobody could claim otherwise. These people, I guess, might have not liked to share some things (some critical points) with the Muslims; because as it was also seen in the past, unfortunately, some things happened because of sharing. Painful and worrying incidents were experienced regardless of friendships or acquaintances. Perhaps, these incidents are the reasons underneath that they do not share many things with them [the Muslims].

It is apparent that there is a perceived difference of attitude towards inter-community business relations, and the 'stricter' attitude in the past is explained by the 'past experiences' of the community. A similar response was marked down by T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F):

I prefer it to be a person I trust. Community does not interest me. ... [Workers] I wouldn't [prefer]. As long as it is a person I trust it does not make any difference for me. If only s/he will see me as I see her/him. ... [In the past] yes. When I was a child, from time to time it was stated that some things should not be spoken everywhere openly, that we should not be much foremost. Because of some events experienced in the past, there is still unrest within the community.

It appears in the above two narratives that the 'memories of the past' were influential in determining the degree of inter-ethnic relations.

All the jewelers, who are working currently, were asked if they were doing business with the jewelers in Istanbul, and if they preferred Armenian Jewelers. It turned out that doing wholesale shopping in Istanbul was possible only for the larger-scale jewelers, and others did shopping from the sellers coming to Ankara. Business relations with the Armenian jewelers in Istanbul appeared to be continuing; however, it is by no means exclusive, since the business market, currently, is not occupied predominantly by the Armenians. Still, however responses and narratives were revealing in that while it was repeatedly stated that the more important criteria in business was 'trust' and 'trade concerns' rather than 'community relations'; it was also apparent that the Armenian jewelers in Istanbul were perceived to be still 'more talented' in "artistic" and at "critical points". One even stated, giving clues on the inter-ethnic relations and self-perception, that "I do shopping in Istanbul. When I go there I feel nothing because all the masters in Kapalı Çarşı are Armenians" (V.T., 1943, Greg.Arm., M). To feel '*nothing*' in this case seems to refer not to feel '*uneasiness*' or '*difference*'.

B.T.'s (1957, Cath.Arm., M) narrative, in relation to the question on his business relations in Istanbul, pointed the pattern I have outlined above and also to the inter-ethnic competition which was shaped in terms of capital ownership:

There are now many Muslims, too. Let me tell you in this way, two thirds of the tradesmen I have been shopping are Muslims, I mean one third is Armenian; they got very few first of all, and also the capital in Istanbul turned more in the hands of such "hacji hochu" you know. That's why not much things are left to the non-Muslims; but they are artisans in that, for example the job of nailing ["mihlama"], that fixing the diamond and so, these are at the hand of Armenians.... The "green capital" as they call, it is a bit much in Istanbul; I mean it is in our job, too... And what is leading in trade is the capital, let me tell you; if there is no capital there will be nothing. I mean even if I know the half of Ankara, if I cannot supply them the variety they want, they will come the first day, the third day, and then they will glide and go... But still, there are Muslims having Armenian partners in Istanbul. They ran the job together also; they ran together. They have partnerships, but not as much as in the past, because Muslims, all, also know everything now, they have learnt too. ... These critical points are still at the hands of Armenians, but in the production of gold and so, the ones who have the capital are foremost. ...

One important repetition was that -as it is also implied in the above narrative- Muslims were the trainees of the Armenian masters. Interestingly, when the issue was inter-community relations in occupational life, the narratives turned one of a sudden to be on the master-Armenian versus trainee-Muslim relation. S.O.'s (1962, Greg.Arm., F) narrative provides one such example:

I have never heard something as such [in-group preference in business life] from my father; neither had I heard from my aunt. ... Those times, for example, there was someone who helped my aunt; the aim was only to learn a job ["altın bilezik kazanmak"]. Because, as I said, culture is not only related to the schooling culture; if you are able to give people something good, and if the other side is not, with one word, an hypocrite ["çiğ süt emmiş"], will see it easily. And then he watches you in every matter; I mean the religion issue disappears altogether. However, the ones who have bad will, will think or say what, I wouldn't know it. ... But I did not come across something either in my father's or my aunt's time; on the contrary, I know the ones who were taken to my father stating that "do whatever you wish, if only he could learn a job". ... Because, there were very few masters in Ankara then. Many had taken their children to my father in order him to train them, just as taking them to a teacher at school. Many, sons of both Christian and Muslim families, there are many who were trained by my father, still saying that "we earn our bread thanks to him".

It is interesting that the trainee Muslims might become the preferred masters in the absence of the 'real' ones. A remarkable narrative on the master-trainee relation was collected by B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F):

Now, everybody is very skillful, but in the past our hand-works were much valued; for instance, from those angora and such, spinning them... My mother used to tell it, they, in their youth, through spinning the wool, making shawls, and selling them, they lived on. Handworks, for instance, needlework. ... But they sewed mostly, they made dresses. And they were superior in sewing. Yet, still, I have my dresses made at a tailor's in Samanpazari now ... whenever I go, he prays for his master training him. He was trained nearby a non-Muslim... He constantly prays for him that he has taught a job to him. And he is the only one in Ankara now. There is no other one who could do handwork like him, they are all with machine now...but he is trained by him. ... Anyhow, when they quit the job, they would transfer the workshop to the apprentice, they wouldn't close the tailor's. To this man, too, that non-Muslim tailor had transferred the workshop when he got old. He is thankful mostly to it anyway, because the customer is ready, you will take it and work, what a nice thing. He works there for years, he is very old now I mean, may be for sixty years he is there.

We learn from Şenol-Cantek's study that also Muslim women who were once neighbors to their non-Muslim counterparts in the city, appreciated the almost exclusive talent of the Armenian women in some handworks, such as lacework and needlework, in that they learnt those works, which they did not know well beforehand, from Armenian women (2003: 304).¹³⁵ Other narratives, in our study, on the past relations between Armenian and Muslim communities in business life were recollected mostly on the "good", "unproblematic", and "civilized" relations with the shop-neighbors, whereby "everybody respected for other's religious beliefs" and "celebrated each other in their feats".

Indeed, deliberate and constant attempt for '*abstention from conflict*' seems to be a factor of these 'smooth' relations. This was mostly an implied factor in the narratives, but in some others, it was expressed openly. H.Ö. (1953, Cath.Arm., M), for example, stated on the relations with Muslim storekeepers in the [...] arcade, which is one of the two malls in Ankara whereby Armenian jewelers are concentrated spatially at present, that: "There is no problem [in the arcade]. We might be a little more careful, however. We try not to engage in conflict or quarrel as much as possible. It is because we are minority perhaps".

¹³⁵ Şenol-Cantek (2003) also quotes other narratives whereby it became apparent that cultural capital of the non-Muslim population of the city was affective on the Muslim population and on the city space, whether in terms of food and alcoholic beverage culture, or in terms of aesthetic culture provided by the beauty and arrangement of the gardens and vineyards non-Muslims possesses.

Another reflection of such ‘abstention’ was that “if you don’t touch anybody, they won’t touch you either”, stated by T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm., F) in relation to the groupings in the labor market.

7.2. MARRIAGE RELATIONS

It is asserted that “marriage is a sacred act in most cultures and religious divisions are significant even when they operate in company with class and racial factors” (Enloe, 1996: 199). Intermarriage, as the ‘bottom line’ of ethnicity, moreover, is usually taken among the institutions the degree of accessibility and availability to which has repercussions on ethnic salience through processes of socialization, through meanings attributed to the boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’, and through heterogeneity vs. homogeneity affects on the groups. Cornell and Hartmann argue that formal and informal prohibitions on intermarriage create or reinforce ethnic identities by designating categories of eligibles and ineligibles; by specifying relative worthiness of the respective groups; and by avoiding the dilution of felt identity that intermarriage often fosters (1998: 171). In the light of these statements, it turns to be crucial for us to look at the marriage patterns and attitudes towards ‘endogamy’ and ‘exogamy’, that is marriage within or across the ethnic boundary, respectively, as they took place in the communities at hand.

7.2.1. Marriage Patterns

It is clear that physical proximity, population density and size are important factors determining both the pattern of marriages and the levels of intermarriages, especially in cases of minority groups. These factors appeared to be determinant in the case of Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara, too. As it was pointed in the fifth chapter, both communities inhabited in separate neighborhoods, valid especially for the first generation, and this had provided residential concentration. It appeared that this was an enabling factor, through providing in-group socialization, for endogamy, which was already the social norm in relation to marriages. Still, the common pattern

of marriages appeared to be arranged marriages; and it was not an unusual case that these arranged marriages took place across different cities.

Accordingly, A.K. (1911, Jew, M), who was married to a lady from Istanbul Jewish community, recollected the below:

We used to come together with friends. Girls and boys, we came together and we danced in the houses. ... I have met with my spouse by means of a friend, a friend who was in Istanbul, he advised her; he knew her. He made us meet each other.

We learn from Bahar's memoirs that these marriages across different cities were also enabled through trade relations engaged with these communities (2003: 144). The pattern was similar for the Armenian community, too. Yumul states that:

[d]espite urbanization and geographic dispersal of Armenians, arranged marriages are still the norm among Turkish Armenians. In Anatolia, for example, if one cannot find a 'suitable' spouse where one lives, one marries someone living at some other place (1992: 150).

A.T.'s (1923, Cath.Arm., M) narrative provides both for such an attempt, and for a detailed description of the in-group socialization and the engagement process which he stated to have a big importance within the community. His narrative also provides for the boundaries between 'us', the Christian/Armenian community, and 'them', the Muslim/Turkish community, in terms of the 'stricter rules' of the latter regarding the inter-sex relations and having alcohol:

Well, my brother is [married] to her sister; they are two sisters ... They were always together, my brother got married to the elder one; then during the visits and so, because we are in the same neighborhood. ... I mean we got married in this way. For example, we will go somewhere, to *gazzino*, we need a [partner to dance]... We said "come on M., you [come] too". What I will say, at the end I got married with someone from Ankara, but I went even to Kayseri to get marry, at last I came and married to her. ... Engagement was very nice among us [in our community]... Among you [the Muslim/Turkish community], for some, there is no going out or so; "it should be like this, it shouldn't be like that"... Well, in engagement we would go to our fiancée's home on Wednesdays. ... Wednesdays, Saturdays and Sundays. We were working in the same area ... in the evenings I went and took her, we together... first, to their home... Well "I am going", "wait a minute", the mother-in-law comes up or the father-in-law: "A. where are you going, come and let's have a dinner". We would wait for it, may they invite so that we can be together with our fiancée, and we will eat and drink... We have a high reverence to the bridegroom and the bride; when the bridegroom comes "come on, let's eat and drink". We have the dinner with alcohol, you know it is permitted for our Christians; we knew that we would drink with the family ... What I will say is, on Wednesday... the fiancée, the girl, cannot go out alone, to a wedding

ceremony, to somewhere, nowhere she can go without her fiancé. Neither the girl nor the boy can go out alone. Together, arm in arm they will go out...On Saturday evening. You will again, go to your fiancé, certainly. You will have something to take with you; food, something, some fruits or so. That is it. They say, "come early, we will wait for the dinner". The next day is Sunday, that is, a plan starting from the morning; some are jealous, "let this child...let our grandson come with you". We were keen for going on our own. Till the night, these engaged could walk around; they eat and drink, at night at twelve or one you take her to her home. ... The engagement among us ... I mean the families come together, the dinners and so, in the New Years... Among us, for example, when you go to ask for a girl's hand for marriage, you will present gold or such, there waits for you a dinner table with alcohol ...

It appeared during the study that the arranged marriages continued to be a common pattern for the second generation, too. The church, in these narratives, emerged to be the place whereby the candidates or mostly the families of the male candidates have looked for the potential brides. S.O.'s (1962, Greg.Arm., F) narrative made this pattern clear:

I might say that there are flirts, it is so; we know each other by means of the church, we have some meetings there, as the youngsters we come together and so, knowing each other is by means of there. But we don't have an atmosphere whereby people get married being deeply in love to each other and so. ... We [with my ex-husband] met in the church, then during the talks and so, the family has asked my hand for the marriage, since my parents have also consented, I have accepted to see him. Then there was the marriage.

One point becoming emergent in the narratives was that marriages being established with the Armenian people, who have emigrated to European countries or to the USA beforehand, were not unusual among the Armenian community in Ankara. Sequence of S.O.'s narrative pointed that these marriages were also arranged marriages:

Well, the new generation, those who went for working, after they give their life an order, they want to marry from Turkey again. ... When they want to get married, they inform their parents, the same thing goes on. The parents look here, this is suitable for us, this would make our son happy, and they come and ask the girl's hand for the marriage. Afterwards, the preparations for the wedding and they take the bride and go.

The general migratory movements in Turkey, also, seem to have affects on marriages. There are cases of intermarriages with Assyrian or Keldani people who have migrated mostly from Mardin to Istanbul, or to Ankara. B.E's (1946, Cath.Arm., F) narrative provides one such example:

It was not love or so; it was an arranged marriage. They saw me at the church, then came home and asked my hand for the marriage. My husband is anyway an Assyrian Catholic, I mean not an Assyrian, an Assyrian Catholic, he came from Mardin; because usually the people of Mardin are Assyrian, Keldani, or Assyrian Catholic. ... My daughter-in-law, too, is an Assyrian Catholic; we got her from Istanbul but, her family is also from Mardin, she was born in Istanbul, her father and father-in-law were class-mates at the primary school.

An important point in the above narrative is on the denominational affiliation. B.E., who is a Catholic Armenian stresses that his husband is also a Catholic, though being an Assyrian. There are also cases of interethnic marriages across denominations. H.Ö.'s (1953, Cath.Arm., M) collection provides one such example, reflecting, moreover, on how a marriage across cities took place:

My wife is a Greek Orthodox from Antakya. Her father is Greek Orthodox; her mother is Catholic. It was an arranged marriage. When we were in Antakya for a visit, we had been in something like a 'henna night' [a traditional party for women organized usually on the day before wedding ceremony], we saw her there, and we asked her hand for marriage. Her family came here, searched for whether I was really a jeweler or not; and they found appropriate, I guess; they consented.

Though one side of the bride's parents is Catholic, she is defined to be an Orthodox in the above narrative. Definition of religious identity according to the paternal lineage might be viewed in line with Yumul's assertion that "Armenian families have traditionally been patriarchal" (1992: 152). This was also apparent in one of the respondents' definition of him as a Catholic, though his father was a Catholic and mother Gregorian.

Although it can be suggested that the small population size reinforced the pattern of arranged marriages for the second generation too, it does not exist to be the exclusive pattern. In the questionnaires, some of the respondents have pointed that they had engaged in love marriages and their parents did not have an arranging role in the process. Education level seems also to be a determining factor in the pattern of marriage engaged. Moreover, inter-ethnic marriages are stated to be love marriages. Three of the participants of the study, all second generation -one Jewish and two Gregorian Armenian- are married to a Muslim. Four other participants -two Jewish, one Catholic and one Gregorian Armenian- have at least one member in their family-unit who has married to a Muslim. In addition, almost all participants have pointed to such cases among the relatives. There are also two participants -one Jewish and one

Catholic Armenian men- who have engaged in marriages with European Christians and this is not an unusual pattern within the larger families of other participants, too.

7.2.2. Attitude towards Intermarriages

A strict suggestion of generational affect on the attitude towards intermarriages seems not to be an easy one, in the sense that both among the first and second generations there were expressions of tolerance and intolerance towards intermarriages. Still, however, it could safely be suggested that intermarriage is more welcomed among the second generation. Now I will turn to the narratives reflecting various attitudes.

Intermarriage was especially unacceptable for some first generation narrators. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F), accordingly, recollected the below narrative whereby her attitude towards not only inter-ethnic but also inter-denominational marriages became apparent:

There are people in our community who got married to the Muslims, taking brides especially. In our family, however, we never thought of it. My nieces had many friends at the university; they have always kept a distance; there were ones among our neighbors who asked their hand for marriage, we did not consent. We, even, used to make a differentiation among the denominations when we were young. A Gregorian Armenian man had asked my sister’s hand for marriage, we did not want. My sister had applied to the Father about what to do, the Father did not consent. He said “do not give up your denomination for a five or ten year’s happiness”. She, then, did not accept. Me too, a lawyer wanted to marry me when we were newly tailors then. Since he was a Muslim, my father did not want; I also did not want. Now, there is no denominational discrimination anymore, because we are very few. There are people who get married to Muslims in our neighborhood now. ... But there will not be harmony, everything in life will be problem, one side will say my religion, and the other will say my religion.

One of the most frequently stated problems supposed to emerge in the inter-ethnic marriages, was of which religion would the children be. A.T. (1923, Cath.Arm., M) stated on this matter that:

[t]here, really, appear problems my daughter. For example, we have a relative here in Keçiören, she got married to a Muslim man. One day she came to me and asked “Brother A. what will happen now to our children, will we sent them to the mosque or to the church for them to learn religion. I said, “you are a Muslim from now on, because your husband is a Muslim, and you will send the children to the mosque”. And the children went to the mosque. These things happen; the children become a problem, which religion will the children be? There are such problems.

Religious identity of the children became a condition for the marriage in some cases, without however the spouse being compulsory to convert religion. V.T.’s (1943, Greg.Arm., M) narrative provides one such case. It, moreover, points cultural capital as an enabling factor of such inter-ethnic marriages:

My wife is a Muslim. She is a soldier’s daughter. But my children are Christian; I have married on that condition anyway. ...My parents were already deceased that time, but if they were alive, I know I couldn’t marry her. I haven’t lived with my wife without problems, but the only matter we have not discussed on is the religion. I am anyway faithless, and my wife is not much a religious person; everybody acts on her/his way. ...It was not a problem for her family; even it is a soldier’s family, not an ordinary family. I mean her father is a soldier and their rules are stricter. The grandfather is a pasha. I mean such a family. But this is for sure the level of culture. I mean you can speak these things with people who are at certain points; I have many deputies, ministers, bureaucrats among my friends, we can speak these with them too. ... I don’t know what my children will do in the future; I just wanted to give them an identity. Because I think Christianity is more open, more progressive, more liberal, more democratic ... Just because I wanted them to be more comfortable, to be like this. ... I took them to the church a few times, I wanted them to see it; I wish their mother, also, would have taken them to the mosque and they would see it, too, but she did not. I did. I didn’t do this because I am a religious person; I am a non-believer.

The above narrative is important also in its implications on the ‘symbolic construction of the community’ through the meanings attributed to the religious identity that the supposed community affiliates, independent of the structural boundaries of the community (Cohen, 2000). Here, the symbolic meanings attributed to the boundaries of the community were ‘*openness*’, ‘*progressiveness*’, ‘*liberalism*’, and ‘*democratic character*’. One interesting narrative, which could also be seen as an indicator of such symbolic construction belonged to S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F). She narrated her idea about the probable attitude of her parents if she had established inter-ethnic marriage in the below words:

[I] mean, I don’t know, if we had been asked a hand for marriage by the Muslims, I am not sure whether it would be consented but, I mean I think because of respect there was no such case ... There was a high respect for the Christian families, from the Muslim families. Do you get what I mean? Perhaps it was for that reason, I mean thinking as “let them keep like

that"... It could have been perceived as disrespect; because our fathers were all respected men. I guess, for that reason there was no one at the door. ... Yes, I think so, because I have never lived such an example, nor did my friends; I mean there were many girls around, at my age, no one ever said "that Muslim family asked my hand for marriage" or so. Never said, the reason underneath might be that [though] we were not much strict but very peaceful in our way; and they might have thought that when they took a Christian bride into family, she should convert to Islam; and since the Christian family would not permit it, the friendships will also be disturbed. That's why they did not ask such a thing for their sons or say daughters, I guess.

'The respect of the Muslim community for the Christian community' turns to be a symbol, in S.O.'s narrative, whereby the boundary between the communities is constructed. Cohen (2000) argues that in some cases, the members of a community 'advertise' the stigma with which its members feel themselves to be branded. Though religious difference may not be thought, per se, as a 'stigmatic identity', we know that it could turn to be so, especially as it was reflected in the yells of 'infidels' ['gavurlar']. It might well be assumed, thus, that such 'stigma' also acts as a boundary marker and, more, an impediment for intermarriages. Thought within this framework, S.O.'s narrative could be reflected upon as "us[ing] the stigma as a symbolic means of asserting and embellishing its own boundaries – indeed, as a means of constructing an alternative community" (Cohen, 2000: 62). It was also important that S.O. stated in regard to her own daughter that she was 'totally free' in her choice in marriage and that "even it could be a Negro; be him first a human".

Indeed, other second-generation parents' reflections on their children's potential marriages were also revealing. Most of them stated that they would have preferred them to marry someone of their community/religion since they believed that there would be "a problem one day", "even if it looks like there is no problem at the beginning", mostly "starting with the baby and continuing with the interruptions of the families and relatives". If faced to such cases, however, many have stated that they will not oppose the marriage to take place since, if their children "will attain happiness with a Muslim, their happiness [was] prior to everything". While some stated that "we would warn them in cases which are in discord with us", others stated that "it wouldn't matter; if only [the potential candidates] were honest and [their children] loved them". Others noted that the "preference belong[ed] totally to the children themselves". One important statement belonged to T.T. (1968, Greg.Arm.,

F), who was single and stated that in case of a marriage “[she] would have thought twice not for [her]self, but for the pressure the person [she] would marry will face in the society”, even though she privileged the children’s preference in a potential case. These statements, all belonged to Armenian respondents -all jewelers- of the questionnaires, were independent of education and denominational affiliation.

In other cases, mutual respect was pointed as an enabling factor of intermarriages. H.A. (1951, Jew, F) for example stated that:

[m]y daughter-in-law is not Jewish, and we love her very much. ... She is very respectful to our traditions; we are too, to their feasts and so. We have mutually a very good relationship.

A.S. (1940, Greg.Arm., F) similarly stated that they have Muslim brides and bridegrooms in the larger family and they love them since “they are very respectful and very decent people”. In these cases, intermarriage seems to be tolerated, provided that respect for ‘different religious-ethnic identities’ was received.

Still, in other cases, boundaries defined through religious-ethnic identities appeared to be blurring in the emphasis on ‘being from Anatolia’. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M) puts forward such an emphasis:

For sure, there is no difference; they [the Muslim brides and bridegrooms in the family] are our dears, our own kids... Anyway, we were together for whole life; we were never separated. Our home is here I mean, I explain you. ... There is no difference for us. At this moment, if my son or daughter comes and asks for our consent, for sure as parents we will search and ask, but when the issue is religion we can not be sensitive that much. The religion factor cannot be the priority. When looked at the whole world, the religion has lost its importance; the only thing is belief. What comes beforehand is the humanity. First of all, it is human, put it aside. Turkishness, I mean we are all Turkish, but there is no difference between being Muslim and being Christian.

Religion, which is perceived to loose its importance in the world, becomes a structural factor laid for the intermarriages in the narrative above. Another structural condition became evident in some other narratives was the fact of “living in Turkey” or “living in a Muslim country” which were pointed as the inescapable ground for intermarriages. B.T. (1957, Cath.Arm., M), for example, stated that “I am not conservative, in any case you live in a, you live in Turkey, in a Muslim country; these are events that will take place sooner or later”. And, B.E., (1946, Cath.Arm.,

F), reflected her attitude on a potential intermarriage of her only single daughter in the words “it would change according to the conditions; but now the children decides everything and since we live in Turkey, why not?”.

Another structural factor enabling intermarriages was indeed the population amounts of the respective communities. It was a recurrent point that since the populations were anymore very few the children did not have the chance of socializing with each other and making their decisions within those relations. H.Ö. (1953, Cath.Arm., M) was among the ones one who have pointed to this factor. However, his narrative was important more in its pointing to the perception ‘other’, the Turkish/Muslim, as a homogeneous whole:

I would prefer [my children] to marry a Christian, but it is 90 per cent clear that it won't be. Because, around us there are not many people. If my daughter comes tomorrow, I won't oppose, but my preference is that he would be a Christian. Because there will be religious dispute, whether to go to the church or to the mosque; if the marriage will take place at the church or at the mosque; which of them the children will attend, there will be many problems. But there are [cases]; my brother is married to a Muslim, married to an Alevi girl, they are very happy, there is no problem. ... Well, I find the Alevis more modern.

Indeed, a comparison between the Alevi and Sunni people was a recurrent one in many narratives, especially in terms of the smoother relations with the former. There were also other cases of intermarriages with the Alevis. K.G's (1937, Greg.Arm., M) family points one such case. His narrative is important not only pointing his perception of the ‘other’, but also the details of their family relations and self-understanding in the face of the other:

Well my daughter-in-law is also Muslim, both of my daughters-in-law... Yet, it happened like this, for instance, to introduce - my younger son got married first, then did the elder - he said “this is so and so, I will bring her”. I said “for sure my boy”. Well, I immediately thought of my own daughter, I said what if my daughter goes in such a situation, and the other side, the mother and father of the boy objects, how will my daughter feel there, I mean. How she will feel. That's why I mean... The only difficulty for me was this, if I had taken someone of my religion, I could behave more flexible. Now it is necessary for me to be gentler in case they say to their daughters, I mean, “look you did not marry someone of our religion and now look your mother-in-law is like that, father-in-law is like this”; that is for them not to hear a word I mean. I am more careful. For instance, the wife of my younger son, they are from Hacı Bektas; Alevis. ... Her father is a gentle man. For example, the whole family, we had a funeral a week ago, and they could not come to the ceremony, they were at the village; yesterday, all the family came for condolence, they were full of two automobiles I mean. ... They are that much decent. ... Well, we went to their village in August, I mean my younger son said “come on we are going to Hacı Bektas, let's go

together". Be sure that there, I, in the month August, wore up shirt and tie and walked around in the village like that; and my *diniür*,¹³⁶ yet, took me and introduced to every relative saying that he is my *diniür*. I was careful with both my speaking, and my dressing, and my things. That's just for my bride not to hear a word. For that reason, of course what we are doing for them, they are doing for us; they are doing the exchange I mean. That's they are that much polite I mean, the children are, too. ... There was no problem I mean. Besides, in terms of religion and so, since we were born and bred here, there will be no problem I mean.

I suggest thinking the narrative above in relation to the one below which was asserted by B.T. (1957, Cath.Arm., M):

I have friends, for example, who are married to Muslims, and we still see each other, we visit each other I mean, and we had nothing uneasy. We are like brothers and sisters you know, nothing, we cuddle and kiss each other, we sit, eat and drink together, we go to holidays; we never had such a difference.

Although, the above two narratives seem to point two opposite poles regarding the state of 'being at ease' in terms of attitude towards the 'other', I suggest that they both engage in the symbolic construction of community identity. Here, this construction is realized through implications of 'more flexible', 'more intimate', if not 'more modern' stand of the community, especially, in terms of inter-sex relations. In both cases, moreover, this construction emerges on the boundary established between 'us' and 'them'; the only difference being that the boundary is 'watched out' in the first case and 'could be crossed' in the second.

Consequently, to reflect upon the narratives on marriage relations, it could be argued, as Cornell and Hartmann did, that intermarriages "make movement across the boundary easier, complicating the transmission of identity, and making single component identities less salient in people's lives; although, it is by no means arguing that there is a "decline in the significance of ethnic identity" (1998: 172-173). On the contrary, following Cohen's argument that "a boundary-crossing stimulates the individual's self-reflexivity", whereby boundaries are understood "as matters of consciousness rather than of institutional dictation" (1994: 69), I suggest that marriage relations and intermarriages help people construct a community

¹³⁶ The Turkish word used to indicate the parents to whose daughter/son, one's own daughter/son is married.

identity whereby they reflect their individual experiences through symbols they have invested on the assumed boundaries of that community.

7.3. RELIGIOUS LIFE

As it appeared to this point, religious and ethnic affiliations were, largely, the one and same for the narrators. Thus, it is important to pay a specific attention to religious life. However, this attention will not be, here, on 'religious identity', which necessitates a comprehensive expertise and which is outside the limits of this study. Specificities of religious beliefs and rituals were, accordingly, not among the issues the study has focused on, though they were in some detail narrated. Rather, I have approached to religious life as a part of community organization and tried to see how it acted as a boundary mechanism for the individual's construction of a sense of community. In the following, I will try to reflect on these as they appeared in the narratives.

7.3.1. The Jewish Community

The Jewish community in Ankara appeared to have experienced a very organized religious/community life until the population got smaller. The center of this organization was apparently the synagogue. The synagogue in Ankara, which is still in the so-called 'Jewish neighborhood' in Ulus, is tied to the Chief Rabbinate in Istanbul. Until the late 1960s, there was a full time Rabbi in Ankara who was assigned by the Chief Rabbinate. As the population got smaller, a rabbi who came to Ankara on Fridays and turned back on Saturdays continued to organize the rituals (Bahar, 2003). Currently there is not a rabbi in Ankara and the synagogue is open only on specific days for religious rituals, for funerals and for the now very rare wedding ceremonies. Rituals are headed by the elders of the community who are accepted to be capable for such post, especially by members of the family who carries the surname that is recognized to be blessed according to the Jewish traditional system.

As already noted, before the population got few in number the role of the synagogue in the community organization appears to be a very active one in Ankara. Until the late 1940s, for example, as Bahar (2003) collects in her memoirs, there was a synagogue chorus, which sang not only in the festivals and wedding ceremonies, but also on Friday evenings and Saturday mornings. Still, it is understood that a chorus existed at later periods too, since H.A. (1951, Jew, F) stated that in her wedding ceremony, which took place in the synagogue, the chorus sang hymns.¹³⁷ There was also a synagogue foundation responsible for the fiscal matters of the community organizations. L.N. (1924, Jew, M) stated that the foundation mechanism was working until a few years ago, however, is not currently. He recollected on how the mechanism worked in below words, which reveal, moreover, a wider framework with references to hierarchical positions within community that are implied by class differences:

They used to want some amount of donation annually; it went on like that. Besides, there is a tradition in the Jewish religion, when you go for the praying, everyone who will have a pray for their deaths like a '*Fatiha*' or so, those are invited to the chair, he does the praying, and then what amount he wishes he donates. This became a tradition and everyone made a donation certainly. Either specifying the way it will be spent for, stating "due for spending in this work" or due for spending for everyone "I have donated fifty millions, a hundred million [liras]" says him and ends the prayer. That money was aggregated somewhere like a charity, and for the expenditure of the synagogue, for the salaries of the servicing men there and so it was used. It was so from the past on, but I guess now there is no such thing, since the mechanism doesn't work. In addition, annually, for example, our elders, my grandfather and so since I had known him, since my childhood, there were some fixed places in the synagogue, fixed banks; he had a place, it belonged to him and for that place every year he paid something, voluntarily. But it was said that 'in proportion with his honor', well the money that time ten millions, if you paid ten liras I mean it was a big money. ... Everyone knows his place. There were such things; I mean that was also accepted as an income. For the fixed places on the sides; there were also the free places in the middle, whoever wishes comes and sits wherever he wishes. For sure, all these were small incomes. ... It was also so in the funerals I guess, some fixed fees were given. Anyway if it weren't, they couldn't stand still. There is no other income, well, it is sure that the state won't help. The community will meet its needs on its own. As I have said, in a closed community there will certainly be an amount of solidarity within itself. The rich, too, not to be ashamed, pushed the boat out ["*kesenin ağzını açar*"] willingly or not, and the stuff went on like this.

An additional factor in the fiscal organization of community appeared to be the relations with the Jewish communities in Istanbul and Israel. This was the case, as

¹³⁷ The wedding ceremony and the synagogue were described in great details by H.A. Since, however, these details are beyond the scope of this study I won't refer them. Still, it is important to point that the synagogue, which was described in its 'beauty', 'oldness', 'magnificence', was perceived by H.A. as a symbol which marked not only the community, but also the personal identity.

H.A. recollected, in the restoration of the synagogue in 1994, as both communities contributed in great amounts. The donators were mostly the ones who have migrated from Ankara earlier.

Another nodal point in the organization of community life was the ‘community leader’. I learnt that there was a community leader for the Jewish community in Ankara and ‘he’, always male, acted almost as a court. H.A. (1951, Jew, F) recollected the duties of the ‘community leader’ as below:

He was our leader here in Ankara. He is one the prior of the community. In case of a problem, they were applied and their words were listened. For example, let’s say there is a problem between two families, immediately people go there and just as the United Nations Kofi Annan, there is immediately a solution posed; because their opinions were very important, there was a huge respect for their ideas, I mean when they said “please solve this problem” the disputes were over.

The rabbis were also apparently not only the religious leaders but also leaders in the organization of the community life. Bahar states that if the community leaders were insufficient to solve the problems then the rabbis were asked for their idea and solution; also, they were responsible for butchering meat (2003: 135). We learn in Bahar’s memoirs, also, that in mid-1960s, under the heading of the rabbi newly came from Istanbul, ‘Mahazeke-Torah’¹³⁸ courses were organized on Sunday mornings and the children were collected by a community member, who was then also in charge of management of the courses, and taken to the synagogue (2003: 136-137). She states that the children were thought the community traditions and customs there, and the boys were trained for their Bar-mitzvah¹³⁹ rituals. N.E. (1957, Jew, M) who attended these courses in his childhood recollected his memories:

That rabbi, I guess, went crazy at a time and decided to teach us Hebrew here. We went to the Synagogue on Sundays. A. [my elder brother] went, I also went, we crowded into a minibus and went to the Synagogue, but I was I think 8-9 years old. ... Our family had sent us, I don’t know why ... I attended for a six months or so I guess, A. may have kept on a

¹³⁸ Mahazeke-Tora: Courses for the religious education of the youngsters that are more comprehensive in content than the Talmud-Tora courses for the children (Bahar, 2003: 192-193).

¹³⁹ The Bar-mitzvah is considered, in the Jewish belief system, to be the start of adult life for the male and is celebrated by a ritual in the 13th birth-day of the male children. H.A. has pointed in her narrative that it was also celebrated for the girls in Israel, and recently also among the Jewish community in Istanbul.

little more; I don't remember clearly but then we did not go there anymore. Then the Rabbi, anyway, left Ankara. I mean after that not a continuous Rabbi came anymore. ... I don't remember how many children were attending the courses, but might be thirty or forty children, since me and A. were not in the same class. ... We went to the synagogue and sang songs, there were also such things.

The rabbi was also responsible for the duty of Circumcision of the male child (Brith-mila) which took place in the 7th day of the birth. A narrative, which was seemingly on the sacredness of the 7th day and the ritual of circumcision, became, interestingly, a boundary marker in H.A.'s (1951, Jew, F) articulation, which symbolized in this case the 'modern' families:

[b]ut recently, I hear a lot that in Turkish families, too, there are many now who have their child circumcised at the hospital immediately after his birth; it is better, I think, than having it at the age of eight or nine. ... I guess not much left so; especially I mean in modern families I hear that they have it at the hospital.

H.A. and R. (1945, Jew, F) also, recollected how the feasts (Pesach, Rosh Hashanah, Sukkoth, Yom Kippur, Shavuot, Hanukkah) and other religious rituals (miqve,¹⁴⁰ bar mitzvah, Brith-mila) were experienced in Ankara. These recollections were in great details not only of dietary organization, dressing style and other normative procedures, but also of the mythical stories on their origins and meanings, the most frequent being "the biblical exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt across the Red sea" (Smith, 1996: 196). Though important, those details will only be reflected, here, in their symbolic meaning as they were mostly "myths of ethnic election" and "myths of ethnic survival" in Smith's words who asserted that these myths "may unite and inspire the members of an ethnic community over several generations" (1996: 189). What is further important in terms of symbolic meaning of these myths, as Smith argues, is that they are demanding in terms obligations since they remind that "one is chosen on condition that one observes certain moral, ritual and legal codes, and only for as long as one continues to do so" (1996: 190). However, recollections of these narratives were not free of reference to changes at present, which were due to the structural conditions the community faces, most important

¹⁴⁰ Miqve was the ritual bath taking place before the wedding day. H.A. and R. called it "bride bath" and described the celebrations took place in Şengül Bath in the Jewish neighborhood. 'Cleanness', 'abundance' 'togetherness' and 'happiness' were the symbolic meanings appeared in the narratives whereby a sense of community was constructed.

being the population size. Thus, following Cohen, we can suggest that all these feasts and rituals were symbols which H.A. and R. attributed meanings regarding “the continuity of past and present” and “the cultural integrity of the community in the face of its apparent subversion by the forces of change” (Cohen, 2000: 103).

7.3.2. The Armenian Community

7.3.2.1. The Church

I have already pointed that the church to which the Armenian community in Ankara has traditionally been attending is the French Catholic Church, which was founded in 1928 in the place whereby an Armenian school stood beforehand. There are two other Catholic churches in Ankara, one in Italian Embassy, the other in Vatican Embassy; and there is not an Armenian church, neither Apostolic nor Catholic. The only church, which serves during weekdays in Ankara, is the French Catholic Church, to which not only Catholic Armenians, but also Gregorian Armenians, Catholic/Orthodox Assyrians and Keldani in Ankara attend. The church was defined to be an ‘inter-denominational’ one by a Catholic Armenian. Another reflection on this situation was articulated by S.O., (1962, Greg.Arm., F), in a manner pointing a distinction between ‘us’ [Christians] and ‘them’ [Muslims]:

When you compare with your *imams*, you have a very different distance, but we are much more intimate; I don’t know due to the Alevi-Sunni issues you have big problems, the one will not go to the place the other is, and visa versa. Look this is a Catholic Church, but when the Patriarch comes from Istanbul, our Father opens the church, whatever should be done does it, our father also accompanies; and this door is always open to all of us.

However, there were also some people, Gregorian and Assyrian,¹⁴¹ stating that they were not attending to the church, or attending only very occasionally, since it was not ‘their’ church. That the majority group attending to the church was mainly Catholic Armenians, was also approved by the priests.

¹⁴¹ I have interviewed with some Assyrian people, but they are not integrated into the study.

The liturgical language in the French Catholic church is Turkish; but when also some French people, who are mostly the consulate members, attend to the rituals French also is used as the language of the ritual. Attendance to other two churches -though a rare one- is also present among the Armenian community; and some narrators stated that they attended to this church since the language here was Turkish. It also emerged that the priests¹⁴² who serve in the church have taken Turkish courses to realize the rituals in Turkish.

The priests have asserted that church went on the donations that the attendants make. One has stated that “there is nothing from France, or another country, only the Christians help us to live on and to do some good things”. And a Gregorian Armenian has replied this stating “the power will emerge out of unity”.

The church appears as the center of the community life and supplies, indeed, a sense of community identity. It has, first of all, a role in religious terms. In addition to the periodic rituals on Sundays, on the first Fridays of each month and the rituals on religious feasts (Christmas, Easter, and special celebrations for the saints), also the ceremonies of baptism, weddings and funerals take place at church. Though attendance on Sunday prayers are not much high –it was stated, by the priests, at most to be 50 persons¹⁴³- it is higher on the feasts -around 150 persons- or other occasional cases, such as baptism, weddings and funerals. One of the priests has stated that “most of them want to live as other Turks do, they don’t come to the church and they want to be ‘normal’... The Father served before us [until 2002] for fifty-six years stated that he was in relation once with 200 families, today we are in relation not more than a 100 person”.

Among people, I have spoken to, only few have stated that they attended to the church regularly. Some of the others stated that there was not much time for

¹⁴² The current three priests respectively from France, Germany and Belgium, are the members of Ankara Jesuit Community. One has stated that after a long period of relations with the Faculty of Theology Ankara University, which were realized on academic ground, the Jesuit Community have decided to send some permanent priests to Ankara and they were chosen among others.

¹⁴³ In the Sunday and Friday prayers I have attended, there were usually less than 50 people; however I observed the increase in number when it was a special day.

attending every Sunday, though they attended to the special prayers certainly; some pointed their health problems as an impediment for a regular attendance; and some stated that they were not much religious persons and attended to the church usually for praying in the name of the deceased family members before a visit to the cemetery.

The church is, currently, also a place for religious education whereby the children at the age of 10 to 14 attend to the classes before taking the First Communion. This tradition was observed also by the first and second generation Armenians. B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F) and V.T. (1943, Greg.Arm., M) have recollected that they attended to the classes at the weekends when they were at primary school. However, this religious training does not actualize as a periodic one for each single child; rather each year some other children attend to the classes and after the First Communion ceremony, the training is over. During the study, I have observed some children, not more than ten, attending to the classes.

The religious role of the church appeared also in relation to religion conversion. In the narratives it appeared that, there were people among the Muslims who have converted to Catholicism. In this line, H.Ö. (1953, Cath.Arm., M) stated that:

My mother was many times the baptismal mother of many people in the church, the ones who converted to Christianity from Islam. One of them has become a Father now; he converted to Christianity a seven or eight years ago. Now there are 15-20 [once] Muslims in the church.

One priest stated that there were Muslims who wanted to convert to Catholicism, but conversion to Catholicism was not actualized as an immediate happening as it was in Protestantism. He stated that they usually waited for two or three years before they baptized the person who wanted to convert in order to understand if s/he was sincere in her/his will. He pointed that there were cases whereby some people who converted to Protestantism beforehand came to the church and stated that they wanted to convert to Catholicism because they understood that it was the true way. He further reflected on the reason why “foreign priests” were serving at the church in a manner revealing some cases of conversion:

But why the foreign priests are coming; because there are no young priests among the Armenian and Assyrian groups in Turkey, unfortunately. Especially none in the traditional Christian families. It is difficult, because there is not a religious school, a university, a faculty for them in Turkey. There are some young people; one is from Antakya, one is from Mersin, that's it. They are coming from Muslim families, and they are baptized; now they are studying Religion in Europe and they want to turn to Turkey.

The role of the priests should also be pointed as a center for the community identity, which is established on religious grounds. Such role and the expression of religious norms as a marker of community identity was articulated in K.S.'s (1928, Greg.Arm., M) narrative:

On festival days, our priests come to visit us, they pray; we won't start the meal without praying, we won't go out of the door without praying, we won't go to bed without praying. That is, our traditions and customs are our peace; that's why as far as possible we come to the church on Sundays, beside we have some days, some religious days we come on those, too.

B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F) also articulated the role of the priests in supplying for the observance of religious norms at everyday life, especially in reference to the practices of the ex-priest of the church who served in Ankara for fifty-six years, until he was called back by France on the ground that he got old anymore. B.E. accordingly stated that:

[H]e used to visit all of us after the feasts; he prayed for our homes [*"evimizi okurdu"*]; we welcomed him for the dinner, he had been in our dinners. We had a different closeness. The patient were prayed just the same as you do; our belief is the Communion for example, we wish s/he take it certainly before s/he passed away, he used to come and tried to give that Communion, that's with prayers and so.

The sincere relations established with the ex-priest were recurrent in many narratives, even in the ones, which belonged to persons who stated that they were not believers. Such references might be thought as being a sign of the symbolic meaning of the religious leaders, the church, or the religion in the construction of the sense of a 'distinct community', whereby the members of a community share the symbol "but its meaning varies with its member's unique orientations to it" (Cohen, 2000: 15).

The role of church in providing a center for the sense of community appeared also in its organization of solidarity patterns among the members of the community. Though

it was a recent attempt, it emerged that under the leadership of the priests and some community members, the few old-aged people who did not have families or relatives in Ankara, were being helped for their daily subsistence. There is not a community hospital or a sanctuary for the old-aged people in Ankara. It appeared in the narratives that the old people were looked after by their children or by their relatives. B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F) stated that there were currently around twenty old women living alone and there were also some men. Most of them had their children in Ankara, or else they could look after themselves. Some few people who had neither children nor relatives in Ankara were sent to the Armenian sanctuaries and hospitals in Istanbul. These institutions having their own “small churches” inside were described as “places of preference” since people “could realize there also their rituals”. There were also cases whereby old aged people were not accepted to the sanctuary in Ankara since they were not born in Ankara; this was the case whereby an Assyrian woman, aunt of B.E’s husband who has migrated from Mardin, had experienced. In this case, the woman was sent also to Istanbul.

The church also appears to be a socialization place for the Armenian community in Ankara. I have beforehand pointed its role in the arrangement of marriages. Above I have also stated that on occasional rituals the attendance to the church was higher than was in regular prayers. Some narrators pointed these occasions in their providing for socialization. This role was especially important when remembered the internal differences of the Armenian community in terms of class and residential places. B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F), for example, after narrating on the dispersal of the community to different districts which reflected to a degree the class differences (Çankaya, Gazi Osman Paşa versus Keçiören, Aydınlikevler) stated that still they came together in the church:

We have dispersed in that way. Still, however, if we are relatives we visit each other. Usually on certain days, after the ritual we have cocktails downstairs in the church. We have the possibility of seeing each other there. In weddings... Also we have much respect to the deceased... We come together in those places. I mean even if we have lost our elders, still we, the youngsters, know each other.

S.O.’s (1962, Geg.Arm., F) narrative on the issue pointed that these occasional rituals also provided for inter-ethnic socialization:

For example, you have the praying “Mevlit” after the deaths, or after the new born babies and so; for this we use the saloon that you have seen in the church. And we call also our Muslim friends and acquaintances, they sometimes join us also in the ritual, then they join to the meeting downstairs, and also everyone who attended to the church that day are invited. And it is a place where everybody comes together, the socialization is there totally. But coming together, visiting each other is different of course. ... It is only with the ones you get along best.

The above narratives could be interpreted through drawing Cohen’s theory of community. It appears that the church reflects, if not provides for, a ‘commonality’ between the individual members of the Armenian community. In this sense, it could be accepted as a symbol of the community. It also appeared to this point that the meanings attributed to this symbol were different in different cases. These different meanings ranged from praying for salvation, to arranging marriages, from introducing children to Christianity, to coming together for socialization; from actualizing a duty to a deceased elder, to making the self-identity apparent to the ‘other’ [by taking a wondering neighbor in the workplace to the church to make him see the ‘commonly shared symbol’ of the community]. Thus, the commonality among the Armenian community, in terms of sharing the symbol of church, could be suggested to be one:

[o]f *forms* (ways of behaving) whose content (meanings) may vary considerably among its members ... [who] recognize important differences among themselves, [but] also suppose themselves to be more like each other than like the members of other communities (Cohen, 2000: 20-21).

In this sense, as Cohen suggests, community becomes a boundary-expressing symbol.

7.3.2.2. Religious Feasts

A detailed elaboration on the specificities of the religious feasts was not among the purposes of this study; thus, I did not ask the narrators to make such a focus. Interestingly, reference to feasts in the narratives usually came up spontaneously; and they had mainly two points: being markers of the unity of the community and one of the boundaries whereby interaction with the Muslim community was actualized. Thus, we can suggest that religious feasts act as symbols of the community.

Feast days appear to be ones of intense preparation according to the necessities of the specific feast, that is Christmas or Easter, and ones whereby the members of community visit each other. The narrators stated that since one day was not enough for visiting everybody, the feasts usually were celebrated during the whole week. Residential dispersal appeared to be the factor causing such lingering. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M) have pointed this factor in his narrative:

The life conditions in the world got harder, for sure. We used to live in specific places of Ankara. For example, when I got up on a feast day, if I walked around Hacı Dogan and Tabakhane, all the relatives, acquaintances, and the feast was over. But now, is it possible, will you go to Keçiören, or to Aydınlık, or to Çayyolu, everywhere there are. Well, the conditions of the day have changed, we don't have that much time; you can not do it all in one day, not in two days...

Some narrators, both first and second generation, recollected that in their childhood they used to take their baskets with them and collected hundreds of eggs on Easter days. Yumul states, in her study on the Istanbul Armenians, that dying eggs in red symbolizes Christ's blood, the egg becoming a symbol of Christ's resurrection and a symbol of life; and that all her respondents observed this tradition (1992: 246). In the current study, too, dying eggs was referred to be the most frequently observed custom at the Easter. The number of the eggs dyed became in some narratives a sign of social capital. On the other hand, Easter was almost in all cases narrated in reference to the good relations with Muslim neighbors who visited their Christian neighbors on feasts days. S.O.'s (1962, Greg.Arm., F) narrative was collected accordingly:

It turns to be a festival in our neighborhood. Everybody is jealous of us; because we celebrate four feasts: our doors are open also in your feasts, too. ... Yet our feasts are recently on the agenda on TV, beforehand it was not so; [our neighbors] used to warn my mother "please tell us; we understand only when the number of the automobiles in front of your house increases that you have something at the house. We want also to come". They were coming to us, dressing in line with the respect you show to your feasts, some with their children, and some with her husband if he has returned from work. Especially the children love Easter very much; they come saying we will take Sister S.'s eggs. Therefore, we at this issue, have a very peaceful and happy feasts period. ... I dye over [400] eggs; thanks to God I have enough friends to consume all of them. ... Most of them are Muslims. ... Not 400 people come to house for sure, I take some eggs to my workplace for the friends who could not come for a visit, and you can take more than one egg, since they are all different in color and embellishment.

A similar narrative focusing on the relations with Muslim neighbors belongs to B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F). Here also the number of eggs is important, this time point to the generosity and the affluence of the family:

We had many Muslims neighbors around; we used to get along with them very well; we loved each other very much. When it was their feasts, we visited them; when it was our Easter and Christmas, they visited us to congratulate. Yet, all of my friends used to come to my mother and ask “Aunt Mari when we will eat Easter brioche, when we will eat eggs”. My father used to boil the eggs in cauldrons stating that “you won’t turn any children back; you will give eggs to all”.

Boundary marking status of the feasts appear in the sequel of B.E.’s narrative whereby she narrates on her old neighborhood friends in the words “my friends with whom I grew up together, who know our feasts and so ... they still tell about their memories on our feasts days”. The familiarity to other’s traditions appears as an enabling ground for the ongoing friendships. This is also recurrent in below narrative of B.E.’s whereby it emerges that such familiarity also prevents a spatial and temporal isolation, which is no doubt enabled with the character of rules that should be observed:

We don’t have uneasiness, we go to our church we practice our customs and traditions. And all our neighbors know that this is so. I mean today is our feast, or we are fasting. You know our fast is different, for example, we eat food only with olive oil; we eat vegetables grown on the earth. For instance, I never abstain from going to my meeting days or so, but my friends would know it certainly, today B. will come, she is for sure fasting, we shall cook something she can also eat, with olive oil, they certainly prepare something for me, too.

The role of feasts in supplying for a sense of community and for the actualization of unity was expressed in the narrative of K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M):

My house is the house of the father, among five brothers and sisters, that’s why, and I am the eldest man among the whole relatives, these are done naturally. Yet, our Easter and Christmas, is not different from your *Kurban* or *Ramadan* Feasts in terms of congratulation; we are same; in the same way there are visits, in the same way... The ones who are very close can stay for the dinner, it is the same with you; I stay for the dinner at many houses I visit in *Kurban* Feasts. ... Then, for example, my door is never closed at the feasts. ... We never close it down. I mean we don’t go for vacation at the feasts. ... Nobody closes; the elders stay usually at home and the youngsters visit them. ...If we don’t have this custom, it will be very bad, because people indeed see each other [through these occasions] ... Now, there is such era on feasts... I have Muslim friends, there are working women; you will see her at the feasts, you see once in a blue moon, not a matter for me, but she has elders too, she has to visit them also ... Closes and goes to Bodrum, closes and goes to Amasra... I don’t like it; we are anyway dispersed, we will break down totally. I mean, if I don’t visit one

whom I love, I respect, an elder on the feast day, when will I do. There is no time anyway, time has changed; some things should be retouched.

“Not closing doors” that is not going for vacation at feast times is asserted as a distinction between Christian and Muslim communities, whereby the former is pointed to observe the rule strictly. The emphasis in K.S.’ narrative is on ‘coming together’ at feasts periods, which supplies for the unity of the community. In other narratives, this norm of “not closing doors” was articulated with reference to some other symbolic meanings in that “at the feasts the door should not be closed, because to close the door is to close the way for the abundance of the year”.

7.3.2.3. Weddings and Funerals

Weddings and funerals are ceremonies accompanying some important rites of passage -marriage and death- that are accepted to be grounds whereby “communication of an ethnic identity is often carried out” (De Vos quoted in Yumul, 1992: 153). Although again a detailed analysis of weddings and funerals was not a purpose of this study, a brief reflection on their role in the construction of community, as it appeared in the narratives, is a necessary attempt.

One crucial emphasis some narrators -both Armenian and Jewish- made was that although the wedding ceremonies were actualized at the church and the synagogue, respectively, there was always ‘official marriage ceremony’. Accordingly, H.A. (1951, Jew, F) stated that “it was always so according to the *Turkish Law*, and there were always two separate ceremonies”. ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F), on the other hand, stated that “without religious marriage it would not be accepted as valid, but without seeing the [document of] official marriage the priest would not actualize the religious marriage”. What was interesting in pointing to a boundary was ‘1’'s statement that there were Muslims who suffice with *hodja*'s contract [*imam nikahı*]. In both cases, the emphasis seems to be on the strict observance of the *Law*.

Another interesting narrative, which could be suggested as revealing the influence of the representational discourse of media on the self-understanding of the narrators,

belonged to B.E. (1946, Cath.Arm., F). Her son got married in a church in Istanbul, whereby the ceremony was documented by the journalists, and was published in one of the mainstream daily papers. She commented on the news in that:

[O]ur ceremony at the church was documented, our dressings, hats, all were explained. I mean not a bad thing, they explained all very nice, stating that “these are the mosaics of Turkey”, everything was very nice. We liked it and even reserved a paper.

It appears that a discourse whereby minorities are represented as merely some authentic cultural entities which enriches the ‘hegemonic’ culture could have a role on the construction of self-understanding, on the ground that it is not a “bad”, if not ‘dangerous’, representation. I suggest that this role could be evaluated in reference to Hall’s argument, which was discussed in the second chapter, that identities were constructed in representation (1992a).

Funerals and other activities following death appeared to be important sites whereby community identity was constructed.¹⁴⁴ Upon the incident of death, the family of the deceased informed the church and the priest came to the home to “calm down the people with prayers”. The funeral takes place on the next day at the cemetery whereby “the priest and the whole community” attend. After the burial, there served some food and beverage for the soul of the deceased. If the death took place at hospital, the corpse is taken to the church and the preliminary funeral takes place there. During the week following death, the relatives and other community members visit the house of the deceased; thus, in this way, “they don’t leave them alone”. On the Saturday following the funeral, people gather in the house of the deceased, prayer takes place, and halva is served to the visitors. During this first week and also on following days, which could last to the 40th day after death the relatives takes some food with them to the family of the deceased. On the 40th day people gather at the cemetery and after the ritual, some food and beverages are served again. This custom was compared to the customs of the Muslim community in some narratives and the similarities were pointed. An important difference, however, was articulated in

¹⁴⁴ In this part I will reflect only on the narratives of the Armenians since in the narratives of the Jews funerals were not a part of recollection.

relation to taking food to the house of the deceased. K.S. (1928, Greg.Arm., M) in these terms stated that:

There is a difference between the Muslims and us in that when we take meal to the family of the deceased, we definitely eat with them; we stay too. Yet still we take with us some people close to us, our uncle, brother or others related to the family of the deceased; in accord with the degree of relation we took for instance three persons, five persons, ten persons and we drink there too I mean. ... And this might last twenty days, as well as forty days. ... But our Muslim friends for example, they also take whether dessert [*"baklava"*] or brioche [*"borek"*]; but they generally want to give it and leave. ... I mean we have such difference.

The same 'difference' was articulated by '1' (1929, Cath.Arm., F) who stated that:

Since Muslims are sending meal, we also anymore send meal to them and not eat with them. But among us it is altogether I mean, a table is prepared and everybody has the meal there, at the house of the deceased, and the thing everybody, who brings food, wishes is this. One day someone will bring, next day the other.

It seems that, though not expressed openly, eating in the house of the deceased is understood to be a part of the respect shown to the deceased and the family. It is also apparently a ground whereby togetherness of the community is actualized. As Cohen suggested, "apart from their religious or cosmological significance" funerary rites for the Armenian community appeared to be "an important sociological index of both the deceased and of those by whom they are mourned" (2000: 82).

Another boundary established between the relative funeral practices of the two communities appeared in S.O.'s (1962, Greg.Arm., F) narrative whereby she "as a person who does not let her friends alone in such occasions" observed a "chaotic situation" in the ceremonies of Muslims which was due to the "practice of burial at *ezan* time". She stated that "being limited to a short period makes it difficult for people to watch for their own funeral and to mourn for it, alongside other cries and among the crowd, since there are many funerals at the same time in the mosque".

The cemeteries of both the Armenian and the Jewish communities in Ankara are part of the Cebeci Asri Cemetery.¹⁴⁵ Many Armenian have stated that the graves were cracked down, the crosses were broken; and accessories on the graves were stolen by

¹⁴⁵ One of the three municipality cemeteries in Ankara.

'people around'. Difficulties experienced in relation to cemeteries were described by '1' (1929, Cath.Arm., F) in her narrative below:

Since there is not much place anymore, the deceased are buried on top of other. Everybody buries it on another relative of her/his. The Cemetery is big but the area reserved for Christians is small. ... They are breaking down the graves. There was a big cross in the graves of my mother and father; they broke it and the marble. Recently these are not repeated much. The guards are also taking care. The district where the cemetery is a little bit like that. Squatter houses, addicted people, uneducated, without families, there are people like that in those districts. The guards also stated that they could not overcome them.

B.T. in a similar way referred to the people around the cemetery as "ignorant" people living in Çin Çin neighborhood; but at the same time pointed, upon the reflection of the man working in the construction of graves, that they were some kind of *mafia* with "a leader who can gather around fifty people upon a single whistle". Many have stated that they had the graves of their relatives and family members restored for four or five times after their first construction. The common strategy followed was to reconstruct the graves in a "modest, simple, and plain" way, since the pictures, the marbles, the crosses were cracked down and the flowers and the ornaments were stolen and being "sold to other graves". B.T.'s (1957, Cath.Arm., M) narrative is interesting in that in the encounter to the 'other' he seems to develop his own strategy:

As far as possible, I try -because the subsistence of the people there is very limited, there are many children- now the children jumps of the wall and brings water or so for the graves; while going there I take with me some biscuits, some juice for them. Some says I have no shoes, I take shoes at home, those being worn less; then the old pants, old sports wear, because they need them there, the children, because really a very poor district it is, there are many children. ... I sometimes give some small amount of pocket money to them; it is also to make them happy you know.

The narratives on the damages to graves usually oscillated between the above references of the 'work of the children', the 'ignorance of the people around', on the one hand, and 'a sign of enmity', on the other. The latter was strengthened by their observation that "there is no similar damage to the Muslim graves" and "nothing in the Jewish graves".

A narrative, important in the strategy it follows, belonged to S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F) in her reflection of the problem as a matter of concern for the larger society and thus reversing the target of the “enmity” from the ‘self’ to the ‘other’:

When I experienced such thing in the grave of my father, I was really hurt. Put aside that we had constructed it recently, and our pain is still alive, there it is a tombstone, what do you want from it. But, for sure, I know the mentality which does this; it is also not important. But the point I am sorry for is that if a person has the power to do this, he is definitely at a certain age. That is the age of this person is at least 18. And he will be a soldier of this state he will be among the next generation this state will be entrusted. I was pained that he was stuck in such culture.

Cemetery, thus, comes to fore as one of the sites whereby encounter with ‘the other’ is realized in daily experience, when we think ‘the other’ in terms of the ‘uneducated, ignorant, nonurban, poor and uncivilized’. Some other encounters, moreover, were recollected in the narratives as crucial sites for the construction of ‘self’ and ‘other’, which could be summed under the title ‘daily experience’. I will turn to these encounters below.

7.4. DAILY EXPERIENCE

Daily experience, as Cornell and Hartmann suggest, refers “to the informal interactions that compose so much of the fabric of daily living” whereby “identities are signified, underlined, asserted and reinforced” in many ways ranging from “suggestive but fundamentally disinterested behavior -the unthinking use of racial or ethnic stereotypes that have become part of the common parlance- to overt discrimination” (1998: 184). Daily experience, thus, constitutes a critical site for the construction of identities of both ‘self’ and the ‘other’.

To this point, I have referred to the inter-group relations in many occasions, whether in the form of neighbors’ relations, or intermarriages, or in occupational life. Here I will focus mainly to the encounters experienced in some institutions of society whereby the ‘name’ of the individuals appeared to be a marker of their ‘difference’. The most frequently faced question in cases of these encounters are “what kind of a name is this?”, “where did you come from?”, “are you a Turk?”, and “do you have a TR identity card?” These questions, even if they were not asked in an overtly

discriminative manner, but only of ‘wonder’, seem to affect the perception of individuals in their position in the larger society and create a kind of resentment. One narrative revealing such resentment belonged to ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F):

At the banks, at the tax office, doctor’s, in the hospital, they ask “where did you come from?”; we didn’t come anywhere, we were always here. Recently at the tax office the officer asked “Are you Spanish, did you come from Spain?”, I got very angry, “what is the interest [“ne münasebet”], why should I be Spanish!”. ... According to the foreigners we are Turks, they call us Turkish-Christians; the native Muslims do not accept it much. ... As soon as they hear our names, they ask immediately “where did you come from”, the question is strange, the basis of Christianity is here, in Anatolia, all around Anatolia it is so. ... If it was only the non-educated [I could understand], the cultured ones ask, too.

An often applied strategy in the face of the question “where did you come from” appears to be reversing the question stating, as S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F) does, “I was in Turkey, even before Turkey had become Turkey; do you know where you came from”. S.O. and some other narrators stated that when faced this question “they stop”, because “there is nothing to tell more”. N.E., (1957, Jew, M), recollected a recent encounter at the Estate Office whereby he faced the stigma ‘foreigner’ in the attitude of the officer who applied to her colleague stating “should we ask him for the documents we asked from the foreigners?”. N.E.’s middle name is the old surname of the family, which was adopted as the middle name at the time of the Law of Surnames. Upon such attitude he reflected asserting “I am T.R. [abbreviation for Turkish Republic], I give you my Identity Card, what foreigner do you talk about!”. Such attitudes, however, are perceived, sometimes, to be ‘normal’ in the rationalization that people are not familiar with the names and they wonder. K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M), accordingly stated that “they ask ‘are you a foreigner’ because they wonder, since the speaking is fluent but the name is foreign”.

Name as the immediate sign of identity appears to be problematic for both the Armenian and Jewish community. As a result, many seem to have changed his/her name. And for the new generations “Turkish”/“Muslim” names were chosen. There seems to be a generational difference in the incident in that most of the first generation kept their names. There seems, also, to be a gender effect in that nonworking women, too, mostly, kept their names. However, one crucial factor affecting the decision whether to change the name or not was, overall, the frequency

of the encounter with the 'other' in official terms. Accordingly, some first generation, nonworking women have changed their names. Such case was articulated by K.G. (1937, Greg.Arm., M) in relation to her wife:

Well, now, I have also changed my wife's name. ... Why was it, well, since I am working here, she was dealing with the monetary jobs. Well, always, when she goes to a state office, the name was seen as foreign, most of them neither can pronounce nor can write I mean. That's why I mean, otherwise no problem.

K.G.'s son also has changed his name, the reason of which was stated to be that "the boy was young, he goes out, with his classmates, with his girlfriends, I mean we decided let's change his name". He also asserted that the teacher [at the high school] of his son, who was also a customer of K.G then, "came immediately" to him -upon learning about the change of the name- and expressed his interest in the words: "is there a problem at school, I am trying to do my best, I treat him with care not to insult him, is there a problem brother, I want to learn". He points to this case to support his claim that "many" among the larger society "tries not to hurt" them.

However, in many other cases the change and the feeling of compulsion to change the name, was not welcomed. An example was articulated by V.T. (1943, Greg.Arm., M) in his reflection on being an Armenian in Turkey:

I am both annoyed and tolerant; I am annoyed because I have experienced many things, I am tolerant because I, sometimes, perceive these to be normal. For example, this is not my name, I have changed my name. My surname also is not this; my father changed it. I want my name back. That time everybody has changed his/her name. Because you had to hide yourself in order to exist. Now, it is not so, for example I gave my daughter ... ["a Christian name"] The reason I perceive what happens in Turkey to be 'normal' is because all around the world such things are experienced. Living in France, in a Catholic country as a Muslim, is as difficult as living in Turkey as an Armenian. That's why I have decided that one should live in a country having the same religion as you do.

Other narrators reflected similar attitudes in some other countries; this time, however, reversing the subject-object positions regarding the discriminative attitudes. For example, H.Ö. (1953, Cath.Arm., M) stated that "they might think in Germany or Netherlands as 'where did these ["Turks"] come from'; it is because they are not familiar with; it [having Christian names in Turkey] is as if 'selling snails in the Muslim neighborhood'".

One crucial point, which came to fore during the study was that in the Armenian community men had already some ‘nick names’ from their childhood onward and they used these names outside their community, at work or at school. It was understood that the first generation used these nick names interchangeably with their actual names in their work life. A.T’s (1923, Cath.Arm., M) narrative provided an example:

We, really, have sometimes made up names. For example, some, the neighbors, the friends sometimes called me Gazanfer. Gazanfer up, Gazanfer down. ... For example, I am working at the store, at the workshop upstairs, Zeynel is talking to the customer, if [the customer] states “the infidels [gavurlar] are like this, they are like ...”, [he called me] “Gazanfer *Usta!* Come down! There is job!”, but if [the customer states] “The Christians are like ...” [he would] “A. *Usta!* Could you come downstairs”. I mean, what I will say, otherwise it is everywhere ‘A’. [If you ask] Have you seen something? I haven’t seen anything, neither a cruelty nor anything.

It was evident also that many among the second generation have changed their names officially and they adopted these ‘nick names’ as their actual names. This was perceived to be necessary mostly in the work life. E.Ş. (1963, Cath.Arm., M) noted down his and his brother’s case in the below words:

For sure there are cases that make us think [that we are treated differently because of our identity]. While our names were E. and F. [Christian names], before establishing our own store we have changed our names as E. and F. [Turkish-Muslim names] which have anyway continually followed us like nick names from our childhood on; and we made use of this change very much. Because, since we are not a very educated nation, you can face people who judge you only by looking at your name. Okay, we are Christians, but I don’t think that it is necessary to constantly announce it to everyone openly. We have seen people who, in order not to buy goods at the store next to us since he was an Armenian and telling this openly, have made shopping from us, without knowing that we were not Muslims. Did we surrender our religion or personality by changing our names? Of course not. Just, we did not think that it would be helpful to tell people that we are Christians and our mother is an Armenian [Gregorian Armenian]. We still do not think it will.

The above narrative reflects on the inter-ethnic/religious relations as well as the ‘use of the invisibility’ in a somewhat ‘hostile atmosphere’. This is also another version of V.T.’s statement that “*you had to hide yourself in order to exist*”. I observed that many second-generation men have had changed their names; and many second generation parents have preferred to name their children in “Turkish/Muslim names” or in “more modern names” as they articulated. Interestingly, moreover, many names had the same suffix, which provided the pronunciation to be similar to a “Christian name”. In some other cases, too, names, which have the same pronunciation in

European languages, were preferred. However, naming the third and fourth generation in Turkish names is not an exclusive pattern and there are cases whereby they are named in Christian names. Indeed, some narrators implied that at present, ‘approach’ of the larger society was getting more flexible and they, consequently, could, more often, name their children in Christian names. One point to note on ‘changing names’ is that it leads ‘real life consequences’ in terms of community traditions since due to changing name an old custom undertaken by the Armenian population, “name days”¹⁴⁶, is currently about to extinct.

We also learn from L.N’s (1924, Jew, M) narrative that converting names or naming the new generations in Turkish names is also the common pattern in the Jewish community. He articulates this to be a strategy among others whereby “everyone resists in his way”. He asserted, though making a reservation that this was “submission in a way”, that:

You won’t bring forward your own religious identity. If you don’t put forward it, I think there is not much problem, I mean more easily does the Sunnite community accepts it. Otherwise, they perceive you as foreigner. Always thinks you as a foreigner, or they don’t trust you, trust you less.

What appears in the above narrative is that L.N. perceives the boundary between the self and the other not in terms of the Jewish community versus Muslim community, but in terms of the ‘hegemonic’ versus ‘subordinate’ groups and in this line makes a difference between the Sunnite and the Alevi communities. Such differentiation was also apparent in S.O.’s (1962, Greg.Arm., F) statements that in many regions of Turkey “the attitude towards Christians is like the attitude of devoted Muslim to the Alevis”. Drawing on her cousins’ school experiences in Sivas, she concluded that “they are treated same as the Alevi children in the school life...they are treated as second class citizens ... I mean both in the religion classes, and in the precedence they are given...when one will be given a duty for example, they are not given”.

¹⁴⁶ “Name days” are defined, by the narrators, to be days when the meaning of one’s name, which is certainly a saint’s name, is celebrated. These days are specified in the religious calendar for Christians. People, better to say men, who have the same name in one family or among relatives, are stated to come together and celebrate these days together. Narrators stated that within Armenian community there were not ‘birthday’ celebrations, but instead ‘name day’ celebrations; however, currently these celebrations are very rare and only among the elders.

S.O.'s assertion was, moreover, important in that since it was not only the Christians but also the Alevis who are treated in a discriminative manner, she did not "worry about these much". Thus, we can understand her differentiation in terms of a criticism directed towards the 'hegemonic' as it was in L.N's case, and as a sign of perceiving the difference not be an 'ethnically oriented one'. This is also apparent in the reason she puts forward for the discriminative attitude, "lack of education".

A similar differentiation, reflecting the heterogeneity of the 'Muslim community', was made also between Kurds and Turks. N.E., (1957, Jew, M), in his reflection on the attitude towards 'difference', which culminated in the face of 'different names', pointed that "the same happens to the Kurds, most probably...some also talk about a Kurdish name 'what kind of a name is it', 'there are no Kurds' and so on... Still it happens to the Kurds less... Kurds are more welcomed now, because there are many Kurds". Although 'hegemonic' versus 'subordinate' relation was pointed above, the fact that Kurds were more in number than the non-Muslim minorities affected the perception in that they were 'less discriminated', at least upon reflection to their names. Another statement made about Kurds, belonged to '1' (1929, Cath.Arm., F) who argued that "they are not discriminated much, since they are also Muslims". We can suggest, therefore, that 'being less in number' and 'being not Muslims', as the perceived criteria defining the 'minority' position, was utilized also as the criteria in their perception of the other 'disadvantaged' positions.

Another differentiation reflecting the heterogeneity of the majority society was made between the 'educated' and 'uneducated' people in that the former develops in many cases "positive discriminations thinking that the minorities are oppressed people". As it appears, perceiving discriminative attitudes faced in the daily life as to be following from individual differences is not an unusual case and such perception might be suggested as an enabling factor for interaction. However, there are also cases whereby more stereotypical attitudes are faced. From the very beginning of the study, it appeared that being called as "*gavur*" was a matter of resentment and anger, which underlined the boundaries clearly. Many have stated that "*gavur*" meant "infidel" but they were "believers of God". They criticized that not only the lay

people but also “even the professors on TV” are using the word. The usage of the term was reflected to be a part of “the culture of the society at large” in that culture as a construction site “refers to those ideas and understandings that appear to be dominant and privileged in a society and assumptions about relevant differences among different groups” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 173). ‘1’ (1929, Cath.Arm., F) pointed that:

[e]ven our closest neighbors call *gavur* when talking about the Europeans; Europeans are Christians we are also Christians, so they at the same time call us as *gavur*. ... On the one hand there is the attempt to integrate into the European Union; on the other hand they call *gavur*.

Cohen argues that “people become aware of their culture when they stand at its boundaries [that is] when they encounter other cultures, or when they become aware of other ways of doing things, or merely of contradictions to their own culture” (2000: 69). The above many examples revealed such encounters whereby boundaries were constructed and were attributed meanings. However, we should still reflect on two cases whereby the narrators claimed that they first became aware of their identities. One belongs to V.T. (1943, Greg.Arm., M) who narrated on his schooling years:

I first realized that I was a Christian at the [...] primary school.¹⁴⁷ The children had made a cross out of a wire and took it to the school. They gathered around me stating “you worship this, you worship this”. I did not understand; I went immediately to the teacher and asked “what is happening, why are they telling like this, why should I worship the wire cross”. And I went home in tears, I asked to my father “what am I, why did they tell so, why should I worship the wire cross”. My father said “you are not a Muslim as the majority is, you are a Christian”. You don’t know what is Christian, what is Muslim, you are a child yet. Upon this my father said “don’t worry, as soon as you complete the primary school I will sent you to a French school, you will be at ease there”; and after I completed primary school, I went to Saint Joseph in Istanbul. For the same reason my sister was also sent to an Italian school”.

Another such narrative belonged to S.O. (1962, Greg.Arm., F) who stated that she had the “first painful shock” from her [primary school] teacher, focusing that “she was not the actual teacher, but a contemporary one because of the illness of the other”:

¹⁴⁷ A primary school in Ankara Ulus. Indeed, it is the school whereby many members of the Armenian community, bor first and second generation, have attended.

In the painting class, the teacher gave us a theme, “Turkish flag, Turkish soldier”, whether in 23 April or in 29 October, now I don’t remember which was it, but the theme was this, and the winner will be chosen. First in the class, then at school and then would engage in a painting competition with the winners of other schools. ... I painted a soldier holding Turkish flag. I liked it very much, I mean it was very nice, our class will be the winner at school, this was important. ... Then, when I came to the class I looked at other paintings; the most beautiful was the one I painted. But I did not suffice with this and looked at the other paintings in the other classes, because I have friends in the other classes from the neighborhood. ... Really the one our teacher had chosen was not the one that could make our class the winner; I came to the teacher and asked “why didn’t you like my painting?”, she answered “I didn’t”; “but, why” I asked, I wanted her to tell me, for example, that its colors were not nice and so. On the contrary, I have painted the picture looking at the red flag at home to find the same color; what is that, on a sheet that absorbs the ink, just for it to be a nice one. I mean I tried hard, and the result was beautiful, why not we would be the winner. “No” she said throwing the picture, and when I asked “why”, she said “you, as a Christian, cannot paint this well”, “you cannot draw Turkish flag this well” she said. It was when I learnt that my religion was an obstacle; it was then, I met with the life for the first time.

She remembers coming home in tears and asking her father whether “being Christian mean[t] not to love [“sahip çıkmak”] this country”. Still, however, she adds that she did not reflected anything to her family and was awarded by the manager of the school, to whom she applied the next day in order for him to look at the all paintings and decide which the best was. At the end, her painting was chosen to be the winner of the school but not successful in the competition. This is again a narrative interwoven in an undecided language which oscillates between the ‘good of the school’ and the ‘talent and hardworking of self’, not in a contradictory but in a complementary manner. Whatever the structure, however, it points to an encounter on the boundary whereby the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ are constituted.

One more point to be made, upon reflection on the above narratives, is that school life for the members of the Armenian community and, to a degree, for the Jewish community¹⁴⁸ was somewhat problematic; and this could be suggested as one of the factors effecting many parents’ decision to send their children to private colleges. It came out during the study that in both communities many among the second generation sent their children to private colleges or prefers to do so. There were only a few cases, whereby the third generation has attended to state schools. Also among the second-generation narrators, there were people who have attended private colleges but this case was less in the Armenian community, whereby more frequent

¹⁴⁸ L.N. (1924, Jew, M) have narrated that he was called at both primary and high school in some Turkish equivalences of his name, either phonetically or in meaning, with the decision of his teachers.

in the Jewish community. Though, many have noted that to supply for “education in a foreign language” or for “a better education” was the main reason for their children to attend private colleges, T.T.’s (1968, Greg.Arm., M) statement was supporting my suggestion that ‘identity’ has a crucial role on such decision:

I have also studied at private schools and my friends have never treated me differently. I have school mates with whom I am in contact more than 25 years. They love what I am. At a state school, this is very difficult. There are always stereotypes.

To conclude, I have tried in this chapter to point everyday life as a fertile ground to understand construction of various boundaries between ‘self’ and ‘other’ whereby assertion and acting out of multiple identifications and feelings of belongings were actualized. Although boundaries are constructed in interaction, “the truth of the interaction is never entirely contained in the interaction” (Bourdieu, 1992: 81) and they draw intensely from, as well as, are burdened with the dispositions of habitus. Thinking this suggestion together with the claim on the symbolic construction of the community, thus, we can conclude that the symbols, attributed multiple meanings by individuals and through which the boundaries are constructed, emerges only on the ground habitus provides for and constantly acts upon it.

Accordingly, I tried to point the occupational life, marriage relations, religious life and daily experiences as spaces whereby ‘community habitus’, at least in some aspects, was structured for the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara and whereby it was re-structured by the very acts, and perceptions of the individual members of these communities. This point also suggests that “sensations of ethnic affinity are founded on common life experiences that generate similar habitual dispositions” (Bentley, 1987: 32). It is, thus, both “common memories that have become unconscious” and “the same rhythm of living” which counts for ethnic identity (Bentley, 1987: 33). Still, moreover, it could be suggested that the internal differences of communities which were reflected in differing class, educational, occupational, residential and socialization patterns of their members were aggregated into ‘a sense of community’ which in its symbolic construction provided a framework to accommodate these differences.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

This study began with an intention of understanding the identity definitions and practices of the members of the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara, with a specific concern on the social, spatial, political and cultural existence of these communities in the city. The historical context of the study was defined primarily to focus on the early Republican era, through integrating people who were born in this period, and to understand the affects of this era on the construction of present affiliations and identifications, through integrating the successor generation to this first group. The basic methodological tool to realize such intention was the evaluation of personal life experiences of Armenian and Jewish people in Ankara, which were obtained through oral history research.

The first task has been to focus on the concept identity. In the context of this study, identity was defined from a social constructionist stance, according to which the notion of identity is based on the premise that social realities are constructed and not given; and therefore need to be regarded as accomplishments to which human beings arrive through various social processes (De Fina, 2003). Moreover, this study aimed at understanding ethnic identities not in terms of their ‘cultural differences’, which bears the risk of ‘hailing’ them, but in terms of their practices and experiences, which were stipulated by the objectives conditions of their existence. Here, ‘habitus’ was applied as an analytical concept to refer to the operation of these objective conditions.

The second task has been to examine the role of memory in the construction, perception and expression of identity. This study drew on the assumption that memory is an active process of creation of meanings, rather than a passive

depository of facts (Portelli, 1998). In this perspective, the relation between the structure of memory, the structure of perception, and the broader socio-historical context of experience was taken to be a powerful one. Oral history provided this study with an opportunity to understand the meanings participants attributed to various events, experiences, and ascriptions that conditioned their identities. The way narrators structured their accounts, and the way they selected and arranged the elements of what they were saying became crucial in this understanding. In this way, the instances of an undecided and oscillating language, tongue slips, sudden shifts, silences, breaks and interruptions in the narratives, provided us with a comprehensive grasp on the various meanings life-stories were pointing. Focusing on practice, moreover, provided us with a broader view of the particular historical circumstances, which conditioned participants' identifications, self-understandings, and feelings of belonging.

Accordingly, it came out that identity perceptions of the Armenian and Jewish populations in Ankara were conditioned, basically, at three levels: the city, the state, and the community. This basic outcome, which is reflected in the organization of the narrative analyses, verified a preliminary assumption of the study that 'belonging' had a spatial dimension, whereby space was understood as articulated movements in networks of social relations (Yuval-Davis, 2001).

Conditioning of identifications at the city level came out to be related to two social-historical structural composition of the city-space, which I have termed as the 'old city' and the 'new city'. Understanding the relative positions of the Armenian and Jewish communities in these two respective spaces was crucial to see the forms of their integration into the respective social-historical-ideological formations that made up these spaces. The new city signified the capital city in its discursive and actual construction, and task of the study at this point was to follow the footprints of the city's Armenian and Jewish citizens, whose citizenship positions at the national level were defined at the margin. The results were as following:

The old city appeared to be a site of belonging, which provided for heterogeneity and for spaces of difference, with which various ethnic, religious and denominational groups could identify. Accordingly, Armenian, Jewish, Muslim and Greek populations lived in separate neighborhoods, having their respective worship places and practicing their own communitarian organization. In this sense, the narrators' identification with the old city should be seen as an assertion of 'we were once an important part of this city'.

In a manner to support the argument that residential concentration increases the probability of interactions with in-group members and adds a spatial dimension to the ethnic boundary (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998), I found out that separate neighborhoods strengthened separate communitarian identities. Accordingly, Catholic Armenians, Gregorian Armenians and Jews were pointed to live in different neighborhoods, although an amount of Muslim population was in all three neighborhoods. It was important that members of these communities pointed their identities and others' identities in reference to the respective neighborhoods wherein they had once dwelled. In the old city, therefore, borders of the neighborhoods operated as the boundaries of community identities.

A narrative of good relations and conviviality dominated the recollections both in terms of the neighborhood relations between Armenians and Muslims, and between Jews and Muslims. However, there was an apparent social distance between Armenians and Jews. This latter outcome was in contrast to my preliminary assumption that physical proximity would bring about a significant degree of relation between these communities. Such unproved assumption, consequently, pointed that physical and mental closeness did not necessarily overlap, but the key determinant in inter-ethnic relations was social distance (Bauman, 1998: 49-50).

Still, moreover, perception of smooth relations with Muslims in each case were complicated through recollections of transferred memories on the fires, the most important being the 1917 'big fire' whereby possessions belonging to many non-Muslim families, including some of the narrators, were lost. The complication point

in these recollections was the perception of an intention in the cause of these fires, for which ‘Muslim population’ was seen to be responsible, although mostly through an implicated manner, which appeared in the sliding of tongue, silences and breaks in the flow of the narratives. Still, more direct expressions, too, were narrated in an oscillating language. Therefore, we can conclude that while memories of fires operated to draw ‘boundaries’ between Muslims and non-Muslims, pointing respectively to the ‘other’ and to ‘us’, in the context of the old city; these boundaries and otherness did not appear to be constructed as ‘absolute’ and ‘once-and-for-all’ kind. They, rather, pointed to contextual, shifting, and ambivalent boundaries.

One point to note in relation to the old city is that generation factor led to a certain difference in terms of identifying with it. Accordingly, the first generation who have spent most of their lives in the old city, and who were direct addressees of their parents’ transferred memories, identified with the old city more strongly than the second generation, who have spent only a small period of their early lives, if at all. Still, however, the image of the old city, as providing for the identity expressions of the respective communities, came to be influential on the perception of the second-generation participants, too. This, I conclude, pointed to the reference status of the ‘old city’ in the symbolic construction of both the Armenian and the Jewish community in Ankara.

A significant remark in relation to the ways of integration to Ankara, however, is that narrators of both communities defined themselves to be ‘Ankaralı’ not only with reference to the old, but also with reference to the new city.

Evacuation of the old city by these communities and their integration to the new city took place gradually which extended from 1930s to 1960s. However, the Jewish community was earlier to integrate into the new city, the process starting in 1930s and ending in 1950s. For the Armenian community, on the other hand, the process started in the late 1940s and ended in the late 1960s. I conclude that there was also a basic difference in terms of the reasons and in terms of the destination points of these movements for two communities. Accordingly, while the Jewish community ended

up in the recently constructed areas of the ‘new city’ following the routine development of the city; Armenians followed the footprints of their traditional life in the city, settling in the areas where already their vineyards were. Moreover, the reason for the Armenian community’s movement from the old city was in line with the dilapidation of the old city in 1950s, which had already become a business center then; while for the Jewish community it seems mostly, although it might have been affected by the dilapidation in its latter period, to be related to taking part in the new spaces of the new era. Another conclusion in terms of this first phase of the movements within the city space was that for both communities there was a certain affect of communitarian relations, since many, if not all, members of these communities followed each other in their destination points of settlement. This was summarized by one narrator, as “there was an inclination to live together”.

The second phase of the movements, on the other hand, emerged between 1960s and 1980s, lingering effects of which continued in 1990s upon the physical expansion of the city space. This second movement, however, reflected internal differentiation of the communities in class terms. Accordingly, due to the increase in their economic capital, some families, within both communities, have moved to the well-off districts of the city. In this case, individual rather than communitarian preferences were influential.

What was most crucial in understanding the positions of these communities within Ankara, however, was related to its capital-city status. Bearing in mind the discursive and actual construction of the capital city, which was burdened by the missions of being a symbol and model for both the newly established nation-state and imagined national community; I assumed that living in Ankara would be perceived and experienced as uneasy by the members of these minority groups. As a consequence of such assumption, I expected that it would be difficult for them to feel at home in Ankara. My assumption, however, was not verified. All narrators concluded that they felt themselves at home in Ankara. Reasons for such perception were important. First of all, it was related to their perception of being the ‘natives’ of Ankara. This was so for both the Armenian and the Jewish communities. Secondly, identifications of the

members of both communities were very much in line with the ‘modernization’ and ‘westernization’ discourse, which dominated the construction era of the capital-city and, indeed, the nation-state. They identified themselves with the symbols of ‘modern’, ‘western’, ‘progressive’, ‘laicist/secular’, and ‘civilized’. Therefore, they embraced the idea of living in a city, which was designed with references to these symbols. Moreover, their memories of having once involved in the very construction and maintenance of the symbolic spaces of the capital city, namely the recreational spaces whereby civilized and modern citizens were projected to be created, enabled them to feel belonging in this city. The last factor was in relation to the current conditions they face in the city. They perceive Ankara as a big city, which provides for the ‘anonymity’ and ‘invisibility’ of the individuals whose maintenance of identity is enabled. This is especially so in the lack of a ground, which permits the visibility at the community level. Therefore, although the Armenian and Jewish identities are invisible in Ankara at the community level, which is a fact strengthened by the social, historical processes and the constraints the communities face, such as small population size, the Armenian and Jewish individuals are integrated in their identity construction through the invisibility the city provides. The alternative life-space to Ankara is usually seen to be Istanbul, which provides also for the visibility of community. Still, however, Istanbul is not an object of preference in actual terms, that is nobody expressed a will to constitute her/his life in Istanbul; but appears to be a reference in abstraction, which could only be applied to ‘in case’. Drawing upon these findings, I conclude that even if they are less visible in the city-space at present, members of both the Armenian and Jewish communities are not less integrated in the actual social, spatial, economic structure of the city. It is only that once the *millets* of the old city are now the citizens of the new city.

Conditioning of identifications at the state level came out to be related to the encounters with the ‘state’ in its definitions of identities, its legal and political operations, and its various policies. We know that from its very establishment onward, various policies and enactments of Turkish state were in line with its projection of creating a ‘nation’ and a nation-state. Minorities were defined at the margin of this nation, if not outside. They were categorically ascribed (Barth, 1969) to be ‘minority’ and were positioned vis-à-vis the larger political community.

Therefore, understanding the positions taken by the minorities in these encounters, and their experiences in light of their categorical ascription, was a crucial attempt. The results reached in this line were as following:

There was a difference between the Armenian and Jewish narrators relating to the perception of minority identity. At the discourse level, Armenians did not appreciate the usage of the term ‘minority’ to point their identities. The term was perceived to indicate an ‘unequal’, ‘separated’, ‘different’, ‘inferior’, ‘degraded’ and even ‘distrusted’ position. Minority, in their perception, was an interpellation more about a ‘social status’ than about a ‘legal status’. Representations in the official discourse and in the mainstream media seemed to be influential in this perception. Jews participating in the study, on the other hand, were more likely to perceive the term ‘minority’ as a legal position and more ready to accept their minority position at this level. Still, however, difficulties of ‘being a minority’ in the context of Turkey was emphasized. Such difference, I conclude, might be a result, on the one hand, of the higher education level of the Jewish community overall, which could have supplied the distant and rational language, and the larger context of the narratives to draw on the issue. Influence of education was indeed apparent among the Armenian narrators, too, whereby the well educated narrated on the concept in a similar manner to the Jewish narrators. Another reason for such difference might have been thought in relation to the more closed structure of the Jewish society in Ankara, and the more integrated relations of the Armenian society in general. Such difference echoes a general representation of the respective communities in Turkey; however, its effect on the perception of being minority should be a focus of further research. Consequently, relative sizes of the two communities might have had an affect on the difference of perception, in that the less a population the more it perceives itself to be ‘minority’ in actual grounds.

The main focus in representations of the participants was on ‘belonging’. They defined themselves to be ‘*Türkiyeli*’, and to be ‘*Anadolulu*’. ‘Being a citizen’, ‘being a true child of the country’, ‘being born and bred here’ were other expressions

whereby these feelings of belonging were revealed. Turkey was perceived to be the 'homeland'.

However, such perception of belonging was complicated by the memories of past, which was coded in the expression of "those times" by the participants, and which referred to the periods whereby they faced various occasions of 'Turkification Policies' and 'differentialist citizenship practices'. Such complication was especially valid for the first generation who have directly experienced many occasions of "those times". These periods composed important sources of experience, which had crucial affects on the current perceptions, self-understandings and identifications of the narrators in both communities. One was that the following generations were constantly subject to the inculcation to refrain to be at the forefront, to express their identity in an open manner, and to trust to the 'foreigners'. Such inculcation seems to have been influential on the everyday acts of people, which appears in their calculated abstention from conflict, even if faced a 'stigmatic' representations of their identity; and in their preference to stay "one step backwards" as one of the narrators had voiced. Inculcation seems to be influential, also, in the more long-term calculations of the narrators, such as not involving in politics actively. Interestingly, moreover, high education level did not seem to lead any difference in terms of the touchy character of the inculcation.

One point to be made on the complicating character of the memories of 'those times' is that they were not woven into a language representing the 'self' as the once and for all 'victim' and the 'other' as the once and for all 'responsible'. Although these memories operated as powerful boundary mechanisms between 'self' and the 'other', these were not frozen into unchanging meanings. Boundaries were rather contingent and shifting. The narratives, accordingly, had an undecided language, oscillating between 'local' versus 'central' causes of the discriminative policies and enactments; or between blaming the 'state', the 'foreign powers', or some 'probable misbehaviors of the community members themselves'. Such undecided language of the narratives, consequently, prevented a closure on the meaning of the 'other'. This could be evaluated as an attempt at forgetting the painful memories in order to build a

peaceful and safe life (Tuğal, 2001), and, accordingly, as a trial to achieve a livable present in the light of a smoothed past (Bahloul, 1996). Still, moreover, I conclude that one important factor, which prevented hailing of the other, was their perception of Turkey, as the ‘homeland’, a determining space of belonging, and their projections of a more integrated society in the future. The homeland in this case was understood, as an articulation of both past and present social relations; and as an eternal and everlasting space being born and bred, having identified with, and attributed with meanings, not only of past but also of present and future life. Therefore, it is the articulation of habitus, as circumscribed by the objective conditions of having lived ‘here’ for whole life and projection of doing so; having lived together with the ‘other’ peacefully as neighbors and friends at present; and believing in a more open and democratic future, which helps prevent a closure on the meaning of the ‘other’. It should also be pointed that specificities of living in Ankara, whereby minorities did not face as harsh encounters as the ones in, say, Istanbul, especially in terms of the more recent occasions such as the 1942 Capital Levy enactment or the 1955 September 6-7 events, also had played a crucial role in these perceptions. The reason for less ‘harsh’ encounters, on the other hand, should be viewed in relation to the objective conditions of the respective communities in Ankara, in that the communities were relatively less in population size, less in wealth, and, thus, less in power. In sum, they were not treated much as ‘threatening elements’.

It was apparent in many narratives that assertion of Turkey as ‘homeland’ served for a claim to be counted as a ‘true Turk’. The narrators were posing for an identity definition based on territorial grounds. Such claim should be assessed in relation to the concept integration. The members of the Armenian and Jewish narrators participated in this study, posed for their integration in the ‘community inside’ (İçduygu and Kaygusuz, 2004). Various symbols in their narratives, Turkish flag, Turkish language, Turkey as homeland, *Atatürk* as the founder of the country and of the basic principles of the nation, military service as a sign of devotion to the country were all utilized for an assertion of theirs: to have participated “in the idea of nation” (Hall, 1992a). A formula of an Armenian narrator, which pointed to the multiple forms of belonging, was important in this sense “we are Turkish-Christians”.

Another identity position occupied in the encounters with the state was citizenship. Apparently, narrators emphasized on their ‘citizen’ positions. This emphasis had two dimensions overall. One was that citizenship pointed their status as ‘equal members’ of the political community, since it was perceived to be an enabling ground for the differences of identities. The other was that, although they fulfilled their duties as a citizen, they were not actually benefiting from the rights on an equal ground that this position provides for. This latter one was pointing, implicitly, to a perception of the “limited”, “conditional” and “at the margin” position of ‘Turkish minority citizenship’ (Parla, 1995). A consequence of such was that they narrated on their citizenry acts in a manner to reveal “a duty-based-passive identity” (İçduygu and Kaygusuz, 2004), which was in line with the general representation and practice of citizenship in Turkey. Another was an explicit abstention from ‘politics’, which was independent of the social, cultural, symbolic and economic capitals one had.

One important cornerstone crucial for the participants’ perceptions of their relative positions vis-à-vis the state was related to the European Union integration objective of Turkey. All participants, whether they had criticized the attitude of the European Union towards Turkey and put some reserves to the outcome of integration, or readily accepted it, shared some expectations relating the process of integration. The usual formulation of these expectations was referring to the overall advances in economic, social, cultural sites in Turkey; and the implication or expression that there would be enhancement in the legal, social, political positions of minorities was always there. Narratives on European Union, also made appear the various identifications of both the Armenian and Jewish populations in Ankara. These were namely ‘modernization’, ‘civility’, ‘progression’, ‘economic wealth’, and ‘education’. These identifications, moreover, operated as boundary mechanisms, through which the ‘other’ was pointed as the one who lacks the above qualities. Still, moreover, the EU process was approached, mostly, as an enabling factor for the multi ethnic, multi-religious and multi-linguistic structure of the society in general.

Conditioning of identifications at the community level came out to be related to the everyday life construction sites, such as occupational life, marriage relations,

religious life, and daily experience. In these sites, collective self-understandings and definitions of other were constructed and community life was organized. The main outcome at this level was that community identity, in both Armenian and Jewish cases, was symbolically constructed through the practices, articulations, and boundary mechanisms as they appeared in these sites. The findings arrived in this line were as following:

It appeared that there was a certain degree of occupational concentration in both the Armenian and Jewish communities in Ankara; for both generations in the former case and for especially the first generation in the later case. Such concentration was related mostly to the social and economic capital, each community respectively had, and to the process of inheritance of these capitals across generations, which was called as 'occupational habitus' (Etöz, 1998). It was added, in the light of the research findings, that although a degree of capital inheritance across the generations and its effects on occupational concentration was visible for both communities, another important reason for the maintenance of such 'habitus', especially for the Armenian community, was their denial of access into state institutions, which could be an alternative for them. Whatever the objective conditions, there was a strong perception of such denial for both the first and the second-generation Armenian narrators; and this operated as a powerful boundary mechanism having effects on identity, in that the community members were directed to find alternative solutions. These alternatives varied inescapably according to the variety of capitals the population had (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998).

In terms of the Jewish community, however, both for the first generation and the second generation there were cases whereby people were employed at state institutions, and there was not a strong perception of such institutional denial. In this case, effect of social and economic capitals the community had, were more determining in the occupational concentration viewed for the first generation. For the second generation, because of the lack of sufficient data, making a conclusion is more difficult; still, however, the narratives indicated that increasing education level led to a differentiation of occupational alternatives for the second generation. We

could observe such differentiation in the Armenian community, only for the third generation.

Whatever the reason, however, such occupational concentrations appeared to have obvious identity effects, sustaining a sense of being somehow 'different'. Accordingly, the fact that Armenians were mostly jewelers or tailors was narrated as a pointer of the 'god-given-talent' they had and their 'artistic skills'. All narrators, moreover, indicated that Armenian people were preferred by the customers, because of their 'talent', 'honesty and correctness at work', 'competence about the details of the job' and 'kindness towards the others'. These representations could, also, be thought in relation to the representation of 'non-Muslim' identity in the general society as one of 'canny', 'mean', 'untrustworthy'. There is therefore a destabilization of the 'stigma' and a consequent reconstruction of self-identity. These qualities appeared, in other words, to be the symbols in reference to which an Armenian identity was constructed.

In terms of community relations in the business relations, moreover, it appeared, not differently from the cases of other social relations, that regular relations were between the Armenians and Muslims, on the one hand, Jews and Muslims, on the other. Business relations were only very limited between the Armenians and the Jews. As a result of social distance between these communities, representations of the 'other' were stereotypical in each community. Relations between Armenians and Muslims were represented as 'unproblematic', whereas the more 'civilized' character of the past relations was pointed. Still, however, the paradigm of these relations seemed to be 'abstention from conflict', the motto of which was, as one respondent noted, "if you don't touch anybody, they won't touch you either".

Marriage relations and intermarriage, which is accepted to be the 'bottom line' of ethnicity (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998), appeared as another site, narratives on which revealed construction of identities and of boundaries. Intermarriage for the first generation of both communities was an unusual case and was mostly unacceptable. For the second-generation, some of whom have engaged in

intermarriages themselves, on the other hand, intermarriage was principally an acceptable phenomenon generally, and when they reflected on their children's potential marriages, particularly. Such perception was also related to the objective conditions the communities face, in that they are small in size, and thus, intra-community marriages are less probable. Still, however, a perception of a potential problem was dominant in these narratives. Thus, intermarriage, was welcomed by this generation on the stated conditions that 'their children would be happy', the potential 'other' side of the marriage would 'respect' for their difference and expression of identity, 'would be honest and loved by their children', and 'would be human' referring to the good manners of a person. Importantly, moreover, in some narratives marriage relations were utilized as tools to indicate the 'openness', 'progressiveness', 'liberalism', and 'democratic character' of the community through a point on inter-sex relations, or on rituals relating marriage.

One important point on the perception of 'other' was revealed in relation to intermarriage. The 'other', in these narratives, was not a generalized image of Muslim-Turk. There was a differentiation between the Sunnite and the Alevi in which the latter appeared as closer to the meanings attributed to the self-community-identity. The Alevis, accordingly, were perceived to be more 'modern' and 'more liberal' in their social relations. Such perception was reflected in the significant number of people, who have engaged marriages with an Alevi, and, strengthened furthermore, by these intermarriages.

Another conclusion arrived at, in the context of identity construction at community level, was on religious life. Religious life had sure an important effect on religiosity and religious identities. At present conditions, however, more than being related to religiosity, it seems to play a role in the organization of community life. In this line, the church, for the Armenians, appeared to be a socialization place, whereby many community members come together and young generations know each other, and know the community. This is especially important in a context whereby no other community institution exists. Similarly, the priests appear to have roles in the organization of community life. For the Jewish community, on the other hand, the synagogue appeared to be a reference of community identity, however, not an actual

space of socialization since it is not open except for special days. This is, for sure related to the very small amount of Jewish people living in Ankara. It appeared that there were no continuous relations among the very few Jewish people in Ankara. However, in the past, the synagogue appeared to be the center of the community life, with rabbis taking similar roles as the priests did for the Armenian community. The funerals, wedding ceremonies, and feasts, moreover, appeared for both communities to be grounds whereby communication of an ethnic, religious, community identities were often carried out (Yumul, 1992). Feasts, specifically, acted out as markers of unity of the community and one of the boundaries whereby interaction with the Muslim community was actualized. Religious life, to conclude, appeared to be a 'commonly shared symbol' for both communities at present.

Just as Cornell and Hartmann (1998) suggested daily experience appeared, in Ankara case, to constitute a critical site for the construction of identities of both 'self' and the 'other'. Such construction was mostly through daily encounters at a public space or a state office, following the various questions on the identity, origin, language, name, and nationality of the Armenian and Jewish individuals. In this way, indeed, their 'difference' was constantly signified and underlined through simple daily acts. The narrators' perception of these acts differed; however, one crucial point dominating all was an observable 'resentment'. These encounters were signifying a negation of their very existence as equal members of the larger society. The reason for such encounters might be following from their invisibility in Ankara; and the usual way to overcome such encounters, which is changing their names, paradoxically, strengthens the invisibility. Similarly, encounters at the basic state institutions, such as schools, seemed to have crucial effects on the decisions of people whether to continue education or not; or whether to take education at a state school or a private college.

Mostly as a result of daily encounters, be it took place at school, at the cemetery, at the bank, hospital, or tax office, it became clear that the 'other' for the Armenian and Jewish narrators was mostly the 'rude', the 'ignorant', the 'uncivilized' and the 'uneducated'. These, however, did not signify one single categorical identity. In other words, it was apparent throughout the narratives that the other was not 'Turk',

or 'Muslim' as a generalized category. The 'fundamentalist Islamist', the 'racist' came to signify the other, but these were not the other of an ethnic category. These were the 'other' of preferred world views. 'Religious person' was not the other, Sunnite or Alevi was not categorically the other. Definition of the 'other' was contextual, and conditional. Just as the definition of the 'self'.

To conclude, throughout the study it became apparent that self-perception of identity among the Armenian and Jewish communities on Ankara was multiple, contextual, changing, and contingent. As Bentley (1987) suggested, for these communities, the sensations of ethnic, religious, communitarian affinities were founded on common life experiences, which generated similar habitual dispositions. These common life experiences were conditioned, I have argued, by their life in Ankara, by their relative positions vis-à-vis the state, and by the specificities they possessed as a community. The memories of past, as well as the acts and representations of present conditioned their identities, and their perception of these identities. The various perceptions within one single community, moreover, were consequences of differing individual positions in terms of age, class, education, occupation, gender, residential and socialization patterns the individuals had.

REFERENCES

Acciaioli, Gregory L., “Knowing What You’re Doing: A Review of Pierre Bourdieu’s Outline of a Theory of Practice”, in Derek Robbins, *Pierre Bourdieu* (ed.), Vol.1, Sage Publications, 2000, pp.93-117

Akgündüz, Ahmet, “Migration to and from Turkey, 1783-1960: types, numbers and ethno-religious dimensions” Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, vol.24, no.1, 1998, pp.97-120

Aktar, Ayhan, *Varlık Vergisi ve ‘Türkleştirme’ Politikaları*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004 (2000)

....., “Trakya Olaylarını ‘Doğru’ Yorumlamak”, Tarih ve Toplum, s.155, Kasım 1996a, ss.301-312

....., “Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Uygulanan ‘Türkleştirme’ Politikaları”, Tarih ve Toplum, s.156, Aralık 1996b, ss.324-338

Aktüre, Sevgi, *19. Sonunda Anadolu Kenti Mekan Yapı Çözümlemesi*, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Baskı Atölyesi, 1978

....., “16.Yüzyıl Öncesi Ankara’sı Üzerine Bilinenler”, in Yavuz, Ayşıl Tükel (der.), *Tarih İçinde Ankara I* (Eylül 1981 Seminer Bildirileri), ODTÜ- Ankaralılar Vakfı, Ankara, 2000, pp.3-48

....., “1830’dan 1930’a Ankara’da Günlük Yaşam”, in Yıldırım yavuz (der.), *Tarih İçinde Ankara II*, Ankara: ODTÜ, Ankaralılar Vakfı, Ankara Enstitüsü vakfı, Ankara Sanayi Odası, 2001, pp.35-74

Alkan, Hakan, *Geçmişten Günümüze Türkiye Patrikhaneleri I*, İstanbul: Kutup Yıldızı Yayınları, 2003

Alonso, Ana Maria, “The Politics of Space, Time and Substance: State Formation, Nationalism and Ethnicity”, Annual Review of Anthropology, vol.23, 1994, pp.379-405

Anar, Erol, *Öteki Kıyıda Kalanlar Azınlıklar, Yerli Halklar ve Türkiye*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları İnsan Hakları Dizisi, 1997

Andersen, Margaret L., “Studying Across Difference: Race, Class, and Gender in Qualitative Research”, in Alan Bryman and Robert G. Burgess (eds), *Qualitative Research Volume IV*, Sage Publications, 1999, pp127-138

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, 1991 (1983)

Arslanoğlu, İnci, “1930-50 Yılları Ankarası’nın Eğlence Yaşamı İçinde Gazino Binaları”, in Yıldırım Yavuz (der.), *Tarih İçinde Ankara II (Aralık 1998 Seminer Bildirileri)*, Ankara: ODTÜ, Ankaralılar Vakfı, Ankara Enstitüsü Vakfı, Ankara Sanayi Odası, 2001, pp.327-340

Atauz, Akın, “Kale ve Sur: Ankara Kal’ası” in Tunç, Güven ; Figen Özbay (der.), *Şehrin Zulası Ankara Kalesi*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004, pp.61-220

Aydın, Suavi; Kudret Emiroğlu; Ömer Türkoğlu; Ergi D. Özsoy, *Küçük Asya’nın Bin Yüzü: Ankara*, (ed.), Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları, 2005

....., “Azınlık Kavramına İçerden Bakmak”, in Kaya, Ayhan; Turgut Tahranlı (der.), *Türkiye’de Çoğunluk ve Azınlık politikaları: AB Sürecinde Yurttaşlık Tartışmaları*, İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2006 (2005), pp.186-223

Bahar, Beki L., *Efsaneden Tarihe Ankara Yahudileri*, İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık, 2003

Bahloul, Joelle, *The Architecture of Memory: A Jewish-Muslim household in colonial Algeria, 1937-1962*, Cambridge University Press, 1996

Balamir, Aydan; Gül Asatekin, “Ulusal Kimlik Sorusu Üzerine Karşıt Düşünceler ve Konut Mimarisi”, *ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi*, (11:1-2), 1991, pp.73-87

Bali, Rıfat N., *Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Türkiye Yahudileri Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni (1923-1945)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999

....., “Resmi İdeoloji ve Gayri Müslim Yurttaşlar”, Birikim, Ocak- Şubat (105–106) 1998, pp.170-176

....., “Türkiye’de Yahudi Azınlığı içinde Farklı Olmaya Çalışmak”, in Nabi Avcı, Deniz Erman, Süheyla Kırca and Arus Yumul (eds.), *Dışarıda Kalanlar/Bırakılanlar*, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2001, pp.119-131

Barth, Fredrik, “Pathan Identity and its Maintenance”, in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969

Batur, Enis (der), *Ankara Ankara*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994

Bauböck, Rainer; John Rundell (eds.), *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*, Ashgate Pub., 1998

Bauman, Zygmunt, *Sosyolojik Düşünmek*, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 2nd ed., 2003

Becker, Howard S., “The Life History and the Scientific Mosaic”, in Darin Weinberg (ed), *Qualitative Research Methods*, Blackwell Publishers, 2002, pp.79-87

Bertaux, Daniel; Paul Thomson, *Between Generations: Family Models, Myths, and Memories*, (International Yearbook of Oral History and Life Stories vol. II), Oxford University Press, 1993

Bentley, G. Carter, “Ethnicity and Practice”, Comparative Study of Society and History, vol.29, 1987, pp.24-55

Blom, Jan-Petter, “Ethnic and Cultural Differentiation”, in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969, pp. 74-85

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, 1992 (1977)

....., “Social Space and Symbolic Space”, in Derek Robbins (ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu*, Vol.4, 2000, pp.3-16

Bornat, Joanna, "Is Oral History Auto/Biography?", in Alan Bryman and Robert G. Burgess (eds), *Qualitative Research Volume IV*, Sage Publications, 1999, pp.193-205

.....; Brian Dimmock; David Jones; Shelia Peace, "Researching the implications of family change for older people: The contribution of a life-history approach" in Prue Chamberlayne, Joanna Bornat and Tom Wengraf (eds.), *The Turn to Biographical Methods in Social Science: Comparative Issues and Examples*, Routledge, 2000, pp.244-260

Bottomley, Gillian, "Culture, Ethnicity, and the Politics/Poetics of Representation", *Diaspora*, 1:3, 1991

Bozdoğan, Sibel, *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Mimari Kültür*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2002

.....; Reşat Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, University of Washington Press, 1997

Bradley, Harriet, *Fractured Identities: Changing Patterns of Inequality*, Polity Press, 1996

Brubaker, Rogers; Frederick Cooper, "Beyond Identity", *Theory and Society*, vol. 29., 2000, pp.1-47

....., "Immigration, Citizenship, and the Nation-State in France and Germany", *International Sociology*, vol.5, no.4, 1990

Bryman, Alan, "The Debate about Quantitative and Qualitative Research", in Alan Bryman and Robert G. Burgess (eds), *Qualitative Research*, Volume I, Sage Publications, 1999, pp.35-69

Cantek, L. Funda Şenol, *"Yaban"lar ve Yerliler: Başkent Olma Sürecinde Ankara*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003

Counce, Stephen, *Sözlü Tarih ve Yerel Tarihçi*, İstanbul: TVYY, 2001

Cerulo, Karen A., "Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions", Annual Review of Sociology, vol.23, 1997, pp. 385-409

Chamberlein, Marry; Paul Thompson, *Narrative and Genre* (eds.), Routledge: London and New York, 2000 (1998)

Cohen, Anthony P., *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London and New York: Routledge, 2000 (1985)

....., "Boundaries of consciousness, consciousness of boundaries: critical questions for anthropology", in Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers (eds.), *The Anthropology of Ethnicity*, Het Spinhuis, 1994, pp.59-79

....., "Chosen Peoples", in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds.), *Ethnicity*, Oxford University Press, 1996, pp.189-197

Connerton, Paul, *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge University Press, 1999 (1989)

Cornell, Stephen; Douglas Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*, Pine Forge Press, 1998

Crowley, John, "The politics of belonging: some theoretical questions", in Andrew Geddes and Adrian Favell (eds.), *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe*, Ashgate, 1999, pp. 15-41

Cutler, William, "Accuracy in Oral History Interviewing", in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp.99-106

Çağatay, Soner, "Citizenship Policies in Interwar Turkey", Nations and Nationalism, vol.9, no.4, 2003, pp.601-619

Çavuşoğlu, Naz, *Uluslararası İnsan Hukukunda Azınlık Hakları*, İstanbul Bilim Yayınları, 1998

Çetin, Fethiye, *Anneannem*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2005 (2004)

Çolak, Yılmaz, “Language Policy and Official Ideology in Early Republican Turkey”, Middle Eastern Studies, vol.40, no.6, November 2004, pp.67- 91

Davison, Andrew, *Türkiye’de Sekülerizm ve Modernlik*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002

De Fina, Anna, *Identity in Narrative: A study of immigrant discourse* [online], John Benjamin’s Publishing Company, available from: <http://site.ebrary.com>, 2003

Demir, Hülya; Rıdvan Akar, *İstanbul’un Son Sürgünleri*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1994

Der-Karabetian, Aghop; Natalie Balian, “Ingroup, Outgroup, and Global-Human Identities of Turkish-Armenians”, Journal of Social Psychology, 132(4), 1992, pp.497-504

Dink, Hrnt, “Biraz Farklı İnsanlar ... Azınlıklar”, in Birikim, vol.71-72, 1995, pp.150-152

Dunaway, David K.; Will K. Baum, *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology* (eds.), (2nd edition)1996

....., “The Interdisciplinarity of Oral History”, in Dunaway, David K.; Will K. Baum, *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology* (eds.), (2nd edition)1996, pp.7-16

Dunn, Robert G., *Identity Crisis: A Social Critique of Postmodernity*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1998

Eidheim, Harald, “When Ethnic Identity is s Social Stigmata”, in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969, pp. 39-57

Erbaş, Ali, *Hristiyanlık*, İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2004

Ercan, Yavuz, *Osmanlı Yönetiminde Gayri Müslimler*, Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi, 2001

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland, "Ethnicity, Race and Nation", in Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, *The Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*, Polity Pres, 1997, pp.33-42

Etöz, Zeliha, 19.Yüzyıl Anakara'sında Sosyal Kültürel Yaşam, Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1998

Farouqhi, Suraiya, Osmanlıda Kentler ve Kentliler, İstanbul: TVYY, 1993

Favell, Adrian, "To belong or not to belong: the postnational question", in Andrew Geddes and Adrian Favell (eds.), *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe*, Ashgate, 1999, pp.209-227

Friedlander, Peter, "Theory, Method, and Oral History", in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp.150-160

Fry, Amelia, "Reflections of Ethics", in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996, pp.161-172

Galanti, Avram, Ankara Tarihi I , İstanbul, Tan Matbaası, 1950

....., Ankara Tarihi II, İstanbul, Tan Matbaası, 1951

Galeotti, Anna Elisabetta, "Toleration as the Public Acceptance of Difference", in Rainer Bauböck, John Rundel (eds.), *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*, Ashgate Publishing, 1998, pp.259-280

Georgeon, François, "Keçi Kılından Kalpağa", in Paul Dumont and François Georgeon (eds.), *Modernleşme Sürecinde Osmanlı Kentleri*, İstanbul: TVYY, 1999

Grele, Ronald J., "Movement without aim: Methodological and theoretical problems in oral history" in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, Routledge, 1998, pp. 38-52

....., "Directions for Oral History in the United States", in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp.62-84

Guibernau, Montserrat; John Rex, *The Ethnicity Reader*, Polity Press, 1997

Haaland, Gunnar, "Economic determinants in Ethnic Processes", in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969, pp. 58-73

Halbwachs, Maurice, *On Collective Memory*, (ed. By Lewis A. Coser), Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992 (1941)

Hall, Stuart, "The Question of Cultural Identity", in Stuart Hall; David Held and Tony McGrew (eds.), *Modernity and Its Futures*, Polity Press in Association with the Open University, 1992a

....., "New Ethnicities", in James Donald and Ali Rattans, (eds.), *Race, Culture and Difference*, Sage Publications, 1992b

....., "Cultural Identity and Diaspora", in Jonathan Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Community, Cultural Difference*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990

....., "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities", in Anthony D. King (ed.), *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, Macmillan Press, (2nd ed.), 1993, pp.41-68

....., "Who Needs 'Identity'?", in Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Sage Publications, 1997 (1996)

Hancı, Kevork, "Ankaralı Ermeni-Katolikler", in *Birikim*, no.73, 1995, pp.35-36

Hareven, Tamara, "The Search for Generational Memory", in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp.241-256

Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989

Hedetoft, Ulf, “Discourses and Images of Belonging: Migrants Between New Racism, Liberal Nationalism and Globalism”, in Flemming Christiansen and Ulf Hedetoft (eds.), *The Politics of Multiple Belonging: Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe and East Asia*, Ashgate Pub., 2004, pp.23-43

Heller, Agnes, “Self-Representation and the Representation of the Other” in Rainer Bauböck, John Rundel (eds.), *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*, Ashgate Publishing, 1998, pp.341-354

Heywood, Andrew, *Politics*, Macmillan Press, 1997

Hoffman , Alice, “Reliability and Validity in Oral History”, in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp.87-93

Holloway, Levis; Phil Hubbard, *People and Place: The extraordinary geographies of everyday life*, Prentice Hall: Pearson Education Pub., 2001

Hutchinson, John; Anthony D. Smith (eds.), *Ethnicity*, Oxford University Press, 1996

İçduygu, Ahmet; Yılmaz Çolak; Nazan Soyark, “What is the matter with citizenship? A Turkish Debate”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.35, no.4, 1999, pp.187–208

..... ; Özlem Kaygusuz, “The Politics of Citizenship by Drawing Borders: Foreign Policy and the Construction of National Citizenship Identity in Turkey”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.40, no.6, November 2004, pp.26- 50

İlter, Fügen, *Ankara'nın Eski Kent Dokusunda Yahudi Mahallesi*, TTK, 1997

Izikowitz, Karl G., “Neighbors in Laos”, in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969, pp. 135-148

Kant, Albert, *Bir Yahudinin Anıları*, İstanbul: Kastaş Yayınevi, 2003

Karpat, Kemal H., *Osmanlı Nüfusu (1830-1914) Demografik ve Sosyal Özellikleri*, İstanbul: TVYY, 2003

Kasaba, Reşat, “Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities” in Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, University of Washington Press, 1997

Kaya, Ayhan; Turgut Tahranlı (der.), *Türkiye’de Çoğunluk ve Azınlık politikaları: AB Sürecinde Yurttaşlık Tartışmaları*, İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2006 (2005)

Keleş, Ruşen, *Eski Ankara’da Bir Şehir Tipolojisi*, Ankara: A.Ü. S.B.F. Yayınları, no.314, 1971

Kemal, Mehmed, *Türkiye’nin Kalbi Ankara*, İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları, 1983

Keyder, Çağlar, “Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s”, in Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, University of Washington Press, 1997

Kılıçbay, M.A., in Bozyiğit, Esat A.(der), *Ankara’nın Taştır Yolu... Türk Yazınında Ankara (Seçki –II)*, Ankara: TC. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001, ss.354-366

....., “Sof Şehri Ankara”, in Enis Batur (der.) *Ankara Ankara*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994, pp.65-72

Kirişçi, Kemal, “Eski ve Yeni Göç Modelleri ile Türkiye’nin Ulusal Kimliği”, in Gönül Pultar and Tahire Erman, *Türk(iye) Kültürleri*, Ankara: Tetragon Yayınları, 2005, pp.79-102

....., “Disaggregating Turkish Citizenship and Immigration Practices”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.36, no.3, July 2000, pp.1-22

Knutsson, Karl Eric, “Dichotomization and Integration”, in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969, pp. 86-100

Kurban, Dilek, “Türkiye’nin azınlık sorununun anayasal çözümü: Eşitlik ile yüzleş(me)mek, *Birikim*, Aralık 2004, pp.36-44

Kymlicka, Will, *Multicultural Citizenship A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995

Landau, Jacob M., *Tekinalp Bir Türk Yurtseveri (1883-1961)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996

Levi, Avner, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Yahudiler*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998 (1996)

Lewis, Bernard, *İslam Dünyasında Yahudiler*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1996

Liénard, Georges; Emile Servais, “Practical Sense”, in Derek Robbins, *Pierre Bourdieu* (ed.), Vol.1, Sage Publications, 2000, pp.83-92

Lovell, Nadia, *Locality and Belonging* (ed.), Routledge, 1998

Mallett, Shelley, “Understanding home: a critical review of the literature”, The Sociological Review, vol.52, Issue 1, February 2004, pp.62-89

Mardin, Şerif, *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995 (1990)

Martin, Denis-Constant, “The Choices of Identity”, *Social Identities*, February 1995, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp.5- 19

Miles, Malcolm; Tim Hall; Iain Borden, *The City Cultures Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 2000

Misztal, Barbara A., *Theories of Social Remembering*, Open University Pres, 2003

Mohanty, Satya P., “The Epistemic Status of Cultural Identity”, in Linda Martin Alcoff and Eduardo Mendieta, *Identities* (eds), Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2003

Moss, William, “Oral History: An Appreciation”, in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp.107-120

Nazroo, James Y.; Saffron Karlsen, "Patterns of Identity among Ethnic Minority People: Diversity and Commonality", Ethnic and Racial Studies, vol.26, no.5, 2003, pp.902-930

Neyzi, Leyla, "*Ben Kimim?*" *Türkiye'de Sözlü tarih, Kimlik ve Öznellik*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004

....., *İstanbul'da Hatırlamak ve Unutmak Birey, Bellek ve Aidiyet*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999

Ankara 1985'den 2015'e, ODTÜ Şehir ve Bölge Planlama Bölümü Çalışma Grubu, Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi EGO Genel Müdürlüğü, 1982

Okihiro, Gary Y., "Oral History and the Writing of Ethnic History", in David K. Dunaway and Will K. Baum (eds.), *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, 1996 (2nd edition), pp. 199-214

Okutan, M. Çağatay, *Tek Parti Döneminde Azınlık Politikaları*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004

Olick, Jeffrey K., *States of Memory*, (ed.), Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003

Ongan, Halit, "Ankara'nın Eski Esnafını Açıklayan Bir Vesika", Türk Etnografya Dergisi, II, 1957, ss.56-61

Oran, Baskın, *Türkiye'de Azınlıklar: Kavramlar, Teori, Lozan, İç Mevzuat, İçtihat, Uygulama*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005a (2004)

....., "*M.K.*" *Adlı Çocuğun Tehcir Anıları 1915 ve Sonrası*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005b

Ortaylı, İlber, "19.yüzyılda Ankara", in Enis Batur, (der), *Ankara Ankara*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994, pp.109-138

Özyürek, Esra (ed.), *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001

- Perks, Robert; Alistair Thomson, *The Oral History Reader* (eds), Routledge, 1998
- Polonyi, Charles K., "In Support of 'Ankara 2015'", METU Journal of Faculty of Architect, (8:2), 1988, pp.105-114
- Portelli, Alessandro, "What makes Oral History Different", in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, Routledge, 1998, pp.63-74
-, "Oral History as Genre", in Marry Camberlein and Paul Thompson (eds), *Narrative and Genre*, Routledge: London and New York, 2000 (1998), pp.23-45
- Rapport, Niggel; Andrew Dawson, "The Topic and the Book", in Rapport and Dawson (eds.), *Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement*, Berg: Oxford Int.Pub., 1998 pp. 3-17
- Reed-Danahay, *Locating Bourdieu*, Indiana University Press, 2005
- Ritchie, Donald A., *Doing Oral History*, Twayne Publishers: New York, 1995
- Robbins, Derek, *Pierre Bourdieu* (ed.), Vol.1, Sage Publications, 2000
- Sargın, Güven Arif (der.), *Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri Başkent Üzerine Mekan-Politik Tezler*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002
- Schermerhorn, Richard, "Ethnicity and Minority Groups", in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity*, Oxford University Press, 1996
- Sennett, Richard, *Flesh and Stone The Body and the City in Western Civilization*, Norton, 1996
- Shopes, Linda, "Making Sense of Oral History," [online] *History Matters: The U.S. Survey Course on the Web*, available from: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/mse/oral/>, February 2002
- Sibley, David, *Geographies of Exclusion Society and Difference in the West*, London and New York: Routledge, 1995

Siverts, Henning, "Ethnic Stability and Boundary Dynamics in Southern Mexico", in Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups And Boundaries* (ed.), 1969, pp. 101-116

Smith, Anthony D., "Chosen Peoples", in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds.), *Ethnicity*, Oxford University Press, 1996, pp.189-197

....., "Structure and persistence of ethnies", in Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, *The Ethnicity Reader*, Polity Press, 1997, pp. 27-33

Somers, Margaret R., "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A relational and network Approach", *Theory and Society*, vol. 23, 1994, pp.605-649

Somersan, Semra, *Sosyal Bilimlerde Etnisite ve Irk*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004

Şimşir, Bilal, *Ankara...Ankara (Bir Başkent'in Doğuşu)*, Ankara 1988

Tankut, Gönül, *Bir Başkent'in İmarı: 1929-1939*, İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 1993

....., "Ankara'nın Başkent Olma Süreci", *ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi*, (8:2), 1988, ss.93-104

Tekeli, İlhan; Güvenç, M., "Ankara Nüfusundaki Gelişmeler ve Nüfus Artışının Bileşenleri", *Ankara: 1985'den 2000'e*, Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi EGO Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, Ankara, 1987

....., "Ankara'nın başkentlik kararının ülkesel mekan organizasyonu ve toplumsal yapıya etkileri bakımından genel bir değerlendirilmesi", in Enis Batur, (der), *Ankara Ankara*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994, pp.143-159

Thompson, Paul, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, Oxford University Press, 1988 (1978)

....., "Family Myth, Models, and Denials in the Shaping of Individual Life Paths", in Daniel Bertaux and Paul Thompson (eds.), *Between Generations: Family Models, Myths, and Memories*, (International Yearbook of Oral History and Life Stories vol. II), Oxford University Press, 1993, pp.13-38

Tilley, Virginia, “The terms of the debate: untangling language about ethnicity and ethnic movements”, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol.20, no.3, 1997, pp.497-522

Toktaş, Şule, “Citizenship and Minorities: A Historical Overview of Turkey’s Jewish Minority”, *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol.18, no.4, December 2005a, pp.394-429

....., “Türk Vatandaşlığının Gayri Müslim Yorumları: Vatandaşlık Kurgusu ve Türkiye’deki Yahudi Azınlık”, in Gönül Pultar and Tahire Erman, *Türk(iye) Kültürleri*, Ankara: Tetragon Yayınları, 2005b, pp.125-144

Tuğal, Cihan, “1915 Hatıraları ve Ermeni Kimliğinin İnşası”, in Esra Özyürek (ed.), *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye’nin Toplumsal Hafızası*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001, pp.127-152

Tunç, Güven; Figen Özbay (der.), *Şehrin Zulası Ankara Kalesi*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004

Üstel, Füsun, “*Makbul Vatandaş’ın Peşinde II. Meşrutiyet’ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*”, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004

....., *Yurttaşlık ve Demokrasi*, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları, 1999

Wallman, Sandra, “New Identities and the Local Factor – or When is Home in Town a Good Move?” in Niggel Rapport and Andrew Dawson (eds.), *Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement*, Berg: Oxford Int.Pub., 1998, pp.181-205

Wertsch, James V., *Voices of Collective Remembering*, Cambridge University Press, 2002

White, Naomi Rosh, “Marking absences: Holocaust testimony and history”, in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, Routledge, 1998, pp. 172-182

Yavuz, Aysıl Tükel (der.), *Tarih İçinde Ankara I (Eylül 1981 Seminer Bildirileri)*, Ankara: ODTÜ- Ankaralılar Vakfı, 2000

Yavuz, Erdal, “19. Yüzyıl Ankara’ında Ekonomik Hayatın Örgütlenmesi ve Kent-İçi Sosyal Yapı”, in *Tarih İçinde Ankara: Eylül 1981 Seminer Bildirileri*, 2.Basım, Ankara: TBMM Basımevi, 2000, pp.195-206

Yavuz, Fehmi, “Başkent Ankara ve Jansen”, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi, c.7, s.1, Bahar 1981, ss.25-33

Yavuz, Yıldırım (der.), *Tarih İçinde Ankara II (Aralık 1998 Seminer Bildirileri)*, ODTÜ- Ankaralılar Vakfı- Ankara Enstitüsü Vakfı- Ankara Sanayi Odası, Ankara, 2001

Yeğen, Mesut, “Yurttaşlık ve Türklük”, in Gönül Pultar and Tahire Erman, *Türk(iye) Kültürleri*, Ankara: Tetragon Yayınları, 2005, pp.103-124

....., “Yahudi Kürtler ya da Türklüğün Yeni Hudutları”, Doğu-Batı, s.29, 2004a, pp.159-178

....., “Citizenship and Ethnicity in Turkey”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.40, no.6, 2004b

Yıldız, Ahmet, “*Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene*” *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919-1938)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001

Young, Iris Marion, “City Life and Difference”, in *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990

....., “Residential Segregation and Differentiated Citizenship”, Citizenship Studies, vol.3, no.2, 1999, pp.237-252

....., “Polity and Group Difference: A critique of the ideal of universal citizenship”, in R. Beiner (ed) *Theorizing Citizenship*, Suny Press, 1995, pp.175-207

Yow, Valerie Raleigh, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, Sage Publications, 1994

Yumul, Arusyak, “Religion, Community and Culture: The Turkish Armenians”, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Sociology: University of Oxford, 1992

....., “Azınlık mı Vatandaş mı?”, in Kaya, Ayhan; Turgut Tahranlı (der.), *Türkiye’de Çoğunluk ve Azınlık politikaları: AB Sürecinde Yurttaşlık Tartışmaları*, İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2006 (2005), pp.101-121

Yuval-Davis, Nira, “Identity Citizenship and the Politics of Belongings”, unpublished article presented at Istanbul Bilgi University

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE GUIDELINE FOR THE INTERVIEWS

I. Demografik Bilgiler

1. Doğum yeri
2. Doğum tarihi
3. Medeni hali
4. Eğitimi (İlkokul, Ortaokul, Lise, Üniversite, Lisans üstü) / (Devlet okulu, özel okul)
5. Mesleği / işi
6. Hane halkı sayısı/ Evlilik
7. Hane halkı üyelerinin eğitimleri /meslekleri
8. Anne ve babasının meslek-işi
9. Anne ve babasının eğitimi
10. Kardeş sayısı/ eğitimleri/ meslekleri/ nerede yaşadıkları
11. Kaç senedir Ankara'da yaşıyor?
12. Anne ve babanın Ankara'ya gelişi: nereden, ne sebeple?
13. Yaşanılan semt/sokak/kentler

II. Sosyo-ekonomik durum / Aile

14. Hala çalışıyor mu, kaç sene çalışmış, hangi işleri yapmış.
15. Mesleğinizden /işinizden memnun musunuz? Değiştirme şansınız olsaydı ne yapmak isterdiniz?
16. Şu anda ekonomik durumunu nasıl değerlendiriyor: üst-orta-alt/ Ekonomik durum geçmişten bugüne nasıl seyretti? Çocukluk-Gençlik/ Yetişkinlik
17. Devlet memuru olmak ister miydiniz?
18. Bir sosyal güvenlik sistemine kayıtlı mısınız? Hangisine?
19. Yaşadığınız ev kime ait? / geçmişte yaşadığınız ev-ler size mi aitti?
Evinizde sahip olduğunuz eşyalar o gün başkalarının (komşu, akraba, Müslümanlar vs.) sahip olduklarından farklı mıydı?
20. Ev işlerinde yardım eden biri var mı? Geçmişte var mıydı? /Ne sıklıkta gelirdi?
21. Maddi sıkıntı durumunda borç almanız gerekse öncelikli olarak kimden/ hangi kurumdan borç almayı tercih edersiniz; kime başvurursunuz?
22. İş ortaklığı yapmanız gerekse/ yanınızda birisini çalıştırmanı gerekse ortak olacağınız kişinin din/mezhebine dikkat eder misiniz? Geçmişte edilir miydi?
23. Çocuklarınızın geleceği, eğitim ve meslekleriyle ilgili beklentileriniz nelerdir? Bu beklentilerin gerçekleşeceğine inanıyor musunuz/ gerçekleştirdiğini düşünüyor musunuz?
24. Çocuklarınızın özel okullarda mı/devlet okullarında mı okumasını tercih ederdiniz/ettiniz? Neden?
25. Çocuklarınızın devlet memuru olmasını ister miydiniz? Neden?

III. Evlilik:

26. Siz evlenirken kendi dininizden biriyle evlenmeye dikkat ettiniz mi? /Kriter?
27. 21.Çocuklarınızın eş seçiminde müdahaleniz oldu mu? Nasıl bir eş seçmelerini isterdiniz? Başka bir dinden, mezhepten ya da milliyetten bir insanla evlenmelerine izin verir miydiniz?
28. Düğünler nasıl, nerede olur? Kimler davet edilir? Müslümanlar/Yahudiler/Hıristiyanlardan katılım olur mu? Eskiden olur muydu?

IV. Kent yaşamı

29. Ankara'nın bir kent olarak sevdiğiniz ve sevmediğiniz özellikleri nelerdir? Geçmişte de böyle miydi?
30. Sizce bir kent/başkent olarak Ankara'nın eksikleri nelerdir? Sizce bir başkent nasıl olmalı?
31. Ankara'da (kent çapında) en çok kullandığınız mekanlar nereler? Niçin bu mekanları tercih ediyorsunuz?
32. Yaşadığınız mahalle/semte en çok kullandığınız mekanlar (park, kahvehane, alış-veriş merkezi vb.) nereler?
33. Ankara'da kendinizi evinizde hissediyor musunuz? Kendinizi misafir, yabancı gibi hissettiğiniz zamanlar oldu mu?
34. Ankara'da yaşamasaydınız hangi şehirde yaşamak isterdiniz? Neden?
35. Başka bir kente/ ülkeye göç etmeyi hiç düşündünüz mü? Sizi engelleyen neydi?
36. Başkent'te değil de başka bir kentte yaşıyor olsaydınız, yaşantınızda olumlu ya da olumsuz bir farklılık olur muydu?
37. Başkent'te bir azınlık üyesi olmanın dezavantajları ya da avantajları var mı?
38. Büyüklerinizden Ankara'nın başkent oluşuyla ilgili öyküler dinlediniz mi?

V. Eski Ankara:

39. Eski mahalle'nin yapısıyla ilgili neler hatırlarsınız? Nerede ne vardı? (Okul, Hamam, Kilise/ Sinagog/Camii)
40. Ankara'da Rum komşu ya da tanıdıklarınız var mıydı? Şimdi neredeler?
41. Yahudilerle/ Ermenilerle ilişkiler ne düzeydeydi? Alışveriş, evlilik, komşuluk?
42. Mahallede nasıl bir sosyal yaşantı vardı? (Geziler, Eğlence yerleri, Gazinolar, matineler...)
43. Müslüman komşularla ilişkiler? Sorular sorarlardı mıydı? Komşuluk/ Alış veriş /Evlilik?
44. Yılbaşları, Balolar, Ankara Palas?
45. Atatürk'le ve Cumhuriyetin kuruluşuyla ilgili hatıralar/duyumlar?
46. Ankara'daki Yangınlar hakkında neler duydunuz?
47. Yangından kimler, nasıl etkilendi/ sadece Ermeniler/Yahudiler mi etkilendi; o zamanlar yangının çıkışı/ kimin çıkardığı hakkında neler söylendi? Anne- Babanız, büyükleriniz neler konuştu yangınla ilgili?
48. Varlık Vergisi hakkında neler duydunuz? Yakın çevreniz nasıl etkilenmiş? Aşkale'ye gidenler olmuş mu?
49. I. Dünya Savaşı ve II. Dünya Savaşı ile ilgili neler anlatılırdı?
50. Şu anda Ankara'da az sayıda Musevi/Yahudi; Ermeni/Katolik Hıristiyan ve Protestan yaşıyor ve hiç Rum yok. Neden böyle? Nüfustaki bu oranların daha farklı olduğu zamanları hatırlıyor musunuz? Göç?
51. Yakın çevrenizden insanlar hangi sebeplerle gittiler?
52. Yurtdışında yaşayan herhangi bir aile üyeniz var mı? Nereye, ne sebeple gitti? Gidenlerle bağlantılarınız ne düzeyde, Türkiye'ye geliyorlar mı? Oradaki yaşam ve Türkiye'deki yaşam arasında fark olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Nasıl farklar?
53. Bütün bu gruplar gitmemiş olsalardı, hala Türkiye'de yaşıyor olsalardı, bugün Türkiye'deki yaşam nasıl olurdu? Bir farklılık olur muydu? Nasıl bir farklılık?

VI. Komşuluk – Ayrımcılık

54. Yaşadığınız mahallede komşuluk ilişkileriniz nasıl? Komşularınız farklı gruplardan mı? Onların ya da sizin kimliğiniz hakkında sohbetleriniz oluyor mu/size gelenekleriniz, inancınız/ kimliğiniz hakkında sorular soruyorlar mı?

55. Komşularınızdan/ tanıdığınız kişilerden ayrımcılık olarak düşünülebilecek tavır/söz/davranışla karşılaştınız mı? Bu tavırları biraz anlatır mısınız?
56. Okul, hastane, vergi dairesi, belediye, muhtarlık, bankalarda böyle bir tutumla karşılaştınız mı? İsim/soy isminizden dolayı farklı muamele gördünüz mü/ size farklı olduğunuzu düşündürten bir tutumla karşılaştınız mı?
57. Gündelik hayatınızda kimliğinizi rahatça ifade edebiliyor musunuz?
58. Çevrenizdeki insanlar (Hıristiyan/Musevi) Ermeni/Yahudi olduğunuzu bilir mi?
59. Bu açıdan geçmişle bugün arasında bir fark var mı? Nasıl bir fark, kolaylaştı mı, zorlaştı mı?
60. Kendinizi nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?

VII. Öteki - Benzerlikler - Farklılıklar

61. Müslüman/Türklerle benzediğiniz ve benzemediğiniz özellikler nelerdir?
Benzerlikler:

Farklılıklar:

62. Başka din/mezheplerden arkadaşlarınız var mı? Onlara hangi konularda güvenir/güvenmezsiniz?
63. Ankara'da yaşayan Ermeni/Yahudilerle ilişkileriniz nasıl? (Dostluk, alışveriş, evlilik vb.)
64. Türkiye'de yaşayan Müslümanlar arasında önemli farklar görüyor musunuz? Farklı mezheplere ait komşularınız oldu mu? Gelenekleri, özellikleri, hakkında ne biliyorsunuz, ne düşünüyorsunuz? Kendinize yakın hissettiğiniz gruplar var mı?
65. Ankara'da yaşayan ve farklı mezhep ve kültürden olan Müslümanlarla ilişkileriniz nasıl? (Dostluk, alışveriş, evlilik vb.)
66. Müslümanlar arasında Türkiye'de yaşayan Musevilere / Hıristiyanlara karşı önyargılar var mı? Nasıl önyargılar?
67. Bir başkasına Ermeni/Yahudi cemaatini anlatmanız gerekse öncelikle hangi özelliklerini söylersiniz?

VIII. Aidiyet / Yurttaşlık / Azınlık Olma

68. Soyadı Kanunu (1934) çıktığı zaman soyadınız değişmiş mi? Yeni soyadınızı neye göre belirlediniz, nereden seçtiniz/seçmişsiniz? Eski soyadınızın kalmasını tercih eder miydiniz? Sizce neden böyle bir kanun uygulanmış?
69. Nüfus Cüzdanında din hanesinin olmasını nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?
70. Okullarda Din Dersleri olmalı mı? Nasıl olmalı? Hıristiyanlığı/ Yahudiliği öğreten seçmeli dersler olmalı mı?
71. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı olarak hak ve sorumluluklarınızın neler olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz? Haklarınızı kullanabildiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz? Hayır ise engel nedir? /sorumlulukları adil buluyor musunuz?
72. Herhangi bir sebeple hukuki dava açtınız mı ya da siz e karşı açıldı mı? Sonuçları ne oldu? (AB müzakereleri çerçevesinde "azınlıklar" ve "azınlık" haklarından bahsediliyor?)
73. Türkiye'de "azınlık" kavramıyla ne anlatılmak isteniyor; ne anlaşılıyor? Siz bu anlayışa katılıyor musunuz? Sizce "azınlık" kime denmeli?
74. "Azınlık hakları" denince ne anlıyorsunuz? Bu haklardan faydalandığınızı düşünüyor musunuz? (Hayır ise neden?)
75. Azınlıklara karşı farklı bir tutum; bir ayrımcılık olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?
76. Ermeni/Yahudi cemaatinden "azınlık" olarak bahsedilmesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz? Siz kendinizi azınlık olarak mı görüyorsunuz Türkiye'de? Azınlık olmak nasıl bir duygu yaratıyor?
77. Dünya genelini düşündüğümüzde kendinizi ya da cemaatinizi daha yakın hissettiğiniz bir grup, toplum, ülke var mı?
78. Dünyanın farklı yerlerinde yaşayan Ermeniler/Yahudilerin yaşayışları, sahip oldukları haklar konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz? Sizinle onlar arasında farklar var mı? Bu farklar nelerdir?
79. AB sürecinden neler bekliyorsunuz? Türkiye'de değişimler olacak mı? Onaylıyor musunuz?

IX. Eğlence- Dinlenme-Boş Zaman Alışkanlıkları:

80. Vaktinizi nasıl geçirirsiniz?
81. Sinema/tiyatro/konser/ okuma alışkanlıkları? Ne sıklıkta?
82. Akraba ziyaretleri/ Komşu ziyaretleri/ arkadaş ziyaretleri?
83. Alışverişlerinizi (mutfak, kıyafet vb.) nerelerden yaparsınız, özellikle tercih ettiğiniz bir yer var mı? Neden burayı tercih ediyorsunuz?
84. Seyahat eder misiniz? Ne sıklıkta? Hangi ülke ve şehirlerde buldunuz? Ne sebeple gitmişsiniz?
85. Özel günlerde düğün-bayram öncelikli olarak kimleri davet edersiniz/ kimlere ziyarete gidersiniz?

X. Cemaat yaşamı

86. Cenazelerinizi nereye gömersiniz? Ayrı bir mezarlığınız var mı? Orada yaşanan değişimler neler? Hep aynı yer miydi? (Değişmiş ise) Neden değişiklik olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
87. Mezarlıkta inançlarınıza göre tören yapabiliyor musunuz?
88. Kiliseye/Sinagoga gidiyor musunuz? Ne sıklıkta?
89. Yalnız yaşayan yaşlıların bakımıyla kim ilgileniyor? Yaşlıların bakımını ile ilgilenen bir Yaşlılar Yurdu var mı Ankara'da?
90. Cemmat içinde çocukların ve bebeklerin bakımıyla kim ilgilenir?

XI. Dil

91. Çocukluğunuzda aile içinde hangi dil/diller kullanılırdı? Akrabalar arasında, büyük anne-büyük babalarla ne konuşulurdu?
92. Türkçe konuştuğunuz (aksanlı vs.) ya da konuşmadığınız için bir tepkiyle karışıldınız mı?
93. Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş" Kampanyasını duydunuz mu? Neler duydunuz?
O dönemler neler yaşandığını biliyor musunuz? Anlatır mısınız?

XII. Türkiye

94. Geçmişten bugüne Türkiye'de neler değişti? (Kişiler, kurumlar, mekanlar, fikirler, davranışlar)
95. Sizce Türkiye'deki değişmelerin niteliği ne yönde olmaktadır? (olumlu-olumsuz)
96. Türkiye'de yaşamasaydınız yaşamayı tercih edeceğiniz başka bir ülke var mı? Neresi? Neden?
97. Sizce Türkiye'nin en temel problemleri nelerdir?
98. 1960, 1970 ve 1980 askeri darbelerini; nelerle karşılaştınız; ailede yakın çevrede, yaşadığınız yerde o günler nasıl yaşandı?
99. Sizce Türkiye bu dönemlerden nasıl etkilendi?
100. Türkiye'de en çok güvendiğiniz kurum ya da kişi, makam hangisi?

XIII. Seçimler

101. Seçimlerde/ her seçimde oy kullanır mısınız? Sürekli tek bir partiye (hangisine) mi oy verirsiniz, değişir mi?
102. Babanız ve anneniz geçmişte kime verirdi?
103. Genel ve yerel seçimlerde oy kullanırken beklentileriniz neler oluyor? Beklentilerinizin karşılandığını düşünüyor musunuz?
104. Muhtarlık, belediye, genel seçimlerde hiç aday oldunuz mu? (aile, akraba, eş-dost arasından aday olan oldu mu?)
105. Aday olmak, seçilmek ister miydiniz?/Neden?
106. Yerel yönetimlerde söz sahibi olduğunuzu düşünüyor musunuz? Neden?
107. Ülke yönetiminde söz sahibi olduğunuzu düşünüyor musunuz? Neden?
108. Mecliste temsil edildiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz? (Kişi ve topluluk olarak)
109. Sizi temsil edecek bir lidere ihtiyaç duyuyor musunuz?

- 110.Mensubu olduđunuz topluluđu/cemaati toplumda kimin temsil ettiđini dűşünüyorsunuz?
(kurumsal olarak)
- 111.Ermeniler/ Yahudiler için bir partinin kurulmasını ve mecliste bulunmasını ister miydiniz?
Böyle bir partiden ne beklersiniz?
- 112.Herhangi bir derneđe, sendikaya, vakfa, siyasi partiye, kulübe üye misiniz? Hangisine? Diğer üyeleri kimler?
- 113.Geleceđiniz hakkındaki beklentileriniz nelerdir?
- 114.Eklemeđ istediđiniz bir şey var mı?

APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

- I -

1. Cinsiyetiniz: E() K()
2. Doğum yeriniz (il/ilçe/sem):
3. Doğum tarihiniz:
4. Medeni haliniz:
5. Eğitiminiz:
(Lütfen okuduğunuz okulların isimlerini aşağıda belirtiniz)
İlkokul:
Ortaokul:
Lise:
Üniversite:
Diğer:
6. Şu anda yaşamakta olduğunuz evde kaç kişi ve kimler yaşamakta:
7. Ailenizin diğer üyelerinin eğitimleri: (evli iseniz eşiniz ve çocuklarınız için)
Ailenizin diğer üyelerinin meslekleri / şu anda yaptıkları işler: (evli iseniz eşiniz ve çocuklarınız için)
8. Babanızın eğitimi:
Babanızın mesleği / şu anda yaptığı iş:
9. Annenizin Eğitimi:
Annenizin mesleği / şu anda yaptığı iş:
10. Babanızın ve anneniz bir sosyal güvenlik sistemine kayıtlı mı?
Hangisine? (Bağ-Kur, Emekli Sandığı, SSK, diğer)
11. Kaç kardeşsiniz:
Kardeşlerinizin eğitimleri:
Kardeşlerinizin meslekleri/ şu anda yaptıkları işler:
Kardeşleriniz nerede yaşıyor:
12. Kaç senedir Ankara'da yaşıyorsunuz:
13. Babanız kaç yılında, nerede doğmuş:
14. Anneniz kaç yılında, nerede doğmuş:
15. Babanız ya da anneniz Ankara doğumlu değilse Ankara'ya gelişleri ne zaman, nereden, ne sebeple olmuş:
16. Büyükanne ve büyükbabalarınız (hem anne hem baba tarafınız) Ankara doğumlu mu?
17. Büyükanne ve büyükbabalarınız ne iş yapmışlar:
Büyükanne ve büyükbabalarınız hep Ankara'da mı yaşamışlar:
Başka bir şehirden geldilerse nereden, ne zaman, ne sebeple geldiklerini anlatır mısınız:
18. Şu anda hangi semtte ve kaç senedir yaşıyorsunuz:
19. Daha önce yaşadığınız semtler:
20. Anne ve babanızın daha önce yaşadığı semtler:
21. Anne ve babanızın(hayattalar ise) şu anda yaşadığı semt/ kent:
22. Şu anda yurt dışında yaşamakta olan aile üyeleriniz var mı, nerede yaşıyorlar: (Lütfen geniş aileyi düşünerek cevap veriniz. Örneğin amca, hala, dayı, teyze ve onların çocuklarını da düşünerek cevap verin)
23. Bu aile üyeleri ne zaman ve Türkiye'nin hangi ilinden yurtdışına gittiler:
24. Bu aile üyelerinin yurtdışına gitme sebepleri neydi:
25. Bu aile üyeleri şu anda buldukları yerlerde hangi işleri yapıyorlar:

- II -

26. Mesleğiniz:
27. Şu anda yaptığınız iş:
28. Daha önce başka bir işle meşgul olduğunuz mu, nelerle:
29. Şu anda yapmakta olduğunuz işi seçme sebebiniz:
(Lütfen bu soruya detaylı bir cevap veriniz. Örneğin yaptığınız işi seçmeden önce seçebileceğiniz başka alternatifler varsa onları seçmeme sebebinizi, sizi bu iş yönlendiren kimselerin olup olmadığını, bu işi seçmenizdeki etkili olan diğer faktörleri ayrıntılı biçimde belirtiniz)
30. Şu anda yaptığınız işi nereden/ kimden öğrendiniz:
31. Kaç senedir şu anki işinizi yapıyorsunuz:
32. Çalışmaya kaç yaşında başladınız:
33. Geçmişte bu işin yapanların topluca buldukları bir semt/ cadde/ pasaj var mıydı?
Nerede, ismi neymiş:
Oradaki iş yaşamı ile ilgili neler duydunuz/ neler hatırlarsınız, kimlerin çalıştığını ve iş ilişkilerini biraz anlatır mısınız:
34. Yaptığınız işin geçmişte icra edilmiş tarzını düşündüğünüzde bugünle bir fark görüyor musunuz, anlatır mısınız:
35. Yaptığınız işin geleceğini nasıl görüyorsunuz:
36. İşinizden memnun musunuz:
Değiştirme şansınız olsaydı ne yapmak isterdiniz:
37. Çocuklarınızın da aynı işi yapmalarını ister misiniz:
38. Şu anda ekonomik durumunuzu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz: (üst-orta-alt)
39. Bir sosyal güvenlik sistemine kayıtlı mısınız:
Hangisine:
40. İşyeriniz size mi ait: (değilse lütfen kime ait olduğunu belirtiniz)
41. Çalıştığınız iş sahasının bir odası, ya da örgütlenmesi var mı:
42. Siz bu örgütlenmeye üye misiniz:
43. Bu meslek örgütlenmesi yöneticiliğinde görev aldınız mı:
44. Görev almak için aday olduğunuz mu:
45. Görev almadı iseniz, ya da aday olmayı düşünmediyseniz nedenlerini, bu konudaki fikirlerinizi anlatır mısınız:
46. Bu meslek sahipleri arasında bir gruplaşma olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz, ne tür bir gruplaşma:
Böyle bir gruplaşma sizin için bir dezavantaj ya da avantaj sağlıyor mu, bu konudaki fikirlerinizi anlatır mısınız:
47. Mesleki nedenlerle iş yaptığınız başka şehirler var mı, nereler:
Bu şehirlerde kiminle iş yaptığınızı anlatır mısınız:
İş yaptığınız kişiler sizinle aynı cemaatten mi:
Onları tercih etme sebebinizi anlatır mısınız:

- III -

48. Yaşadığınız ev kime ait:
49. Geçmişte anne ve babanızla birlikte yaşadığınız ev/ evler size mi aitti:
Ev size ait idiyse, ailenizin yaşadığınız evi kimden hangi şartlarla aldığını biliyor musunuz, anlatır mısınız:
50. Başka bir gayrimenkul sahibi misiniz, nerede:
51. Çocukluğunuzda evinizde sahip olduğunuz eşyalar başkalarının sahip olduklarından farklı mıydı:
(Lütfen çevrenizdeki komşu ve akrabalarda genellikle olmayıp sizde olan eşyalardan hatırladıklarınızı belirtiniz)
Geçmişte ailenizin kendisine ait otomobili var mıydı:
Sizin şu anda bir otomobiliniz var mı:
52. Şu anda eşinize/size ev işlerinde yardım eden biri (ücretli çalışan) var mı:
Ne sıklıkta geliyor/ hangi işleri yapıyor:
53. Çocukluğunuzda annenize ev işlerinde yardım eden biri (ücretli çalışan) var mıydı:
Ne sıklıkla gelirdi/ hangi işleri yapardı:
54. Maddi sıkıntı durumunda borç almanız gerekse öncelikli olarak kimden ya da nereden borç almayı tercih edersiniz:

- IV -

55. Sizi siz yapan en önemli özellikleriniz nelerdir:
56. Bir başkasına kendinizi tanıtmamız gerektiğinde öncelikli olarak ne söylüyorsunuz:
57. İş yerinizin bulunduğu ortamda başka iş sahipleri sizin hangi cemaate mensup olduğunuzu bilir mi:
58. Mensubu olduğunuz topluluk/ din/ ya da mezhepten olmanızın iş hayatınızda etkili olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz:
Nasıl bir etki gördüğünüzü anlatır mısınız:
59. Müşterileriniz sizin hangi cemaatten olduğunuzu bilir mi:
Bu konuda size sordukları şeyler olur mu, neler sorarlar:
60. Özellikle sizi tercih ettiğini bildiğiniz müşterileriniz var mı:
61. Sizi tercih etme sebepleri hakkında ne söylerler:
62. Günlük yaşamınızda mensubu olduğunuz cemaatten dolayı size farklı davranıldığını düşündünüz mü, örnekler anlatabilir misiniz:
63. İş ortaklığı yapmanız gerekse ortak olacağınız kişinin sizinle aynı cemaate mensup olmasını tercih eder misiniz:
64. Yanınızda birini çalıştırırken o kişinin sizinle aynı dinden/mezhepten olmasına dikkat eder misiniz:
65. Geçmişte babanız ya da yakın çevrenizde buna dikkat edilir miydi:
Bu konuda hatırladığımız örnekler varsa anlatır mısınız:
66. Mensubu olduğunuz cemaati başkalarına anlatmanız gerekse öncelikli olarak nelerden bahsedersiniz:
67. Mensubu olduğunuz cemaat çevrenizdeki başka cemaat ya da gruplardan hangi açılardan farklıdır:

- V -

68. Çocuklarınızın geleceği, eğitim ve meslekleriyle ilgili beklentileriniz nelerdir:
Bu beklentilerin gerçekleşeceğine inanıyor musunuz/ gerçekleştiğini düşünüyor musunuz:
69. Çocuklarınızın özel okullarda mı, devlet okullarında mı okumasını tercih ederdiniz/ettiniz:
Neden:
70. Çocuklarınızın devlet memuru olmasını ister miydiniz:
Neden:
71. Çocuklarınızın Ankara'da yaşamasını ister misiniz:
Neden:
72. Çocuklarınızdan şehir dışında olanlar varsa neredeler ve gitme sebepleri neydi:
Onları haklı buluyor musunuz:
73. Çocuklarınızdan yurtdışında olanlar varsa neredeler ve gitme sebepleri neydi:
Onları haklı buluyor musunuz:
74. Çocuklarınızın mensubu olduğunuz topluluktan biriyle evlenmesini tercih eder misiniz:
75. Çocuklarınız evlenirken eş seçimlerinde müdahaleniz oldu mu/ olur mu:
Neden:
76. Siz evlenirken mensubu olduğunuz topluluktan biriyle evlenmeyi tercih ettiniz mi:
Neden:
77. Ailenizin bu konuda bir yönlendirmesi oldu mu: Ne söylediler:
78. Çevrenizde karışık evlilikler yapanlar oldu mu, kimlerin ne tür evlilikler yaptığını anlatır mısınız:
79. Bu evlilikleri yapan kişilerin karşılaştıkları sorunlar duyduunuz mu, ne tür sorunlar duyduunuz:

- VI -

80. Ankara'da (kent çapında) en çok kullandığınız mekanlar nereler:
81. Hangi amaçlarla bu mekanları kullandığınızı anlatır mısınız:
82. Ankara içindeki ulaşımınızı hangi araçlarla gerçekleştiriyorsunuz:
83. Ankara'da yaşıyor olmanın size sağladığı avantajlar var mı, nelerdir:
84. Ankara'da yaşıyor olmanın size getirdiği dezavantajlar var mı, nelerdir:
85. Başkentte yaşamak iş hayatınızı nasıl etkiliyor:
86. Başkentte yaşamak cemaat yaşamını nasıl etkiliyor:
87. Sizce bir başkent olarak Ankara'nın eksikleri var mı:
Nasıl eksikler gördüğünüzü anlatır mısınız:

88. Başka bir şehirde yaşamayı ister miydiniz:
Nerede:
Neden orada yaşamayı isterdiniz:
Ankara'da kalmayı tercih sebebiniz nedir:
89. Yaşadığınız semtte ailenizin başka üyeleri ya da akrabalarınız da yaşıyor mu:
Kimler size hangi mesafelerde yaşıyorlar, yakınlık derecesini belirterek anlatır mısınız:
90. Size yakın oturan bu kişilerle ne sıklıkta, nerede görüşürsünüz:
Bir aradayken neler yaparsınız:
91. Ankara'nın başka semtlerinde yaşayan akraba ve aile üyelerinizle ne sıklıkta, nerede görüşürsünüz, yakınlık derecelerini belirterek anlatır mısınız:
92. Ankara denince aklınıza ilk gelenler nelerdir:
93. Ankara'da kendinizi evinizde hissediyor musunuz:
94. Kendinizi yabancı ya da farklı hissettiğiniz zamanlar oldu mu, ne zaman ve nasıl olduğunu anlatır mısınız:
95. Başka bir ülkeye göç etmeyi hiç düşündünüz mü:
Nereye:
Neden:
Türkiye'de kalmayı tercih sebebiniz neydi:
96. Yurt dışında yaşayan tanıdıklarınızın oradaki yaşam biçimleri ve kendinizinki arasında farklar olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz, farkların ne tür olduğunu anlatabilir misiniz:
97. Başkent'te değil de başka bir kentte yaşıyor olsaydınız, yaşantınızda olumlu ya da olumsuz bir farklılık olur muydu, nasıl olabileceğini anlatır mısınız:
98. Büyüklerinizden Ankara'nın başkent oluşuyla, Cumhuriyetin kuruluşuyla ya da Atatürk'le ilgili öyküler dinlediniz mi, hatırladıklarınızı anlatır mısınız:

- VII -

99. Türkiye'de yaşayan ve Müslüman olmayan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlarıyla ilgili olarak "azınlık" tanımının kullanılması hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz:
100. Siz kendinizi azınlık olara hissediyor musunuz, bu konuda ne hissettiğinizi anlatır mısınız:
101. Vatandaş olarak sahip olduğunuz hakları kullandığınızı düşünüyor musunuz:
Evetse nasıl kullandığınızı, hayırsa neden kullanmadığınızı anlatabilir misiniz:
102. Avrupa Birliğine katılım hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz:
103. Avrupa Birliğine katılım gerçekleşirse Türkiye'de nasıl değişikliklerin yaşanacağını düşünüyorsunuz, anlatır mısınız:

- VIII -

104. Her seçimde oy kullanır mısınız:
105. Yerel ya da genel seçimlerde hiç aday oldunuz mu:
106. Aile ya da akrabalarınızdan aday olanlar var mı:
Varsa seçildiler mi:
Yoksa neden aday olunmadığınızı düşünüyorsunuz:
107. Babanız ve anneniz hangi partiye oy verirdi:
108. Genel olarak ülke politikasında temsil edildiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz:
109. Sizi temsil edecek bir lidere ya da partiye ihtiyaç duyuyor musunuz, bu konudaki fikirlerinizi anlatır mısınız:

- IX -

110. Büyüklerinizden Varlık Vergisi döneminde neler yaşandığını duydunuz mu:
Neler yaşandığını anlatır mısınız:
111. Türkçe dışında başka bir dil konuşan büyükleriniz var mıydı:
Diğer dil /diller neydi, ne zaman nerede kullanırlardı:
Bu dil/dilleri kullandıkları için sorunla karşılaştıklarını anlatırlar mıydı, nasıl sorunlar olduğunu anlatır mısınız:
112. Lütfen eklemek isteyeceğiniz noktalar varsa ekleyiniz.
113. Lütfen sorularla ilgili eleştiri ve fikirlerinizi ekleyiniz:

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCING THE NARRATORS

To understand narratives better in their multiple dimensions and multiple layers we should have an opinion about the people who narrates them. Because narratives, I believe, bear the burden of life practices. Gender, class, marital status, age, network relations (social capital), all effect the perception of identity, and thus, relationally, the construction of narratives.

‘1’: (03/09/2004; 03/12/2004; 16/10/2005)

‘1’, a Catholic Armenian, was born in 1929 in Ankara, Tabakhane/Ulus. Her father was a tailor, and mother was a housewife but helped his husband. Her grandfathers were also tailors. Both her father and mother had studied at primary school in the neighborhood, besides her father had attended the Armenian Church, which was once also a school. She and her elder sister had graduated from primary school; and her elder brother dropped out of the secondary school in the 3rd year. ‘1’ was a tailor, worked with her sister; and her brother was a carpenter. She and her sister have never married; and ‘1’, currently, lost all her family members, lives in Küçük Esat alone, in a flat she owns. She does not have social security; she lives on some savings in the bank and her nieces in the USA, her brother’s daughters, sometimes help her. She seems to have acted upon her individual preferences throughout her life, and values this. She is a religious person.

A.T: (22/06/2005)

A.T., a Catholic Armenian, was born in Ankara, Tabakhane/Ulus neighborhood, in 1923. He was the fourth child of a family who had six children. He dropped out of the primary school in the 4th year. His father, born in Ankara was a carpenter, making peg-tops, coffins and spinning-wheels, he was illiterate; his mother born in Kayseri, was a housewife, she was literate. All of his brothers and a sister were tailors. Only A.T. was a jeweler, that is, he worked in a jeweler’s and did never own his own store. Two of his brothers moved to France in 1966, and two others died in Ankara. Currently, only his sister lives in Ankara. He has two children; his daughter graduated from high school, is married to a Catholic Armenian man, they have one child and live in Istanbul. His son graduated from middle school, is married to a Catholic Assyrian, they have two children, and live in the same apartment with A.T. He is retired currently and lives in Keçiören with his wife.

M.T: (22/06/2005)

M.T., (A.T.’s wife), a Catholic Armenian, was born in Ankara, Inner-Castle/Ulus in 1929. She has graduated from primary school. She worked in a drapery shop for 26 years and after quitting job, retired by paying for her retirement. She got married to A.T. in 1954. She is a kind person, who values personal characteristics rather than communitarian attachments and identities in her relations with the ‘other’.

B.E: (08/10/05)

B.E, a Catholic Armenian, was born in 1946, in Ankara, Tabakhane/Ulus. She was the second child of a family who has three children. Her father was a leader trader in Ulus, and mother was a tailor. She has two brothers, the elder being a stepbrother, lives in Istanbul since he left Ankara in the 4th year of the primary school, for a boarding Armenian school. He after completing university education became a psychologist, married and currently is a retired person. The younger brother, lives in the same

apartment with her, married, and is a jeweler. She, herself having not completed her education at the middle school, is a housewife currently, married with a Catholic Assyrian man from Mardin and has three children. Her eldest daughter, who left Ankara upon marriage, lives currently in Istanbul and is married to a Catholic man. Her son lives next door, married and is a jeweler. Her younger daughter after having worked as a nursery teacher at a private school in Istanbul is back in Ankara, single, and unemployed currently. B.E. and her family lives in Keçiören for 42 years. It is understood that she is an active person in her social relations who is to be applied in case of any problem which ranged from monetary problems, to knitting a baby sweater, from providing support for the headman of the neighborhood, to be a leader in searching for the years-old friends and making of them a peer group.

K.S: (16/10/2005; 24/10/2005)

K.S., a Gregorian Armenian, was born in 1928 in Ankara, Tahtakale/Ulus. After their house was burnt in the 1929 fire of Tahtakale his family moved to Hacıdoğan neighborhood, buying a house there. His mother was born in Kalecik, a town of Ankara nearby, at the very beginnings of 1900's. His father was born in Usak. His mother's family had moved to Ankara from Erzurum and Sivas around; whereas his father's family was from Aydın, Söke. He is the fourth child of five, the eldest of whom was born in 1922 in Kalecik. His parents got married in Kalecik and moved to Ankara around 1925. The other children were born in Ankara. His father was an attorney in Samanpazarı, and was the partner of the time's Minister of Justice who worked at the same office. He was also the secular leader of the Gregorian Armenians in Ankara. K.S. dropped out of the high school in the 2nd year. He has been working in the same business selling automotive spare parts, since the age of six. He was also an ATO member in the committee and his expertise was applied many times at the courts. He has also inherited from his father the secular leadership of the Gregorian Armenian community in Ankara, though it is not a formal status. He reflected upon his position in the words: "ask my name to all; if they don't know me, you will understand that they are not Armenians". His elder sisters were graduated from middle school; his younger brother was graduated from university and was an expert accountant, he then moved to Canada and lives, currently, there. K.S. has two children, his son is doing the same job with his father, married and lives currently in Istanbul; his daughter, a housewife, is married and lives, currently, in Bahçelievler, Ankara.

A.S: (24/10/2005)

A.S., (K.S.'s wife), was born in Ankara in 1940. Her family was born in Zir, then an Armenian village of Ankara. Her grandfather and great-grandfather were exiled during the WWI together with other men in the village and did not turn back. The village was evacuated and her mother was at the age of 5 when her family moved to Ankara. Her father was a waiter in Karpiç Restaurant in Ankara, and then managed his own restaurant in Kızılay. Her mother was a housewife. She has two elder and one younger brother. One, who is a doctor, lives in the USA and the other two in Canada, the eldest of whom died two years ago. K.S. and A.S., currently, lives in Çankaya in their own flat. A.S.'s 93 year-old mother was living with them at the time of the interview but I have learnt that she passed away a few days later.

K.G: (12/11/2005)

K.G., a Gregorian Armenian, was born in 1937 in Hacıdoğan/Ulus, Ankara. His mother and father were born in Zir, respectively, in 1910 and in 1906. Both of his grandfathers were exiled during the WWI. His father was a waiter in a restaurant in Ulus, and his mother was a housewife. He has an elder brother who has migrated to Australia as a worker and lives currently there. He and his brother are graduated from primary school, and worked as tailors since childhood. He is retired currently, but continues to work in his workshop he owns in Ulus.

L.N: (29/06/2005)

L.N., a member of the Jewish community in Ankara, was born in 1924 in Istanbul, Uskudar. In 1929, when he was at the age of 5, his family moved to Ankara. His mother was from Salonika, and his father was from Uskudar, Istanbul. They first lived in the Jewish Neighborhood in Ulus for a few years, and then moved to Isıklar Street again in Ulus. His father was the accountant of the Central Restaurant (Merkez Lokantası) in the Atatürk Forest Farm (Atatürk Orman Çiftliği) and his mother was a tailor. He had a younger brother who once owned a patisserie in Kızılay. His brother was born in 1928, in Istanbul, and died a few years ago. He has graduated from Faculty of Medicine of Istanbul in 1947. He is a doctor, worked at the beginning at a factory hospital, then at a university policlinic in

Ankara. He still works at a private hospital in Ankara. He has married to a French woman, and had two children. Both of their sons were doctors, surgeons, one of whom died, and the other lives, currently, in France. He and his wife, who was the secretary of the French Consulate before marriage, live, currently, in an apartment in Cankaya.

N.E: (17/06/2005; 29/07/2005)

N.E., a member of the Jewish community in Ankara, was born in 1957 in Sıhhiye, Ankara. His father's family had lived in different cities of Anatolia, because his grandfather, who was born in Edirne and whose family was from Edirne, was a state officer, an accountant, at the Ottoman Bank. His father was born in Samsun and uncle in Trabzon. His mother's family, on the other hand was from Istanbul, his grandfather was a trader, but lived for a short time in Ankara, too. His father, graduated from Istanbul Technical Faculty, worked, also, as a state officer at the TCDD, as a civil engineer and his mother, graduated from high school, was a housewife. He has an elder brother, born in 1953 in Ankara, and a younger sister born in 1969 in Ankara. He studied primary, middle and high schools at the same private school in Ankara. He was graduated from Industrial Engineering Department at university and is, at the moment, a Professor at a private university in Ankara. His brother, after Ankara Fen Lisesi graduated from Mathematics at university, and works, currently, as a Mathematics Professor at a private university in Istanbul. His sister is also graduated from Electrical Engineering Department at university and currently a Professor at a university in the USA. N.E. is married to a Muslim woman, who is also a Professor at a private university. They have a daughter and she studies graphics at a private university in Ankara. He lives, currently, in Cankaya with his family.

H.Ö: (01/11/2005)

H.Ö., a Catholic Armenian, was born in 1953 in Ankara, Bentderesi/Ulus. When he was at the age of 5-6 his family moved to Keçiören and he attended primary school there. He dropped out of the middle school in the 2nd year. His father, born in 1929 in Ankara, was a tailor in Ulus, sewed shirts for men, thus was called a shirt-maker. His mother, born in 1933 in Ankara, was also a tailor. His grandparents also were born in Ankara, his grandfather was a musician and played violin. He is the eldest child of the family who has three children. He is a jeweler and he is one of the rare persons in Ankara who makes the production of the jewelry rather than only buying and selling them. He has a brother, who is also a jeweler and is married to an Alevi. His sister is a housewife, married to a Greek Orthodox from Antakya and lives currently in Antakya. H.Ö. is married to a Greek Orthodox from Antakya but they live separately at the moment. They have two children who had their education at private schools, including university education in case of his daughter. His son is preparing for the university entrance exam. He lives currently alone, in an apartment in Gazi Osman Paşa in rent, while his wife and children lives in Çankaya in a flat they own.

S.O: (16/10/2005; 20/10/2005)

S.O., a Gregorian Armenian, was born in 1962 in Yenimahalle, Ankara. Her father was born in 1928 in Yozgat and his family moved to Ankara, after Samsun and Istanbul, when he was 7. They settled in Hacıdoğan neighborhood and he was graduated from the primary school there. S.O.'s father was a tradesman; he sold auto spare parts. Her mother, born in 1941 in Sivas, graduated from primary school, moved to Ankara after marriage and was a housewife. She remembers her mother's father being both a miller and a farrier in Sivas. S.O was grown up in a large family consisting of grandmother, two aunts, one uncle, her own parents and her brother. Her aunts and her uncle were tailors. He has a younger brother, graduated from middle school and continues his father's business, selling auto accessories. S.O. is graduated from high school, a technical school but never did her job, technical painting. She first worked in the as a beauty expert for 16 years, and works at the moment as the sales manager of a French gift shop since 1996. She has a daughter who has completed her high school education and works as a receptionist at a restaurant now. S.O. is divorced and lives with her daughter in Yenimahalle in the house where she was born.

B.T: (09/11/2005)

B.T., a Catholic Armenian, was born in 1957 in Tabakhane/Ulus, Ankara. His father was born in 1922 in Tabakhane, and was a trader of leader and angora. His grandfather was also a trader of leader and angora. His mother was a tailor. B.T.'s family had moved to Keçiören when he was 5. He dropped out of school in the 2nd year. He has a sister who is graduated from high school [Girls' Evening Art School], married to a Catholic Armenian currently and lives in Ankara. B.T. is a jeweler. He is

married to a Catholic Armenian and they have a son who has completed his education at private schools and currently studies at a private university in Ankara. They live in Cayyolu in a flat they own.

V.T: (22/11/2005; 29/11/2005)

V.T., a Gregorian Armenian, was born in 1943 in Tabakhane/Ulus, Ankara. His father, born in 1908, in Kastamonu/İnebolu came to Ankara due to the deportation of 1915 and was adopted by another family since V.T.'s grandfather was among the deportees. His father had two brothers who had converted to Islam at that time. V.T.'s mother was born in 1912 in Ankara and was a housewife. His father was first a taxi driver who established the first phone-taxi stop in Ankara. After he had returned of exile from Aşkale, he had set up an agency selling mineral waters and managed it between the years 1950-1963. Simultaneously, he owned his business in the brickfields nearby Ankara. V.T., after completing primary school in Ankara, has studied at a French college in Istanbul, and was accepted by LSE [London School of Economics] for university education. However, since he learnt that his father was death at the time he was preparing to leave Turkey, he returned to Ankara and led the family business, completing department of French Philology at Ankara University. He had two sisters who were born in 1952 and 1954, one studied at an Italian School. However, he has lost his sisters and mother in a traffic accident. He is married to a Muslim, and they have two children who were baptized and are Christians. V.T. is a jeweler.

A.K: (18/09/2004)

A.K., a member of the Jewish community in Ankara, was born in 1911 in Ankara Jewish neighborhood/Ulus. His father returned ill from the WWI and were death in a short period. He and his four sisters were brought up by their mothers who made cleaning works to live on. He was graduated from the Jewish Primary School in the neighborhood. He was a milliner and owned his store in the mid-1950s. He was married to a Jewish lady from Istanbul. They had three children, two daughters and a son. Their son, born in 1941, completed high school at a technical high school in Ankara and studied in the department of Electrical Engineering at Istanbul Technical University. He has migrated to Israel and lives there currently.

R: (18/09/2004)

R. is the eldest daughter of A.K., was born in 1945 in the Jewish neighborhood in Ankara. She has completed high school education in İsmet Paşa Girl's Institute. She migrated to Israel in 1963 upon her marriage to a Jewish man from Edirne who have migrated to Israel earlier. She currently lives there and was interviewed simultaneously with her sister and father, at a time she was in a visit to Turkey.

H.A: (18/09/2004)

H.A. is the younger daughter of A.K., was born in 1951 in the Jewish neighborhood in Ankara. She has completed her education at a private college in Ankara and is a high school graduate. She is a consulate secretary currently and lives in Tunalı Hilmi in a flat she owns. Her husband is deceased. One of her sons, both university graduates, lives currently in Bursa and the other in Izmir.

APPENDIX D

Table 4: Social Demographic Profile of the Armenian and Jewish Communities

Names	Communities	Birth	Sex	Education	Occupation	Father's		Mother's	
						Education	Occupation	Education	Occupation
The Narrators of the Life Stories									
1	'I	Cath.Armenian	1929	F	Primary Sch.	Tailor	Primary Sch.	Tailor	Tailor
2	A.T.	Cath.Armenian	1923	M	Primary Sch.Left	Jeweler	NE/Illiterate	Carpenter/spinning-wheels	House Wife
3	M.T.	Cath.Armenian	1929	F	Primary Sch.	Shop assistant		Self Employed	House Wife
4	B.E.	Cath.Armenian	1946	F	Second.Sch.Left	House Wife		Angora and leather Trader	Tailor
5	B.T.	Cath.Armenian	1957	M	High Sch.Left	Jeweler		Angora and leather Trader	Tailor
6	H.Ö.	Cath.Armenian	1953	M	Second.Sch.Left	Jeweler	Literate	Tailor	Tailor
7	K.S.	Greg.Armenian	1928	M	High Sch.Left	Auto-spare parts	Primary Sch.	Attorney	House Wife
8	A.S.	Greg.Armenian	1940	F	High Sch.	House Wife	Literate	Waiter	House Wife
9	K.G.	Greg.Armenian	1937	M	Primary Sch.	Tailor	Literate	Waiter	Washing-up
10	S.O.	Greg.Armenian	1962	F	High Sch.	Sales Manager	Primary Sch.	Auto-spare parts	House Wife
11	V.T.	Greg.Armenian	1943	M	University	Jeweler		S.Emp./Brick-factory own.	House Wife
12	A.K.	Jew	1911	M	Primary Sch.	Self Emp./ Milliner			
13	H.A.	Jew	1951	F	High Sch.	Consulate Secretary	Primary Sch.	Self Emp./ Milliner	House Wife
14	R.	Jew	1945	F	High Sch.	House Wife	Primary Sch.	Self Emp./ Milliner	House Wife
15	L.N.	Jew	1924	M	University	Doctor	High Sch.	Accountant	Tailor
16	N.E.	Jew	1957	M	University	Academician	University	Engineer	House Wife
The Respondents to the Questionnaire									
1	N.P.	Cath.Armenian	1957	M	University	Jeweler /Accountant	Primary Sch.	Tailor	House Wife
2	C.E.	Cth.Ar/Assyrian	1969	M	Secondary Sch.	Jeweler	Primary Sch.	Jeweler	House Wife
3	R.M.	Cath.Armenian	1950	M	Secondary Sch.	Jeweler	Primary Sch.	Tailor	House Wife
4	E.Ş.	Cath.Armenian	1963	M	High Sch.	Jeweler	High Sch.	Jeweler	House Wife
5	T.T.	Greg.Armenian	1968	F	University	Jeweler/ Architect	Primary Sch.	Jeweler	House Wife
6	A.E.	Greg.Armenian	1953	M	Secondary Sch.	Jeweler	Secondr.Sch	Self Employed	House Wife
7	A.I	Greg.Armenian	1953	M	University	Jeweler	Primary Sch.	S.Emp./Seller of offals	House Wife

APPENDIX E

Table 5: Data on the Birth Place and Birth Date of three Generation Armenian and Jewish People

Name	Community	Birth Place/ Birth Date							
		Own	Father's	Mother's	Mt.Gr.Fath.	Mt.Gr.Moth.	Pt.Gr.Fath.	Pt.Gr.Moth.	
The Narrators of the Life Stories									
1	'I'	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1929	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
2	A.T.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1923	Ankara	Kayseri	Kayseri	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
3	M.T.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1929	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
4	B.E.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1946	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
5	B.T.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1957	Ankara	Ankara/1930	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
6	H.Ö.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1953	Ankara/1929	Ankara/1933	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
7	K.S.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1928	Uşak	Kalecik/1900s	Sivas(Erzurum)	Sivas	Aydın/Söke	Uşak
8	A.S.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1940	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara
9	K.G.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1937	Zir/1906	Zir/1910	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara
10	S.O.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1962	Yozgat/1928	Sivas/1941	Sivas	Sivas	Yozgat	Yozgat
11	V.T.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1943	Kastamonu/1908	Ankara/1912	Ankara	Ankara	Kastamonu	Kastamonu
12	A.K.	Jew	Ankara/1911	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
13	H.A.	Jew	Ankara/1951	Ankara/1911	Ankara/1924	Istanbul	Istanbul	Ankara	Ankara
14	R.	Jew	Ankara/1945	Ankara/1911	Istanbul/1924	Istanbul	Istanbul	Ankara	Ankara
15	L.N.	Jew	Istanbul/1924	Istanbul/Üsküdar	Salonika	Salonika	Salonika	Istanbul	Istanbul
16	N.E.	Jew	Ankara/1957	Samsun	Istanbul	Istanbul	Istanbul	Edirne	Edirne
The Respondents to the Questionnaire									
1	N.P.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1957	Ankara/1925	Kayseri/1922	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
2	C.E.	CthArm/Assyrian	Ankara/1969	Mardin/1938	Ankara/1946	Ankara	Ankara	Mardin	Mardin
3	R.M.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1950	Ankara/1920	Ankara/1930	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara	Ankara
4	E.Ş.	Cath.Armenian	Ankara/1963	Ankara/1930	Istanbul/1940	Samsun	Istanbul	Ankara	Ankara
5	T.T.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1968	Ankara/1940	1948/Kayseri	Kayseri	Kayseri	Yozgat	Yozgat
6	A.E.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1953	Zir/Ankara	Kayseri	Kayseri	Kayseri	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara
7	A.i.	Greg.Armenian	Ankara/1953	Ankara/1928	Ankara/1937	Erzurum	Yozgat	Zir/Ankara	Zir/Ankara

APPENDIX F

THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN A.T; M.T; Ö.B. ON THE PHOTO ALBUM

- M: Efendim çay koyayım.
Ö: Yok hiç zahmet etmeyin, ben..
M: Estağfurullah.
Ö: Yok,yok zahmet etmeyin,, oturun, yani şey yapmayalım, rahatsız etmeyeyim ben de sizi..
M: Olsun hayır şey yapma, zaten..
A: Ben, ben sonra sana resim albümü, albümün kendisini gösterelim, büyük albümü gösterelim de baksın resimlere.
M: Ne, ne için bakacak..
A: (Bağırarak) Resimlere! Resimlere!
M: (Yüksek sesle) Anladım resimlere de yani ne için, siz mi dediniz bakayım diye.
Ö: Yok ben de, olsun yani bakabilirim eğer isterseniz.
M: Yani resimlere, resimde ne bakacak işte şunlar albümde de var (Konsolun üstündekileri gösteriyor) ne, haa, ne..
A: İşte tamam tamam. Tamam neyse.
M: Yani kıyafetimiz değişik değil aynı.
A: Tabi tabi.
Ö: Yok ben yani A. amca önerdi, ben de olur dedim sevinirim dedim yani.
A: Tamam, tamam bir şey yok.
M: Yani ver baksın canım, bir şey yok bakılacak ama.
A: Tamam bir şey yok, şey diyeceğim...
M: E yine ver.
A: Çay, hakkakten bir çay...
Ö: Yok sağ olun ben zahmet vermeyeyim, zaten de bitiririz yani biraz uzunca da oldu herhalde.
M: Yok şey değil, yani ben saatinde damlamı yapıyorum benim için fark etmez de. Şeydir, göster albümü A.
A: Tamam, tamam dur getireceğim, bir dakika getireceğim. Diyeceğim kızım şey sen...
M: Ben çayı koyayım da yetişirse..
A: Ha yetişirse bir çay koy da hanım. (Sessiz konuşmaya başlıyor) Yürüyemiyor da, kemik erimesi var. Ayakları...

APPENDIX G

THE WRITTEN PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH AND THE RESEARCHER

These perceptions were noted down by three among the seven respondents, to the last question of the questionnaire: “please add your criticism and ideas on the questions”. The notes are given as they existed in original forms; spelling mistakes are not corrected.

A.İ: Sorular, gayet mantıklı, etik ve normaldir. Bu soruları bize cevaplamamız için sunan sayın Özgür Bal’ın özel veya meslek alanında şanslı ve başarılı bir ömür geçirmesini temenni ederim.

Saygılarımla
İmza

E.Ş: Herhangi bir eleştirim yok ancak bazı sorularda dinden dolayı mutlaka bir şeyler yaşamamız gerekmiş gibi bazı yönlendirmeler hissettim. Ben dürüstçe ve açıkça sorularınızı cevapladığımı düşünüyorum. Sizin tezinizde bir katkı olabildiyse ne mutlu bana. Size başarılar diliyorum. (İnanılmaz bir vakit aldığında belirtmeden geçemeyeceğim).

T.T: Soruları cevaplarken önce tedirginlik yaşadım. Çünkü geçmişte olan olaylar o kadar çok anlatılıyor ki, çok yakın çevrem, arkadaşlarım (bu arada tüm çevrem Müslüman) dışında konuşmak çok hoşuma gitmiyor. Günümüzde kime güvenilebileceğinizi bilmeniz zor.

APPENDIX H

K.G.'s NARRATIVE

K.G.* Her zaman çoğu zaman şeye giderdik Atatürk Orman Çiftliğine, Kayaş'a, hep oralara. Şimdi bayındır Barajına, şimdi arabamızı aldıktan sonra Bayındır Barajına da gitmeye başladık yani, çünkü otobüs oraya pek bize ters gelirdi. Şimdi bir enteresan bir şey anlatayım. Şimdi bilmiyorum Bayındır Barajını biliyor musunuz siz..

Ö: Yok çok iyi bilmiyorum.

K: Şimdi Bayındır Barajı öyle bir şey ki, şimdi girişte (elinin altındaki tersinden dikiş diktği pantolonun cep tarafına, eline bir sabun alıp çizmeye başlıyor. Bir boş kağıt uzatıyorum “şunu vereyim size” diyerek, “yoo ben şey yaparım, hiç onu bozma” diyor ve oturdukları yeri tarif etmek için birbiriyle kesişen iki yolun ortasında üçgen şeklinde bir ada çiziyor. Ö.B.) Şimdi giriş şöyle bir şeyi var, şurası ince, şurası şöyle büyük şöyle bir şey var, ada var, böyle, şöyle burası ince, şimdi şuradan araba yolu var, buraya piknik alanına gidiyorsunuz. Burada da gene piknik alanına gidiyorsunuz, şimdi şurada bir ada var, şurada yine piknik alanı var. Şimdi girişte tabi buradan geliyorsunuz siz, ya buraya gideceksiniz, ya buraya gideceksiniz. Şimdi buralarda biz yer bulamadık, şimdi şurada oturuyoruz, biz tabi biraz dolaşmağa falan gittik, şurada annem, teyzem, kayınvalidem oturuyorlar üçü. Şimdi bunların üçü de, tabi *köylü* giyimleri olduğu için yani, basma elbise giymişler, basma elbise giymişler. Ondan sonra başında başörtüsü var, siyah, yani ne Müslüman'da var o, ne Hıristiyan'da, yani bizlerde var. Yani belki de, Yani İstanbullularda falan da görmedim ben oranın Hıristiyanlarında da, belki de bizim buranın adetiymiş, siyah bir başörtüydü yani. ondan sonra başlarında başörtü var, uzun, bir yaz günü uzun kollu basma elbise var, ellerinde sigara var üçünün de, ve üçü de iskambil oynuyor, kağıt oynuyor. Yaşları da en aşağı 60 diyelim yani. Şimdi gelen geçen orada bir bakardı onlara. Ya şimdi bu çıkamıyorlar işlin içinden yani, hem köylü, hem köylü baş örtüsü var, sigara içiyor, bir de iskambil oynuyor. Hiç burada, Türkiye'deki köydekilerde, hiç Ankara'nın, hiç olmayacak bir şey yani. Tabi onlar konduramıyorlar, ya bunlar yabancı din de diyemiyorlar, hani bilmiyorlar ki onlar, e konuşmalar Türkçe, konuşmalar Türkçe ama neyin nesi, çoğu bilmez, çoğu bilmez. Hani bizim... hani diyeceğim hemen böyle bir işten artan bir vakit buldular mı, hemen böyle bir eğlence, gezme, piknik, bizimkilerinde bu hadi gidelim şeyi vardır yani. Pek evde oturmayı sevmezler.

* K.G. arabasını 1975 yılında aldı, dolayısıyla anlatılan hikaye o yıl ya da takip eden yıllarda gerçekleşmiş olmalı (Ö.B)

APPENDIX I

K.G's LETTER

Çok Kıymetli ^{POSTA} ~~İNANILMAZ~~ GERÇEKLER Gazetesi Okuyucuları

Su gündeki durumlardan dolayı başımdan geçen bir olayı yazmak mecburiyeti duydum Ben ailesi yüz yıllar evvel Ankaraya göç etmiş Ermeni Asıllı Türk vatandasıyım ve Ankara Ulusta Bağı Kurdan emekli olup Halen Terzilik yapmaktayım Başımdan geçen olaya gelince bundan yıllar evvel Televizyonda çağrı dizisi gösterilmisti ben bu diziden çok etkilendim diziden bir kaç ay sonra o yıllarda bende dört defa ~~On~~ iki parmakta mide kanaması geçirdim ve devamlı mide ağrısı çektiğim bir cumartesi gecesini Ağrıdan duramıyorum ilaç aldım hiç faydası yok Hanımım ve çocuklarım beni hastahaneye götürmek istedikler gitmedim ve saat oniki civarında yatağıma uzandım ve kendimden geçip dalmışım olaylar başlamış Ben Şimdi Cebeci dikim evinin bulunduğu Erşan Caminin olduğu yerdeyim kırk yıl evvel cami düğün salonu idi benim düğümüm orada yapıldı düğün salonu Alt kattadır ben salonda oturuyorum o sırada merdivenlerden bir beyaz deve hışımla geliyor ve herkes sağa sola kaçıyor bende hemen

...
merdivenin Altına kaçıyorum ve sonra kendime soruyorum Sen niye kaçıyorsun gelen deve hazreti Muhamed Peygamberimizin devesi Sende kimseye kötülük yapmadın niye korkuyorsun dedim ve merdivenin Altından çıktım ve o sırada gül yüzlü deve yanıma geldi benim yüzümü omuzlarımı belimi yaladı gitti bende uykudan uyandım ne göreyim ne midemde ağrı var ne sırtımda ağrı var sapa sağlamım hemen ev halkını uyandırdım günlerden pazar olmuştuk kalkın sizleri pikniğe götüreyim dedim evdekiler şaşkın şaşkın yüzüme bakıyorlar ne pikniği Sen hastasın miden ağrıyor sırtın ağrıyor o gün ev halkına birşey Anlatmadım pikniğe gittik bir hafta sonra Art komsum olan Hacı Abiye Anlattım ve herkese Anlattım bir sene evvel Hacı Abi rahmetli oldu Toprağı bol olsun sevdiği Türk halkı ve ^{POSTA} gazetesini okuyucuları Aradan geçen yüz yıldan sonra Hazreti Muammer Peygamberimiz devesi dini ayrı olan bir insana şifa veriyorsa Hastalığını ~~Hastalığını~~ iyi ediyorsa bu günlerde Ermeni Tasarısını meclislerine getiren devletler Utansın

APPENDIX J

TURKISH ORIGINALS OF THE QUOTATIONS

I tried to provide the Turkish originals of the narrative quotations as I heard in the recorder. Written responses in the questionnaires, on the other hand, are provided as they appeared in the original forms, spelling mistakes are not corrected.

CHAPTER V

‘1’

Çocukken annem eski kuleleri, kilise kalıntılarını gösterirdi. Annemlerin gençliğinde, çocukluğunda, bütün, çok kilise varmış Ankara’da. Ve hepsi ayrıymış... Çok kilise varmış. Yani Katolik kilisesi ayrı, Ermeni Gregoryan kilisesi ayrı, Rum Kilisesi ayrı, böyle kiliseler varmış çok. Ama hiçbirisi kalmamış, yanmış, yıkılmış falan...Benim çocukluğumda kendi yerel kilisemiz yoktu, buraya gelirdik. Hala, bizim kendi yerli Hıristiyan olarak bir kilisemiz yok. Yabancıların kilisesindeyiz, onlar da Katolik olduğu için, sağ olsunlar Fransız kilisesi bize sahip çıkıyor.

A.T.

Bizim, Ticaret Lisesi var ya Hacıdoğan’da, ordaydı bizim Katolik kilisemiz, kilise ordaydı ve de onun önünde böyle büyük şeydi, mezarlık da ordaydı, sonradan hükümet orayı...papazımız öldü mü bir şey oldu kilise yıkıldı galiba, her şey dağıldı. Ondan sonra bizim burada papaz mapaz yoktu, bu Fransızların bu şey, burası okuldu. Sonradan işte orda kilise yaptılar falan. Ve bizi bunlar aldılar, Ankara Katoliklerini, bizi bunlar aldılar. Ondan işte bu şekilde gidiyoruz işte.

‘1’

Bizden evvelkiler çok zorluk çekmişler. Birer ikişer odalarda yaşadılar. Bizim...Öyle işte. Babamların ayrıca, annemlerin de şeyde Aşağı Ayrancı’da, şeyde Kızlarpınarı’nda, Dikmen’de mülkleri varmış hep, bağlıkları, evleri varmış. İşte annemlerin Hisar’da babamların Hisarönü’nde, diyorum ya orada, işte kışık evleri varmış, o zamanlar oralar çok makbul yerlermiş. İşte evleri varmış çok malları mülkleri varmış ama hiçbirisi kalmamış, hepsi gitmiş. ... Benim çocukluğum hep kirada geçti, farklı evlerde oturduk.

...

Mahalledeki evlerden başka, bağ evleri varmış herkesin Çankaya, Ayrancı, Esat, Keçiören’de. Cinnah yokuşundaki Kırkpınar sokaktaki ay yıldızlı ev babamların bağ eviymiş. Büyük bir arazi üzerindeymiş. Ama zamanla ellerinden gitmiş her şey. Zamanın Diyanet İşleri Başkanına hediye etmek için Müslüman komşuları istemiş, 600 liraya vermişler, oysa daha önce 1500 lira veren de olmuş ama vermemişler, zorlamışlar herhalde biraz, hepsi ellerinden gitmiş

A.T.-M.T.-Ö.B.

A: İç Hisarda. Ondan sonra Hisar’ın kapısı var ya, şu ikici, birinci kapı bu aşağı tarafta, önü yeşillik ya, o yeşillikten aşağı doğru, orası da Hıristiyan mahallesiymiş, aşağı doğru. Sonradan büyük yangın çıkmış, tamamen o evler yanmış

Ö: Siz doğmadan önce çıktı o yangın.

A: Bizden evvel, bizden evvel.

Ö: Babanız filan hatırlar mıydı o yangını.

A: Bilmiyorum

A: Yıka da git! – Diyeceğim oralarda Hıristiyanlar varmış.

Ö: O yangın hakkında neler anlattırlardı?

A: Valla normal bir yangın, işte yanmış.

Ö: Yani kim yapmış o yangını, çok büyük bir yangınmış çünkü değil mi? Ankara'nın üçte biri yandı diyorlar.

A: Evet. İşte o kaleden aşağı doğru yanmış.

M: Hı evet. Hisar'da benim, varmış babalarımızın annelerimizin arsası, hepsi gitmiş.

A: Hatta bir Pazar gününe mi rast gelmiş desem, bilmem neye mi ra..

M: Tabi.

A: Bir de Tahtakale yangını da, halin, Hacıdoğan'ın, o Tahtakale yangını da gayı eskiydi, çok evler eskiydi. Rahmetli, hatta, Atatürk de seyretmiş yanlış hatırlamıyorsam. Çünkü neden... Yani bakmışlar ki şey değil, yangından çıkınca, çok sıklık, şey imiş Tahtakale yangını da büyümüş Ankara'da. Orada o şekilde yangından gitti., yani şey oldu. Çukur, Hacıdoğan çukur ya, oradan merdiven ini... Aynıymış orası böyle çukurmuş. Sonradan dolma yapıldı yükseldi orası

'1'-K.S-S.O

'1': Onu bilmiyorum yani. Yani bir de 29'da bir yangın.

K: Tahtakale yangını... Aşağı yukarı şu andaki yeni hal var ya yeni hal, büyük hal yani, yegane hal, Anafartalar'da. hani Belediye binasının arkası, hali de içerisine alır oranın adı Tahtakale. Tahtakale yangını o zaman yaptı.. , çok yanmış yani bizim ev de yanmış, ben de o zaman 1 yaşındaymışım. Gazoz fabrikasından girerek, ben evde yalnız beşikte yatıyordum, beşikten almışlar kurtarmışlar beni. Onu biliyorum 49'da, "töbe" 29'da, 1929'daki yangın.

'1': yalnız bir dakika, o yangın biraz kastıymış değil mi?

K: Söylerler, ama...

'1': Kasti bir yangınmış yani, temizlensin diye.

K: Yani öyle tabirler var ki o zaman su yerine şey benzin sıktılar, kaldırdılar falan diye öyle tabirler var ama onu...

S: Yani gözle görülmemiş ya da hani direk hani o dönemi yaşayıp da... Öyle söylüyorlar, ama emin olamayız, gözümüz görmedi. Benim mantığım bunu kabul etmiyor. O zamanlar zaten parasal imkanların azdı, bir de itfaiye arabasının içini benzinle dolduracak kadar imkan zaten olamazdı.

'1': Hatta babam işte o zamanlara daha bekarmış. Babam itfaiye gibi şeyler pek öyle şey de değilmiş yani gelişmiş değilmiş, babam böyle şeyler...Sular getirip, böyle para verip döktürüyormuş. Sucu demiş ki "boşuna uğraşma burası yanacak, boşuna hiç paramı da harcama, emeğini de harcama" demiş babama. Yani öyle kasti bir yangınmış, öyle derler.

'1'

Yangından sonra geceleri sokakta yatmışlar, ekmekleri falan da yokmuş, bir tel dolap bulmuşlar, içinde bir ekmek. Şükretmişler Allah gönderdi diye. Evleri yanmış tamamen, kiraya gitmişler. Müslüman komşuları varmış, iyi davranmışlar. Ankara'nın yerli Müslümanları biraz kabaymış, İstanbul'dakiler gibi değilmiş, onlar çok nezihtir. Yangından sonra gittikleri kira evinde masa ve tüm eşyalar yandığından, annesi bir leğenin üstüne örtü koyup masa yapmış. Üstüne tabakları dizip yemeğe oturmuşlar, onları candan gören komşuları "ama madam", madam derlerdi önceden, "siz can ciğer kardeşiniz, onlar da yeğenler niye aynı tabaktan yemiyorsunuz" demiş. Onlar tek tabaktan yerlerdi, hala görüyoruz filmlerde filan ortadan yiyor hepsi.

A.T

Biz kızım, bizler Katoliğiz kızım, biz Ermeni değiliz, Katoliğiz, Katolik. Bizde lisan yok, Türkçe'den başka.. Bizim, belki kiliseye gittin mi? Hiç dua dinledin mi? Hah! Hep Türkçe diyeceğimiz. Onun için biz... Tabakhane mahallesi diye Katolikler, ekseri durduğu yer, bizim mahallemiz, Hacı Bayram Camisinin alt tarafına doğru gelir, orada oturur bütün bizim Katolik milleti orada oturur. Tabakhane, Bentderesi. Hacı Bayram Camiinin hemen alt tarafı, biliyorsunuz, eski dolmuşlar molmuşlar zaten... onun daha biraz daha ilerisi, fırın filan var, cami filan var.İşte oralar , mesela... bizden ekserisi orada otururdu. Mesela, Hacı Doğan'da Ermeniler var, Hacı Doğan'ı biraz geçerseniz Şengül Hamamı'nı bilir misiniz? Şengül Hamamından, oradan da yukarıya doğru, Yahudi Mahallesiydi orası. Müslümanlar da, Kayabaşı, Kalenin içi, mesela hanım Kalenin içinde doğmuş büyümüş, yani o da Angaralı işte yerlisi o da, yani o da şey.. Dıyeceğim bu, bu gadar yer vardı, bu şekilde otururduk, hepimiz, gardeş gibi, yani aynı vaziyette otururduk, konuşurduk, muhabbet. Hıristiyan, biz Hıristiyanız, onlar da Müslüman da olsa hepimiz...

M.T.

Aslında dedelerimiz de atalarımız hep Türkiye'den, yani Türk, olarak şey yapıyor. Buralıyız. ... Ermeniler mesela Diyarbakırlı, Mardinli, şeyli, ne bileyim her taraftan Kayseri, Yozgat, Sivas her

taraftan Ankara'ya geliyorlar, Ankaralıyız diyorlar ama asılları, kütükleri başka yani Ermenilerin. Fakat Katolikler hep Ankara'nın içi. Ankaralı. Ankara'nın yerlisi Katolik'tir.

A.K.

Eski Ankara eski Ankara'dır. Ben Samanpazarı'nda doğdum, orası yine eskisi gibi duruyor, bir değişiklik yok. Cadde tarafında tabi var, o yeni inşaatlar filan yapıldı. Bizimki alt tarafta, aşağı kısımdadır, eski mahalledir, eskisi gibi duruyor oralar. O bizim havranın olduğu yer eski Ankara'dır, o yine olduğu gibi duruyor

H.A.- R.

H.A: Yani şartlar çok kötüydü ama bizim çok mutlu geçti çocukluğumuz değil mi. Yani çünkü daha iyisini bilmiyorduk, çok güzel geçti, mahalle oyunları... Ne televizyon var ne hiçbir şey var tabi o zaman, mahallede bütün çocuklar oynardık işte, çok güzel bir çocukluğumuz geçti yani...

R: Her akşam bir kere sulanırdı evimizin önü, her akşam sularlık evimizin önünü, herkes ama, herkes!

H.A: Tabi, böyle köpüklü sularla herkes evinin önünü yıkardı, hele Cuma günleri, özellikle Cuma günleri...

R: Ondan sonra herkes sandalyesini çıkarırdı otururdu orda, kahve gibi, sohbet, konuşulur, çok güzel olurdu...

H.A: O sokaklar yıkandıktan sonra herkes evinin önüne sandalyeleri çıkarır ama tertemiz o sokaklar inanılır gibi değil, yani sabunlu sularla yıkanırdı böyle, sandalyeler konur yaz akşamları, herkes oturur orada evinin önünde, sohbetler, muhabbetler, benim çocukluğumda aklımda kalan en güzel şeylerden biridir o. Mesela o komşu muhabbetleri, çünkü başka bir şeyimiz yoktu.

K.G.

Üç katlı. Üç katlı ama bir evde aşağı yukarı 5 aile oturur, 6 aile oturuyor yani, bir havludan giriyorsunuz, sağda bir aile, üstünde ayrı bir aile, ortada bir aile, üstünde bir aile, yani burada bir aile olarak Hacidoğan'da ev yok öyle...Yani komşu olan da vardı, hani memleketimiz olan da vardı. Mesela annemle babam doğum yeri olan burada şimdi Yenikent...Evler küçüktü tabi, evler küçüktü. Herkesin, iki odası olan çok nadirdi yani. Herkes bir göz odadaydı; mutfak, işte tuvalet...Mutfak ortak değildi, evin odanın bir tarafını da mutfak yapılmıştı. Tuvaletler müşterekti çoğunlukla yani. Ama hiç bir komşunun da kapısında kilit yoktu, hiç bir şey yoktu. Sokak kapısı da kapanmazdı. Avlu kapısı da kapanmazdı. Çünkü kimin kaçta gelecek, beş aile var, altı aile var, kimin kaçta geleceği belli değil ki. Ama herkes kendi kapısını kapatan kapatırdı, yoksa hiç kapatmazdık.

B.T.

Bizim ilk oturduğumuz yer, şey, tabakhane mahallesiydi. Bu Çıkmaz Sokak derlerdi, orası bir meydandı, çıkmaz sokakta, nasıl biliyor musunuz, sanki bir otel odası gibi, yani, yani bir koridorda bir kaç kapı var böyle, ondan sonra, bazen tuvaletlerin bile ortak olduğu, tuvaletler falan evin dışındaydı, orada avlu gibi bir yerdeydi, avludan sonra...Tuvaletler avlu aşağı, yani çıkardınız gece aşağı tuvalete inmeye korkardık biz, biz çocuktuk çünkü o zaman.

S.O.

Orada oturan bir teyzeciğimiz vardı, ziyarete giderdik, hep eski büyüklerdenmiş o da, rahmetli babam da çok severdi, annem de çok severdi, dolayısıyla babaanneden yadigar bir hanımefendiydi. O zaman gittiğimde onun evini hatırlıyorum, tümüyle iptidai konumda oradaki evler...bak tuvalet hatırlamaya çalıştım neredeydi hatırlayamadım tuvaleti, alt katta mıydı galiba. Yani her şey bir göz odanın içerisinde öyle diyeyim size. Bir göz odanın içerisinde, sobayla ısınıyor, çoğunlukla sedirlerde yatılıp, kalkılıyor, sedirlerin altı şey vaziyetinde, yüklük vaziyetinde, tümüyle ahşap, ocak bu ikili üçlü olanlarımız vardı ya, onda ya da çoğunlukla gazlı, o tek ocakta, eski tip ocakta, ve çok küçük yani bir metrekare alan bir mutfak gibi düşünün. Yani çok iptidai koşullarda o Tabakhane denilen yer. Mesela bu teyzeciğin evi iki katlıydı, kendisine aitti, alt katta da gene bir göz oda vardı, merdivenle çıkılıyordu üst kattaki şeye, alt odayı da bir üniversite öğrencisine kiraya vermişti.

H.A.

Kızılay'a inmek büyük lükstü, Samanpazarı'ndan tabii, çok büyük lükstü, hatta biz Kızılay'a babam dükkanı aldığında biz daha Samanpazarı'nda oturuyorduk, dükkana gelirdik bazen annemle, hiç unutmam annem derdi ki "Ayyy! Şimdi böyle güzel bir yerden git oraya mahalleye" annem hiç istemezdi öyle Kızılay'dan mahalleye gitmek, yani bir de orası..." Ama Kızılay'dan sonra böyle geri dönmek istemezdi, hani böyle New York'tan sanki en, Uganda'ya gidermiş gibi falan bir duygu

içinde olurdu böyle ama...Hep şıktı... Kızılay'a inmek, Kızılay sosyeteydi o zaman...Biz genelde güzel giyinmeye çalışırdık zaten yani evden böyle çıktığımızda falan...

H.A.

Sihhiye'ye taşındık. Sihhiye, Necatibey. Bu Sezenler Sokak, ve Serçe Sokak vardır, orada mesela çok Musevi aileler vardı oturan, bizim bütün akrabalar oradaydı, arkadaşlar oradaydı. Ondan sonra yavaş yavaş bu bölgeye [Kavaklıdere, Tunalı Hilmi] başladılar. Mesela benim kayınvalidem bu evi 1960'ta almış. Bu taraflara başladılar yavaş yavaş gelmeye. Yani Samanpazarı, Sihhiye, Kızılay, işte Kavaklıdere, Gaziosmanpaşa o şekilde bir yayılma oldu. hatta kayınvalidem bu evi aldığımda 1960'ta herkes demiş ki "sen deli misin oraya kışın kurtlar iner", buradan dere falan akarmış, inekler geçermiş sokaklarda yani şimdi ne oldu burası mesela. ... Yani genelde Yahudilerin böyle hep bir, bir arada oturma şeyi var, böyle bir yaklaşımları var, bilemiyoruz niye. ... Zaten bir kısım İstanbul'a gitti, bir kısım İsrail'e göç etti falan, epey biraz dağıldık yani şimdi.

B.T.

Keçiören'de işte babadan kalma, yani babamın dedemden kalma daha doğrusu bağda işte bir kısmı amcamgile, bölüştüler yani, dedem rahmetli olduktan sonra, yalnız bir bağ evimiz vardı taş ev, önünde böyle 3-6 tane veya daha fazla da olabilir akasya ağacı, kuyusu önünde filan, böyle taş bir evimiz vardı dededen kalma, ondan sonra... Ondan sonra 27 dönüm bir arazi vardı, 27 dönüm arazide, tabi evvelden çok varlıklı bir aile değildik yani, babam işte kendine düşen parsellerden sata sata bir tane o zaman derdi ki, "burası bize 54 liraya mal oldu" derdi, 54 liraya bir ev, iki katlı, altında iki tane dükkkanı olan iki katlı bir ev yaptırdı. Çok zor şartlarla yapılan bir şey, kendisi çalışmak zorundaydı, yani gündüz işinde, gece...

K.G.

Biz bu mahallelerden ayrılırken artık beraber hep oraya taşındık yani Keçiören'e... İlk Önce Dikmen'e gittiğimizde, bir sene oturabildik orada da zaten, çünkü bağ eviydi, tek katlıydı, e bütün bizim hanımın da ablaları şey...Keçiören'deydi... Bir sene orada oturduktan sonra, işte oraya, neden şey oluyor, yani bir akraban orada, benim hanımın iki ablası da Keçiören'deydi, e şimdi onlar orada otururken sen kalkıp da başka bir semte gidemezsin, çünkü bir ziyarete gidecek olsan, şey olsan... Onun için o oraya geldi, o akraba oraya geldi, o akraba oraya geldi, bizimkiler ekseriyet hep Keçiören'e geldiler.

'1'

1953'te Işıklar sokakta üç katlı bir apartman almıştık biz, yani ablam ve ağabeyimin çalışmalarıyla, oraya taşındık. Orada terizlik de yapıyorduk. Ablamla orada dikiş dikiyorduk. Ama orası 1982'de istimlak edildi valilik tarafından, yandaki ilkokulun arazisine katmak için. İşte o zaman çok az bir para verdiler bize, değerinin altında. Abim zaten evliydi o zaman, onun payını verdik. Ablamla ben apar topar Keçiören'e taşındık. Keçiören'de tanıdıklar, ahbablar çok diye. Taşra havası vardı Keçiören'de. Ablam orada kalmak istedi ahbablar orada diye. Ama ben istemedim, orada yaşamam dedim. Gecekondu gibi, köylü, eğitimsiz, öyle bir yerd. Kadınlar sokaklarda oturur örgü filan örerlerdi, şalvarlar giyerlerdi, başları örtülü, oturup dedikodu yaparlardı. ... Abimin hissesi de ayrılınca ancak Esat'ta küçük bir daire alabildik, oraya taşındık. Eski bir evdi, pek sevmedik önce ama...

B.E.

Benden sonra ufak ufak orası dağılmaya başladı, yani o muhit de bozulmaya başladı. Herkes, kimisi Keçiören, kimisi Aydınlikevler, hatta Çankaya, Esat, Ayrancı dağıldık. ... Bir sene sonra babamlar da ev alarak geldiler işte, o arada zaten orası dağıldı, herkes yani, semt bozulmaya başladı, daha çok ticarete döndü, şey Bentderesinin havasını biliyorsunuz, artık herkes uzaklaştı..

B.E.

Bu belki de Çankaya'da oturmakla Keçiören'de oturmanın farkı. Anlatabiliyor muyum? Burada her bütçeden, her gelenekten, görenekten insanlar var, oradakiler biraz daha elenmiş varlıklı kültürlü insanlar. Belki ben ya da onlar da onların yanına gidince daha değişik şeyler yapmaya çabalayacağız, onlara yetişebilmek babında.

B.T.

Onu hiç düşünmedim, ama tabi şöyle, ha bir İstanbul'a mesela gitmeyi hiç düşünmedim. Benim orada kayınbiraderlerim filan var, arkadaşlarım da var orada çok...Valla biz Ankara'da... Ben biraz da

şeyim yani şöyle, büyüklerimin hani kaldığı yerde yaşamayı daha çok seven bir insanım biliyor musunuz. Onun için pek gitmeyi düşünmedim.

‘1’

Burası bizim vatanımız, yerimiz yani; öyle ki biz yazlığa gitsek (Ayvalık) 06 plaka görünce aaa! hemşerimiz diye yakınlık duyuyoruz. Ankara’ya dönerken içinde bir sevgi oluyor. Fransa’daki kuzenlerim gelirken, mesela, anneleri tembih etmiş, “evimize mahallemize gidin, fotoğraflarını çekin” demiş. İçinde oturanlar şaşırmış bunlar ne yapıyor diye, izah etmişler.

K.G.

O zaman burayı bilemezdin, o zaman burayı bilemezdin orada şey.. Sonra kızım.. Bizim milletin bir şeyi varsa, her gittiği yere o kadar çabuk alışır ki yani, o kadar çabuk alışır.

L.N.

Ankaralılarla ilişkilerimiz daima mesafeli olmuş belki, yani Ankaralı Musevilerle ilişkiler mesafeli olmuş anlaşılır. Dediğim gibi yani onlar bizi, biz onları belki çok benimsemedik. Yani nasıl diyeyim, bilhassa annem tarafı için söylüyorum yani, Ankaralı Yahudilere biraz köylü gözüyle bakarlardı, biraz. Yani onları, İstanbullu onları daha şey, geri görüyor. Hele böyle kapalı bir muhitte, bir mahalle...

A.İ.

Başkent bazı illere göre daha entelektüel ve çeşitlilik arz ettiğinden cemaat yaşamını daha olumlu yönde etkiliyor. [Başka bir kentte yaşasaydım yaşamımda bir farklılık] Olurdu tabi. Sizi ufak yerlerde herkes tanıyabilir. Oysa büyük kentlerde bu durum öyle değil. Büyük şehirlerin kültürel yapısı bizlere daha uygun olabiliyor.

S.O.

E tabi ki, tabi ki bir tanem. Şimdi her şeyin ötesinde çok güzel bir soru, ama çok da açık bir cevabı var, bir şey çok nadideyse çok göze batar, çoksa eğer az göze batar, aynı şey. Ben Hıristiyan’ım diye atıyorum bir belki Artvin’de gezemem, belki Kars’ta gezemem, bilemem hani yaşamışım da söylüyorum adına söylemiyorum ama hani böyle bir kriter olabilir, onu bilemem, konuştuğunuz insanlar, sohbet ettiğiniz, insanlar, yani görüyoruz işte, ailelerde işlenen cinayetleri, bu mantığın olduğu yerde bir Hıristiyanlığın kabulünü ben hiç zannetmiyorum. ... Ankara tabi ki daha farklı bir kültüre sahip.

S.O.

İstanbul’la var tabi, fark var. Orada daha sosyaller, daha rahatlar, ama bunların sebepleri zannediyorum biraz da maddiyatla birlikte oradaki çok fazla oturmuşluk, daha görsel olarak var olmak, dediğim gibi işte tabelasından tutun, iş yerinden tutun İstanbul’da kafanızı çevirdiğinizde Hıristiyan avukat ve doktorlara ait tabelaları her yerde rahatlıkla görüyorsunuz; ama biz Ankara’da eğitimle bir yerlere gelen insanlara sahip değiliz, bir ara bir diş hekimi vardı galiba... İstanbul’da tabi ki okulların da olmasından dolayı, Hıristiyan okullarının da olmasından dolayı orada eğitim biraz daha ön plana çıkıyor. Burada da eğitim normal okullarla devam ettiği için, genellikle baba mesleğine yönlendiriliyor evlatların hepsi ki, bizim etrafımızda da gördüm kadarıyla hep böyle. Ankara’dan İstanbul’a gidip okuyan şu an hiçbir çocuğumuz olmadı. Hani ne benim, ne etrafımdaki ailelerden gördüğüm kadarıyla. Dolayısıyla da Ankara’da böyle tabelalar göremiyorsunuz.

N.E.

Şimdi İstanbul’da bir, bir gözlemim bu, ama şimdi için geçerli mi bilmiyorum, zamanlar da aynı değil, İstanbul’daki Sinagogun etrafında oturan insanlar oradaki Sinagogun varlığını kanıksamış, gelen insanları hiç garip karşılamıyor, ama bakıyorlar tabi çünkü işte büyük bir grup geliyor, ama bakar insan zaten neye geliyorlar diye, fakat daha kanıksamış, daha iç içe olmak, mesela. Ankara’daki Sinagogda hiç onu hissedemedim, çünkü Ankara’daki Sinagogda eskiden orası Yahudi Mahallesi denilen yermiş. Fakat sonradan işte bu, ben en azından ben daha çocukken artık Yahudi Mahallesi değildi orası. Tamam mı? Ve orada daha sonradan gelmiş olan insanlar vardı. Onlar hiçbir zaman aslında orayı tabi benimseyememişler, onların bakışları arasında çok da büyük fark var çünkü birileri hiç anlamıyordu. İstanbul’dakiler anlıyordu, farklı amam hani işte bunlar da aynı insanlar diye anlıyordu; buradakiler resmen turiste bakar gibi bakıyorlar, yani öyle bir farklılık var.

N.E.

Ben size şeyi anlatıyordum ya hani bu şehir sonradan kuruldu, dolayısıyla böyle şeyler sonradan geldi buraya çünkü bunlar yoktu küçük bir yer burası, ve bunları ekemiyorsun aslında işte çok kolay ekilmiyor bunlar. Onun için de insanlar belki de tercih olarak zaten İstanbul'a gitmeyi tercih ediyorlar. Daha çok kendilerinden bir arada oldukları yerlere, ya da kendilerinin daha sıcak karşılanabileceğini düşündükleri yerlere gidiyorlar. Karşılıyorlar mı o ayrı bir konu tabi.

N.E.

Ankara yani bence işte belki başkentlerin şeyi o, yani işte 1920'lerde başkent olmuş şehirle.., ya da 1920'lerde başkent olan şehirlerin kaderi gibi Ankara'nın durumu bana, ben öyle görüyorum. Yani o, o, o zamanlar devlet hep devlet kendi içinde büyümüş ve hani o büyümeyi sayısal ve fiziksel olarak göstermeye çalışan devlet anlayışının olduğu dönemler, dolayısıyla Ankara da öyle büyümüş, ama işte Varşova da öyle büyümüş, geleneksel olarak belki Paris de biraz öyle büyümüş ama hani Paris'in başka büyüme eksenleri her zaman var. Ama bir çok şehir sayabilirsiniz öyle büyüyen. ... Yani öyle büyüyen bir şehir Ankara ve öyle oluşmuş. Dolayısıyla aslında Ankara bir anlamda hani o kültürlerin, işte o kendisini oluşturan kültürün potası. Ama aynı zamanda tabi "unified" olmak zorunda olan bir ortam, Varşova da öyle. Dolayısıyla aslında bu tip zaten yerler genellikle kültür merkezi olmuyorlar "eventually". Yani "up to a certain extent" kültür merkezi olabiliyorlar, çünkü o, o, o, o potada erimişlik o "indigenous" kültürleri yaşatmıyor kendi içinde fazla diye görüyorum ben. Halbuki İstanbul öyle değil, İstanbul başkent olmuş ama çok başka bir dönemde başkent olmuş, ve onun başkent olmasının nedeni zaten o karışıklık, metropol olma özelliği, ve İstanbul'un mesela şimdiki özelliği hala var o metropollük İstanbul'da ama Ankara'da mesela öyle bir metropollük özelliği yok. Ankara'yı ben çok seviyorum, yaşıyorum o ayrı ama öyle bir metropollük özelliği yok. Onun için de hani, mı belki azınlık için bir azınlık olarak hani yaşamının tek yolu zaten parçası olmak, doğrudan bir parçası olmak yani kendini ayrı bir grup olarak oluşturup kenara çekmek değil belki.

CHAPTER VI

A.İ.

Azınlık tanımını kabul etmiyorum. Burada doğan, büyüyen vatandaşlar azınlık değildir. Bu yanlış bir tabirdir. ... [Kendimi azınlık olarak] Hissetmiyorum. Ancak, medyada bizlerin aleyhinde bir şeyler yazılıp, söylenirse, bizlerce hiç olumlu bir durum olmuyor.

T.T.

Azınlık ne demek?!!!... Ben çok şanslıyım. arkadaşlarım sayesinde asla hissetmedim ama devlet kuruluşlarında farklı muameleler oluyor. kendi çevremde hissetmemekle birlikte başka bir yere gittiğimde (benim bilinmediğim bir yerde) beni üzecek konuşmalara rastlıyorum. çok önyargılı insanımız var.

B.E.

Ay yok işte, öyle bir şey biz hiç hissetmedik. O sadece isimde azınlığız. Azınlık ismini biz hiç kullanmayız, Hıristiyan'ız der geçiniriz. Azınlığız demeyiz hiç. Yani içinden çıkamayıp, ismin ne manası ne şu bu dediklerinde biz Hıristiyan'ız deriz.... Eskiden o laf [azınlık] hiç yoktu, o yeni çıktı. (Gülüyor) Eskiden o hiç yoktu. O zaman da Hıristiyan'mış da denmezdi de Ermeni derlerdi. Ama ne olursan ol Ermeni'sin o zaman da. Öyleydi. Ama şimdi hüviyetimizde bile Hıristiyan yazar. Ama eskiden öyle yazıyordu, Ermeni yazıyordu, Katolik yazıyordu, mezhebin yazıyordu, şimdi yazmıyor hepimizinkinde Hıristiyan yazıyor.

E.Ş.

Ben bu tanımları biraz incitici ve hatta birazda aşağılayıcı buluyorum. ... Daha öncede bahsettiği gibi tabiki hissettiğiniz zamanlar oluyor. Mesela askerde meslek seçimleri için geldiler ve tabiki bir mesleğiniz veya bir kabiliyetiniz varsa biraz daha rahat ve günlerinizi sevdiğiniz bir işi yaparak geçirirsiniz. Ama seçimler esnasında gayrimüslümler kenara ayrılınsın dendiği zaman zaten sizin hiçbir şansınız kalmıyor. Acemi birliğinde bütün dağıtımın Ankara-İstanbul ve İzmir'e yapıldığını sadece 13 adet gayrimüslümün Diyarbakır, Malatya ve Erzurum'a gönderildiğini yaşamak bir tesadüf olmasa gerek. Lise mezunu olupta bırakın çavuşluğu onbaşı bile olamayan bir er örneği gösterilebilirmiyi acaba bizlerden başka. Komutan şoförü olamazsınız, emir eri olamazsınız ordu evlerinde görev yapamazsınız vs. vs. Hatta zamanında gayrimüslümlerin askeri elbiselerinin renginin bile farklı olduğunu eniştemiz veya dedelerimizden biliyoruz. Ancak şimdi baktığımızda artık bir takım şeylerin

biraz daha yumuşatılmış olduğunu çevremizden gözlemliyoruz. İnşallah bunlar düzeltilerek devam eder.

K.S.

Azınlıklara yapılan muameleye sayın Patriğimiz söylüyordu, ben de biliyorum ki bir ayırım yok, eğer hakiki anlamda bir ayırım arıyorsanız bu bizim lehimize, senin şimdi şurada gelip benle röportaj yapman, bana değer vermen, benim için kötü mü, iyi mi?... Mesela asker ocağında kantine verdiler beni, kantine bakacaksın sen. E kantin paralı bir yer, istemedim ben, “hayır bakacaksın”, üstüne üstlük gazinoya bakacaksın, üstüne üstlük tabldota bakacaksın dediler. Şimdi benden evvelkiler ne yaptı ne etti bilmiyorum, ama ben 1948-49 senelerinde, 50 senelerinde, ortalama alırsak 49 senesinde İstanbul’da Yarımburgaz’da... Şimdi burada, “sen yapacaksın”, “sizler doğru olursunuz”, benim doğruluğum değil, Ermenilerin doğru olduğu şeye geliyor, ortaya geliyor.... Anlatabiliyor muyum yani, şimdi gel de söyle hadi azınlık olarak, silah da kullandım...Hayır! Zaten azınlık kelimesini sevmiyorum, niye sevmiyorum, niye ayırım yapıyorsunuz ki senle benim ne farkım var. Azınlık kelimesini kullandığın zaman beni başka bir anlamda eksi, ekalliyet olarak görüyor, ekalliyet değilim ki ben, ben de bu memleketin doğup büyüme öz be öz evladım.

A.T.

İşte az nüfusu olan ve Müslüman olmayan şey. Ama Türkiye’de çok Müslüman olmayan var. Hıristiyanlık da, bakın Hıristiyanlık da, her memlekette Hıristiyan varmış. Her memlekette, Yozgat’ında da varmış, Samsun’unda da Sinop’ta da, öyle bir her tarafın Hıristiyan’ı varmış. Biz yok zannettiydik....Biz yok zannettiydik ama Türkiye’nin her tarafında Hıristiyan var. ... Yine de, şeyde diyorum ya bak biz şimdi burada herkesinen “ismin ne?” “A.” “A! tamam” “A. amca nasılsın iyi misin?” tamam. Bir şey yok, çekinme..., çekinip de ne yapacağım.

B.T.

Şimdi, ben bir kere azınlığı kabul etmiyorum. Şöyle azınlığı kabul etmiyorum, ben buraya yerleşmişim, ben bu devlete vergi veriyorum, askerliğimi yapıyorum, çocuğumu Türk okullarında okutuyorum, e onun için böyle bir ayrıma bence gerek görülmemesi lazım. Görülmemesi lazım, işte hep devamlı da aynı şeyi söylüyorum gerçi ama, yani bir Müslüman, bir Hıristiyan, bir Katolik, bir Rum, ben bu ayrımları da kabul etmiyorum esasen. Tabi...İnsanlıktır bence, önemli olan insanlıktır. Başka hiç bir şey yani, dinler hepsi mes..., ha o gider Camiye, hepsi Allah’ın evidir efendim ne olacak, o gider camisinde dua eder, öbürü gelir kilisede dua eder, bir fark görebiliyor musunuz siz, bence bir fark olacak hiç bir durum yok. Ha buradaki arkadaşlarımız mesela merak ederler, ondan sonra, o bilir o Noel’de şunda, Paskalya’da, ben alırım kiliseye götürürüm onları ...Ben, karşı komşum dedi ki, “yav ben” dedi “görmek istiyorum ya”, tabi, hemen, beraber gittik, oturduk, orada, siz kiliseye gittiniz mi, hah, yani çok şey bir durum yok zaten, gittik çok da hoşuna gitti, ondan sonra arzu edenı götürüyorum gösteriyorum, ondan sonra..

‘1’

Lozan’da galiba öyle yapılmış, haklarımız fazla olsa da tatbikatta öyle değil. Biz de kabullenmişiz, öyle alışmışız. Gençlerimiz askerlik yapıyor, vergi veriyoruz, aynı haklara sahip olmalıyız. ... Dikkat etmedim rapora. Tepki gösteriliyor haklara temelde. Zaten bir hak iddia etmiyoruz. Haddimizi bilip oturuyoruz

L.N.

Her zaman menfi bir duygu. Çünkü bütün mesele eşit muamele görüyor musunuz, görmüyor musunuz. Görüyorsanız zaten siz kendinizi azınlık diye duymazsınız.... Ben iş hayatımda çok sıkıntı çekmedim, iş bulmak da çektim ama. İş hayatımda hiçbir zaman benim dinimden dolayı başıma bir şey gelmedi ve yadırganmadım. Ben de yadırganmadım. Onun için ben bu problemi yaşamadım. Ama yaşayan çok kişiyi tanıdım. Bazen onları da kusurlu buldum, çünkü onlar da kendilerini ayrı tuttular. Yani bu dar şeyde kalmak, gettoda kalmak hissi korku yüzünden, telkin yüzünden yani büyüklerin, anne babanın telkini yüzünden kalmak onları etkilediği için. Ben onu yapmadım da, sıkıntısını da çekmedim onun için. Problem olmadı, ama bir azınlık kendini azınlık hissettiği sürece, yani bunu hissettiriyorlarsa zor iş. Ve bunu çok insan hissediyor. Ama bazen de aldırıyor...

S.O.

E tabi ki yani, eğer bu nüfus kağıdı olarak bakılırsa doğru azınlık. Ama onunla birlikte şöyle bir sözcük de vardır işte ne bileyim bir Ahmet Taner Kışlalı gibi nerede, çok az insan var öyle dendiği

gibi, ben de azınlığım, onlar da azınlıktı. Anlatabiliyor muyum, bundan bir rahatsızlık duymuyorum. Benim için çok rencide edecek bir kelime hiçbir zaman olmadı. ... Valla, ben şunu söyleyeyim, bir kere onunla ilgili [Azınlık Raporu] hiçbir inceleme yapmadım, bana kalsa ve ben bir yönetici olsam zaten sınırları yok ederim, her şeyin ötesinde. Önce dünya görüşümden kaynaklanıyor tabi ki bu, benim için önce dünya var, dünyaya saygı var. Toprağa saygı olmaz, toprak özgürdür. Ben insan olarak, bir Tanrı kulu olarak özgürüm, bütün dünyanın toprakları benim, dünya beni kabul etmiş, bir ucundaki sınır mı beni kabul etmeyecek, dünya üzerinde bugün yaşıyorsam, bugün ayağımı buraya basabiliyorsam, Avusturalya'ya da basarım, Rusya'ya da basarım, Hindistan'a da basarım. Yani bana göre bu daha farklı, onun için bu konuyla ilgili bir şey söylemeyeğim, çünkü okumadım. Onun da bit katakullisini getirirler mutlaka.

A.S. - K.S. – Ö.B.

Ö: Peki o erkeklerin gönderildiği zaman dönen olmuş mu?

A: Hayır, olmamış, hiç biri dönmemiş.

Ö: Bütün ailenin erkekleri, diyelim sizin büyük dedeniz...

A: Evet, evet. Gitmiş hepsi, babası oğluyla beraber. Dedem ve babamın babası...

Ö: Dedeniz, dedenizin babası...

A: Evet. O zaman hiç şey kalmamış. Erkek kalmamış köyde.

Ö: Yani bu tehcir zamanında oluyor...

A: Tabi, tehcir zamanında, o dönem.

Ö: İşte savaş zamanında gittiler...

A: Evet, evet.

Ö: Ve siz onların öldüğünü duydunuz.

A: Evet. Geri gelmemiş yani.

K: Nereye gittikleri belli değil. ... Tehcirde mi öldüler ne oldular belli değil, ama geri dönmediler. ... Teşir zamanı, yani daha doğrusu o zamanın adı neydi, soykırım. Almışlar götürmüşler... Erkekleri toplamışlar götürmüşler kesmişler. Başka türlü değil bu yani, bu böyle.

A: Öl.. ölmüş.. Yani öldürmüşler.

K.G.

İşte 1914'de, bu ilk Cihan şeyinde savaşında seferberlik zamanında bunlar dağıtma gitmişler, diyelim ki bayanları ayrı bir köye göndermişler, köyleri boşalttırmışlar... Bizimkiler, burada Sincan'da, Sincan'ın Peçenek köyüne gitmişler... Tabi. Şimdi demek ki, teyzelerim, iki teyzemle annem burada Beçenek köyüne şey yapmışlar...Annesiyle beraber, erkekler yok yalnız. Erkekler savaş zamanı veyahut da o Hıristiyanları mesela gayri-Müslimleri şey yapmışlar, köyden göndermişler, veyahut askere almışlar. ... Hani boyuna Ermeni şeyleri diyorlar ya evet, hani o zamanlar, biraz evvel bir arkadaş geldi buraya, o da benim ustamın şeyi kardeşlerinin, kız kardeşlerinin ve şeyin.. O da Ankara Aydın köyüne gitmiş onlar... Tabi. Yani hepsini, bizim Zir'deki bayanları aynı köye vermemişler, üç-beş kişi bir köye vermişler, üç-beş kişiyi bir köye vermişler, hep dağıtmışlar Ankara'nın civarına. Hep dağıtmışlar... Herhalde her köye bir aile vermişler yani... Ama, ama şimdi öyle bir şey ki, hangi bir aile köylere yani gittiyse ilişkileri daha kesilmedi yani. Ama onlar öldükten sonra işte çocukları da biraz gene şey yapıyor. Çok iyi şeyler olmuş yani, intibalar olmuş... İyilikler unutulmamış, çok iyi bakmışlar yani... Yani gittikleri köyde... Köylüler veyahut ağa bakmış yani. Köylüler bakar bir de oranın, her köyün bir ağası vardır yani bütün mesuliyet onda, onda. Mesela ben ta, diyelim ki 8-10 yaşındayken biz devamlı her yazın Beçenek köyüne giderdik yani, annelerimle tabi, yıllar yılı... Davet ediyorlar yani, davet ediyorlar. Yani bak şimdi gelen de, biraz evvel gelen arkadaşım da benim ustamın ablasıyla kız kardeşinin gittiği köy, Aydın köyü, Aydın köyü, e ben şimdi ustamın ismini vererekten o köye gidersem ben itibar görürüm yani. Yani ilişkiler kesilmedi hiç. Mesela bizim Hacıdoğan'daki evde biz otururken, Beçenek köyündeki şeyler, tanıdıklar yani, o köyde kaldıkları annemgilin hastaneye falan hasta getirdikleri zaman bizde yatarlardı.

K.S.

Babam Uşaklı. O da bilahare bu teşir ["tehcir"] zamanında oradan Uşak'tan atna binmiş, şeye gelmiş, Kalecik'e gelmiş. Ama o zaman annem 17-18 yaşındaymış, anneannem, evde şeyde yok, erkek kalmamış tehciye gitmişler, onun için tutmuş bu adam yani babamı, babamın eli kale, kalem de tutuyor o zaman. İşte orada tanışmışlar nasılsa, anneannem demiş ki bu bizim hem damadımız olur, dört kardeş annem, en büyüğü annem, onu istemiş babam, anneannem derhal kabul etmiş, hem demiş evin erkeği olur hem de damat olur demiş. Öyle evlenilmiş. En büyük ablam 1922 doğumlu, en büyüğümüz o Kalecik'te doğmuş, sonra 2-3 sene sonra babam Ankara'ya gelmiş, yani aile Ankara'ya

gelmiş, sonraki dört çocuk da burada doğmuş. Beş kardeşiz.... esas itibariyle yani eskilerden dolayı, bize annemiz babamız hiçbir şey anlatmadı ve ben bundan da mutluyum yani. o tehcir zamanını falan biz bilmiyoruz....Anlatmadılar. Çok şükür anlatmadılar. Yoksa benim haliyle, dostlarım arkadaşlarım, tabi ki Ermeniler de var ama ... fakat daha büyük bir kesimi, daha büyük bir grup, Türk arkadaşlarım var. Onlarla kardeş gibi yaşadık. Annem babam belki, onun için çok daha seviyorum onları, Allah rahmet eylesin, bize hiç böyle çatışmalardan, tehcirden falan hiç bahsetmediler. Yoksa ben seni bu kadar sever miyim, ya da bir komşumu herhalde bir, böyle bir huzursuzluğumuz olurdu, ama şimdi öyle bir şeyimiz yok.... Tehciri tabi ki yaşanmış bu, yaşamamak, ben bilmiyorum ama işte en son öğreniyoruz ki yaşamışlar, olmuş böyle bir şeyler, sebeplerini bilmenin imkanı yok. Ama şunu kesinlikle bilmek lazım ki hiçbir şey tek taraflı olmuyor yani, bir şeyler olmuş demek ki. daha çok benim anladığım kadarıyla, tabi ki bunlarla da ben de meşgul oluyorum, şimdi öğrenmek istiyorum nasıl olmuş, çünkü günümüzün koşullarına uygun bunları öğrenmek, herkes bunları konuşuyor şu anda. O zaman diyorum ki, kendi kanaatim olarak ki, inanyorum buna dış ülkelerin büyük etkileri var, onların dolduruşuna gelmiş olabilirler. Ama bunlar bütün Türkiye'deki Ermenilere ait olmayabilir, öyle olabileceğini zannetmiyorum. Mesela annem babam, onlar hiçbir günahının olduğunu hiç hiç kabul etmiyorum, onlar da burada çok rahat yaşadıklarını söylüyorlardı.

B.T.

Evet, şimdi o da Avrupa Topluluğunun bazı bu Türkiye'ye karşı şeyi, kabul ettirme politikası. Bence kabul etmemelerinde, veya olmuşsa da "tamam olmuştur" diyerekten geçiştirmekte yarar görüyorum, yani çok fazla üzerine gidilmesine taraftar değilim yani. Taraftar değilim. Çünkü, olmuyor efendim, yani o olsa da tekrar münakaşalar oluyor, şunlar oluyor bunlar oluyor, onlara hiç gerek yok esasen. ... Tabi yani kinlenmeler oluyor işte, "siz şunu yapmıştınız" diyor seneler önce olmuş bir hadiseye, ondan sonra şimdi işte mesela diyorlar ki, şimdi Ermeniler işte bir zamanında efendim işte Trabzon'dan, işte bu Van'dan bilmem neden, işte buralar Kars şuralar buralar bizim toprağımızdı, bunları Türkler aldılar, zaptettiler, bu, bu.. E gidin hadi yaşayın bakayım, git Kars'ta bir yaşa, yaşayabiliyor musun. Hayır yani bazı şeyleri düşünürken şimdi, bazı şeyleri de yapmak lazım biliyor musunuz efendim, yapamıyorsun, öyle bir hakkın yok, ha o zamanlar öyleydi bitmiş, olmuş, her... Yani insanın huzurunu bozmaktan başka bir şey yok, başka bir şey yok. Olabilir mi yani, siz şimdi Ankara'da yaşıyorsunuz, sizi alıp Kars'a götürseler yaşayabilir misiniz? Yani zor hadiseler bunlar, şimdi böyle senaryolar yapılıyor. İşte bilmem ne, orası bizim, hadi git yaşa o zaman yaşayabiliyor musun, alabiliyor musun hadi al. Yok öyle bir şey, yani..

A.T.

Valla bunlara hiç bir şey aklım yatmaz, onun için onu biz bilemeyiz, onun şeyine karar, şey yapamayız. Onun için bir şey konuşamayız. Biz ancak kendimizi konuşabiliyoruz. Yoksa şimdi neler oluyor, neler oluyor.

L.N.

Ankara'da Rum yoktu, kalmamıştı. İstiklal harbinden sonra onlar anlaşılın hepsi gitmiş, mecburen gitmiş Anadolu boşaltılmış...İstanbul dışında bırakmadılar hiç Rum.Mukabilinde de işte mübadele dediğimiz Trakya Türkleriyle bir değiş tokuş olmuş.

N.E.

Ama tabi korkarım şey kötü oluyor tabi bu mübadele falan, hani entellektüelize edersek mübadele falan kötü. Çünkü bu tip unsurların içeriye alınmasını hep geciktiren, hatta yani imkansız hale getiren unsurlar. Hani mübadele, çünkü o zaman ne yapıyorsun sen aslında birlikte yaşadığın insanı oraya gönderiyorsun, tanımadığın insanı getiriyorsun... O tip şeyler tabi insanları hep ürkütüyor, yani insanların kaçması, işte Ermenilerin gitmesi, Yahudilerin gitmesi falan filan hani bizim hep bu toplumun bu konuda daha birbirini anlar hale gelmesini engelliyor. Yani bunlar çünkü sembol aslında yani işte, çünkü Anadolu'da düşünürsen biz işte 500 küsur yıldır yaşıyoruz, ötekiler, başkaları daha az yaşıyor, başkaları daha uzun yaşayanlar var, isimler değişmiş falan filan yani isimlerle insanları sadece hani gruplamak falan filan bunlar geçmesi gereken şeyler diye düşünüyorum. Tabi mübadele gibi şeyler bunları hep geciktiriyor. İnsanlar şey olmaya başlıyorlar "ha demek ki o yabancıymış gittiğine göre" demeye başlıyorlar, halbuki işte o gitme gelme falan hani çok da, öyle onların dinamikleri çok da kolay dinamikler değil tabi.

L.N.

Mesela aklımda kalan şeylerden biri. Mesela “Vatandaş Türkçe konuş”. O dönemde bu kapalı gayrimüslim toplumlar... Bunlar kapalı toplum olduğu için erkekleri iş hayatında kör topal Türkçe bilirlerdi, çok şiveleri iyi olmasa da. Ama kadınlarda Türkçe bilen, iyi bilen çok azdı. Onun için yani Yahudi kadınları kendi kapalı ev hayatlarında Türkçe sıkıntısı çekerlerdi ve dışarıda ne bileyim alışverişte başka bir şey için çıkmaya mecbur olduğunda da böyle tenkitlere uğranırdı. “Vatandaş Türkçe konuş” kelimesi oradan kalmaz. Çünkü eğilimleri, kendi çocuklarıyla ve kocalarıyla daha çok... İbrani bilmez, ama Ladino konuşurlardı. İspanyolca’dan bozma bir Yahudi dili... Yani bu Türkiye’deki Yahudilerin özelliği idi, çünkü bunların hepsi biliyorsunuz 1492, II. Beyazıt zamanında İspanya’dan en çoğu başta Selanik’e sonra İstanbul’a hicret etmiş olan, İzmir’den, Yahudilerdir... O bakımdan, demek ki biz biraz ayrı tutarlardı. Daha kapalı bir toplumdur, ama biz tabii ilkökula Türk okulunda başladığımız için, bilmiyorum bizim şivemizde filan fazla bozukluk olmadı ama, benim annem de Türkçe’yi iyi konuşmazdı, ve daha ileri yaşlarda belki daha biraz konuştu. Yoksa tam bilmezdi, babam tabii bilirdi... Biz kardeşimle hep Türkçe konuşurduk, kardeşim İspanyolca bilmezdi. Yani evde onu konuşup konuşmama meselesi. Evde eğer İspanyolca konuşuluyorsa Türkçe Aksanı mutlaka bozuk olacak. Yani bağdaşmayan diller vardır. Fransızca, İspanyolca ve İtalyanca Türkçe’yle bağdaşmaz. Ama Almanca ile Türkçe bağdaşır, fonetik olarak bağdaşır, onun için bir Alman daha iyi Türkçe konuşabilir.

S.O.

Şimdi şöyle bir şey dikkatimizi çekmiştir, ve onu söylemişlerdir, çok güzel Türkçe konuşuruz. Çok güzel Türkçe konuşuruz, yani Türkçe’imizde Lehçe yoktur. Kelime vurguları, aksan yoktur, çok güzel Türkçe konuşuruz. Bu doğma büyüme hani bununla gelmişiz. Ana bir dil, başka bir dil olma olasılığımız hiç olmamış zaten. [İstanbul’da] Türkçe’yi kırık konuşurlar, düzgün konuşamazlar. Çünkü onlarda Ermenice konuşmak çok fazla, Rumca var...

E.Ş.

Annemin sülalesi Ermenice de bilirlere ve konuşurlardı ayrıca annem Fransızca’da konuşurdu. Ama ana dili 2 tane olmasına rağmen bizlere Ermenice’yi aktarmadı. Bizler bilmiyoruz.

A.İ.

Duydum. Büyüklerimiz Ankaralı olduğundan, varlık vergisi ile karşılaşmışlar. Ancak, İstanbul’dakiler kadar ağır değilmiş. Bu vergi tamamıyla adaletsiz bir vergiymiş, ancak, bir kesimden alındığı için anormal bir vergiymiş. Allah böyle bir şeyi bir daha nasip etmesin.

E.Ş.

Duydum. Bunları anlatmak istemiyorum. Ama sadece şunu söyleyeyim. İnsanların sahip oldukları 1 Liralık servetlerine 200 liralık vergi konursa zaten neler yaşandığını veya yaşanabileceğini tahmin etmek çok güç olmasa gerek. ... Burası Türkiye; ne zaman ne olacağını hiç kimse bilemez!

‘1’

Bizde korkardık kirada olmamıza rağmen. Ablam abim çırağı o zaman, muhtaç durumdaydık ama yine de kimseye muhtaç olmadık. Bu halimize rağmen korktuk, o dönem başka bir terzinin terzihanesinden çok yüklü bir vergi istemişler çünkü... Filmi izlediysen [Salkım Hanımın Tanelerini], o tabii hafif kalır da. ... Ankara’da pek sorun olmadı yine de, İstanbul zengindi ve sayı çoktu diyor.

L.N.

Haaaa! O hikayeye girmek istemiyordum. Evet. Evet, Varlık vergisi hikayesi var. Babam henüz sağdı. İşte, yani Ankara’da İsmet Paşa devrinin büyük darbelerinden biridir o. Yani gayri-Müslimlere sorarsanız Atatürk’le İsmet paşa arasında büyük bir değerlendirme farkı olacaktır. İsmet Paşa tabii makbul bir adam Atatürkçülüğü benimsemiş, Türkiye’ye tabii hayırlı işler yapmış, Türkiye’nin harbe girmemesini sağlamış. Ama onun bir de menfi taraflarını gayri-Müslimlerden duymak lazım. Onun bir tanesi sizin söylediğiniz Varlık Vergisi hikayesidir. İşte Recep Peker dönemi vardır, başbakanlığı. İşte Recep Peker biraz faşist mizaçlı bir insandı. Varlık Vergisi herhalde Türkiye’nin ekonomisini daha çok Müslüman gruba aktarmak için bir vesile idi. Yapıldı. Benim babam bundan zarar görmedi. Dedem öldükten sonra o dediğim imalathane babama kalmıştı, babam işletirdi onu. O bakımdan bize de böyle bir şey gelebilirdi. Ankara’daki bütün Yahudiler Varlık vergisinden az veya çok etkileniler... Biz etkilenmedik. Beş yüz lira. Büyük paraydı ama beş yüz lira herkese gelmişti zaten, Müslümanlara da gelmişti, göstermelikti... Biz bunu çözemedik. Ama bir sene, bir buçuk sene

geçtikten sonra ki, parayı ödeyemeyenler sürgüne gönderildi Aşkale'ye. Aşkale'yi biliyorsunuz, Doğu'da. Babam bunu kurcaladı bazı ahabları vasıtasıyla ve tecelli garip bir şey, listede, babamın adı İsrail'di, İsmail diye yazılmış. Yani bunu İsmail görerek, ona da herkese yazılan Müslüman beş yüz lirayı yazmışlar. Müslümanlara da yazılan. (Gülüyor) Kısmet, yani böyle bir tesadüf olmuş. Yoksa Ankara'da bu cezayı vermemiş hiçbir gayrimüslim yoktur. Ve çok aileyi yıkmıştır, bundan yıkılanlar da olmuştur. Ben o sırada öğrenciydim, İstanbul'daydım. Bu arada bir tek komik olay hatırlıyorum, ağlanacak kadar komik. Galata'da bir ailenin yanında kalıyordum, kendim şahit oldum, duyulan bir hikaye değil, orada bir... Orada bir adama, Yağcı Mişon diye, büyük bir şey geliyor, Varlık Vergisi. Ve adam şıkır şıkır oynamaya başlıyor. Bu Yağcı Mişon orda, merdivenle inilen küçücük dehliz gibi bir yerde bu dükkanların kepenklerini yağlamak için çalış..., çok basit yani hiçbir sermayesi falan değil de öyle bir yağ şeyi, onla, buna bahşiş veriyorlar bunla geçinen bir adam. Ama adı yağcı olduğu için buna işte bilmem elli bin lira altmış bin lira, neyse o zamanın kıymetli parası, büyük bir para geliyor ve adam fittiriyor. Ve ben bu adamı duydum, tanıdım. Yani bu tesadüfen şahit olduğum bir şey ama bunu gibi tabi bir çok böyle olaylar oldu. Kim tayin etmiş, hangi... bir takım haksızlıklar olmuş, yani bu İsmet Paşa devrinin...bir... zayıf tarafıdır. Benim kendi bakımından, sizin eğiliminizi falan bilmiyorum ama ben kendimi Atatürkçü zanneden bir adamım, bugün vardığımız noktada, yani iktidarın bu günkü gidişi içinde de bunun başlangıcını aradığım zaman İsmet Paşa devrine kadar gidiyorum. ... Çok değil. Zaten o zaman yani buranın şeyi, kalabalık değillerdi. Ama giden oldu, gidenler oldu. Ödeyemeyenler mecburen gitti. Çok yardımlaştilar, yani parası olmayan, olan olmayana verdi, ne bileyim o kapalı toplumların bir özelliği var yani. Yahudilerde de var, belki Ermenilerde de vardır, onları pek tanımam ama...yani.. Aslında fakir zengin ayrımını çok iyi görürsünüz, yani bu Sosyalist bir toplum değil. Yapısında hiç bu taraf yoktur, zengin hep üsttedir. Ama öyle dışardan gelen bir baskı olduğu zaman cemaati bir arada tutma eğilimi hep vardır. İşte ödeyemeyenler de bedelini ödemişlerdir. Ankara tabi çok önemli değil, bu konuda. Esas gürlüti İstanbul'da koptu.

K.S.

Varlık Vergisini ben biliyorum, ablama, çırağı ablam, terzi çırağı, 500 lira şey geldi.. Vergi geldi, ödeyemedik tabi. Ondan sonra onlar, 18 yaşından aşağı olanlar bir müddet sonra affedildi. O zaman Valiye falan çıkmalar olmuştu, Ankara Valisi meşhuur!.. herkesin tanıdığı, evet, Nevzat Tandoğan'dı. Valiye çıkıldı, vali 18 yaşından aşağılar için... Af çıkardı, yani Ankara'da aldırma, ama bizim Ankara'da olmadı, Ankara'da iyi kötü mesela dayımgilin 5000 lira gelmişti, onu taksit taksit ödedik, hatta onun bende şeyi de var... Makbuzu var da bulamadım. Efendim o da yani, şimdi biliyorsunuz Varlık Vergisi olan, bugün de aşağı yukarı Varlık vergisine benzer bir vergi ödüyoruz. Kim ödüyor, sen de ödüyorsun, ben de ödüyorum. Ne ödüyorsun, gelir vergisi ödüyorsun. Gelir vergisi de aşağı yukarı kazancının vergisi. Varlığının değil ama, kazancının vergisi... ["Fakat bu biraz farklı değil mi, Varlık Vergisi..."] O başka, o, karıştırma onu. Varlık vergisini bırak, onu... ["Yok, bırakmayayım, o şimdi benim için önemli"] E peki önemliyse söyleyeceğim. Şimdi varlığı olanlardan alınsın diye devlet öyle bir kanun çıkarmış, esasında mesela Vehbi Koç'tan da alındı bu, çok ... Müslümanlardan da alındı yani, hepimiz Türk'üz onun için öyle ayırıyorum yani, hem gayrimüslimlerden... gayrimüslimlerden ve Türklerden alındı. Ben o zaman 14 yaşında falandım, ben biliyorum, çok iyi biliyorum, Enginin, yani benim şu andaki dükkanın [amcasından kendine kalan dükkan] 5000 lira ödediğini taksitle, taksitlen ödediğimizi biliyorum. Aron Araf diye bir firma vardı burada meşhurdu. Onlar ödeyemediler ve şirket borçlarına karşılık haraç mezat satıldı. Haraç mezat satıldı ama sonra gene toparlandılar, gene... Onlar Yahudi'ydi. Gayrimüslimlere gelmişti, Ankara'da büyük bir tahribat olmadı, yani aşırı olmadı, şimdi bunu devlet kanunu, veya bu gerekçeyle gelir vergisini ihtas ettiği zaman bazı mahallelerde, bazı mahallelerde orayı iyi tanıyan zannederim muhtarlar seviyesinde insanlara verdi, onlar tespit ettiler. Ama öyle tespit ettiler ki, adamın bütün varlığı, bir gayrimüslimin bütün varlığı 100 liraysa, global olarak söylüyorum veya 100 milyon liraysa, o günkü parayla 100 lira diyelim, buna tuttular 200 lira, 250 lira vergi koydular. Maksat yıkmaktı, çoğunu da yıktılar. Sonra af falan geldi. Örneğin mesela Salkım Hanımın Taneleri var, orada bunu çok güzel işlemiş... Ben hiç hatırlamıyorum Ankara'dan Aşkale'ye giden, hiç olmadı, İstanbul'dan oldu, onun için dedim ki tahribat orada oldu daha çok. ... Mesela oturmuşlar, bu vergi salıyolar, varlık vergisi, bunlar matbaada filan ilan edildi, "Yağcı" diye İstanbul'da birisini şey yap... ["Yağcı Mişon'muş galiba değil mi?"] Mişon'muş ya da, veya neyse Andon'muş fark etmez. Gayrimüslim nihayet, adama Yağcı diye bir vergi salınıyor, bu neymiş biliyor musun, meşhurdur hala vardır, kepenkler var, vitrinleri kapatmak için camekanları falan, onları yağlayan elinde bir tane... Şu anki koka kola kutusu gibi de, o var yağ elinde onları gidiyor yağlıyor. Yağcı diye ona olmadık...Tüccar filan değil yani. Hiç ilgisi yok, yani böyle yanlışlıklar olsun. Yağcı, ver gitsin,

bilmem ne tüccar ver gitsin, gelir, Varlık Vergisi böyle bir yanlışlıklara sebep oldu. Ama sonra gene bütün gayrimüslimler ticareti gene iyi kötü ucundan kıyısından gene tuttular... Varlık vergisinden sonra bir çok yurtdışına göçenler oldu. 6-7 Eylül hadisesinden de oldu. Sonra o Rumların mübadelesinde de çok oldu. Mesela Rumların mübadelesinde İstanbul'daki gayri menkullerin yarı fiyatına değil, üçte bir, beşte bir, sekizde bir fiyatına satıldı, alan aldı, almayan almadı yani, öyle şeyler oldu... Olacak yani bir, hayatta bunların hepsi oluyor, ama işte idarenin, hükümetin bile kötü niyetini söylemek mümkün değil, işte yöneticiler, kim yönetiyor o işi, dört tane muhtar veya ileri gelen tabir edilen insanlara verilir... Yerel düzeyde tabi. İstanbul'da oldu, daha çok İstanbul'da oldu, ama yereldeki insanlar yaptı bunu, mahallenin adamları işte oraya gelen, yoksa oturup da günün bakını Ahmet'e şunu versin, Mişon'a şunu versin, Andon'a bunu versin demedi. Karar bu kadar acı olacağını zannetmiyorum, böyle bir şey olamaz yani, önümüzde çok iyi bildiğimiz 6-7 Eylül hadisesi var. Onun da kararını hükümet verdi ama tatbikat ağır geldi, onda da buna mümasil bir şey olduğunu düşünüyorum, başka olmaz yani.

R.

Ben İsmet Paşa Kız enstitüsü mezunuyum, şimdiki Olgunlaşma Enstitüsü. Çok sevdiğim bir hocam vardı, derslerde memleket meseleleri konuşurduk. Bir gün dedi ki, "evet bu ülkede Varlık Vergisi gibi bir şey oldu, ama düşman botları da içeriye girmedir". Bu sözü hiç unutmuyorum.

B.T.

Şimdi onu ben, vergi durumunu bilmiyorum. yani onlar da hiç mevzu olmadı, yalnız babamın bir tepkisi vardı, her zaman için ne derdi biliyor musunuz, biraz İsmet İnönü'ye çok kızardı. Askerde bize...o zamanlar Gayri-Müslimlerin askeri elbiseleriyle Müslümanların elbiseleri değişikmiş biliyor musunuz, ona çok içerlerdi esasında, dört sene askerlik yapmışlar... En son Gençlik parkında yapmış, derdi ki...Gençlik Parkı'ndaki ağaçların çoğunu biz diktik derdi...40'da, tabi savaşın zamanında savaş zamanında, dört sene askerlik yaptım derdi, yani yemek yok, bilmem ne yok, yatak yastık yok, yani sırtımızda verdiği parkanın içine otları yerleştirdik, başlarını da ezerdik ki o sivrilere çıkıp da batmasın diyerekten, öyle kıvrılır yatarlık derdi, yani çok eziyetli bir askerlik süresi geçirmişti.

A.K.

Askere gidinceye kadar çalıştık, sonra asker oldum işte, askerlik yaptım. Muvazzaflıkta. Ankara'da. Bir aralık ihtiyat olarak toplandık tekrar, o zaman Hadımköy diye bir yer var İstanbul'da, oraya, orada yaptım askerliğimi, 6 ay mı ne yapmışım. Ben askerliğimi bedelli olarak yapmışım... Ben o zaman tezgahtardım mahallede ve ben tezgahtar olmama rağmen yani bana da bir vergi konmuştu. Ben de ödedim, ben de ödedim... Mal sahibi daha fazla ödedi. Ben müstahdem olduğum halde yani benden de vergi kesildi, ben de o nispette, yani ben de ödedim. ... Bir, birkaç kişiyi göndermişlerdi [Aşkale'ye] hatırımda kalan. Döndüler tabi. O zaman pek, gençtik yani, ne bileyim gidenler yaşlılardı ve bizimle konuşmadılar o mevzuları, işte konuşulmadı. Öyle işte. Bizim aileden pek olmadı. Fakat işte yani konu komşu gidenler oldu.

A.T.

Bana da 500 lira vergi geldi, ama o sırada muvazzaf olarak askerdeydim, gelip de vergiyi ödeyemedim, öyle kaldı. Asker adam nasıl vergi ödesin! Askerliğimizi tam oralarda yaptık, Erzurum'da. Tepedeydik, bir baktık bunlar geliyor, yanımdan biri Varlık Vergisinden gelenler bunlar dedi. Üstlerinde bizdeki giysilerden vardı. Onlardan mıydı hatırlamıyorum. Bizdekiler kahverengi, şöyle açık kahverengi, o aralar deprem olmuştu, Yunanistan kumaş göndermiş, çadır için kullanılsın diye. Savaş için bizi alınca askeriye onlardan elbise yaptı.

V.T.

Babamla bunları konuşacak zamanımız olmadı. Bunları ancak daha sonraları, arkadaşlarla konuşuyoruz. Çok iyi bir Yahudi dostum vardı, Vi. İsminde. İnönü öldüğü zaman, işte naaşı kaldırılacak, Vi. İle otuyorduk, bana dedi ki "N.ciğim", böyle konuşurdu o, acaba İnönü bizden aldıklarının bir kısmını bize vasiyet olarak bırakmış mıdır?" Böyle de bir espri geçmişti aramızda. Yine başka bir Yahudi dostum, bir dönem işleri için, inşaat mühendisiydi kendisi, Aşkale'ye gidecek oldu, ve yine aynı Vi. üçümüzün de olduğu bir ortamda ona "Bende makbuzlar var, gidince sorarlarsa her şeyi ödediğimizi söylersin" demişti, esprili bir insandı. Bunlar tabi kara mizah.

K.G.

Çok şeyler yapılmış yani. Yani bilinçsiz yapılmış. Mesela benim bir teyzemin kızının kocası var, 7 yaşındaymış şurada bir kalaycıda çalışıyormuş filan, ona 500 lira Varlık Vergisi şey yapmışlar, yazmışlar. Hani olmayanda alamadıklarında bir şey yapmamışlar, alamadılar ama çoğunu da böyle..belki bir film vardı, siz onu... Hani onlar hep şey olmuş yani, çok... Babama gelmemiş, belki de askerdeymiş o zaman, askerdelermiş onlar.... E tabi, kahverengi elbiseler...Hani onları artık öyle bir şey ki, onlar hiç benimsemiyorlar onları yani. kanun öyleymiş diyorlar, yani, sonra öyle bir şey olmuş ki mesela tabi bazı varlık Vergilerinde şunda bunda bazı şeyler olabilir. Ama diyelim ki bu 1. Cihan Harbinde şeylerde falan yani bu kadar böyle şey olmuş ki, e zaten Yunan buraya şeye kadar gelmiş, Polatlı'ya kadar gelmiş, bizim akrabalarından bir tanesi orada diğerine şimdi çalışıyormuş, oranın ağası çağırmış demiş ki durum böyle böyle, eğer demiş sizinkiler kazanırsa sen beni koru demiş, eğer bizinkiler alırsa ben sana sahip çıkayım demiş. Yani bu kadar birbirlerine tutkunluk var, ama devirler neler getirmiş, neler götürmüş yani. ... [Vergi] hükümetin yoksulluğundan yani, hükümetin yoksulluğundan.... [Aşkale'ye gidenler] olmuş. ... Hükümet gönderiyor. ... Gene Ermeniler gitmiş, yani hiç Türklerden giden... [Akrabalardan giden] yok. Ama bazı zenginler bilmiyorum mesela, bizim akrabalarından benim tanıdıklarımından yok. ... Hükümetin kanunu dediler, gitmişler yani. Bir şey yani, bir şey söylese ne olacak? Hani onu ne yapabilirsin? Diyelim ki şöyle bir, bir kanun geldi gayri-Müslimler, ben şimdi şöyle çalışıyorum mesela e şöyle bir gayri-Müslimler için kanun çıkarsalar ne yapabilirsin? Bir şey yapabilir misin, yapamazsın.... Valla işte biz yaşamadığımız için bilemeyeceğim ki. bilemeyeceğim ki. şimdi ben, kalkıp da şimdi hiçbir şey yokken benim şöyle şu komşularımın hakkında, belki o zaman insanlar yapmış ama şimdiki insan yapmaz. Çünkü şimdiki insanlar biliyorsun dışarıya bağlanıyor, Avrupa Birliği var, dünya şeyleri var, burada bir Müslüman bile görüyorsun yani, böyle bir adaletsiz gördüğü zaman, dışarıya şeylere, ne mahkemesi diyorlar mesela onlara...[Avrupa İnsan Hakları mahkemesi] Avrupa...Onlara veriyor, o zaman böyle bir şey yokmuş ki, onun için ne hükümet de böyle şeyleri yapabilir, ne de insanlar onu kabullenir yani.

K.S.

Başka şeyler de anlatacağım sana, sen bana bir emir veriyorsun yukardan, git şöyle yap böyle yap, benim o andaki tutumum ne olur bilemiyorsun, bunu niçin anlatıyorum, biraz sonra anlatacağım dediğimi anlatayım da anla. Menderes, Bayar İstanbul'dan trene biniyorlar, o sıra İstanbul'da bütün ticaret gayrimüslimlerin elinde. O zaman diyorlar ki, ya biraz şu, gayrimüslimlere dokunun diyorlar şöyle, ne yapın, işte bir şeyler yapın, yani bir göz dağı verin falan diyor, trene de atlayıp geliyorlar, bunların üzerine meşhur! 6-7 Eylül hadisesi var, o oluyor işte. Önüne de geçemiyorlar. Ben geleceğim şöyle "bana bak" diyeceğim, bu sefer beni, seni dövmeye, soymaya, malları alıp sokaklara atmaya kadar gidiyor. Yani böyle ufak tefek kötü hadiseler oldu, bunları geçiyorum. ... [Hadiselerin sebepleri] Tek kelime, hemen cevap vermek icap ederse, çekememezlik. Bütün gayrimüslimlerin hayat yaşantıları, kazançlarına tevazu olarak yani aynı seviyede kazançlarıyla masrafları, görüntüleri,, haliyle daha yüksek görünüyordu. Yaşam şartları onlar için daha iyiydi, haliyle bunu çekemeyenler de vardır. Hala herkesi herkes çekmeyebilir. ... [Hala var mı bu çekememezlik] Tahmin etmiyorum şu anda artık, dünya medenileşti, görüşler değişti, çalışanların yükselip gideceğini herkes biliyor. Tabi Türkiye'de eskisine göre çok fark var. Ama bazı idrak, odaklar gene belki sivriliğini devam ettiriyor ama, şunu hemen söylerim biz azınlık olarak Ankara'da hiç hiç ama, benim bildiğim kadarıyla bir ayrıcalık görmüyoruz. Bir aşırı hiçbir şey biz de yapmıyoruz, karşıyızdakiler de yani, Müslüman arkadaşlarımızın da bir, kötü bir baskısı yok. Bir şeyi yok. Hatta ben kendi adıma askerde olsun, iş hayatında olsun her zaman takdirle karşılandım ben.

K.G.

Valla onda, onda yani hükümet bile müsaade etmiş ona yani. yani tabi çapulcular şeyi de, siz mesela ben de pek şey yapmıyorum ama, o zamanki şeylerde ne kadar böyle Müslümanlar, ne kadar komşularını saklamışlar, ne kadar korumuşlar yani. ama tabi bu herkese yansımada, anca duyanlar şey yaptı, çok böyle arka, sahip çıkanlar olmuş yani.... Yapanlar ama yani hepsi de şeydi onların, çapulcu takımı. Şimdi o çapulcu takımına sen bir önder ol da gel bir İstanbul'da şuraları bir şey yapalım de, tinerilere, ne yaparlar.

S.O. -'1'

S.O: Bir de biraz önce söylediğim gibi, biz önce Türk'üz sonra Hıristiyanlığımızı devam ettiriyoruz. Ve hani bunun içerisinde hani Ermeni'si, Katolik'i şunu, hayır biz Hıristiyan'ız bitti. Yani bunu didikle., mesela önce Türk'üz, yani asla ve asla şöyle bir şey için....

'1': Yani kendimizi Türk, Türk-Hıristiyan olarak görüyoruz ve yani maalesef Müslümanlar bizi öyle görmüyorlar doğrusu yani, Türkler ve Hıristiyanlar olarak. Yani bizi Türk saymıyorlar yani, halbuki biz Türk Hıristiyan olarak görüyoruz kendimizi.

S.O: Şöyle bir şey söyleyeceğim size, bir gün üşenmeyin, hani bunu bu yazılarınıza yetiştirmek zorunda değilsiniz, bir 29 Ekim olduğunda, 23 Nisan olduğunda falan üşenmeyin, kendi adınıza, ben kendimi büyütmek için bunu yaptım çünkü, gidin ve Hıristiyan ailelerin oturduğu evlere bakın, bayrak asılıdır, o bayrak çok önemli.

'1': E tabi ki bayrağımız...

S.O: Rahmetli babam benim hem dükkanına hem evine, bildiğimiz hani sancak asılabilecek bir yer yaptırttı. Bayrak asılacak. Ola ki sabahleyin biz uyuyorsak, bizim odamızdan bayrağın sallanacağı yerd, biz uyuyorsak sabahleyin giderdi işe, telefon ederdi, "çocuklar kalktıysa bayrağı as". Eğer bir gün unutmadıysa onu geceden asmıştır zaten kendisi, ama eğer unutup da gittiyse ya da biz uyuyoruz diye odamıza girmediyse, sabahleyin telefon ederdi "bugün 23 Nisan bayrak asılacak" diye. Hani bu sözün altında önce Türklük yatıyor. Ondan sonra Hıristiyanlık yatıyor.

S.O.

Babamın bahsettiğinde hatırlıyorum, çok şey mutlulukla bahsederdi Atatürk'ü görmüş. Su satıyormuş o zaman babam. Testiyle su satarmış o dönemlerde, Atatürk'ü görmüş ve ben bu kadar güzel insan görmedim diye hep bahsederdi. Tabi çocukça aklında kalanları bizimle paylaştığında, Atatürk başkent olacak dedikten sonra Ankara'nın üstünde bir güneş açtı derdi babam hep. Hep böyle söylerdi, çünkü mantıklıdır, bir şeye değerini verdiğiniz anda o göze batar. Aksi taktirde göze batmaz. Dolayısıyla ondan sonra Ankara'nın çok daha iyi olduğunu söylemişti.

A.İ.

O zamanki meclis Ulus civarında olduğundan Atatürk o zamanki ünlü Karpiç lokantasında yemek yediğini, orada çalışanların büyük bir çoğunluğunun sahibi de dahil bizim cemaatten olduklarını söylerlerdi.

H.A. - A.K. - R.

H.A: Benim halamı dansa kaldırmış hatta Atatürk. Tabi hep anlatırdı ay nasıl gururla anlatırdı "Atatürk'le dans ettim, Atatürk'le dans ettim". Güzelmiş, çok hoşmuş böyle, hep iftihar ederdi böyle ben Atatürk'le dans ettim Ankara Palas'ta diye halam.

A.K: Evet, Ankara Palas'ta gördüğümü hatırlıyorum. Konuşmadık tabi konuşmadık ama işte bir baloda tesadüfen bulunduk. Bir gece, bir yılbaşı gecesiydi, kız kardeşimle gitmişim ben, işte o da yani sağdan soldan yani Atatürk hep dans ederdi herkesle, sıra bizim kardeşe de geldi, onunla da biraz döndü şöyle. (Gülüyor) O büyük bir hatıra.

R: Aman çok iyi koruyun Atatürk'ünüzü. ... Ben her zaman, oldum olası Atatürk'ün aşığıydım. ... Gölgedekileri, Sarı Zeybek'i okudum. ... Oldum olası yani ben Atatürkçüydüm bilmiyorum. ona iyi bakın. Bakın dediğim yani o Türkiye için değil, yalnız Türki.. inanın bütün dünya için ender gelen dehalardan biridir Atatürk. Yok, böyle insan her zaman gelmez. Her zaman gelmez, her millete nasip olmaz, bu yüce insanı tutun yani. ... Tutun. Çünkü Osmanlı İmparatorluğu imparatorlukken falan, çok güzeldi, çok büyüktü, çok muhteşemdi, ama işin sonuna bakılırsa Atatürk olmasaydı Türkiye olmayacaktı. Çok büyük bir insan, çok akıllı bir insan.

H.A: Atatürk hayranlığı var bizde.

E.Ş.

Ankaranın başkent oluşu veya Cumhuriyetin kuruluşuyla ilgili dinlediğim pek bir şey hatırlamıyorum. Ama konu Atatürk'e gelince tabiki bende her Türk insanının mutlaka olması gerektiği kadar ciddi bir Atatürkçüyüm. Onun yaptıklarına baktığımızda neredeyse mümkün olmayacak kadar zor şeyleri başardığını görüyorsunuz. Öyle bir insanla gurur duymamak mümkün mü? Tek üzüldüğüm şey ise onun en az 15 sene erken öldüğünü düşünüyorum. Eğer biraz daha yaşasaydı zannediyorum ülke olarak şu anda çok daha farklı bir konumda olurduk.

K.S.

Ondan sonra tabi ki o zaman, benim bildiğim mesela Allah rahmet eylesin Atatürk'ün ölümünde ben okuldaydım, okulda duydum ve...Hiçkırığa hiçkırığa okuldan çıktık, ne olduğunu da bilmiyoruz daha. Gerçi ben Atatürk'ü bir defasında babamın yazıhanesinin karşısında, şimdi ki tam pili piline [...'in] Çıkrıkçılar Yokuşundaki apartmanın önünde kalabalığın ortasında gördüm ama, hayal meyal

görmüştüm. 38'de de okuldaydık, ders yapıyorduk, çıktık, ağlaya ağlaya, hiç unutmuyorum caddeden geldim, Sulu Han'ın yokuşundan yani Posta Caddesinden indim, adım gibi biliyorum, nereye bakarsam bakayım, bütün millet hümgür hümgür ağlıyordu yani. anında demek ki duyuldu, belki biz 10'da mı çıktık, 11'de mi çıktık okuldan, bilmiyorum ama şey yaptılar yani bir ders falan varken tatil ettiler, ben de oradan yürüye yürüye, ağlaya ağlaya evime geldim, ondan sonra tekrar çıktım dükkana gittim. ...Sonra bir gün okuldayız, bize Atatürk'le ilgili şiir ezberlememiz istendi, ben de hasbel kader bir rahatsızlandım evdeydim, o Behçet Kemal Çağlar'ın izinde şiiri var, çok uzun bir şiir, onu ezberledim, çok uzun ama. İzinde/ Ey dünya yeryüzünde/ sarsılıp yarıl göç/ neysen kendini göster/ dilim boşa göç/ diye devam eden çok güzel bir şiirdi o. Çok da iyi içerisinde bazı notlar almış oluyoruz, mesela bir, bir kıtasında diyor ki kendini yere çal parçalan tabi/ Ey Timur, Atilla, Yıldırım, Fatih/ ey evvelce ölen yüzlerce milyon/ kalkın mezarlarınızdan doğrulun saf saf/ doğrulun gelen en büyük insan/ Doğrulun geliyor Atatürk diye devam ediyor. Şey de şöyle kaç yıldır Türkiye'de Tanrının dili / kaç yıldır Türkiye'de tanrının dili/ bir anında 17 milyon öksüzüz biz, tam 17 milyon, Atatürk öldüğü zaman Ankara, şey töbe İst, Türkiye 17 milyonu. Yani o şiir çok güzel bir şiirdir, Behçet Kemal Çağlar'ındır, işte hastalığımdan dolayı zamanım uzundu, yattığım yerde o çok uzun şiiri ezberlemiştim, orda çok güzel şey.. Gerçi et kemikti onun ta dışı/ ama semalara denkti bakışı/ saçları alevdi, ruhu alevdi/ dünya ona hayrandı. Çok çok hoş bir şiir...

L.N.

Merkez lokantası genellikle, ilk kuruluşunda Atatürk'ün öğlen yemeklerini yediği yerdi. Yukarıda otururdu. Babam o lokantanın muhasebecisi olarak geldi, orada çalıştı. O bakımdan Atatürk'ü çok daha yakından görme şansımız oldu çocukluğumuzda. Demek ki, 1933'lerde, 933 kardeşim 28 yılında, kardeşim o zaman 5 yaşında falandı. Atatürk'e ait hep bir hatıra vardır bizde. Kardeşim Atatürk'le ahbaplık kurdu, Atatürk çocuklara çok düşküdü. İşte bir gün de, yukarıda Marmara Köşkü vardır, otel yapılıyor tepede, orda Atatürk'ün köşkü vardı, halk da gelir orada otururdu, yenilir içilir, Atatürk de halk arasına karışırdı. Yine öyle bir cumartesi günü, babam orada çalıştığı için biz hafta sonları oraya giderdik, oraya gidiyor oturuyor, işte Atatürk'ün yanına sokuluyor, annem arkadan dinliyor falan, Atatürk ilgileniyor, yemek masasına oturtuyor, soruyor, işte "adın ne" diyor, "İzzet". Asıl adı "İzzi", ama o İzzet diye kendi kendine uyduruyor, eğilim vardı Türkçe isim almaya. "Peki" falan diyor, "babanın adı" diyor, "babam İsrail" diyor. "Nasıl olur" diyor, "Ona bakma" diyor "o Yahudi'dir". Bu çok hoşuna gidiyor Atatürk'ün. Yani ahbaplığın kurulmasına, beş yaşında bir çocuk için, epey... Ama o zamanki halet-i ruhiyeyi gösteriyor zannediyorum, bu bende kalmış. İşte Atatürk ikramda bulunuyor. Annem de bir masada korkudan titreyerek oturuyor, biraz uzağında, görüyor bunları bir şey yapamıyor tabi... ikramda bulunuluyor küçük çocuğa, kardeşime. Almıyor, "Annem kızarmam" diyor. "Orda" diyor. "yav" diyor "benden büyük kimse var mı" diyor "ben Atatürk'üm" diyor, "benden büyük kimse var mı, ver" diyor, "oooo!" falan diyor bu, "kim", "bak" diyor, yukarıyı gösteriyor, "ben bir şey görmüyorum" diyor "bir şey yok" "kör müsün yav!" diyor "Allah var işte". Bu da çok hoşuna gidiyor, yani onların ahbaplığının kuruluşunda bu tanışmanın rolü var... Ondan sonra her hafta kardeşimi arar oldu, onu alır hayvanat bahçesine götürür, gezdirir falan, pek hoşlanmıştı... Ve o dört-beş yaşında olan kardeşim, yani bunu şey ayrılık gayrılık için söylüyorum, annem çalışan bir kadındı, terzilik yapardı, ben okula başlamıştım, ama kardeşim zor, beş yaşında bir çocuk.. Onu, çocuk esirgeme kurumu vardır, bir zaman Anafartalar Caddesinde, işte oraya yerleştirmeye çalıştık, almadılar, torpil lazım zor tabi. Fuat Bey'di galiba Atatürk'ün yakın adamlarından biri. Neyse...Ve ondan sonra hemen, babamı huzuruna kabul etmeyen Fuat bey ertesi günü önünü ilikleyerek babamı kabul ediyor ve kardeşim ilkokul çağına kadar Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu'nda, gündüzleri gidip akşam eve dönerek, e böyle bir... Şimdi tabi burada, yani o dönemde bir Yahudi için zor bir şey oraya girmek, başka da kimse yok, bir kardeşim var. Yani o dönemler bugünkü gibi değil, yani sizin kuşak bunu bilemez yani böyle bir ayrımı, o dönemler böyle bir ayrım, belki zordu. Bu biraz şeye cevaptır belki, gençlerin İsrail'e gidişi de bir yerde, iş bulmak zorsa, devlet memuru olmak...

K.G.

[Azınlık hissetmiyorum] Etmiyorum. Mesela madem ki rahat değilse, sen kendini azınlık hissediyorsan, bu kadar devletler var, bu kadar ülke var, çek git. Çek git o zaman, niye duruyorsun ki. İnsan her türlü yoldan gidebilir.

S.O.

Çoğunlukla evlilikle, evlilikten dolayı gidildi. Yani hani benim ailemden kimse gitmedi, benim etrafımda olan çekirdek ailemden de mesela kimse gitmedi ama, büyük teyzemin üç tane kızı

evliliklerini yaptılar ve eşleri onların işte Almanya'daydı, Fransa'daydı, derken gitmek zorundalar, yapabilecekleri bir şey yok. [Diğerleri] askerlik bitince gitmiş olanlar var, askerlikten önce gitmiş olanlar hemen hemen hiç hatırlamıyorum. Hep askerliğe kadar hani burada kalıp, bir şeyler yapmaya çalışıp, olmadığını gördükleri zaman yurtdışına açılıp, orada mutlaka gene böyle bir hani tanıdık vasıtasıyla gitmiştir, orada bir iş yapmıştır, iş alanının olduğunu görmüştür, ondan sonra da buradan kalkıp oraya gitmece yapıyorlar.... Çünkü ya bir baba mesleklerini yapacaklar, ya kendileri bir ortam yaratacaklar, e parasal olarak bir yetinme söz konusu olmadığı zaman emeğe kalıyor, emekte de, burada emeğinle bir şeyler yapabilmek biraz zor, her ortam için zor. Orada tutunmuş olanlar, daha önceden gitmiş olan büyükler, ya da bir şekilde daha atılımcı olanlar yurtdışını tercih ediyorlar. Buradaki mesleklerinin orada daha değerli olduğunu görenler mesela, birçok terzilerin falan gittiğini bu yüzden bilirim mesela, İstanbul'dan terzilik yaparken orya gidip, bu işi orada biz yaparsak çok daha iyi, hani çocuklarımıza da daha iyi bir gelecek hazırlarız diye düşünen bir çok aile olduğunu bilmekteyim mesela. Onlardan bir tanesi, işte bu teyzemin kızı mesela, İstanbul'a gelin gitmişti, o... Sivas'tan İstanbul'a gelin gitmişti, uzunca seneler sonra Sivas, şeyde İstanbul'da kaldılar, daha sonra böyle bir şey fark ettiler, oradaki şeyde Fransa'da daha iyi tutulduğunu bu işin, çok şükür şimdi hakikaten burada çabaladıklarında çok daha iyi durumdalar.... Ekonomi.. Zorunluluktan giden yoktu, yani hiçbir şekilde hani burada barınamıyorum, işte şuyum buyum, her şeyi elimden alınıyor falan yooo, hiç kimse zorunluluktan dolayı gitmedi. Sadece kendilerine daha iyi bir hayat seçebilmek adına, hani burada çab.. harcıyorum, orada işte amcamın yanında, dayımın yanında her neyse bir tanıdığın yanına gidip, onun yanında var olmayı seçtiler.

T.T.

Australia [yaya gitmeyi düşündüm]. Amcam orda olduğu için...Daha iyi bir yaşam için. Australia'ya gördükten sonra Türkiye'deki arkadaşlarımın ve yaşantımın benim için daha önemli olduğunu anladım. burada dostluklar daha güzel. Gerçekten çalışırsanız karnınızda doyuyor. Daha ne isteyebilirim ki?... Onlar belki daha özgürce yaşıyorlar ama oralarda dostluk, arkadaşlık yok. ekonomik sıkıntı dünyanın her yerinde var.

E.Ş.

Avustralya'dakiler tamamen göç sebebiyle gittiler. Ancak diğer kuzenimin eşi [Kanada'da] yanlış hatırlamıyorsam dükkanında bulunan 1 yada 2 kişiye whisky yüzünden 2 ay hapis yattıktan sonra bu ülkede yaşamamaya karar verdi diye biliyorum. ... [Başka bir ülkeye göç etmeyi düşündüm] Daha medeni bir ülkede yaşamak adına. Yeri çok önemli değil. Demin de söylediğim gibi daha medeni bir şekilde yaşamak adına, gerçekten insan olduğunuzu anlamak adına. Sakın bunu dinle falan bağdaştırmayın çünkü hiç alakası yok sadece sokağa çıkın yürüyün veya araba kullanın yeter. [Kalmamızın nedeni] Buradaki yerleşim şartlarımız, bütün düzenimizin, arkadaşlarımızın, dostlarımızın burada oluşu. Unutmayın ki bir ülkeyi satın alacak kadar paranız dahi olsa eğer yanınızda dostlarınız ve sevdikleriniz yoksa hiçbir zaman mutlu olamazsınız.... Bir laf vardır ya "bir giden pişman bir gitmeyen" işte aynen böyle. Ben 4 senemi yurt dışında geçirdim öyle uzaktan bakıldığı gibi çok kolay bir hayat yok oralarda. Hele birde buradaki hayata "kuralıslığa" bu kadar alışmışsınız. Türkiye her şeyi ama her şeyi bir şekilde yapabileceğiniz bir ülke o yüzden onu bırakıp gitmeside o kadar kolay olmuyor.

A.T.

Her seçimde, her, muhtar şeyine ayrı. E kullanmamız lazım, kendimizin! Biz nerde doğup, nerde... Bizi mesela Türkiye'den atsalar nereye gideceğiz, bizim vatanımız yok!. Katolikler bizim, bir vatanımız yok, ne Fransa alır, ne İtalya alır, ne bilmem ne alır, ne.. Biz Türkiye'yi, Türkiye'de Türk şeyiz... Fransa'ya gidenlere de Türk gözüyle bakıyorlar. Yani kaç sene olursa olsun... Aslında yani Türko diye, Türk diyorlar... İşte bir türlü o, nere benim vatanım nere! Vatanım yok, Fransa mı benim vatanım? İtalya mı vatanım? Almanya mı?... Abim diyor kalk diyor burada şey oldu, ben dedim kalmam arkadaş dedim, gelmeyeceğim, git oraya dedim, gittin oraya. Siz diyor kralsınız bizim yanınızda, bir orda sefiliz, valla bilmem dedim sen gittin. Çoluk çocuğun var orda senin. Oraya da kayıtlısın, bilmem nesin, orda kalacan arkadaş.

V.T.

Hala tartışıyorlar neyi tartıştıklarını da bilmiyorum hep söylemişimdir ben Türküm. Tayyib Erdoğan'ın söylediğine katılıyorum alt kimlik üst kimlik; yurtdışında nereden geliyorsun Türkiye'den. Türklük benim üst kimliğim nesin Türküm ama Ermeni asılıyım. ... Pek çok kişi milliyetçi diye tanır beni, bazıları derki olur mu Ermeni'den milliyetçi olur mu?... Dün TV'de bir tartışma vardı, adam

ben Kürt'üm diyecekmiş niye desin sen Türk'sün ama Kürt asıllısın Türkiye'de yaşayan bit Kürt demek bence anlamsız. ... Türklük bir ulus bir halk onun kurallarını kanunlarını taşıyan onun pasaportunu artı kimliğini taşıyorum mezarım burada olacak ailem burada gömülü. Ama din olarak Müslüman değilim yani o bir din aslında dinin bütün bu işlere karışmaması gerekiyor yani o ayrı bir şey.

K.G.

Yani hiç memnun değil, sonra gidip gelenler orada söylüyorlar, bazı tanıdıklarımız falan gidiyorlar oraya turlar falan var.. Gezmeye gidiyorlar. Şimdi orası artık öyle bir şey olmuş ki, insanların yarısından çoğu aç, öbür taraf çok zengin. Gerçi belki burada böyle ama, ama orada daha çok oluyor.

H.A.

Şimdi bir kısım, büyük bir kısım 48'de devlet değil mi, yani 48'de İsrail devleti kurulduktan sonra gitti, bir kısım da 1980'de o çok yoğun bir anarşi dönemi vardı burada hatırlarsın, yani hatırlarsın derken hani duymuşundur mutlaka. O ara bir grup gitti, değil mi buradan. İşte önce çocuklar gitti, arkasından aileler dayanamadılar tabi hasretlerine, aileler gittiler. Yani Ankara o şekilde bayağı azaldı, ama yani İstanbul'da falan çok büyük bir cemaat var tabi, 20.000 kişi sanıyorum aşağı yukarı, yani tam kesin rakam bilmiyorum, İzmir'de 2000 kişi civarında. Ankara zaten ufaktı... Bir kısmı da İstanbul'a ama taş.., kal, şey yaptılar İstanbul'a taşındılar, yani büyük bölümü de İstanbul'a kalkmaya karar verdi, yani o şekilde bir azalma oldu, ona bağlı olarak. [niye İstanbul] Daha iyi imkanlar olması açısından herhalde, yani iş imkanları olarak, İstanbul'da daha fazla imkanımız var Ankara'ya göre, tercih ettiler, başka bir sebebi yok.

N.E.

[Nedenleri tahmin etmek] Çok zor ama ben genellikle şöyle yorumluyorum, şimdi gidenlerin önemli bir kısmı, şimdi bir, bir fakir bir grup vardı, biz pek tanımazdık ama. Benim tahminim bu sinagog çevresinde oturlardı onlar, onların gitme nedeni çok açık yani Türkiye'deki ekonomik durumlar gittikçe bozulunca, işsizlik gittikçe arttıkça, onlar kendilerine yeni bir çıkış yolu buldular, İsrail'de çünkü inşaatlar veriliyor aslında, o yüzden gittiler onlar, bence doğal yani onları gitmesi. ... Bir de tahmin ediyorum bir kesim de, yani hayır şimdi batan tüccarlar da gitti. Yani ben öyle bir iki tane örneğim var bildiğim, yani isimlerini bilmiyorum ama anımsıyorum şu anda, yani onların da işleri iyi gitmedi gittiler. Şimdi onun dışında gidenler, yani mesela büyük tüccarlar falan Ankara'dan İstanbul'a "move" ettiler. Çünkü iş ortamı, birazcık daha oraya daha uygun bir iş ortamı vardı yani. Yani gidenler birazcık hani böyle sanki. Ben hani bir de üniversite okumak için de gidenler oldu, o yıllar üniversiteye girmek işte zorlaştığı yıllardı. Ondan sonrasını tabi bilmiyorum, üniversite okumak için de gidenler oldu yani. Onun sonrasını pek bilmiyorum. Bana, bana sorarsanız aslında fakirler daha çok gitti, yani orantı olarak yani, öbürleriye iş çerçevesinde ne yapmaları gerekiyorsa onu yaptılar. Yani İstanbul'a "move" ettiler Ankara'dan, işte İsrail'e gittiler falan. Hani, yani "vatan, millet, Sakarya", "benim vatanım orası" diye gidenler de mutlaka vardır, ama hani ben en azından bilmiyorum onu.

L.N.

Ankara'da kalmadı pek. Kimse kalmadı. Çoğu gitti. O zaman belki yüz küsur aile varmıştı yani hatırlamıyorum ama, şu dakikada 16-17 Yahudi ailesi kalmış diyorlar Ankara'da. Çoğu ayrıldı Ankara'dan.Tabi vakti de..İsrail devletinin kuruluşu zamanında hali vakti olmayıp da oraya gidenler oldu. O dönemi iyi biliyorum ben.... Pek, pek kimse kalmadı, hepsi kaçtı. Çoğu İstanbul'a kaçtı. Biraz, ekonomik durumunu biraz düzelten veya dükkanını nakil edebilen İstanbul'a gitti. Fakir fukara da hala, gençler sonra onlar ana babalarıyla çektiler gittiler. Belki de, biz gençleri gönderdik dedim ya, İsrail'e gidenler. Bugün Ankara'da ya 16 aile var ya 17 aile var. Onlar da birbirlerini tanımaz görmezler hiç. [İsrail'e] Epey gitmiş olmalı, tabi daha çok gençlerdi. Bu işe girmez ama mesela o gidenleri ben mecburen tanıdım, çünkü o zaman akıllı İsrail devleti genç eleman istiyordu. Yeni kuruluş halinde, hasta istemiyordu. O bakımdan gidenlerin muayenesini istiyordu ve bu muayene, yıllarca ben yaptım. Bu genç çocuklar, yani orada yeni bir istikbal aramak için tabi gittiler. Yani böyle bir dönem geçti, bu da şey olarak, gönüllü olarak hizmetti yani. Yaptık belki iki-üç sene sürdü. Yaşlılara gelince tabi onları ince eleyip sık dokudular. [daha çok ekonomik kaygılarla mı gittiler] Gayet tabi, gayet tabi... İşte Cumhuriyetin kuruluşu.Kuruluş yıllarındaki Gayri-Müslimlerin durumu neydi. Tabii, imparatorluğun yıkılışı üzerine kurulan bir devlet. Cumhuriyette ağır basan ilk akım diyelim, milliyetçilikti. Koyu milliyetçilikti hatta. O bakımdan, mesela gayrimüslimin kolay kolay devlet memuru olması mümkün değildi.... Ha doktorlar için falan belki mümkün ama, başka yüksek tahsil için, bir lise mezunu ben hiç memur tanımadım. Ama mühendis olarak tanıdım, mesela...

N.E.

Hayır ama, biz hiç düşünülmedi, yani ben böyle bir konunun konuşulduğunu dahi hatırlamıyorum. Çünkü biz aslında kendimizi hep buraya ait hissediyoruz. Yani farklı hissettiğimiz zamanlar oluyor, biz farklıyız diye yani, annem özellikle şimdi onları daha çok vurgular öyle şeyleri, biz işte bu açılardan bizim gibi değil bunlar falan filan gibi derler, annem hala der ama ben yani bu ayrıyet duygusu yani ben farklı da olabilirim ama yani gittiğim yerde insanlar zaten hiçbir zaman o kadar heterojen olmuyor. Hani ben çok net buraya aitim yani, beni orda, benim için olabilecek hiçbir şey yok, bir de ben şimdiki halimle bir de düşünürsem bunu üstüne yani benim İsrail’de olmam için en ufak bir neden yok. Yani ben Amerika’da çok rahat yaşayabilirim, Avrupa’da da çok rahat yaşayabilirim. ...Ben gittim bir kere İsrail’e, gitmem oraya yani savaşın ortasında bir yerde niye gitsin ki insan yani başka türlü bir duygum hiç yok. ... Yani işte Arap ülkelerinde yaşamak istemiyorum, yani net o konuda, çünkü o “bias”ı orada, yani kanlı bir “bias” olacağı için istemiyorum. En az... olma ihtimalinin daha büyük olduğu yoksa kategorik bir şey söylemiyorum; Kuzey Afrika’yı sevmiyorum aynı nedenlerden dolayı, İsrail’i sevmiyorum aynı nedenlerden dolayı, yani öyle bir “bias” olmasın, bir de tabi yani mentalite olarak Türkiye Cumhuriyeti mentalitesinin daha ilerisine gidememiş bir çok ülke var Avrupa’da, dünyada onları da sevmiyorum. ... Ama şeyin de farkındayım tabi benim en iyi “operate” ettiğim yer burası,yani bana git Amerika’da yaşa dersen yaşarım ama hani orada çok rahat “operate” edemem herhalde. Burada en iyi, en iyi burada ediyorum hani burada iyi ettiğim söylenebilir, ya da söylenemez o da ayrı bir şey ama, yani burası iyi tanıdığım bir ortam diye düşünüyorum. Yani burasını, onun için hani eğer ev olarak görmek, tabi burasını ev olarak görüyorum doğal olarak, ama o huzursuzluklar hep oluyor. ... Ama dediğim gibi, yani sanırım burada kalma tercihini kullanan insanları bu çok rahatsız etmiyor, bizim gibi insanları. Tabi gidecek yerimiz de yok bir yandan düşünürsen, nereye gideceğim ki ben şimdi mesela, hani burası benim değil diye düşünsem, bu belki benim kaçış yolum hani böyle düşünmem. Neresi olacak ki benim yerim yani. Hani daha bilinçli bir insan olarak düşünüyorum ben hani beni burada istemiyorlar, ben nereye gideceğim. Ama ben böyle düşünmüyorum, yani öyle olmadığını sanıyorum, yani çünkü insanlarla, yeterince insanlarla hani birebir ilişkiye girmiş durumdayım, ve ben biliyorum ki insanlar “predominantly” öyle düşünmüyorlar aslında insanlar.

‘1’

Onların hürriyetleri daha fazla, tamamen Fransız vatandaşı görülmüyorlar. Biz de öyleyiz ama azınlık muamelesi görüyoruz biz. Bizim zamanımızda gidenlerden kaç tane milletvekili var oralarda, Türk asıllı milletvekilleri Almanya’da, Belçika’da, Fransa’da. ... Çok isterdim, ama okuyamadım, abımla abim karşılayamayız dediler, zaten memur da olamazsın dediler. O zaman devlet memuru olunamıyordu, hala olunamıyor. Geçenlerde bir programda izledim, ermeni bir gazeteci söyledi açık bir gayrimüslim asker olamaz, yani askerlik yapıyoruz tabi, gençlerimiz askerlik yapıyorlar ama meslek olarak asker olamaz, devlet memuru olamaz diye. ... Demek ki bir güven duyulmuyor Müslüman olmayanlara. Bizi Türk saymazlar, Türk demezler. Oysa yabancılar bize Türk diyorlar. Türk, Müslüman olur fikrindedirler. Biz de alışmışız artık. ... Gagavuz Türklerini tanıttılar televizyonda. Onlar Hıristiyanlar esas. Türkçeleri bozuk vesaire ama Türk sayılıyorlar.

T.T.

Hepsini değil. Sivil hayatta her vatandaş gibi haklarımı kullanıyorum. Sağlık gibi hizmetlerden herkes gibi faydalıyorum. Vergimi veriyorum, oyumu kullanıyorum, seçme hakkım olmasına rağmen seçilme hakkım yok. Askerlikte özel muamele yapıyor. Benim “cemaat”imden mecliste bulunan en son insan Atatürk dönemindeydi!

E.Ş.

Hem evet hem hayır diye cevap vermek istiyorum. Tabiki bazı sahip olduğumuz haklarımız var ve bunlardan yararlanıyoruz. Ama ne dersiniz deyin geçmişte yaşanan bazı şeyler sizin tam olarak nelere veya kimlere ne şekilde güvenebileceğinizi tereddütte bırakıyor. Yani biraz korkak ve bastırılmış duygularla yaşamınızı sürdürüyorsunuz. Bu yüzdende kurallara uymayan çok az gayrimüslüm vardır diye düşünüyorum.

S.O.

Bir aile dostumuz evlilik yapmıştı bir Müslüman hanımefendiyle, ve çalıştığı yerde müdürlüğe gelmek konumundaydı, daha sonra hangi hükümet zamanındaydı bilmiyorum ama bir Erme.. Hıristiyan’la evli olduğunu öğrenildiği için depo görevlisi ilan edildi. Ve orada emekliliğin, istemek zorunda kaldı.

Bunu duy..., hani bu da duymadığım bir şey değil sonuçta çok yakın bir aile büyüğümdür, böyle şeyler de duyuyorduk. Dolayısıyla biz böyle hani bir adım gerideydik, ne denir, hani kıracağım da şu işi yapacağım diye bir inada hiçbir zaman bindirmedim. Hani denemedim. Öyle bir şeyle karşılaş... Çünkü emek vereceksiniz, çok iyi çalışacaksınız, her şey yolunda gidecek ama sadece bu sebepten dolayı bir geri adım atmak zorundasınız, e bu insanın içine sindireceği bir konu değil. Maalesef bu tarz düşünceler de var tabi ki.

L.N.

Ben 1947'de İstanbul tıp fakültesi'nden mezun oldum, hiç takılmadım, 41'de liseyi bitirdim... 47'de Tıp fakültesi'ni hiç kaybım olmadan bitirdim. Ve iş aradım, iş bulamadım. Hiç kimse bana iş vermiyordu, yahut da iş bulunmuyordu, iş zordu.... Ve hemen, mezun olduktan hemen sonra da babamı kaybettik. Kalp krizi..., zaten..ondan sonra iş aramakla geçti. Tek tek söyleyemem ama tuttuğum notlara göre altmış kadar iş müracatı. E bunu şeyden sonra, eğer tarih söylersem 1947 mezunuyum 1951'de ihtisasımı aldım, dahiliye ihtisası, Ankara 2. Dahiliye'den, ondan sonra iş aradım. 51'e kadar, başta volunter, yani.. Ondan sonra iş aramaya başladık, iş yok. İşte sağa sola, sağa sola... Hastane, iş yeri, ne olursa. Mutlaka bir iş arıyorum, çünkü kalkıp muayenehane açıp, akılma bile gelmiyor çünkü kolay iş değil. Bu işlerden bir tanesi en enteresandı, yani.. yani dinin rolü, ben inanmazdım o zaman, ama böyle telkin ederlerdi bizden yaşlılar, işte yani başka dinden olduğumuz için farklı işlem görüyoruz. Ben buna bir türlü inanmazdım, çok Türkçüydüm, çok Türk'tüm, nasıl söylemeli.dinle hiç ilgim olmamıştı. Ama bir tanesinde artık garanti bit iş buldum, çünkü boşalacak bir kadroyu, boşalmadan evvel... [..] Bankası doktorluğu, [..] Bankasının üç tane doktoru var, bir tanesinin boşalacağını, birkaç ay sonra, sonradan o kadın, İngiltere'ye gitti döndü, Numune Hastanesine şef olarak döndü, o kadro boşalacağını ve müracaat ettim. [..] Bankası'nda da tanıdık da var. Buna rağmen reddedildim. O zaman ilk defa sarsıldım, çünkü her zaman, ee "yok, boş yerimiz yok", inanırsınız, ama ben boşalacak kadroyu, onlar bilmeden ben biliyorum, daha [..] Bankası'nın haberi yok. Diyorum ki sizde boşalacak bir kadro var, dört gün sonra boşalacak, bu kadro'ya talibim. Ondan sonra, "daha evvel oraya biz tayin yapmıştık" diye reddedildim. Veee tayin edilen de, şimdi ismini çıkaramayacağım ama iyi tanıdığım, ben ihtisas yaparken öğrenci olan Tatar bir kızdı, o tayin edildi. Tabi bunlar çok ağır geldi o yaşlarda, ne yapacağımı bilmez haldeydim. Çünkü iş lazımdı, babamı kaybettim, geçimimiz zordu, zengin değildik, hiçbir zaman zengin olmadık.

K.G.

Sol partiye vermezlerdi. Ben mesela ben her partiye veririm. İki tane aynı partiye hiç vermiyorum, hep değişik değişik. Ve şimdi de, Ak Parti zamanı, şimdi Ak parti var ya, ben şey yapmayacaktım, ver..kullanmayacaktım, hepsine mühür basıp boşa şey yapacaktım, fakat [...] şey olunca Ak Partiden olunca, bütün aileme şey yaptırıldı yani. E şimdi neden, ha öbürlerinden hiçbir istifadem olmadı, ama [...]tan istifadem şu oldu elbise diktim, paramı aldım, ekmeğini yedim hiç olmazsa.

N.E.

Babam benim hep CHP'ye oy verirdi.... yani bizim aileden hatırladığım benim o eski işte Demokrat CHP arasında bir bölünmüşlük hep vardır. Yani genellikle daha serbest çevrede çalışanlar Demokrat partiyi severlerdi, Adalet Partisi ondan sonra, sonra Özal'ı çok sevdiler, ya hep öyle bir ayırım vardı. Ticaretle uğraşanlar, ama şimdi tabi çok az kaldığı için o "sample" da çok doğru değil. Ama o tamamıyla şeydi, nedeni ekonomik tamamıyla. Çünkü genellikle daha küçük ticaret yapanların önünü açan şeyler hep o dönemlerde geldiği için, işte vergiler düştüğü için falan filan. Yani çok, daha "short term reasoning"lerle. ... İdeolojik değil.ötekinin de alışkanlık olduğunu düşünüyorum, mesela babamın hani CHP'ye oy vermesi alışkanlık olduğunu düşünüyorum. Hani okumuşlar verir, CHP'ye oy verir, cahil çünkü DP'ye öyle çıkmış. Yani cahiller, okuma yazma bilmeyenler ve işte onu sömüren üç kağıtçılar verir falan filan diye.

'1'

Söz sahibi olduğumuzu düşünmüyoruz. Ülke yönetiminde de öyle. Bizim dikkat edildiğimiz yok. 6-7 Eylül zamanında vardı mecliste birkaç kişi, sonra da yok. ... Lidere ihtiyaç duymayız. İstanbul'da Ermeni Katolik Kardinali Episkoposu var. Türkiye'deki Ermeni Katoliklerin dini lideri, en söz sahibi o. Daha ziyade İstanbul'dakiler için. ... Parti istemeyiz. Haddimizi bilip oturuyoruz. Yürümez zaten.

T.T.

Bir lider veya parti olsa bile hiçbirşey fark edeceğini düşünmüyorum. Bazı kafaların değişmesi lazım önce. Ülkeyi yönetecek düzgün bir parti olsun da, beni temsil etmesi önemli değil. Sistem bozuk.

S.O.

Yok, bizim gruplarda hiç olmamıştır. ... Birincisi hep daha fazla okumak gerektiğinden dolayı, dediğim gibi hep üstatlar vardı, yani ustalar vardı etrafta, yani babamın da tanıdığı benim de büyükler olarak gördüğüm insanlar hep usta insanlardı. Okul bitirmiş, işte doçenttir şudur budur tarzında olan insanlar değildi. Ve babam hep kafasında, işte eski milletvekillerini anlattıklarında daha kültürlü insanlar olduğunu anlatırdı. Sanırım buradan kaynaklanmıştır, ne İstanbul'da böyle bir adaylığını koyma ve seçilme ihtiyacı duyuldu, ne de Ankara'da. bildiğim hiçbir şey olmadı yani.

'1'

Olmadı böyle bir şey. Çekimsellik var Hıristiyanlarda, tercih edilmeyiz diye. Herkes kendi kabuğunda yaşıyor.

N.E.

Yani yok, hep telkin, genelde hani büyürkenki telkinim hani "öyle şeyler olunmaz" telkinim var aslında onu söylemişim geçen sefer de yani bizimkiler tedirgin olurdu hani çok, çok öne çıkma falan diye de... Yani ama ben de, ben de düşünmedim doğrusu, ben oranın insanı değilim. ... Böyle fırsatlarım oldu ama ben istemedim.

A.T.

Zaten şimdik öyle bir şey yok zaten. Hıristiyanlar öyle bir.. Eskiden mecliste Hıristiyan mebuslar vardı, şimdik yok. Yahudi mebus da vardı, Ermeni Mebus da vardı, Katolikler, Müs..Bir kaç şey, mezheplerden vardı, o Kürtlerden. Bilmem Dersim Kürtlerinden filan meclise Atatürk toplamıştı, onlardan vardı Atatürk zamanında mebus vardı, sonradan şimdi ayrıldı. Şimdi Müslüman var başka bir şey yok. Yani onun için Belediye azası, bilmem ne azası belki var, hatta İstanbul'da Şişli, şeyin mi diyorlar Belediye reisi vekili Ermeni miymiş bir şeymiş... İşte diyeceğim var amma burada biz kendimizi idare etmemiz lazım. Biz normal adam olduğumuz için, biz siyaset miyaset, biz karnımızı bugün doyuralım, şimdi hükümet bizim maaşımızı yükseltsin biz onu yiyeceğiz, onu geçineceğiz. Başka ne bir şey, bir şey bildiğim yok... evet biz de hakkat.. Türk vatandaşıyız, benim de sözüm tutulması lazım. Bazı muhtara gittiğim, amca sen ne diyorsan sen de vatanşsın. E tamam ben de diyom, bir şey demiyom. Yani bunu hep... Şu ev bizimse hepimiz burada çalışacağız, hep emeğimizle, kendi şeyimizle çalışacağız.

K.G.

Şimdi öyle bir şey ki ben evde bir oy koysam, yani bir başkalık için şey yapsam, aday olayım apartmanda kazanırım, bu dükkanda koysam bu dükkanda kazanırım. [Yerel yönetimlerde adaylık] Yani şimdi bizimki, millet biraz böyle eğlenceye düşkün olduğu için, öyle mesuliyetli işlere filan gelmez. Yani ben şimdi muhtar olsam vazifem olacak demi ben öyle diyene kadar, ben bir yere gezmeğe giderim, misafire giderim. [Parti ya da lidere ihtiyaç duyuyor musunuz?] Hıristiyanlar için mi? Ona bir lüzum yok ki yani, keşke beni bir, böyle bir Müslüman ülkede beni bir Müslüman şeyinde meclisinde böyle bir görev verirlerse bana, daha ne isteyeyim yani... Bir zamanlar vardı [milletvekilleri]... Ama o zaman da işte aday olmak için de muhakkak ya partide sözü geçen biri olacan, ya paran olacak, ya bir şey olacak... Siz de diyeceksiniz ki, paralı olan gayri-Müslim yok mu diye. Ama işte demek ki siyasete bulaşmak istemiyorlar.

K.S.

Valla başta memleketimiz bana göre kalkınacak, bir çok tabuları yıkacağız, hep iyiye doğru yönelinecek, mesela ne gibi dersin birbirimize daha çok saygılı olacağız, kanunları daha çok tanıyacağız, yere tükürmeyeceğiz, sigara atmayacağız ...

A.İ.

Türkiye çok daha iyi yerlerde olacaktır. ... Gerçekleşirse, mümkün mertebe insanların kafa yapılarının, daha müsbet olacağını, sosyal, ekonomik ve kültürel alanlarda daha ileri seviyelere ulaşılacağından eminim.

N.P.

Katılmamız gerekli halkın daha bilinçlendirilmesiyle kültür seviyesinin yükseltilmesi her toplum için faydalıdır. ... Daha çok yatırım olacak. Yatırım işsizliği ortadan kaldıracak. Fiyatlar yükselmeyecek. Gelir seviyesi yükselecek.

A.T.

Hakkaktan olsa iyi. Çünkü neden iyi, diyoruz hakkaktan, şimdiki yalnız biz orayı da batırırız gibi geliyor bana. Almanya'yı batırdık hesabı, yine aynı şekilde. Yani biz tam şeyimizi bilemiyoruz kızım. Yani ne bileyim şöyle, bizde boş gezenimiz çok. Affedersin serserimiz çok. Bilmiyorum orda da vardır, yok değildir, orda da vardır da... Yoksa hakkaktan Avrupa Birliğine girelim. Şart. Çünkü neden: Avrupa Birliğine girersek işler de açılır, ordan buraya bak, bak şimdi Rusya'dan bir sinek için sebze almıyorlarmış bizden. ... Hakkaktan bizim Türkiye bir zamanları dünyaya ekin satıyordu. Şimdi ekin alıyoruz dışardan, değil mi ekin alıyoruz. Onun için Avrupa Birliğine girmemiz lazım... Valla girdik işte, ben oraya gidecem çalışmaya, ordan buraya gelecekler çalışmaya, ondan sonra evlerimiz, onlar da buradan alacak, belki ben de gidecem ordan alacağım, şimdi alıyorlar, Türkiye'ye çok gelen var Avrupa'dan, mesela yazlık yerlerden bilmem nelerden. Bu iyi olur, yani genişleme olur, herkes serbest gider. Ben Ulus'a gider gibi ... Almanya'ya giderim, Fransa'ya giderim, İspanya'ya giderim; onlar da buraya gelir, hiç olmazsa onların parası bize gelir, bizim paramız ona. Bir parada marada bir değişiklik olabilir diyoruz. Yani iyi olur, bence iyi olur.

K.G.

Hani memlekete eğer bir faydası olacaksa girsinler, yalnız ben şeye kızıyorum, hani bizim bazı halkımızı yaptığı hatalara, diyorum ki Avrupa Birliğine rezil olmayalım yani Türk milleti olarak rezil olmayalım da almasınlar. ... E kızım öyle bir şey ki, şuradan lambadan geçiyorum, kırmızı lamba, heykel, Atatürk'ün heykelinin oradan, kırmızı ışık yanmış kalmış 20 saniye 15 saniye, bir bakıyorsun bir beyle yanında bayan, yanında ellerinde çocuğu tutmuşlar, çekistirerekten karşıya geçmeye çalışıyorlar ve sor yüksek okul mezunudur yani, giyinmiş bayan güzel, erkek yakışıklı, erkek güzeli gibi. Yani 15 saniye kala niye çekistirerekten geçiyor, ve oradan da arabalar geliyor, heykelin orası, Ulus'u biliyorsun yani. ben çok sinirleniyorum. Ha o bakımdan rezil olmayalım diye şey yapmıyorum. Yoksa, ben bu yaşıma gelmişim ben, girsek ne olur, girmesek ne olur.

E.Ş.

Ben en az 15-20 seneden önce böyle bir şeyin gerçekleşebileceğine inanmıyorum. ... Zaten onun ismi bile bir takım değişikliklerin oluşmasını sağlamış gibi gözüküyor. Ancak bizdeki en büyük fark eğitimsizlik. İşte bu açığın kapanmasının zor olduğunu düşünüyorum. İnsanlar öncelikle kendine saygı duymadan zaten başkalarına duyamaz. En azından Avrupa Birliğine bir gün katılacağız diye onların olmazsa olmaz diye önümüze koydukları 100 şeyden 70ini bile başarsak birliğe katılmasakta ülkemize çok faydası olacaktır. Zaten bence onların bize yapmaya çalıştıkları bundan ibaret olacaktır diye düşünüyorum.

T.T.

AB'nin samimi olmadığını düşünüyorum. Tümüyle menfaati nedeniyle Türkiye'yi oyaladığını düşünüyorum. AB'ye katılmadanda Türkiye'nin o seviyelere gelebileceğine inanıyorum. Türkiye'de o potansiyel var. yeter ki, yeterli eğitim, dürüstlük olsun. Yolsuzluklar kalsın. "AB" güzel ama olmasa da ilerleyebilmeliyiz. ... [Girilirse] sosyal olarak epey değişiklikler olacağına inanıyorum. Bizim insanlarımız bazı şeylerde zorlanmazlarsa adım atmıyorlar. Eğer bu gelişmelerin olması için eli sopalı bir "AB" lazımsa, olsun. Başka türlü bazı insanlara laf anlatamıyoruz. çok vicdanlı bir ülkeyiz ama çok başıbuyruk yaşıyoruz. en basiti, trafik. Çıkn trafiğe, bakın, herkes kendi kurallarını uyguluyor. Diğer insanlara saygıyı bilmiyoruz. AB ile hayatımızda bir düzen olacağını düşünüyorum ama ekonomik olarak daha iyiye gitmeyeceğimiz kesin.

N.E.

Ya şimdi Avrupa Birliği katılım sürecinde, yani Avrupa Birliğinin katılım sürecine ben inanıyorum, sürecin kendisine inanıyorum. Aslında Avrupa Birliğine katılmamız, katılmamız belki de çok önemli değil ... o süreci düzgün yaparsanız o zaman onun yararını ortaya çıkartır. Ama sürecin yani içeriğinin anlamına bakmak lazım, o süreci düzgün yapmak demek o dediklerini yapmak da demek değil. Yani onun onları "key point"leri algılayıp ona göre davranış biçimi geliştirmek demek ya da ona göre önlemler almak demek. Onun düzgün yapılması Türkiye'deki o dediğim süreci hızlandıracaktır biraz

hani ben diyorum bir türlü hızlı gitmiyor o, bu süreç, işte onu birazcık hızlandıracak bir süreç olarak görüyorum onun için olumlu. Ama Avrupa Birliğine katılmak o kadar olumlu olacak mı olmayacak mı o konuda çok emin değilim. ... Avrupalılar çok çifte standartlı, özellikle azınlıklar konusunda. ... Resolve etmediler daha. En iyi Fransa. Hollanda din ayrımını körükliyor, milliyetçi ayrımın körüklendiği bir yer Hollanda. ... Siyasi kriterler ayrı onları tartışmak gerekir. İnsanlığın gelişimi din, ırk, dil farkı gözetilmemesi, kanunların eşit uygulanması, ne kadar uyarsak o kadar olumlu. ... Süreci yaşayalım. Günü geldiğinde keşke bize sorsalar, bir bakalım desek.

S.O.

Ben Türkiye'deki azınlıklara bir artı ya da eksi gelecek diye değil, Türkiye adına ne artı gelecek diye bekliyorum. Gönülümün istediği tek bir şey var, kelimenin tek anlamıyla aslında şu geliyor dilime, ben avuç açmadan yaşayabilecekken niye bu duruma düştüm diye çok düşünüyorum. ... Çünkü Türkiye, tamam ekonomik açıdan şu an diğer ülkelere göre küçük gözüküyor olabiliriz, literatür ya da sayımlar şunlara bunlara göre, ben isterdim ki sınırlarımın hepsini kapatayım bana beş yıl ver, ben Türk olarak çalışıp her işi hallederim, kimseden de beş kuruş istemem, ama yeter ki nifak soymayın.

L.N.

Gayri-Müslimler, bence Gayri-Müslimler ister, yani Avrupa Birliğine girmek, Avrupa Birliğinin şartlarını ki, daha demokratiktir, daha çağdaştır, ve bu bütün gayri-Müslimlerin isteyeceği bir şeydir. Daha az ayırım olacaktır, ne bileyim en basit örneğini alırsak nüfus kağıdına dinin yazılması yasaktır Avrupa'da. ... Fransa'da öyle. Tamam. Bunu, bunu her gayri-Müslim ister. İsmi değiştirmek kolay ama nüfus kağıdını ne yapacaksınız yani orda dininiz yazıyor. Nüfus kağıdına dinin yazılması, Fransa'da ayıptır yani sormak ayıptır, "sen hangi dindensin" diye bir adama soramazsınız, nüfus kağıdında yazmaz zaten. Nüfus kağıdı değil de, şey belgesi neyse kimlik belgesinde. O bakımdan Avrupa Birliği bence bütün gayri-Müslimlerin isteyeceği bir şeydir, ama Türkiye bakımından bunun doğruluğu yanlışlığı o devlet katında tartışılacak ayrı bir konudur. ... Yani bu devletin, şimdiki hükümetin politikasıyla girilebileceğine ve tutulan yolun doğru olduğuna inanmak lazım. ... Bizi alacağına evvela inanmak lazım. Şimdi ben Avrupa Birliğinde söz sahibi olsam Türkiye'yi almam bir kere. Avrupa Birliğine girmek için evvela, hayır yanlış anlaşılmasın kelimelerim, ona layık olmak lazım. Ona layık olmak demek, o kuralları bilmek değil benimsemek demektir. Türkiye bence o olgunlukta görünmüyor daha. ... Eşitlik bazında. En basiti işte kadınların eşitliği bazında. Kadınların eşitliğinin tanınmadığı bir ülkede Avrupa Birliğine ne hakla girecek yani. Kadının başını bağlamak kadının özgürlüğünü kısıtlamak değil midir? Çünkü onu, erkek istediği için böyle oluyor, yoksa kadın gönüllü olduğu için, belki gönüllü olanlar da var, çünkü şu yaştan itibaren kursuna giderse olacağı budur ama öbür türüsünde erkek istediği için yani ... E böyle bir ülkenin Avrupa Birliğinde İşi ne? Yeri ne? Ama Avrupa Birliğine tabi ben taraftarım, Türkiye olarak girmesini isterim ama yani bir de layık olmak lazım. Ona layık olmak için evvelalazım. bu hükümetin Avrupa Birliğine gireceğine ben inanmıyorum. Ne onların alacağına. Uyutuyorlar. Yahut da istiyorlar böyle bir hükümeti sırf yarım yamalak Avrupa Birliğine bağlamak yani asli üye değil de özel şart, şeyleri olan. ... Bu Türkiye'yi sadece istismar etmek için bir, bir yol. ... Bugün mesela Gümrük Birliğinden kar eden onlar. Bugün Türkiye'de ziraat geri gidiyor, pamuk ekemiyorsunuz, tütün ekemiyorsunuz, diyor adam, daha fazlasını yapamazsın. ... Bu bizi yavaş yavaş yeni bir sömürge olmaya götürüyor. Türkiye Avrupa'nın sömürdüğü ve kendi mallarını kolayca ihraç ettiği bir ülke haline geliyor. ... İşte böyle büyümeyen biz, "Türkçe konuş" yanında "yerli malı kullan" ile büyüdük biz. Bizi böyle büyüttüler, Avrupa malı kullanmak nerdeyse ayıptı. Şimdi ise tamamen farklı ... Marka yoksa nerdeyse giyinmeyecek bir şeye girdik, döneme girdik, e bunlar tabi ters. Ben Avrupa Birliği'ne girmek istiyorum, bu hükümetle olmaz. ... son yıllarda kaybettiklerimizi tekrar kazanırız. Ama bunun için Avrupa'nın Atatürkçü Cumhuriyeti benimsemesi lazım. Bakıyorum da yok global İslam diye bir laf çıkardılar, o lafla gidiyorlar. E demek ki onların niyeti bozuk, bunların niyeti Türkiye'yi yamaçlarına almak, tam üye yapmadan, özel haklar vererek burayı sömürmeye devam etmek. Bu niyetle bu Avrupa Birliğine girmek olmaz, bu Türkiye'nin giderek zayıflaması olur.

CHAPTER VII

K.G.

Babam garsondu, sabahleyin 6'da giderdi, akşamleyin 10'da gelirdi, ne bayramı vardı, ne Pazar'ı vardı.... Süreyya Pavyonundan dayım işte oradan emekli. Biz oranın mesela masa örtülerini, garsonların, aşçıların, şeylerin çamaşırlarını biz yıkardık, annemle teyzem yıkardı.... Ben üçüncü sınıf geçtiğimde, ikiyi bitirip üçüncü sınıfa, mesela bir de bizim dönemimizde talebeler hiç bir zaman o

dört aylık dönemde boş gezemezdi yani. Muhakkak bir işe girecek yani, ister, yani şimdiki arkadaşlarımızın içerisinde doktor olan var, avukat olan var, tiyatrocu olan var mesela. Ha bunlar da ya terzinin yanına girecek, ya kunduracı yanına girecek, ya bir işe girecek öyle boş gezmek yok. ...Ben terzi yanına girdim. [Akrobam] değil, ama gene o da Yenikent'liydi yani, Zirliydi. Evet, onun yanında. Onun yanına ben 1949 yılında ilkokulu bitirdim. Ben ilkokulu bitirdiğimde 4 senelik terziydim. İlkokulu bitirdiğimde. Şimdi ilkokulu bitiren, giden çocuğa ekmek ver, ekmek yemeyi bilmez.... 58 yılında askere gidinceye kadar onun yanında çalıştım. Geldikten sonra kendim atölye açtım. ... atölyeye aç, ilk önce evde burada oturduğumuz yerde açtık. Evde dikiyordum, ondan sonra Denizciler caddesine gittik [...] iş hanına, iki sene demek ki 60, 61'de oraya gittik, 65'de gene [...] Hana geldim, buraya, 65'ten sonra da buradayız yani.

K.S.

Okula başlamadan evvel yani 6 yaşında dükkana gitmeye başladım. 8 yaşında 7 yaşında okula gittim zaman... Ama Gazi Lisesi ikiden terk ettim, çünkü çalışıyordum. **C.7.1.** Hem ilkokula gitmeden başladım, o zaman bizim okullarımız özellikle ilkokul hem sabah üç dersi yapardık, ondan sonra da iki ders yapardık. Ben sabah erken okula giderdim, sonra eve gelir yemeğimizi yedik, zaten yakındı orası, yokuşu iner inmez hemen Hacıdoğan'a inerdim, yemekten sonra tekrar okula giderdik, iki ders yaptıktan sonra çıkardım, Rüzgarlı Sokak'ın başında Ulus matbaasının karşısında dayımın mağazası vardı, ki o mağazayı şimdi hala devam ettiriyoruz ... Oto yedek parçası.

A.T.

Babam çıkırdı, el tornası yapardı, o şekilde çalışırdı. Topaç yapardı, topaç çocukların oynadığı topaç, hatta tabut yapardı, marangozdu yani, bu şekilde eski usulde böyle idare.. çalışırdı.... Ben kuyumcuym, idim, sanatkarım. Oradan emekli oldum. Çalıştık sanatkarlık üzerine, ondan sonra, tezgahtarlık filan çalıştık bu şekilde ve emekli olduk.... Valla biz çocuktan başladık, okuldan evvel.... Daha ondan evvel de çalıştık, ağabeylerimiz terzilikteydi filan, evde filan çalışırdı çalışırdı yani, eeee, ben şeye 38-39'da filan girdim, kuyumculuğa. Terzilik yapardı., şey çıraklığı yapardık filan, yani bizlerde yani çocuk şey etti mi hem okula gidecek hem çalışacak. Yani öğleden sonra işe giderdi, sabahleyin çalışmaya giderdi. Bu şekilde.... Ben işte o şekilde, bizim mahallede arkadaş vardı işte, ben ağabeylerin terzi, işte onların yanında çalışıyordum, sonradan Ali Usta diye birisi vardı, terzide pantolonu vardı, şuyu buyu ... Zeynel'de çalışıyordu o da Ankara'nın en büyük mağazası, Anafartalarda üç tane dükkan vardı, o zamanlar tek dükkan. Şimdi Ankara'da eskiden, banım kuyumculuğa girdiğimde dört tane kuyumcu vardı. bir tanesi Hırıstiyandı: Pier. Zaki, Zeynel, ıı adam var, bir de Karadenizli var Hololu, İbrahim Hololu, dört tane dükkan vardı.... Ondan sonra gel dedi Zeynel Ustaylan şey yapalım, gittim şey yaptım. Ondan sonra bir şekilde çıraklığa başladım.

'1'

Babam terziydi. Normal değil, köylü elbiseleri dikerdi. Seğmen, efe kıyafetleri gibi. Annem de elbiselerin kenarındaki kordonları, su taşlarını dikerdi. ... Babam askerdeyken attan düşmüş, bir ayağı sakatlanmış, ve uzun zaman çalışmadı, çok güçlük çektik. ... Ağabeyimde işte önce, askere gitmeden önce bir rakı fabrikası vardı burada, şeyde, bakayım nerde, halin arkasına düşer, o zaman şey yani müst..., şey özel bir rakı fabrikasıydı "Güzel İzmir" diye. İşte onu, ağabeyim orada muhasebeciydi, sonra ağabeyim oradan askerliğe gitti. Ticaret lisesine kadar okumuştum, üst kısma geçilmeden orta kısmından ayrılmıştı. ... Çok yetenekliydi. Hesabı kuvvetliydi, sanata çok yatkındı, okumuş olsaydı iç mimar olurdu diyor Askerlikten geldikten sonra da marangozluğa başladı, senelerce işte orada şey olarak çalıştı, sonradan kendisi işte ortağıyla beraber şey sahibi oldu. Hatta bu kilisenin oradaki bütün şeyleri, kanepeleri o yapmıştır, ağabeyim yapmıştır. Dekor çizirdi, Ankara'da pek çok evin içini çizmiştir, hatta Air France havayollarının dekorunu çizdi. ... İşte ablam terziydi, ben de terzi oldum sonradan, ben çok tahsil yapmak isterdim ama durumları yoktu yaptıramadılar, karşılayamayız dediler ... Ben çok direndim, terzi olmak istemiyordum; nakış, çiçek, resim kurslarına gittim Akşam Sanat okulunda, dikişe gitmedim. Sonra bir gün ablam yetiştirilmesi gereken bir şey için yardım istedi, bir bayram ya da özel bir gün öncesiydi, ben de yardım ettim, başlayış o başlayış. Çok çıraklar, kalfalar yetiştirdik; takımlar, döpiyesler, çok özel gelinlikler dikerdik. Yaptığımız gelinlikleri görmek için insanlar sokağa dökülürlerdi. ... [...] ailesine gelinlik diktik; radikal dinci, tarikat şeysi, Bozcaadaya sürülmüştü Atatürk aleyhine bir şeyler yaptı diye. Türbanlı insanlardı, ama Fransa'dan danteller getirttiler, çok varlıklılardı. Ankara Sanat Atölyesinin başı "ben böyle gelinlik görmedim" dedi. Aydınlıkevler'de otururlardı, bütün sülalelerine diktik kıyafet. ... Bazıları daha ufak çaptandı, bizim çok seçkin müşterilerimiz vardı.

M.T.

Bizim zamanımızda ilkokulu bitiren zordu zaten. Ben bitirdim başka ama çoğu yarından terk ederdi yani, tamamlama filan yoktu. Okumaya önem mi vermiyorlardı aileler.. Öğrenemedi mi, okumadı mı, sınıfta kaldı mı erkek çocuklarını alıp, kuyumculuğa, terziliğe, çıraklığa yolluyorlardı. Ondan sonra kızlar da olsa gene terziliğe giderdi çırak olarak, ama bizim şey, ben ilkokulu bitirdim ondan sonra kasiyer olarak mağazaya girip çalıştım. Tuhafiye mağazası. Aynı mağazada yirmi altı sene çalıştım, sonra da emekli oldum.

B.E.

Ankara'daki genelde bütün Ermeni Katolik kadınları kadın terzisiydi, ondan para kazanırlardı, kocalarına yardım etmek için, hiç kimse boş durmazdı. Kadınların genelde hepsi terziydi, benim annem, teyzem, yengem, halalarım hepsi. Dışarıya dikiş dikerlerdi, yani baya vergi levhaları olan terzilerdi.... Yani evlerinde bir odaları terzihaneydi ama, vergi levhaları falan olur.. Yani böyle hani konuya komşuya dikip üç kuruş kazanan değil, baya dikiş dikerlerdi.

K.G.

Şimdi evvelden pantolonları pantoloncular dikerdi, yani o zaman bir overlok makinesi yok, bir paça makinesi yok, bir ilik makinesi yok, bunları bayanlar evde el işi yaparlardı. Mesela bir pantolon üç saatte dikiliyorsa üç saatte de el işisi var onun, bunları evde bayanlar yaparlardı.... Dışardaki kızlar yapardı, el işçi kızlar yapardı, mesela bizim hanım gibi...şimdi evde, çalışmıyor da yani. ama kendisi kız sanat okulunun iki senelik bölümünü bitirdi. Ondan sonra yani kızken bitirmiş.... sonra bir özel bir dikiş yur., şeyinde 10 ay da oradan sertifikası var yani, diploması var, oradan da var. Hani ama yapmadı yani bize yardım etti, bize yardım etti.... sonra bir özel bir dikiş yur., şeyinde 10 ay da oradan sertifikası var yani, diploması var, oradan da var. Hani ama yapmadı yani bize yardım etti, bize yardım etti.... benim şimdi işlerim sıkı olmuş olsa, hanım burada yani bir kalfanın yaptığı işi, ütü işlerini de yapar, makine işini de yapar.

E.Ş.

Bu işi 1988 den beri yapıyoruz. Okul zamanlarından beri her fırsat bulduğumuzda dükkandaydık. Bizi yönlendiren tabiki babamız oldu, kendi mesleğinin devam etmesini istiyordu, bize de bu iş enteresan ve de özel geldiği için bunu kabul ettik. Şu anda 59 senelik bir firmaya sahibiz ve bunun herkese nasip olmayacağını düşünüyoruz çünkü iyi bir ismimiz var.

A.T.

Yani bizim Hıristiyanların ekserisi yani sanat üzerine, şey üzerine, yani kuyumculuk filan yani. Yani memuriyet aklımıza gelmez, çünkü olmayız hesabına. Yok ben memur olayım, yok müdür olayım. Eskiden bankalara da alınmazdı şey de olmazdı, bilmem ne olmazdı. Onun için hiçbir yere de heves gitmezdik. Diyeceğim bizlerde kadınlarda terzi, terzi kuyumculuk, marangoz. ...Çünkü mesela senin arkadaşın kuyumcuysa, ben seni alırım, ben şey yaparım, şu şekilde...

T.T.

Babama yardımcı olmak için seçtim. Babamın güvenebileceği birisine ihtiyacı vardı. Ben tek çocuğum ve benden başkası olamazdı. Mesleğimi devam ettirmek isterdim. Bir süre özel sektörde çalıştım. Maalesef Türkiye'de özel sektör o sıralar çok olumsuzdu. Devlet dairesine girme hakkım olmadığı için, özel sektörde de aldığım eğitimimin karşılığını alamadığım için aile işine yöneldim. İşimden çok memnunum. Babam mesleğe ilk orada 10 yaşında başlamış. Çok başarılı bir öğrenci iken okuldaki bir öğretmenin babama ismi ve içinde olduğu toplum nedeniyle farklı davranması sonucu babam ilkokuldan sonra okumayıp sanata yönelmeye karar vermiş ve o zamanlar Anafartalar caddesinde şu anda hayatta olmayan dayısının yanında sanat öğrenmeye başlamış.

K.G.

[Çocuklarımla terzi olmalarını] İstemedim. Ve devamlı uzaklaştırdım buradan. Hiçbir hayatı olmaz ki, emek işinde hiçbir hayatı olmaz

A.K.

İlkokul. Sonra çalışmaya başladık, çırak olarak çalıştık, tuhafiyeye üzerine. Perakende satışında bulunuyorduk. Öyle, öyle büyüdük... Tabi, tabi, askere gidinceye kadar çalıştık, sonra asker oldum işte, askerlik yaptım.... Meslek, bir mesleğim yoktu. Yani meslek olarak bir şey yoktu. Tuhafiyeye mağazasında çalıştım, tezgahtar olarak. Vitrin de yapardım....57'de işte kendi dükkanımızı açtık, tuhafiyeye...

H.A.

Pek eğitim imkanı olmadığı için hep ticarete yönelmiş, yani Musevi cemaati. Her, daha sonra değil mi Kızılay'da yavaş yavaş dükkanlar almaya başladılar, değil mi baba. Yani eskiden Atatürk Bulvarında dükkanların bir çoğu Musevilerindi, yani hep hazır giyim üzerine. ... Mobilyacı vardı bir tane galiba, döşemeci vardı, perdecisi, ve bebe mağazaları. Hep hazır giyim üzerine. Yani mesela Ermeni azınlık daha çok kuyumculuk üzerine yoğunlaşmış... Bizde hazır giyim, konfeksiyon...Terzilik falan. Mesela kayınvalidem kız kardeşleriyle gömlek dikerlermiş, üç kız kardeş gömlek dikerlermiş ve o zaman, o zamanın Ankara'sı bütün, e hazır gömlek tabi şimdiki gibi yoktu bütün milletvekilleri, bütün böyle üst düzey bürokratlar hep onlara diktirirlermiş gömlekleri. 3 kız kardeş veya 4 kız kardeş, Kızılay'da şeyleri varmış, "Gömlekçi kardeşler" derlermiş onlara... Yani erkek çocuklar da babalarının iyi bir şeyi varsa hani bir dükkan, iş yeri filan, onlar da yine liseyi bitirip hani babalarıyla çalışmayı tercih ettiler. Mesela benim Ağabeyim her zaman mühendis olmak isterdi, o İstanbul'da okudu, Teknik Üniversite'de, elektrik mühendisi oldu. Ama dediğim gibi yani bir, mesela ticareti hiçbir zaman sevmeydi o, mesela babam isterdi gelsin dükkana yardım etsin falan, hiçbir zaman düşünmedi ticareti mesela, hep öbür alana kaydı. O yüzden ticarete hani ilgisi sevgisi olan bir de hani kurulu bir işyeri, bir dükkan varsa babaların işlerine baba-oğul birlikte çalışmak şeklinde devam ettiler. De var öyle çok.

L.N.

Dedem İstanbul'dan geldi 1929'da, yani annemim babası. Yani burada iş kurmak için işte, yeni hükümet merkezi, bir takım iş sahaları var... Üç kızını beraber getirdi. İki kızı bekardı, büyük kızı, annem, evliydi. Dedemin işte bir, bir imalathanesi vardı. Teneke işleriyle... Babam oranın muhasebecisi olarak çalıştı. Dedem imalathanesinde çalışıyordu, burada bir ara orman çiftliğinin yoğurt hanesi vardı, o yoğurt hanede küçük, yarım ve birer kiloluk teneke kutular içinde yoğurt yapılır, Ankara'da en makbul, en iyi yoğurt yapan yerd, onları, küçük ... onun imalathanesi, o kutuları yapar çiftliğe verirdi. Yani böyle bir ilişkisi oldu... Babam sonra, o işten sonra, kendi başına ayrı bir alet edevat satan bir dükkan açtı, Samanpazarı'nda, çünkü o zaman orası işlek bir yerd. ... Merkez Lokantasının muhasebecisi olarak çalıştı Orman Çiftliğinde. Bunun dışında gene bir süre Ankara Palas'ta çalıştı... muhasebesi olarak.

N.E.

Babamın babası Osmanlı bankası'nda çalışmış, muhasebedeymiş, onun için de babam benim samsun'da doğmuş, amcam bir yıl sonra Trabzon'da doğmuş. Oralarda Osmanlı Bankasında dolaşıyorlarmış aslında. Ben Ankara'da doğdum. Babam Demir Yollarında çalıştığı için yüksek mühendis olarak, Demiryollarında çalışıyordu, Türk Devlet Demir Yollarında, demiryolu hastanesinde doğdum.... Anne tarafım İstanbul'dan. İstanbul'da işte Harbiye'de bir Modern Mefruşat açılıyor, annemin babası orada çalışıyor. Sonra bir ara Ankara'ya geliyorlar, Modern Mefruşatı kuruyorlar. Ankara'dayken işte babamla birlikte oluyorlar vesaire, hani öyle evleniyorlar Ankara'da. Sonra annemin babası tekrar İstanbul'a dönüyor mefruşatçı olarak.... Babam İstanbul Teknik mezunu, ilk mezunlarından biri. Onların, yani baba tarafının aile daha mütevazı; annemin işte babası birazcık daha zengin, hani işte mef.. mobilyacı, Modern Mefruşat, mefruşat işleri falan hani, o işlerden dolayı. Baba tarafım daha mütevazı ama baba tarafı geleneksel olarak hep eğitilmiş. Anne tarafı çok öyle değil, yani anne tarafı daha az eğitilmiş. Baba tarafı da hep, işte şeye bakarsanız muhasebeciymiş işte onun babası, babamın babası, babam mühendis, amcam doktor, tıp doktoru, o da Ankara Üniversitesi, İstanbul Üniversitesinden doktor. Yani öyleyle bakarsanız, onlar ama daha mütevazı parasal olarak, annemler birazcık daha iyi, ticaretle uğraşıyorlar; yani daha geleneksel, hani bizim Yahudiler, Türkiye'deki Yahudiler genellikle ilgileniyorlar.

T.T.

Bazen evet.... Bizim meslek ata mesleği... Gerçekten bu işe çok yatkın bir topluluğuz. El becerisi isteyen bir iş...

A.İ.

Mensubu olduğumuz cemaatin iştiğal ettiği meslek genellikle kuyumculuktur. Sanatkar olduğumuzdan bizi beğenenler çoktur.

K.G.

Hepsi bilir. Olmayana da söylerim. Zaten ona söylerim, ondan zaten bir istifade ediyoruz kar ediyoruz yani. ... Tabi. Bu dindeki insanlar düz..., doğru olur derler, yani hile yapmıyorlar diye, daha da sayıyorlar, şey yapıyorlar... Evet, böyle düşünüyorlar. Hepsi de öyle düşünür, hepsi de öyle düşünür. Çünkü öyle bir şey ki, mesela Müslümanların içerisinde çok doğruları var, çok doğruları var ama şimdi, e tabi nüfus kalabalık olduğu için, doğrusu kadar da eğrisi de var ... E bizimki az olduğu için göze batıyor. ... Ya şimdi şöyle biraz evvel izah ettim de, mesela Hıristiyanlıkta el emeği, mesela bizim Ermenilerde diyelim ki el işi, Rumlarda diyelim yemek işi, onlarda böyle yemeklerde, restoranlarda, Yahudilerde ticaret işi, e şeylerde de tarım işi mesela. e hiçbir Hıristiyan'ın, hiçbir Yahudi'nin, hiçbir şeyin bir ekin ektiğini gördün mü yani, bir hayvancılık mesela, işte Allah herkese böyle bir şey vermiş... Eee bir yetenek vermiş, herkes bir şeyi seçmiş yani. ... Bir de şöyle bir şey var, hani bizim millet eli daha yatkındı, bu Müslümanlar, hanımları filan pek elişiye yatkın değildi elleri onların. Bizim yani gayri-Müslimlerin, Rumların olsun, şeylerin olsun, bizim el emekleri çok daha fazla.... hepsi de gayri-Müslim kadınlar yapardı yani. Diyelim ki 20 tane el işçi varsa bu Hacıdoğan'da, bunun on dokuzu hep şeydi, gayri-Müslimleri yani.

K.S.

İnşallah senin için de kıvanç olur, "sizler doğru olursunuz, namuslu olursunuz" diye iltifatlar görürüm ve tercihler vardır yani. Mesela K. Ş. Allah rahmet eylesin, öldü. Sayın [...]'nin terzisiydi, var böyle bir şeyler. Mesela çok eskiden Hacıdoğan'ın göbeğinde, O.İ.T. diye, bilahavelet bir beyefendi vardı, şahane bir terziydi, erkek terzisi, o zamanın yani bundan 60 sene evvel, bütün parlamentonun, bütün bakanlarına, mebuslarına elbise diken bir arkadaştı Ermeni asıllı...

S.O.

Halalarım, iki halam da evde dikerdi. Hatta büyük amcam da, babamın küçüğü olan amcam da onlara yardım ederdi.... Onun da el becerileri varmış. O da erkek pantolonları dikermiş. Onun da el becerisi varmış, o da onlara... Hatta bir ara Fransa'ya gidip gelmiş bu konuda bir minik eğitim alıp gelmiş oradan. Ondan sonra, sonrasında işte burada halalarımınla birlikte işte bir dönem durmuş sonradan esnaf oldu o. Bu iş çok zor, çok emek gerektiriyor diye. ... Halalarım Ankara çapında ünlüydü, elçiliklerden dikiş için insanlar gelirdi. ... Telefonla randevu alınırdı. Elçiliklerden genellikle sekreter hanımlar ararlardı, işte bugün şu saate gelebilir mi diye, halacığım da onlara randevu verirdi, onlar da çıkar gelirlerdi.... Sanırım bu daha öncesinden kalan bir şey, ne denir o, miras. Öyle diyelim hani bir bilgi var ki öyle buluyorlar, çünkü ben hatırladım hatırlayalı özel arabalarla insancıklar gelir, girerler, provalarını olurlar, çıkar giderlerdi. Ama bunu hani kartını mı bıraktı ben terziyim diyerekten olduğunu zannetmiyorum. ... Halalarımın öğrendiği iş yani terziliği onlar İstanbul'dan öğrenmişler. İstanbul'da büyük halalar, ya da işte teyzeler kim vardysa bilmiyorum, onlar sarayda bu işi yapıyorlarmış. Daha sonra da teyze, halalarım bunlardan öğrenmişler. ... Orada şu an rahmetli olan, Fransa'ya giden büyük halalar vardı, onların yanına giderdi, giderler., ben ilkokuldayken, tabi, ilkokuldayken de onlar Fransa'dan geldiklerinde bir dönem İstanbul'da Sarıyer'deki eski oturdukları evleri ziyaret etmeye filan gidelerdi, buradan halalarım da giderdi. Öyle anılar tazelenirdi yani. ... Yani o dönemlerde saraylarda biliyorsunuz hep şeyler, Hıristiyan kökenli üstatlar iş yaparlarmış gerek yazı konusunda, gerekse terzilik, ne bileyim işte nalbantlık şu bu falan gibi, o dönemlerden de halalarım da terziliklerini öğrenmişler.

V.T.

Babam çok çalışkandı. 5'ten daha geç kalktığını hatırlamıyorum, çok çalışkandı, inanılmaz çalışkandı. Tuğla ocakları İmrahor vadisindeydi, ortağı ile beraber çalışırdı. Kimse daha yokken kamyonetinin arkasına yükler götürürdü bizi de. Ben ticareti çok sevmişimdir. Öğle yemekleri fiş karşılığı verirdi sıra için, ben o işe bakardım. ... Hatta bir anımı hatırlarım, örfi idare vardı ihtilal döneminde (1960). Çok şık giyinirdi, kolalı gömlekler, cilalı gömlekler giyinir ve beklerdi, örfi idarenin kalkmasını beklerdi. 5'tesyse 5'te, 6'daysa 6'da. işe giderdi kimse gelmemiş olurdu ve sinirlenirdi, küfürbaz bir tipti, kızardı.

B.E.

Yani babamın düşüncesine göre dükkan komşusundan önce dükkanı açması lazımdı, dükkan komşusundan sonra dükkanı açarsa “utanırım” derdi. “Ben dükkan komşumdan önce açmalıyım.” Yani geç açılan bereket olmaz gibi düşünürdü, hatta “üstüne güneş doğmayacak” derdi. Sabah oldu mu, üstüne güneş doğmadan kalkıp işine gideceksin derdi. Ve o zaman, şimdi de belki vardır yine, bu At Pazarının meydanda Pazar vardı, Salı Pazarı, o Salı Pazarından mutlaka erzakımızı alır gönderirdi, dükkandaki çalışan işçilerle ya da hamallarla, o gelen hamal mutlaka bizde bir kahve içmiş olması lazımdı ya da karnı doyurulmuş olması lazımdı, döndüğünde o işçiye sorarmış “yengen sana ne yaptı” diye, eğer rast gelip de bir gün bir şeysi kayarsa, eşyayı getiren kişiye evde bir izzet-i ikram yapılmamışsa akşama kıyamet kopardı. Halbuki, “başka herkese herkes ikram yapar, ama benim sana eve yolladığım işçime ikram yapman marifet”. Onlar da çok severlerdi.

B.E.

Yok, alış veriş ederdik. Mesela onlar elektrikçi, tuhafiyeci filandılar. Yani onlar bizimkiler gibi dikiş mikiş değil, bizde erkekler de dikiş dikerdi. Yani genelde erkekler erkek elbisesi dikerdi, pantoloncu, ceketçi, yelekçi, ayırılır ya erkek kıyafetleri öyleydi. Onlar da sanatkar değil, onlar esnaftr hep. Yani alıp satanlar. Onlar birazcık daha akıllıymış. (Gülüyor). ... Ben çok iyi hatırlıyorum bir şey vardı, böyle Yahudi mağaza, annemler dikiş diktiği için onlardan fermuar, ibrişim, düğme almaya giderdim. Elektrikçiler filan vardı, onları hatırlıyorum. Ama, şimdi hiç yok değil var, ama çok az galiba.

K.G.

Hiç de yok. Bağdaşamazdık niyeyse yani. başka dinlerle pek şey olmuyor. Yahudiler biraz ticaret adamıydı yani, bizimkiler de emek üzerineydi. Pek şeyimiz olmadı yani. Belki de bizim fakirler, çünkü Yahudiler daha zengindi yani. Hepsi mağaza sahipleri olunca onların kazancı fazlaydı belki, bizimkiler emek olduğu için azdı. Belki de onlar şey olunca birbirine uyum sağlamadı yani. ben hiçbir Yahudi'nin bizim eve geldiğini ben hatırlamam. Ama bizim oturduğumuz ev sahibimiz vardı, ev sahibi de, mesela... misafirliğe gittiği zaman kadın, kocası da biraz genç ölmüştü, çocuklarını bize bırakırdı. Çocuklarını bize bırakırdı. Yani hiç... Ama bir Yahudi bize pek şey yapmadı.

E.Ş.

Daha öncede söylediğim gibi bizler insanları din ve cematlerine göre değerlendirmeyiz. Eğer karışımzdaki insan bizim güvenebileceğimiz bir kişiye dini ne olursa olsun bizim için farketmez. Tabiki onlar içinde farketmiyorsa. ... [İşçi tercihi] Kesinlikle hayır. Bizim mağazamızda özellikle babamızın yanında adedini hatırlayamayacağım kadar dini müslüman olan kişiler çalışmıştır. Bizim cematte sadece bir kişi hatırlıyorum. ... İstanbulda bu konuda eskiden zannediyorum daha katıydılar ama artık o katılığında biraz gevşediğini düşünüyorum. ... Herhangi bir örnek hatırlamıyorum. Ama tabiki sanat ermenilerin zekada Yahudilerindir. Bunun aksini kolay kolay kimse söyleyemez. Bu insanlarda tahmin ediyorum bazı şeyleri (bazı püf noktalarını) müslümanlarla paylaşmak istememiş olabilirler, çünkü geçmişdede maalesef görüldüğü gibi bazı şeyler paylaşılmaktan çıkmış. Arkadaş, dost denmeden çok acı ve müessif olaylar yaşanmıştır. Belki de onların bir sürü şeyi paylaşmamalarının altında bu olaylar yatıyor olabilir.

T.T.

Güvendiğim insan olmasını tercih ederim. Cemaat beni ilgilendirmez. ... [işçi tercihi] etmem. Güvendiğim kişi olduktan sonra benim için fark etmez. Yeter ki o da beni onu gördüğüm gibi görsün. ... Evet. Ben çocukken zaman zaman bazı şeylerin her yerde uluorta konuşulmaması, kendimizi çok fazla öne çıkarmamamız söylenirdi. Çok eskiden yaşanan bazı olaylardan dolayı topluluk içinde tedirginlikler hala var.

B.T

Şimdi Müslümanlar da çok, Müslüman da yani, ben size şöyle söyleyeyim benim alışverişi yaptığım mesela esnafın üçte ikisi Müslüman artık, yani üçte biri Ermeni, onlar çok şey oldular, yani azaldılar bir, bir de İstanbul'daki sermaye biraz daha böyle hacıların hocaların eline döndü biliyor musunuz. Ondan dolayı gayri-Müslimlerde pek öyle şey yok, ha onlar da şöyle sanatkar, mesela mıhlama işi,, mıhlama dediğimizi anlatabiliyor muyum, o pırlantanın takılması filan şunlar bunlar işlerinde hala çoğunluk onlardır.... Biraz işte o yeşil sermaye dedikleri var ya, o İstanbul'da biraz daha çok efendim, yani bizim meslekte de var, bizim meslekte de var, onlar daha sermayeli hareket ediyorlar, şu anda çok sivrilenenler var bu konuda. Yani mesleki olarak çok sivrilenenler var. Her işin başı bir kere ben size bir şey söyleyeyim, ticarete her işin başı sermayedir. Sermaye olmadığı müddetçe

hiçbir şey olmaz, yani ben şuraya isterseniz Ankara'nın yarısı tanıdığım olsun, gelsin dükkanda istediği çeşidi sunamazsam bir kere gelir, üç kere gelir ondan sonra kayar gider, yani onun için işin başı sermaye. Bunlar da ağırlıkta. Ha şöyle de söyleyeyim ben size, Müslüman olup da ortakları Ermeni olanlar çoğunlukta yine İstanbul'da, beraber de götürüyorlar işi yani, beraber götürüyorlar... Şimdi ben size şöyle söyleyeyim, gene ortaklıkları var yok değil, ama eskisi kadar değil, çünkü Müslümanlarda şimdi hepsi her şeyi bilir, onlar da öğrendiler. Ha bazı kritik, bu mıhlama işinin de çok fazla şeyi vardır, yani Alaturkası mıhlaması vardır, moderni vardır filan, yine de kritik noktalarda Ermeniler yine de başı götürüyor yani, götürüyor.

S.O.

Babamdan yana böyle bir şey hiç duymadım, onun ağzından da duymadım, benim halam da terzidir ondan da duymadım. O dönemlerde mesela halama yardımcı olan birisi vardı, amaç sadece altın bilezik kazanmaktı. Çünkü bu biraz önce söylediğim gibi, kültür derken illa okul kültürüyle ilgili değil bu, eğer siz insanlara iyi şeyler vermeyi beceriyorsanız, karşıdaki de hani kelimenin tam tabiriyle çığ süt emmediyse bunu çok rahat görüyor. Ve o zaman size her konuda kol kanat geriyor, hani din olayı tümüyle ortadan kalkıyor. Ama içinde art niyeti olan tabi neler dünür, neler söyler onu bilemem... Ama ne babamın zamanında ne halamın zamanında hiçbir şekilde rastlamadım, tam tersine eti benim kemiği benim bunu öğrensin, bundan başka bir şey çıkmayacak deyip babama teslim edilenleri bilirim mesela... Çünkü o dönemlerde Ankara'da usta sayısı son derece azmış ve yanında ustayı yetiştiresin diye, okulda hani öğretmene emanet edilir gibi babama emanet edilmiş. Al sen yetiştir diye, e malum erkek çocukları dav çok meraklıdır. Bir çok, gerek Hıristiyan çocukları, gerekse Müslüman ailelerin çocukları tarafından çok yetişmiş şeyleri vardır, talebeleri vardır babamın evet, şu an hala "onun sayesinde ekmek yiyoruz" diyen birçok insan vardır.

B.E.

Şimdi herkes çok marifetli ama eskiden bizim el işlerimiz çok geçerliymiş, mesela o tiftiklerden filan kendimiz, nasıl köylerde eğeyle eğiriyoruz... Annemler gençliklerinde, anlatırdı, öyle yünleri eğirerek, şallar yaparak, satarak geçinmişler. El işi. mesela iğne oyaları... Ama genelde dikiş, dikiş dikerlerdi, yani dikişte de üstünlerdi. hatta ben şimdi Saman Pazarında bir terziye dikiş diktiririm, ne zaman gitsem yetiştirdiği ustasına dua eder. O da Gayrimüslim birisinin yanında yetişmiş... Hep ismiyle söyler "ustam" diye. De devamlı dua eder ki bana bu mesleği öğretti diye, şu anda da Ankara'da tek kalmıştır. Yani onun gibi el işi diken, mesela şimdi dikiş dikiyorlar ama makineyle ilik açıyorlar, yakalara yapışkan tela koyuyorlar, bu öyle değil, bu kendisi telayı koyar eskiden el işiyle işlerlerdi, öyle işler, ilikler parça iliktir filan, benim dikişlerim, o diker ve her gittiğimde söyler... Zaten işini bıraktığı zaman kalfasına bırakırdı, ben bu terzihaneyi kapatıyorum diye kapatmazdı, bu de, bahsettiğim adamcağıza da aynı işi yapmış, o Gayrimüslim kişinin yanında öğrenmiş, o ihtiyarlamış artık işini bırakırken, sana bırakıyorum diye iş yerini kalfasına bırakmış, en çok duayı da oradan ediyor zaten müşteri hazır olan bir yere al, buyur, otur, çalış, ne kadar güzel bir şey.

H.Ö.

Bir sorun yok. Biraz daha dikkatli olabiliriz belki, konuşmalarımızda, kavga gürültü mümkün olduğunca yapmamaya çalışırız, azınlık olduğumuz için belki.

A.K.

Arkadaşlar arasında tabi toplanırdık Kızlar erkekler dans ederdik... Evlerde toplanırdık... Burada bir arkadaşım vasıtasıyla tanıştım, İstanbul'da olan bir arkadaşım, o, o tavsiye etmişti, o tanyordu. Bizi o tanıştırdı.

A.T.

Eeee, ağabeyim, bunun ablasına, yalnız bunlar iki kardeş... Diyeceğim bunlar hep beraber şey olurdu, ağabeyim büyüğünü aldı işte, ondan sonra gide gele, ama aynı mahalledeyiz... Diyeceğim bu şekilde evlendik. Otururduk, bir yere gidilecek, gazinoya, bir yere gidilecek, abim gidiyosa "hadi A. sen de gidecek misin, tamam" tek gidilmezdi, yanımızda, dans edecegiz, bir şey lazım. Bunlan, derdik "hadi M. sende". Diyeceğim sağ olsun Angara'dan evleneceğim, gittim Kayserilere kadar gittim evleneceğim diye, en sonunda geldim bunu aldım. Diyeceğim bizde bu şekilde, birbirleriyle evl... Nişanlılık bizde çok iyiydi. ... Sizler, bazısı gezmek de yoktur, aman şöyle olsun, aman böyle olsun. İnanmazsın, yine şurda şey var da [kayıt cihazı] konuşamıyorum bazı şeyleri, bizde nişanlılar... Şimdi nişanlılıkta, Çarşamba günü nişanlının evine gideceksin. ... Çarşamba günü ve Cumartesi. Pazar. Biz ikimiz beraber aynı yerde çalışırdık, şimdi bunu akşam saat 7'de, o dükkanda, ben dükkanda

Zeynel'de çalışırdım, Sus sineması vardı orda da hanım çalışırdı, giderdim onu alırdım, ikimiz beraber... Evvela buradan onların evi, onların evini geçince benim evim burada. Onlara uğrarız, işte "ben gidiyorum", "dur bir dakikaya" kaynana çıkar yahut kayınpeder çıkar: "ee A. nereye gidiyorsun" "e ben gidiyorum" "gel oğlum gel". Ya derdik çağırırsalar da nişanlımızla bir arada olsak, yiyelim içelim. Bizde de damada geline hürmet çoktur. Damat geldimiydi "hadiii yiyelim içelim". Bizde yemek sofrası içkili olur. Bilirdin ki aileynen içeceğiz, şöyle olacak böyle...Bakardım ki orası daha kuvvetli, "ben geliyom peki, eve haber vereyim de geleyim". Diyeceğim Çarşamba günü, gelin, şey nişanlısı, kız bir yere gidemez, düğüne müğüne hiçbir şeye, nişanlısı olmadan hiçbir yere gidemez.... Cumartesi günü akşam. Yine muhakkak nişanlıyla gideceksin. Elin ağır, şeyli olacak. Yiyecekler, bir şey, meyve götürürsün bilmem ne filan. Öyle. Derler ki "erken gel de işte yemeğe de beklerim". Ertesi gün Pazar, sabahleyinden gayı bir program, bazısı şöyle kıskanç, şey yapar "e senin yanına çocuğu da koyak, torunumuzu da koyak". Yalnız kaçmaya meraklıydık. Akşama kadar bunlar, nişanlılar gezebilir, yerler içerler, gece de on ikide birde alır getirirsin evine teslim edersin. Bizde nişanlılık, ama nişanlılık... Diyeceğim aileler birleşir hep yemekler bilmem, yılbaşında.. Böyle nişanlılar oturur, nişanlıyı bırakırsın gezsinler, dolaşsınlar, şey yapınlar diye. Kız da ayrı gezemez oğlan da ayrı gezemez. Bizde mesela kız istemeye gittiğin zaman güzel ya altın takılır; istemeye gidince gayrı içkili bir masa olacak, gayet oturulacak, damat bir tarafta işte nişanlısı bir tarafta, rakı vereceksin, içkiler miçkiler, bu şekilde isteme olur.ondan sonra verme, bir de kız evi yapar, oğlan evine karşılığını yapar. Ziyafetler başlar gari ondan sonra...

S.O.

E flörtler olabilir diyebilirim, şöyle diyebilirim, kiliseden dolayı birbirimizi tanıyoruz orada çeşitli toplantılar yapıyoruz, gençler bir araya geliyoruz filan, orada tanışıklıktan dolayı. Ama çok böyle sevda çekerekten evlilikleri olduğu bir ortama sahip değiliz.... [Biz] Kilisede karşılaştık, ondan sonra da işte, sohbetler muhabbetler sonrasında aileden istenir, aile de tasvip edince ben de görüşmeyi kabul ettim, görüştük. Sonrasında da evlilik oldu.

S.O.

Şimdi orada bir şekilde çalışmak için giden yeni nesil, hayatını bir düzene soktuktan sonra evliliği yine Türkiye'den yapmak istiyor. ... İşte evlenmek istedikleri zaman ailelerine söylerler, aynı şekilde devam ediyor. Orada yaşıyorlar, hayatlarını düzene soktuklarına inandıkları zaman, burada ailelerine haber veriyorlar, ve aileler bakıyor ha bu bize uyar, bu oğlumuzu mutlu eder hesabı geliyorlar, isteme oluyor, arkasından işte düğün hazırlıkları falan derken alıp götürüyorlar.

B.E.

Öyle sevme sevişme değildi, sanki görme usulü gibi oldu, beni kilisede gördüler eve geldiler istediler filan, ondan sonra zaten eşim de Süryani Katolik, yani Süryani değil, o Süryani Katolik, Mardin'den geldi, genelde çünkü oranın halkı Süryani, Keldani ya da Süryani Katolik. Eşim Süryani Katolik. ... Benim gelinim de, İstanbul'dan aldık ama, onun da ailesi Mardinli, İstanbul doğumlu. Babasıyla Kayınpederi ilkokul sınıf arkadaşymış.

H.Ö.

Eşim Antakyalı Rum Ortodoks'u. Babası Rum Ortodoks, annesi Katolik. Görücü usulü tanıştık, gezmeye gittiğimizde oraya (Antakya'ya) kına gecesi gibi bir şeye gittiğimizde gördük, istettik. Ailesi geldi buraya, araştırdı, gerçekten kuyumcu mu değil mi diye, münasip gördüler herhalde verdiler.

'1'

Bizim cemaatte oldu Müslümanlarla evlenenler, gelin alanlar özellikle. Ailemizde düşünmedik ama biz. Yeğenlerimin çok arkadaşları oldu üniversitede, hep bir mesafeyi korudular onlar; komşularımız dan isteyenler oldu, onaylamadık biz. Mezhepleri de ayırırdık biz gençken. Ablama talip oldu ermeni Gregoryen biri, istemedik. Ablam Pedere sormuş ne yapayım diye, peder onaylamamış, beş on senelik bir mutluluk için mezhebenden vazgeçme demiş. O da istemedi. Beni de daha yeni terzilik yaptığımız zaman bir avukat istemiş evlenmeyi. Müslüman olduğu için babam da istemedi, ben de istemedim. Şimdi mezhep ayrımı yapılmıyor artık, çok az kalındı çünkü. Mahallemizde Müslüman'la evlenen var şimdi. ... Uyum olmaz, herşey sorun olur hayatta, o benim dinim der öbürü benim dinim.

A.T.

Kızım hakkaktan şey oluyor, bak şimdi, mesela burada Keçiören'de oturan bizim bir akrabamız var, Müslüman'la evli. Bir gün geldi bu "A. ağabey ne olacak şimdi bizim çocuklar, din öğrenmeleri için

camie mi göndereceğiz, kiliseye mi". Valla "Sen artık Müslümansın, kocan Müslüman, çocukları da camie göndereceksin" ve çocuklar camie gittiler. Diyeceğim böyle şeyler oluyor; çocuklar sorun oluyor; çocuk hangi dinden olacak? Böyle sorunlar oluyor.

V.T.

Benim eşim Müslüman, bir asker kızı, ama çocuklarım Hıristiyan, zaten o şartla evlendim. ... Benim zaten ailem yoktu o zaman, ama olsalardı evlenemezdim, onu biliyorum. Ben eşimle bulutların üzerinde filan yaşamış değilim, ancak bütün evliliğimiz boyunca hakkında tartışmadığımız tek bir konu varsa, o da dindir. Ben zaten dinsizim, eşim de çok dindar biri değil, ve bu konuda hiçbir tartışma yaşamadık, herkes kendisine göre hareket eder. Onun ailesi için de sorun olmadı, üstelik de bir asker ailesi, sıradan bir aile de değil. Sıradan derken yani babası asker, onların kuralları çok daha katı olur, dedeleri paşa. Yani öyle bir aile. Bu bir kültür seviyesi, yani belli bir noktadaki insanlarla bunları konuşabiliyorsunuz. Benim çok milletvekili, bakan, bürokrat arkadaşım var, nasıl sizinle böyle konuşabiliyorsak, onlarla da konuşabiliyoruz.... [Çocuklar] İlerde ne yapacaklarını bilmiyorum, ben sadece bir kimlik vermek istedim. Çünkü Hıristiyanlığın daha açık olduğunu düşünüyorum, daha ilerici, daha liberal, daha demokratik... Onların daha rahat etmelerini istediğim için, onların da böyle olmalarını istediğim için... Birkaç kere kiliseye götürdüm, çünkü görsünler istedim; keşke anneleri de alıp camie götürseydi de onu da görselerdi, ama götürmedi, ben götürdüm. Bunu dindar bir insan olduğum için yapmadım, çünkü zaten dinsizim.

S.O.

Yani, hani bilmiyorum belki Müslümanlar tarafından da çok istenmiş olsaydık, öyle bir şey de gündeme gelir miydi bilmiyorum ama, hani saygıdan dolayı hiçbir şekilde de öyle bir şey olmadı. Yani hiç öyle bir şey gelmedi.... Hıristiyan ailelere saygı çok vardı. Müslüman ailerden. Anlatabildim mi? Belki ondan dolayı bir şey gelmiyor, hani onların şeyi öyle kalsın.... Saygısızlık olarak addedilebilirdi bu, çünkü babalarımız hep böyle çok sayılan insanlardı. Ve ondan dolayı bir kapı çalma olmamıştır diye düşünüyorum. ... Evet, yani ben öyle düşünüyorum. Çünkü hiç yaşamadım, başka arkadaşlarım da yaşamadı sonuçta dünya kadar benim yaşıtı olan genç kız vardı etrafta, hani hiçbirisi de beni şu Müslüman aile istedi falan demedi. Demedi, ha bunun altında şöyle bir şey yatabilir, siz sormadan ben söyleyeyim, bizim dinsel olarak çok katı olmadan ama çok huzurlu bir şekilde ilerliyor olmamız, ailelerine bir Hıristiyan gelin geldiği taktirde onun Müslüman olası gerektiği, Hıristiyan ailenin bunu kabul etmeyeceğinden dolayı o dostluk da bozulacak korkusuyla işte oğullarına, ya da ne bileyim kızlarına oğlu almak gibi bir şey talep etmediler diye düşünmekteyim.

H.A.

Gelinim Musevi değil ve çok seviyoruz, o da bizi çok seviyor. Hani toplumlar arası diyorsunuz ya... O da bizim şeylerimize çok saygılı, biz de hani onların bayramlarına çok saygılıyız, karşılıklı çok güzel bir ilişkimiz var.

K.S.

Tabi, tabi. Hiç bizim için bir ayrıcalık yok yani, onlar [ailedeki Müslüman gelin ve damatlar] bizim canımızı ciğerimiz, kendi evlatlarımız... Zaten hayat boyunca beraber olduk biz, hiç kopmadık ki. Bizim vatanımız burası işte anlatıyorum.... Kızım biz Anadoluluyuz yani.... Bizim için hiç fark etmiyor. Şu anda oğlum ya da kızım gelse ve mutabakatımızı istese, elbette anne baba olarak sorarız araştırırız, ama konu din olduğu zaman pek fazla hassasiyet gösteremeyiz. Dinsel faktör ön planda olamaz. Bütün dünyaya baktığımızda din önemini kaybetti, sadece inanç var. Bir kere önce insan kaldı onu. Türklükten, tövbe Türklüğümüzle bir şey yok da Hıristiyanlık'la Müslümanlık arasında bir fark yok.

H.Ö.

Çocuklarınızın mensubu olduğunuz topluluktan birileriyle evlenmesini tercih eder misiniz?: Hıristiyan olmasını tercih ederim ama %90 olmayacağı belli, çünkü yok çevremizde çok fazla insan. Yarın kızım gelse, ben karşı çıkmam, ama tercihim Hıristiyan olması, çünkü din anlaşmazlığı oluyor, kiliseye mi gitsin, camie mi gitsin, nikah kilisede mi olsun, camide mi olsun, çocuklar nereye gitsin bir sürü sorun olur. Ama var, erkek kardeşim bir Müslüman'la evli mesela, Alevi bir kızla evli, gayet de mutlular, bir problem yok. ... Valla ben Alevileri daha modern buluyorum.

K.G.

E sonra bizim gelin, iki gelin de Müslüman. ... Şöyle bir durum oldu, mesela tanıştırmak için ilk önce küçük oğlum evlendi, sonra büyük evlendi. Baba böyle böyle şey yapıyorum dedi, getireceğim dedi. Tabi oğlum dedim. Şimdi hemen ben kendi kızımın yerine koydum, dedim ki benim kızım böyle bir duruma gitti, karşı taraftan, erkek tarafının annesi babası itiraz etti, benim kızım orada ne duruma düşer yani. ne duruma düşer. Onun için yani.. benim bir sıkıntım şöyle oldu mesela, ben kendi dinimden almış olsaydım, daha rahat hareket ederdim, şimdi daha efendi olmam icap ediyor, demesinler ki yani kızlarına, yani siz gittiniz de bizim dinden evlenmediniz bak kayınvaliden şöyle, kayınbaban böyle, yani bir, onlara bir laf gelmesin yani. Daha dikkat ederim böyle. Mesela diyelim ki, şeyler küçük oğlumun gelini, yani hanımı, onlar Hacı Bektaş'lı. Alevi. ... Babası. Çok efendi, ya ailece dün bizim evde bir cenaze vardı. Yani bir hafta evvel bir arkadaşımızı kaybettik. Ondan sonra dün, onlar da köydeydi bizim dünürler, cenazeye gelemediler. Dün baş sağlığına geldiler, iki araba geldiler yani. Kızı, onlar da, mesela dedi ki biz dün ya işte şu gelir, bu gelir, bu evde oturur falan, ben dedim ki bunlar evde hiç biri durmaz, hani üç kız var, bir tanesi de İstanbul'da Maliye'de, yani kim var kim yok, iki araba gelmişlerdi yani, o kadar şeyler yani, efendi. Şimdi ben Ağustos ayında köylerine gittik, yani benim küçük oğlum baba dedi hadi gidiyoruz dedi.... Emin olun ben orada, Ağustos ayında gömlek kravat taktım gezdim köyde yani, ve dünür de mesela beni aldı, benim dünürüm diye bütün akrabalara gezdirdi yani. Hem konuşmama dikkat ettim, hem giyinmeme dikkat ettim, hem şeyime dikkat ettim, hani gelmesin böyle gelinlerime bir söz yani. o bakımdan, hani tabi biz onlara ne yapıyorsak, onlar da karşılığını bize yapıyorlar yani. onlar da o kadar efendiler yani, çocuklar öyle. ... Hiçbir sorun, hiçbir sorun yok. Sonra bir de bu, hani dinlerde falan biz burada doğup büyüdüğümüz için, hiçbir sorun yok yani.

B.T.

Yani benim çok arkadaşlarım, Müslümanlarla evli hala kardeş gibiyiz, yeriz içeriz otururuz, hiç yani ne onlar bize, ne biz onlara ne kötü gözle bakmışızdır, hanımları kardeşimizdir, hepsi sarılır öperiz böyle, hoştur sohbetlerimiz, hiç öyle kötü bir günümüz olmadı şimdiye kadar, olmaz da.

L.N.

Senelik bir şey isterlerdi, bir yardım isterlerdi, falan o şekilde gidiyordu. Sonra bir şey, bir adet vardır Yahudi dininde, işte namaza gidildiği zaman eğer kendisi ölmüşlerinin ruhuna bir Fatiha gibi bir şey okutacaksa onu davet ederler kürsüye, o namazı yapar sonunda da gönülünden geldiği gibi bağışta bulunur. Bu bir adet haline gelmiş, herkes mutlaka bir bağışta bulunur. Ya falan şeye dönük olarak, der ki "şu işe harcamalıdır", ya genel olarak herkese harcamak üzere "elli milyon bağışladım, yüz milyon bağışladım" diye bitirir. O bir yerde birikir, vakıf gibi ve sinagogun masraflarına, orda hizmet veren adamların aylıklarına falan kullanılır. Eskiden beri vardı ama şimdi mekanizma işlemediği için sanıyorum pek olmaz. Bir de yıllık mesela şimdi büyüklerimiz, dedem falan tanıdığımndan beri, çocukluğumdan beri sinagogda sabit yerler vardır, sıralar vardır, bir yeri var, o onun yeri, ama her, o yer için her sene o bir, bir şey öder, gönülden, ama herkes derki işte şerefiyle mütenasip, işte o zaman ki parayla on milyon, on, on lira verseniz büyük para o zaman için, şimdiki on milyon gibi. Herkes kendi yerini bilir. Öyle şeyler vardı yani o da bir gelir sayılırdı. Sabit yerler için, etraftakiler. Bir de ortada serbest yerler var, isteyen gelir, istediği yere oturur. Tabi bütün bunlar ufak gelirler. ... Cenazede tabi, cenazede de sabit olan bir ücretler verilirdi herhalde. Zaten bu olmasa ayakta duramazlar. Başka bir gelirleri yok ki, nereden, devlet yardım edecek değil ki. Cemaat kendisi ihtiyaçları kadar, kendi işini kendi görür. Dediğim gibi kapalı bir cemaat mutlaka kendi içinde bir yardımlaşma olacak. Zenginler de utanma belası, mahcup olmamak için biraz kesenin ağzını ister istemez açar da böyle yürür işler.

H.A.

O bizim başkanıydı burada Ankara'da. Yani cemaatin önde gelen isimlerinden. Yani herhangi bir problemde onlara müracaat ediliyordu ve onların lafı dinlenir. Mesela iki aile arasında bir problem oldu değil mi, derhal ... Beylere gidilir, hani Birleşmiş Milletler hani Kofi Anan gibi böyle anında çözüm getirilir, çünkü onların şeyleri çok önemliydi yani hani fikirleri, düşünceleri çok büyük saygı duyulurdu, yani onlar "lütfen bu sorunu halledin" dediği anda akan sular durur.

N.E.

O haham bir ara kafayı yedi herhalde bizim burada, bize İbranice öğretmeye karar verdi. Biz pazarları, Pazar sabahları şeye giderdi.. Sinagoga giderdik. Bize İbranice öğretecekti. A. da giderdi, ben de giderdim, minibüse doluşup giderdik, ama ben galiba 8-9 yaşındaydım. A. daha ileri kurdaydı, ilk

önce şimdi o, o da İbranice şeydir de bir ...Bizimkiler de gönderdiler bizi, bilmiyorum şimdi, tekrar dönüp bir sormak lazım niye gönderdiniz diye. ...Ben sanırım bir altı ay filan gittim, hatta A. da belki, A. benden daha çok gitti, tam hatırlamıyorum ama, sonra da zaten gitmedik bir daha. Sonra da zaten haham da ayrıldı Ankara'dan. Yani haham artık, ondan sonra da sürekli bir haham gelmedi galiba. ... Kaç çocuk olduğunu hatırlamıyorum, ama A. ile ben aynı sınıfta değildik, yani demek ki en az otuz kırk olabilir, çocuk olarak.... Sinagoga gidiyorduk, işte şarkı markı söylüyorduk bir şeyler, öyle bir şeyler de var.

H.A.

Ama şimdi ben çok duyuyorum yani hani Türk ailelerde de hastanede falan hemen yaptırıyorlarmış sünneti, yani öyle 8-9 yaşında değil mi herhalde olmasından iyidir küçük yaşta olması... Ama o kadar da pek kalmadı herhalde, özellikle hani modern ailelerde ben çok duyuyorum hemen hastanede yaptırıyorlar.

S.O.

Sizin imamlarınızla kıyasladığımız zaman çok farklı bir mesafeniz var, ne bileyim mesela Alevi Sünni meselelerinden dolayı büyük olaylarımız var onun olduğu yere o gitmez, onun olduğu yere o gitmez falan. bakın burası bir Katolik Kilisesi, ama İstanbul'dan Ermeni Patriği geldiği zaman, Pederimiz açar kiliseyi, yapılacak yani ne neredeyse gösterir, burada ayin yapılır, Pederimiz de eşlik eder, her an bu kapı hepimize açıktır.

H.Ö.

Annem kilisede bir çok kişiye vaftiz annesi olmuştur, Müslümanlıktan Hıristiyanlığa geçenlere. Bunlardan bir tanesi şimdi papaz oldu, 7-8 sene önce geçti Hıristiyanlığa. Kilisede 15-20 tane vardır Müslüman.

Rahip

Ama niçin yabancı rahipler geliyorlar, çünkü Türkiye'de Ermeni, Süryani tüm gruplardan sıfır genç rahip var maalesef. Özellikle geleneksel Hıristiyan ailelerde sıfır.o de zor çünkü Türkiye'de bir din okulu, onlar için üniversite fakülte gibi yok. Birkaç genler bir tanesi Antakyalı, bir tane Mersinli var, o kadar, Müslüman ailelerden gelen ve vaftiz aldılar ve şimdi İlahiyat Avrupa'da okuyorlar ve Türkiye'ye dönmek istiyorlar.

K.S.

Bayram evinden evvel ziyarete gelir rahiplerimiz, dua ederler, duasız yemeğe başlamayız, duasız kapıdan çıkmayız, duasız yatağa girmeyiz. Yani bu örflerimiz, adetlerimiz bizim huzurumuzdur, onun için mümkün olduğu kadar kiliseye her Pazar geliriz, bu arada bazı günlerimiz dini günlerimiz vardır onda da geliriz.

B.E.

Tabi bayramdan sonra hepimizi dolaşırdı, hani evimizi okurdu, yemeğe davet ederdik yemeklerimizde bulunurdu, ayrı bir sıcaklığımız vardı, hastalarda nasıl sizde de okunur, hastalarımız oldu mu gelir okurdu, inancımız mesela kominyondur, ölmeden önce mutlaka almasını isteriz, o kominyonu vermeye çalışırdı. Öyle, yani her şey duayla o da öyle.

B.E.

O şekilde dağıldık. Ama tabi bu akrabasak gidip gelmelerimiz hiç eksik olmadı. Zaten gidip geliyoruz. Genelde belli günlerde kilisede ayinden sonra aşağıda kokteyllerimiz var, birbirimizi görme imkanımız var. E düğüne, ölüye fazlaca saygımız sonsuz, oralarda buluşuyoruz, yani gene de yaşlılarımızı kaybetsek de biz gençler birbirimizi tanıyoruz.

S.O.

Mesela sizlerin Mevlit okutursunuz siz, ölülerinizi arkasından ya da işte yeni doğan çocuğunuzun arkasından falan, biz bunun için kilisede o gördüğümüz o salonu kullanırız. Ve hem Müslüman eş dostumuzu çağırırız, gerek ayine katılırlar ondan sonra o aşağıda toplantımıza katılırlar, hem de o gün kiliseye gelen herkes davetlidir. Ve bizim herkesi bir arada olduğu bir ortam yani, tümüyle sosyallik oraya ait. Onun dışında toplanma, gezmece, tozmaca o ayrı. ... O tabi ki çok anlaştığımız insanlarla devam ediyor.

K.S.

Dünya şartları ağırlaştı tabi. O zaman mesela biraz evvel söylediğimiz gibi yalnız Ankara'nın mahdut yerlerindeydik. Mesela bir bayram günü ben kalktığım zaman Hacı Doğan'la, Tabakhane'yi bir dolaştın mı bütün tanıdıklar, akrabalar, bayram biterdi. Ama şimdi imkanı var mı, Keçiören'e mi gideceksin, Aydınlık'a mı gideceksin, Çayyolu'na mı gideceksin, her yerde var. E tabi ki biraz, biraz dünya şartları değişti, o kadar çok bol zamanımız yok, bir güne de yetiştiremezsin, iki güne de yetiştiremezsin...

S.O.

Bizim mahallede o çok şenlik oluyor, çünkü herkes bizi kıskanıyor, çünkü biz dört bayram kutluyoruz. Yani hem sizlerin bayramında evimizin kapısı açıktır... Ondan sonra, bir de bizim bayramda, hatta onlar tabi bizim bayramımız televizyonlarda şimdi son derece gündemde, ondan öncesinde değildi, annemi sıkıştırdıkları, "aman ne olur söyle, arabalar çoğalınca anlıyoruz sizin evde bir şey var, onun için" hani "gelmek istiyoruz". Onlar da bize bayramlarda gene sizin bayramlarınıza gösterdiğiniz saygı çerçevesinde giyinirler kuşanırlar, kimisi çocuklarıyla, kimisi eşi görevden geldiyse eşliyle birlikte gelir, özellikle çocuklar Paskalya'yı çok severler, S. Ablanın Paskalya.. şeyini yumurtasını alacağız diye gelirler, dolayısıyla biz o konuda son derece hani huzurlu ve de mutlu bir bayram dönemi geçiriyoruz. ...Ben 400den fazla yumurta boyuyorum; Allah'a çok şükür tüketecek kadar dostlarım var. ...Çoğu Müslüman. ... 400 kişi tabi ki ilk gün için gelmiyor, ama bir hafta boyunca gelen kişilere dağıtılıyor. Artı, ben burada çalıştığım süre içerisinde ve daha önceki iş hayatımda da çalıştığımda gelemeyen arkadaşlara da ben getiriyorum. Yani bayram olduğu için mesela buraya geliyorlar beni kutlamaya o zaman ellerine yumurtayı veriyorum gönderiyorum. Çok keyifli oluyor. Çünkü bir tane almak zorunda değilsiniz, yani o rengarenk olduğu için bir sarı, bir kırmızı, bir yeşil, bir mavi ne kadar isterseniz alabilirsiniz.

B.E.

Çevremizde de Müslüman komşularımız pek çoktu, onlarla da çok iyi anlaşır, çok iyi sevişirdik; onların bayramları olduğunda biz onlara bayramlaşmaya giderdik, bizim Paskalyamızda, Noel'imizde onlar bize bayramlaşmaya gelirlerdi, hatta bütün arkadaşlarım anneme gelip "Mari Teyze zaman Paskalya çöreği yiyeceğiz, ne zaman yumurta yiyeceğiz" derdi, babam kazanlarla yumurta kaynatırdı ki, "hiçbir çocuğu geri etmeyeceksin yumurta vereceksin" diye.

B.E.

Her şeyimizle çok rahatız, yerine göre kilisemize de gideriz, örf ve adetlerimizi de yaparız. Bunun böyle olduğunu da, bunun böyle olduğunu da bütün konu komşumuz da bilir, yani bugün bizim bayramımız, ya da biz oruçtayız. Biliyorsunuz bizim oruçlarımız farklı, mesela hep zeytinyağlı yeriz, topraktan çıkan şeyleri yeriz. Mesela ben günlerime filan gitmekten hiçbir şeyimi eksik etmem, ama benim arkadaşlarım hepsi bilirler, bugün B. gelecek, o mutlaka oruçtur, onun yiyeceği bir şey yapalım zeytinyağlı diye mutlaka bana göre de bir şey hazırlarlar.

K.S.

Benim evim ayrıca baba evi, beş kardeşin içerisinde baba evi, onun için, şu anda sülalenin en büyük erkeği ben kaldım, haliyle bunlar yapılıyor. Yalnız Paskalya ve diğer bayramımız, Noel bayramımız sizin Kurban ve Ramazan bayramından tebrikat anlamında hiçbir farkı yok, aynıyız yani, aynı şekilde ziyaret edilir, aynı şekilde.. Çok yakınlarımız akşam yemeğe de kalabilir, sizde de öyle Kurban'da ben gittiğim yerde çok yerde yemeğe kalırım, çok yerde kalırım yemeğe yani Kurban Bayramı... Yani, sonra mesela benim bayramda hiç evim kapanmaz. ... Katiyen yapmayız. Bayramlarda tatile gitmeyiz yani. ... Herkesin evi kapanmaz, büyükler umumiyetle evde kalır, gençler dolaşır. ... Eğer bir de bu adetimiz olmasa fevkalade kötü olacak, yani insanlar arasında birbirini, o mesela şimdi maalesef böyle bir çığır açıldı, bayramlarda... Hak vermiyor musun, hak veriyorum ama gönlüm istemiyor. Çalışan hanımlar var, Müslüman arkadaşlarım, tam bayramda göreceksin, kırk yılda bir görüyor, hadi benim için sorun değil, ama onun yakınları var, veya onun gitmesi icap eden büyükleri var, hadi kapatıyor Bodrum'a gidiyor, kapatıyor Amasra'ya gidiyor. Hiç sevmiyorum, zaten kopuğuz, büsbütün kopuyoruz. Yani bir bayramda sevdiğimi, saydığımı, saydığımı, yaşlımı ziyaret etmezsem, ne zaman edeceğim. Zaman yok zaten yani, devir değişti, onun için bazı şeyleri rötuşa girmesi lazım.

B.E.

Bizim işte kilise nikahımız anlatılıyor, kıyafetlerimiz, şapkalarımız hepsi anlatılıyor, yani kötü bir şey yok gayet güzel anlatıyorlar, ve bunlar şey, Türkiye'nin Mozaikleri diyerek anlatılan bir yazı dizisi, her şey çok güzel. Bizim de hoşumuza gitti, hatta sakladık birer gazete de.

K.S.

Fakat bizimle Müslümanların arasında bir nüans farkı var. Biz yemeği götürdüğümüz zaman cenaze evine mutlaka kendimiz de yeriz yemeği, biz de kalırız. Hatta hatta çok yakınımızı amcamızı, kardeşimizi ve o cenazenin ilgili olduğu, yakınlık derecesine göre biz de mesela üç kişi beş kişi on kişi götürürüz, içki de içeriz orada yani. Anlatabiliyor muyum. Ve bu artık, 20 gün de sürer, 10 gün de sürer, 40 gün de sürer. ... Aynı şekilde mesela Müslüman dostlarımız da bir baklava olsun tepsi tepsi, börek olsun, onları da getirirler. Ama onlar umumiyetle bırakıp gitmek isterler.... Yani aramızda öyle bir farkımız var.

'1'

Biz de şimdi Müslüman komşulara falan öyle olunca yemek gönderiyoruz. Onlar da öyle. Ama biz hep beraber yani, tamamen sofraya kurulur ve orada yemek yenir, ölünün evinde bütün götürülenlerin de yapmak istedikleri budur. Bir gün birisi götürür, bir gün başkası.

'1'

Artık yer kalmadığı için üst üste gömülüyor ölümler. Herkes kendi akrabasının üstüne gömüyor. Mezarlık büyük ama Hıristiyanlar için ayrılan alan küçük... Mezarları kırıyorlar. Anne babamın mezarlarında büyük bir haç vardı, onu ve mermer tablayı kırmışlar. Son zamanlarda olmuyor böyle şeyler bekçiler de koruyorlar. Mezarlığın olduğu muhit biraz öyle. Gecekondu, tiner çeken insanlar, eğitimsiz, ana-babasız gibi, o şekil aileler var oralarda. Bekçiler biz de baş edemiyoruz dediler.

B.T.

Ondan sonra mümkün olduğu kadar, işte oradaki o, tabii halkın geçim şeyleri çok kısıtlı, çocuk çok fazla, şimdi çocuklar atılıyorlar duvarlardan su getiriyorlar mezarlara işte. Daha çok elimden geldiği kadar onlara işte giderken bisküvi götürüyorum, meyve suları götürüyorum, işte bazısı diyor ki, ayakkabım yok amca filan diyor. Ayakkabı işte evde böyle az giyilmiş ayakkabılardan filan yardım maksadıyla onları götürüyorum. Ondan sonra işte pantolon eskisini, eşofman eskisini, onları çünkü ihtiyaçları var orada o çocukların, onların, çünkü hakikatten şey, çok fakir bir semt, çocuk çok fazla ... Oraya geliyorlar zaten, işte su dökmek için geliyorlar, ufak bir paralar veriyorum onlara harçlık olarak, ondan sonra hem onları da mutlu etmek biliyor musunuz...

S.O.

Ben babamın mezarında böyle bir şeyle karşılaşınca hakikatten içim acıdı yani, biz yeni yaptırmışız acımızın taze olmasını bırakın, orada bir mezar taşı kardeşim ne istiyorsun. Ama tabii ki bunun yapılan şuurun da ne olduğunu biliyorum, o da önemli değil. Üzüldüğüm nokta bunu yapabilecek güçteyse bu insan belirli bir yaşa gelmiştir. Yani bu insanın en az yaşı 18'dir. Ve bu devletin bir askeri olacak, bu devletin emanet edildiği yeni nesilden olacak. Bu kültürde sıkışmış olmasından kaynaklanan acı beni üzdü.

'1'

Bankalarda, vergi dairesinde, doktor, hastanede 'nereden geldiniz' diye soruyorlar, biz bir yerden gelmedik, biz hep buradaydık. Yakın zamanda bir vergi dairesinde memur 'İspanyol musunuz, İspanya'dan mı geldiniz' diye sordu, 'ne münasebet efendim niye İspanyol olalım'. ... Yabancılar göre biz Türk'üz, Türk Hıristiyan diyorlar; yerli Müslümanlar pek kabul etmiyorlar. ... İsmimizi duyunca, ismimizden hemen 'nereden geldiniz' diye soruyorlar. 'Nereden geldiniz' sorusu acayip, Hıristiyanlığın temeli burada, Anadolu'da, bütün Anadolu'da böyle. ... Cahil olsa neyse kültürlü olanlar da soruyor.

K.G.

E benim şimdi hanımımın da ismini değiştirdim ben.... O da neden şey yaptı. Şimdi ben burada çalıştığım için, maliye işlerine, mesela o zaman muhasebeci bize hep getiriyordu şeyleri, evrakları, bizim hanım götürüp yatırıyordu. E şimdi hep devlet dairelerine gittiğinde isim hep yabancı olarak şey oluyordu. Çoğu da hem söyleyemiyor, hem yazamıyor yani. ha bu bakımdan, yoksa hiçbir sorun olmaz.

V.T.

Hem öfkeliyim hem de hoşgörülüym; öfkeliyim çünkü başımdan çok şeyler geçti, hoşgörülüym çünkü bunları normal karşıyorum, bazen” diyor. Mesela benim ismim bu değil, ismimi değiştirdim ben. Soyadım da bu değil, on babam değiştirmiş, ama ismi ben değiştirdim. Ben kendi ismimi istiyorum. O dönem herkes ismini değiştirdi. Çünkü var olmak için gizlenmek zorundaydın. Şimdi artık öyle değil, mesela ben kızımın ismini [...] koydum. Türkiye’de yaşananları “bazen” normal karşılamamın sebebi dünyanın her tarafında böyle şeyler yaşanıyor, Fransa’da, bir Katolik ülkede bir Müslüman olarak yaşamak da, Türkiye’de bir Ermeni olarak yaşamak da zor. Onun için bir karara vardım, kendi dininle aynı dinden bir ülkede yaşayacaksın.

A.T.

Ondan sonra bir de hakkakten, bazı uydurma isimlerimiz de bazı oluyor. Mesela bazısı, komşu, arkadaşlar bazı Gazanfer derlerdi bana. Gazanfer aşağı, Gazanfer yukarı. ... İşte öyle dakma isim, arkadaşlar, onun için. Ondan sonra dükkanda mesela çalışıyorum ben. Atölyede çalışıyorum, üst katta Zeynel şey, müşteriyle konuşuyor ya konuşurken işte “gavurlar şöyle, bilmem neler böyle” “Gazanfer Usta! Gel, aşağı gel iş var”, ama “Hıristiyanlar şöyle...” “A. Usta! Aşağı gelir misin?” yani diyeceğim yoksa her tarafta ‘A’. Bir şey gördün mü? Bir şey görmedim, ne eziyet gördüm, ne bir şey gördüm.

E.Ş.

Tabiki düşündüğümüz oluyor. Bizlerin isimleri E. ve F. iken kendi mağazamızı açmadan önce zaten küçüklüğümüzden beri takma ad gibi sürekli peşimizden gelen E. ve F. olarak isimlerimiz değiştirdik ve çokta faydasını gördük. Çünkü çok eğitilmiş bir millet olmadığımızdan sadece sizin isimlerinize bakarak sizi yargılayabilen kişilerle karşılaşabiliyorsunuz. Tamam biz Hıristiyanız ama bunu illada herkese aleni bir şekilde sürekli ilan etmemize gerek olduğunu düşünmüyorum. İki dükkân yanımızdaki ermenden mal almamak için bizimde tabiki müslüman olmadığımızı bilmediğinden ve bunuda açık açık söyleyerek bizden alışveriş yapan kişileride gördük. İsmimizi değiştirerek bizler dinimizden veya kişiliğimizden ödün mü vermiş olduk, tabiki Hayır, sadece biz hıristiyanız annemizde ermenidir diye insanlara bahsetmenin bir faydasının olacağını düşünmedik. Halen de düşünmüyoruz.

L.N.

Kendi din hüviyetinizi ön plana çıkarmayacaksınız. Onu ön plana çıkarmazsanız bence pek problem olmuyor, yani daha kolay kabul ediyor Sünni topluluk. Öbür türüsünde sizi yabancıyorlar. Her zaman sizi yabancı, yahut da size itimat etmiyorlar, daha az itimat ediyorlar.

‘1’

Hakaret olarak değil de, mesela komşularımız laf arasında, bize değil de Avrupa’dakiler için “elin gavuru” diyor, Gavur ne demek Hıristiyan, ben de Hıristiyan’ım, bize de dokunuyor yani. ... Bir yandan Avrupa Birliğine girmeye uğraşılıyor, bir yandan “gavurlar” deniyor; öyle gider bu değişmez.

V.T.

Zaten ilk orada [... ilkokulu] anladım Hıristiyan olduğumu. Çocuklar telden haç yapıp getirmişler, sen buna tap, buna tap sen diyerek etrafıma toplandılar, ben anlamadım, hemen hocaya gittim “ne oluyor, niye böyle söylüyorlar, neden telden haça tapacağım diye sordum” diye sordum ve ağlayarak eve gittim, babama sordum, “ben neyim ki, niye böyle söylediler, niye telden haça tapacağım”. Babam da “sen çoğunluk gibi Müslüman değilsin, sen Hıristiyan’sın” dedi. Bilmiyorsun ki Hıristiyan ne demek, Müslüman ne demek, çocuksun daha. Babam bunun üzerine “merak etme ilkokulu bitirince seni Fransız okuluna göndereceğim, orada rahat edersin” dedi ve ben ilkokulu bitirince Saint Joseph’e gittim diyor. Bu sebeple kız kardeşimi de İtalyan okuluna verdi.

S.O.

Resim dersiydi, ve resim dersinde de bize şey yaptırdı hoca, yap... konu verdi, “Türk bayrağı, Türk askeri”, ya 23 Nisan, ya 29 Ekim tam hatırlamıyorum yani hangi döneme geldiğini ama konumuz buydu, bu yapılacaktı, ve birinci seçilecek. Sınıftan birinci seçilecek, sonra okuldan birinci seçilecek, sonra da böyle bir resim yarışmasına katılınacaktı. Böyle bir duyuru vardı... Ben de çok güzel bir resim yaptım, Türk bayrağını tutan bir asker yaptım. Çok da beğendim yani çok da güzel oldu, sınıfımız birinci olacak bu çok önemli okulda. ... Sonrasında sınıfa geldim bakıyorum diğer arkadaşlarıma, yani en güzel resim benim yaptığım resim şimdi. Ama bununla yetinmedim gittim

diğer sınıflara da baktım, resimleri nasıl, çünkü diğer sınıfta da mahalleden diğer arkadaşlarım var falan. Ay bakıyorum, hakikatten hocanın seçtiği resim, sınıfımızı birinci yapacak bir resim değil, onda sonra geldim hocaya dedim ki, “niye benim resmimi beğenmediniz” dedim, tekrar kağıtların arasından çıkarttı “beğenmedim” dedi, “hayır ama neden” dedim yani bana de ki, desin istiyorum ki hani “renği güzel olmamış” oysaki evdeki kırmızı bayrağı çıkartıp aynı renği bulacağım diye boyadım şeyi, ne o, mürekkep emen kağıt var ya onu boyadım, aynı renk olsun diye, hazırlarında bulamadığım için. Hani çok emek harcadım, çok da güzel bir şey çıktı ortaya niye birinci olmayalım. “Hayır” dedi, attı şeye, “ama neden” diye ben sorunca bana verdiği cevap “sen bir Hıristiyan olarak bu kadar güzel resim çizemezsin” dedi, “bu kadar güzel Türk bayrağı çizemezsin” dedi. O zaman dinimi bir engel olduğunu öğrendim işte, o zaman ilk, hayatla o zaman karşılaştım.

T.T.

Ben de özel okulda okudum ve çevrem asla bana farklı davranmadı. 25 senedir görüştüğüm okul arkadaşlarım var. Beni ben olduğum için seviyorlar. Devlet okulunda bu çok zor. Önyargı hep oluyor.